CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Concept of Literature review

A framework of the literature is provided in this chapter. This framework was created using the existing literature on the work-family balance, work-family conflict and locus of control. The framework serves two fundamental purposes. First, it provides structure to the literature review. The review uses the framework as a guide as it proceeds further. Second, the framework suggests questions that might be answered through this study. It requires review of the very large body of literature in order to map the field, formulate hypotheses to be tested in the empirical work and develop a clear conceptual framework for the research.

In literature review, the researcher will explore the concepts of work-family balance, work-family conflict and locus of control in depth. Various aspects of work-family balance will be explored i.e. history, components, factors contributing, outcomes and work-family management techniques. Similarly factors contributing to conflict and outcomes of work-family conflict will be explored. Various aspects of locus of control in terms of internals vs externals, variables impacting locus of control and various scales measuring locus of control will be explored.

2.2 Concept of Work-Family Balance

Work-family balance has gained tremendous momentum across the globe, but despite its importance, the concept has not been studied scrupulously. The term “work-family balance was coined in 1986, and today it has become a term that is used almost everyday. One might feel that his/her life is “out of balance” and may be confused as to what efforts to be taken to balance it.
The dual-earner families face much work-family conflict than single-earner families due to interference of work and family domains. The dividing line between work and free time is not distinct as some people draw more life satisfaction from their work than from free time activities (Fisher and Layte, 2004). Work-family balance is not just about working fewer hours, but it is about how effectively you divide the time proportionately between work and family domains. Managing work-family boundaries also play an important role in balancing work and family domains. For e.g., employees in the Unite States prefer an integration of work and family domains through permeable boundaries, whereas employees in India tend to separate work and family domains through solid boundaries (Poster and Prasad, 2005). Padhi (2010) in her paper gave new concept to non-work role. She referred non-work life as extra-organisational life and identified seven critical predictors (targets, performance, promotions, incentives, work pressure emotional life and leisure time available) of extra-organisational life.

Work-family balance has become multi-faceted in its approach to include: how long people work (flexibility in the number of hours worked), when people work (flexibility in the arrangement of hours), where people work (flexibility in the place of work), developing people through training to balance their work and non-work domains better (Maxwell, 2005). As per Senécal, Vallerand, & Guay, (2001) balancing work and family demands depend on how individuals allocate their time to various life domains.

Caproni (1997) views balance to be beyond reach because of unpredictability of life and internal ambivalence towards social life. She says that framing balance as desirable goal is difficult due to two reasons. First balance advises to achieve the unachievable thus creating frustration when it is not achieved and second emphasis on balance creates an “idealized image” of oneself. She advocates that even if life were predictable, human beings are incapable of systematic and rational planning.
2.2.1 History of work-family balance in India

The term “Work-family balance” was coined in 1986 in response to the growing concerns of people and organizations that work is taking a toll on their family life. In India, the work-family issue is in tandem with the social and institutional context of the country. In India support for work and family can be categorized into two types: i) non-institutional that includes support from parents, in-laws, husband and paid domestic support and ii) institutional which is provided by government in its various important policies like Maternity Benefit Act, 1961, The Factories Act, 1948 and the Sexual Harassment at The Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act and Rules, 2013 that addresses sexual harassment in the workplace. But these government policies are poorly implemented by the organizations due to lack of stringent laws.

There are no laws passed that include right to share family responsibilities, rights of part-time workers, and rights of home workers. The Indian government has also not implemented various measures undertaken by ILO in these areas.

The period of mid 1990s to mid 2000s saw sheer liberalization of Indian economy. Researchers began to look for career oriented women and the possibility of men’s roles in transition in a traditional Indian society (Parikh and Shah, 1994). During 1995 – 2000 India saw ITES sector boom where organizations adopted organizational culture and practices of the developed countries. The workers were expected to work 24*7*365 days of the year. To safeguard the health and productivity of workers, organizations started offering various facilities within their premises like gymnasiums, day-care facilities, laundry facilities, canteen facilities, and transport facilities (Devi, 2002). Psychologists offer a myriad of solutions to alleviate stress arising from balancing both work and family like yoga, meditation, jogging, swimming, labour saving devices at home, easy to cook meal recipes, seeking help from parents/in-laws.

In India the response of organizations to work-family issues has been limited due to various reasons like a culture that does not sanction power to women, a notion that the joint Indian family is always better to provide support than nuclear or non-family culture and low rate of organized work-force participation among women than men. The most developed work-family
programs advents from public sector like reduced hours, career break leave, parental leave, sickness leave. In the private sector, the rigorous work-family programs are offered in ITES and IT multinational companies\textsuperscript{2}.

### 2.2.2 Defining Work-Family Balance

There has been much debate over the formal definition of work-family balance due to existence of vast literature on WFB. In many reviews work-family balance is not explicitly defined. Kanter’s seminal book (1977), “Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy”, brought the issue of work-family balance to the arena of research and organizations. Living a balanced life represents empathy with and attention to what is valued and given priority in life.

Different researchers have given different definition of work-family balance. As per Gallos (1989), a ‘balanced life’ is a theme where work and family are mutually reinforcing with family experiences as part of what workers bring to enrich their contributions to work and organizations and vice versa. According to Clark (2000), work-family balance is all about achieving satisfaction and excellent functioning at work and at home with a minimal role conflict.

Other recent definitions have emerged in literature. As per Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw (2003), work-family balance is the extent to which an individual is equally involved in and equally satisfied with his or her work and family roles. They have given three components of work–family balance which are as follows: 1) Time balance: Time devoted to work and family roles in equal proportion, 2) Involvement balance: Psychological involvement in work and family roles in equal balance and 3) Satisfaction balance: The level of satisfaction with work and family roles in equal proportion.

As per Grzywacz and Carlson (2007), “work-family balance refers to the extent to which an individual is meeting negotiated role-related expectations in both the work and family domains”. Grzywacz, Carlson and Zivnuska (2009) have clearly demarcated work-family balance from work-family conflict and that balance contributes to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and family satisfaction. They have defined work-family balance as the “accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains”.

As per Greenblat (2002), work-family balance is described as absence of unacceptable levels of conflict between work and non-work demands and achieving work-family balance depends on obtaining and managing sufficient resources that are most important to people. The resources important in work-family balance are (Greenblat, 2002):

a) Temporal resources – Provides adequate time to an individual to do whatever he/she feels like (Telework, multitasking)

b) Financial resources – Provides money to buy goods/services to an individual to improve life satisfaction and quality (Budgeting)

c) Control – Provides ability to select when and how to create important outcomes (Empowerment, flexible scheduling, flexitime).

As per Ransome (2007), the entire activity of an individual is divided into three realms: work, life and recreation. Work-family balance is seen as a response to these three realms of activity and achieving balance across the three. As per Lewis, Gambles and Rapoport (2007), work-family balance is characterized in terms of workplace flexibility. As per Narang (2011), work-family balance is not an equal balance between work and life, but it is achieving harmony among different roles, at different stages by gaining more control on working time.
The researcher has defined work-family balance as follows: “An individual’s attempt to do justice with both work and family roles that are shared by his /her partner or done individually on a daily basis”.

Every individual whether successful or not get the same 24 hours of time daily. Such concepts are useful as they simplify the work-family interface for organizations. The surge in stress, conflict, turnover and job dissatisfaction has helped to gain more insight into the concept of work-family concept. People are inherently ambivalent towards their feelings, goals and choices irrespective of whether the circumstance is home, work or social environment (Caproni, 1997: 52).

The intrusion of work roles into family roles have diverted attention of researchers to focus on both personal and professional spheres of life. The prevailing corporate atmosphere poses several new challenges and problems for employees like constant change, wide variety of job responsibilities and uncertainties with increasing pressure from the top level management to increase productivity (Swamy, 2007: 22-27) As a result of these changes in the internal and external environments the balance between the two realms of life of the employees, i.e., work and home gets disturbed bringing in dichotomy and confusion in individual’s life. The study of working hours, additional working hours, non-standard working hours and commuting hours will give new dimension to the concept of work-family balance.
Table 2.1
Different phases of work-family balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Changes in work and family roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Communal living in early</td>
<td>Entire family engaged in work for survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Pre industrialization</td>
<td>All family members irrespective of age or gender engaged in productive labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>After industrialization</td>
<td>Separation of life spheres into paid and domestic work; introduction of ‘living wage’, ‘family’ and ‘labour laws’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>1960s – 1970s</td>
<td>Women participation increased significantly thereby defining work roles in a new way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Mid 1990s to mid 2000s</td>
<td>More women of all ages into workforce including mothers; transitional role of men; increase in work—family balance facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>2005 onwards</td>
<td>Introduction of family-friendly practices in all occupations; employers more conscious about well-being of their employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Table depicts changes in work and family roles with the evolution of time.

---

2.2.3 Components of Work-Family Balance

Literature gives evidence of how different researchers have given views on various components of work-family balance. Marks and MacDermid (1996) gave two components of work-family balance: 1) Positive – full engagement in multiple roles and 2) Negative: full disengagement in every role. Work-family balance can also be studied in terms of inputs and outputs. As per Kirchmeyer (2000), input component to balance include personal resources ie. time, attention, involvement and commitment that are applied to both work and family roles. The output component to balance includes satisfaction (Kirchmeyer, 2000; Clark, 2000) that an individual experiences in work and family roles.

There are three components of work–family balance which are as follows: 1) Time balance - time devoted to work and family roles in equal proportion, 2) Involvement balance - psychological involvement in work and family roles in equal balance and 3) Satisfaction balance - the level of satisfaction with work and family roles in equal proportion (Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw, 2003: 513)

Frone (2003) gave four components to work-family balance: work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict, work-to-family facilitation and family-to-work facilitation. Aryee, Srinivas and Tan (2005) gave conflict and facilitation components of work-family balance. They gave more emphasis on the facilitation component of work-family balance and found job involvement to be positively related and family involvement to be negatively related to work-family facilitation whereas family support was significantly related to family-work facilitation.

Valcour (2007) introduced the concept of satisfaction with work-family balance construct. According to the concept work-family satisfaction has two components. One is cognitive component which involves an appraisal of one’s degree of success in meeting work and family demands while affective component involves a positive feeling resulting from that appraisal.
2.2.4 Constitution of “Good” Work-Family Balance

Many researchers have assumed that work-family balance is equivalent to presence of work-family enrichment or absence of work-family conflict. Similarly failure to achieve work-family balance was significantly associated with low levels of well-being and life satisfaction (Aryee, 1992; Gropel, 2005). Literature advocate that work-family balance was positively related to well-being and quality of life (Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw, 2003: 514-526). As per Gropel (2005), action orientation ameliorated the negative impact of stress on life balance i.e., action orientation buffers the negative effect of stress and helps in balance. People scoring high on affective coping i.e., action-oriented individuals, are more able to maintain time-balance under stressful life events. As per Burke (1988), presence of stress and conflict results in loss of balance.

2.2.5 Factors contributing to evolution of work-family imbalance

Exploring work-family balance and its outcomes will help human resource professionals, counsellors and employers to find ways to improve quality of life. This might help to create family supportive work environment (e.g., flexitime, work from home option, day care facilities) to reduce work-family conflict. For this purpose it is necessary to bring various contributing factors to the forefront. Various factors are as follows:

2.2.5.1 Societal drivers. In Indian system, men has been given the status of prime breadwinner traditionally (Awasthy and Gupta, 2001). But this trend is changing now, with large number of educated, confident women joining the workforce. The reason for this increase in women workforce are increasing consumerism and rise in cost of living, promotion of women literacy rights, equal career opportunities for men and women, more career oriented women opting for late marriage and childbirth, increasing tendency of women to return to work after childbirth, need for dual salary earners and diminishing grounds of male dominated sectors making women entry permeable. The situation of dual salary earners is more intricate in metros and Tier – 1 city than in other cities.
As a result of this there is a growing need for implementing family supportive work environment in the workplace and introducing various employee benefit programs. Uncomfortable working environment can negatively affect efficiency and encourage turnover. Indian companies have also started paying attention to make workplace flexible to help employees balance their work and family. Many multi-national companies (MNCs) and large Indian companies, such as Wipro, Infosys, TCS and HCL have telecommuting policies, flexible working hours, option for a part-time assignment, and job-sharing arrangement to divide the workload. But even then the Indian companies have to go a long way to retain talented employees by balancing their work and life.

2.2.5.2 Available technologies. As per Greenblatt (2002), the advance and sophisticated technology are helping employees to reduce time attributed to work and devote more time on other non-work roles. Emergence of virtual work places and flexiwork patterns like telecommuting; work from home options and gadgets like mobile phones, laptops and internet are helping to cope with work demands better. It is no longer necessary to go to work place now days. But the flip side is that 24 * 7 work environment coupled with modern technologies has given rise to extreme jobs where people can work for 70 to 90 hours per week as work gets accessible all time (Hewlett and Luce, 2006; Subramanian, 2009: 38). Literature provides evidence that work from home options helps in potential way to balance work and family.

2.2.5.3 Personal expectations. As per Greenblatt (2002), people have become very ambitious with myriad personal expectations. They are ready to sacrifice their personal time to meet their goals, e.g., crunching on children time to meet work targets. Further performance driven corporate culture prevents an employee from saying ‘no’ to longer working hours (Subramanian, 2009: 36-37). This human expectation has blurred the boundaries between work and non-work time (Guest, 2002).

2.2.5.4 Global competition. Competition can be both positive as well as negative. It is considered negative because it can create high performance standards leading to negative spillover (White et al., 2003). Globalization coupled with sophisticated technology has opened grounds for 24 * 7 work place. This has resulted in longer working hours and employees are
connected to workplace for longer hours through technology (e.g., internet, cell phones etc). With more global competition the definition of work days has become more blurred. This arouses the need for flexible working conditions.

2.2.5.5 Changing life style. There has been a change in lifestyle preferences among recent generation population. Those individuals born within the range of 1965 - 1979 or “Generation X” population is a group of people who give greater priority in achieving a balance between work and the rest of life; follow non-work time, irrespective of other responsibilities and hence may actively seek employers who offer work-family balance arrangements (Maxwell, 2005). For Gen Y work-family balance means ‘my own space’ throughout the day.

2.2.5.6 Increase in dual income earning family. Traditionally men have been given the status of prime bread earners and women were expected to look after household chores and family. But with more number of educated and confident women entering the workforce, there is a surge in dual salary earning families. As a result of this people has to devote proportional time to multiple roles, especially women have to juggle between work and family domains.

2.2.5.7 Increased pressure from work. The average working hours has been increased in couple of years. In order to complete high targets on time and keep up the slogan of ‘customer satisfaction’, employees are working for longer hours and are under tremendous pressure. The problem worsens when the boss is demanding and unsupportive as well when there is personality-job unfit. Both these conditions decrease an individual’s efficiency and job satisfaction. An individual has to struggle hard to meet the performance with the set standards. Work overload, longer working hours, tight deadlines, financial crisis and large family contributes to arousal of stress among employees. Increasing level of stress lead to low morale, poor productivity, absenteeism, violence in workplace, depression, marital problems, employee burnout etc., (Lockwood, 2003: 4).

2.2.5.8 Changing attitudes, beliefs and values of workforce. As per Guest (2002), Generation ‘X’ population is a group of people born during 1965 – 1979. They vary in attitudes and values in that they are pragmatic, frustrated, informal and technology oriented. Another set
of independent, high-tech and confident people are the ones born during 1980 – 2000 or Generation ‘Y’. Generation X and Y have a greater acceptance of global diversity than previous generation as a result of which their attitudes and values have changed. They look for work-family balance initiatives like flexible work schedule, virtual workplace, part time jobs etc.

2.2.6 Work-family balance across different occupation

In India many youngsters are experiencing early burnout due to overwork and stress and this situation is seen across almost all occupations. Traditionally medical and police profession were infamous for work-family imbalance but now almost all occupations face the brunt of this hazard (Subramanian, 2009: 39). Stress level varies among different occupation. Jobs of doctors, pilots, sales people, BPOs, constructors are highly stressful. Whereas jobs of faculty, government officers, clerks in government sector are less stressful. In Indian context there is tremendous rise in turnover rate, workplace violence, rise in claims due to unhealthy food habits, physical and mental illness and broken homes (Subramanian, 2009: 36). Dual career couples face additional challenges like finding two different positions, tenure, promotion process and advancement opportunities (Kirk and Noel, 2005).

Various researchers have studied myriad of occupation like BPO professionals (Chawla and Sondhi, 2011), police officers (Tremblay et al., 2011), IT professionals (Dash et al., 2012) and teachers (Chawla and Sondhi, 2011; Miryala and Chiluka, 2012). Deery and Jago (2009) studied tourism industry and found that individual differences and family factors influence work-life conflict and that there is greater need for flexible work practices like flexitime, work from home option and paid and unpaid leaves. Miryala and Chiluka (2012) studied education sector both in public and private domain and found that there is a need for formulation and implementation of work-family balance policies. Since flexi-time and work from home are not feasible in education sector, making 5 days work week might help in balancing work and life (Miryala and Chiluka, 2012: 39-45).
2.2.7 Status of work-family balance in Indian scenario

Work-family balance issue in India is not as grim as in West, but many issues are quite similar to those in West. In India joint families are disappearing at a fast pace and nuclear families are burgeoning where both the spouses are going to work. The rise in nuclear families is eventually decreasing the social support of other members of family thereby making balance difficult (D’cruz and Bharat, 2001). Despite nuclear family norms, couples manage to work in regular timings with some support from parents/ inlaws in the same locality (Subramanian, 2009: 39). Miryala and Chiluka (2012) in their study found that having children and quality of time at work as well as sense of missing life are dependent on each other.

Many studies conducted in India advocates that work-family balance has been improved and many workers find easy to balance work and family domains. As per survey carried by Workplace Options (HR focus, 2012), it was found that about 43 percent of employees reported an increase in work-family benefits and these benefits like child/elder care, personal health, wellness programmes and flexible working arrangements have increased in the past five years.

2.2.8 Study of Working Hours and Additional Working Hours

In today’s era it is inevitable for companies to retain knowledge workers. Knowledge workers are the backbone of organizations and are professionals like doctors, engineers, teachers, lawyers, scientists and architects. The term ‘Knowledge worker’ was first coined by Peter Drucker in 1959 and is defined by him as one who works primarily with information or one who develops and uses knowledge in the workplace (Drucker, 1999).

Ananthan and Rao (2011) suggest few talent retention and job motivation strategies:

- Management/organizational strategies
- Communication effectiveness strategies
- Training and development strategies
- Reward and recognition strategies
- Employee ideas and suggestion strategies

2.2.8.1 Working hours. Working hours is defined as weekly hours worked during the most recent pay period, exclusive of unpaid meal breaks and unpaid overtime. Brett and Stroh (2003) defined “working” as the amount of time required by an individual to carry out a job. Time has two dimensions – quantitative (as time is an amount) and qualitative (due to its significance). As per Krings et al. (2009), working hours differ not only in terms of length but also in terms of schedules and variability. They advocated that short working hours are on the rise, like part-time jobs; but, at the same time, there is an increase in longer working hours as overtime or supplementary work.

As per ILO working hours is eight hours per day and 48 hours a week (convention – 1), provided that maximum working hours does not exceed nine hours per day (Convention – 1) or ten hours (Convention – 30). Liberalisation of 1991 bought about global competitiveness and economic growth opportunities for India; but paved path for long working hours, demanding workloads and tight deadlines (Lewis, Gambles and Rapoport, 2007). Ransome (2007) defined work as ‘Formal paid employment’ or ‘Market work’. There is a substantial non-market work like household work that has to be done to maintain structure of household. Ransome (2007) divided total responsibility into ‘Necessary labour’ (Market ‘paid’ work) and ‘Recreational Labour’ (Non-market ‘unpaid’ work, community activities, self care, personal time, leisure, pleasure and enjoyment).

Financial pressure or lack of resources may lead to longer hours of work that can lead to disturbance of personal life (White et al., 2003). Workers in developing countries work for longer hours than in transition economy or in developed countries (Nizami, and Prasad, 2012). Majority of IT employees worked for longer hours (more than 8 hours per day) and even on weekends/holidays as a regular part of their job and the provision of decent working time is not granted to them. People work for longer hours either for voluntary (personal interest, ambition, dedication) or involuntary (work nature, industry standards, tight deadlines, low hourly pay) reasons (Nizami and Prasad, 2012)
With the advent of digital age like information technology and mobile technology, the managers are able to work for longer hours, on weekends and even at odd hours i.e., the workplace has become more flexible (Kurland and Bailey, 1999). Hewlett and Luce (2006) found that current managers and chief executives are satisfied with their work even though they work for 70 hours per week due to the satisfaction they gain from rewarding and challenging work. European data shows that working longer hours is male phenomenon while working part-time is female phenomenon (Krings et al., 2009). Longer working hours in paid jobs will reduce the family time, thereby making it difficult for employees to maintain family relationships (Voydanoff, 2004

In Indian context the fixed working hours of 9 – 5 or 10 – 6 (for 5 days per week) has been changed to 12 – 16 hours per day leaving less or no time for hobbies or leisure activities. Many workers, especially managers stay late in the office due to additional work load. Mid level employees i.e., those with 5 – 10 years of experience, work for 55 – 60 hours per week on average and the condition worsens at senior and top management (Subramanian, 2009: 36-37). As per Lakshmikanthan and Deepa (2010), employees in BPOs/ KPOs, engineering and construction companies, stock markets, textile and garment manufacturing units, export houses, retail malls and multiplexes, hotels and transport companies work for more than 60 hours a week and employees in banking/insurance companies work 50 – 55 hours per week as compared to the 40 - 48 hours per week in Europe and U.S. In most developed and EU countries, the standard working hours is 48 hours per week, but in Asia and the Pacific the legal standard hours either do not exist or is exceptionally high of 60 hours or more per week (ILO report, 2011).

Barnett (1988) state that long working hour has a positive impact but depends on specific situations. Having sufficient time to think about life and self was found to be a characteristic of individuals perceiving the world to be comprehensible, manageable and meaningful (Gropel, 2005). Work and family can be managed effectively by work-home segmentation and family support. The 24 hours in a day can be divided into five major activities – commuting, work, family, sleep and retrieval.
2.2.8.2 Additional working hours. Employees at senior level face the maximum stress and pressure in the Indian industry (Lakshmikanthan and Deepa, 2010: 330). Additional hours of work were common amongst all grades of staff, but managers and professionals were most likely to experience them (Hogarth, Hasluck and Pierre, 2000; Krings et al., 2009). Brett and Stroh (2003) researched the reason for managers working extreme hours (61 or more hours per week) and found the reasons as financial and psychological rewards the managers receive from working longer hours. Managers work long, stressful hours extending into weekends and late evenings (Gordon, 2012: 7).

Additional working hours and workplace practices increases negative job to home spillover for both men and women while flexible hours and personal discretion over start and finish work times tend to reduce the problems (White et al., 2003). Additional work hours result in subtraction of family hours from the total hours and increased pressure from work result in tardiness, anxiety and other serious psychological consequences (White, et al., 2003).

2.2.9 Non-standard working arrangements

Non-standard working rhythms include working during evening, night, on weekend or weekend-based short work week (WBSW) (Cooke et al., 2009: 410-411). A typical working schedule is spreading across the weekends or at unusual times; particularly during the evening, nights or during holidays. Weekend work is any work occurring on normal day of rest. In India weekend refers to Sunday and/or Saturday. Non-standard working rhythms occur to meet the growing demand of the market. Many employees who work on non-standard work schedule do so as a part of job requirement rather than choice (Fagan et al., 2011). A study conducted by Cooke et al. (2009), in Canada found that weekend-based short work week (WBSW) is mostly utilised by younger, less educated and less experienced females. Albeit non-standard work arrangements help employees to manage their domestic responsibilities better, it has fewer career advancement and training opportunities.
2.2.9.1 Health outcomes. Albeit a large number of employees prefer not to work on weekends, but when they do so their health suffers a lot. Health effects on employees working on saturdays and sundays include backache, insomnia, stress, muscular pain, gastrointestinal and cardiovascular disorders and fatigue. Working on non-standard work arrangements involving long hours increases accident rates, work-family conflict, disturbs sleep and eating habits, emotional exhaustion, burnout as well as reduces satisfaction and time with family (Fagan et al., 2011).

2.3 Relationship between Commuting and Work-Family Balance

Long commuting distances add to the time demands of employment thereby contributing to work-family imbalance. Hours spent on travelling and work related worries are dependent on each other whereas hours of travel and work-family balance facilities are independent of each other (Miryala and Chiluka, 2012: 44-45).

Time spent on commuting is an additional time-based demand on the top of work hours and the stress that result due to commuting lead to decreased satisfaction (Hill et al., 2001). In place like Bangalore, software and other professionals spend about 2 hours per day in commuting and are left with time crunch for social life outside work (Bharat, 2008).

According to Hill, Ferris and Martinson (2003), virtual office has a positive impact on aspects of work but has somewhat negative impact on aspects of family life and the influence of traditional office is mostly negative on aspects of both work and family life. Employees experiencing flexibility in the timing (Flexitime) and location of work (Flexiplace) have less difficulty with work-family balance. Many studies have analyzed the commuting time for various purposes (McLafferty and Preston, 1991; McLafferty, 1997; Lee and McDonald, 2003; Wang and Chai, 2009) but the impact of time spent on home-work and work-home travel on a daily basis has been neglected in literature (Schwanen and Dijkstra, 2002).
2.4 Work-Family Conflict

Today employees are concerned with how to balance work and non-work domains simultaneously. Women particularly have to juggle between work and family roles. Work-family conflict occurs when cumulative demands of work and non-work roles are incompatible in some respect, such as participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other roles (Guest, 2002; Duxbury and Higgins, 2003). The interference or incompatibility between work and non-work always results in work-family conflict. Social scientists adopted discourse of balance, conflict and stress in studying work-family interface (Duxbury, Higgins and Lee, 1994; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985: 76-86; Marks and MacDermid, 1996). An important element of work-family conflict is work related stress caused by long working hours, heavy workloads, lack of participation in decision making, health and safety hazards, job insecurity and tight deadlines (Todd, 2004).

Increased competition, focus on customer service, sophisticated technology, change in demographic profile and productivity issues have contributed to stress for both employees and employers (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986).

The concept of work-family conflict was studied as early as 1964 by Kahn et al. and found that work roles interfere with family roles. They defined ‘work conflict’ as the extent to which a person experiences opposing pressures within the work domain and ‘family conflict’ as the extent to which a person experiences opposing pressures within the family domain. This definition given by Kahn et al., (1964) is consistent with Greenhaus and Beutell, (1985). It indicates the sum total of the work difficulty caused by household duty and family difficulty caused by work duty and is seen as reciprocally recurring process, such that any increase in work roles would affect family roles and vice versa (Schaubroeck, 1990).

Various researchers have studied different type of stress models that have negative impact on both personal and professional outcomes like work stressors (e.g., number of hours worked, work deadlines, overload), non-work stressors (e.g., number of dependent children/parents, strain in marital relationships) and interaction between work and family (e.g., inter-role...
conflict), (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986; Frone, Yardley and Markel, 1997). Nixon et al. (2011) studied occupational stressors impacting health and well-being of employees like: interpersonal conflict, lack of control, organisational constraints, role ambiguity, role conflict, work load and work hours. Pleck (1977) gave the concept of work-family role system which is composed of the male work role, the female work role, the female family role and the male family role.

Work-family conflict is defined as ‘a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect’ (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985: 77). They divided work-family conflict into three categories: time-based, strain based and behavior based. Time based conflict occurs when time spent in one role precludes participation in another role (e.g., an individual is not able to attend an urgent meeting due to sick child at home). Strain based conflict occurs when stressors arising in one role affect the individual’s enactment of another role (e.g., increased family responsibilities makes difficult to complete work on time). Behavior based conflict occurs when prospect for behavior in one role are incompatible with the prospect for behavior in another role (e.g., different expectations of a person at work and family). When work-to-family direction is crossed with family-to-work direction then this combination yields work-family conflict. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) state that conflict occurs when an individual perform multiple roles as an employee, parent, spouse or an employer.

Work-family conflict is bidirectional and found that work stress increased work-to-family conflict, while family stress increased family-to-work conflict (Gutek et al., 1991; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992: 69-75). Both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict contribute to stress for employees. Rothbard (2001) reported that participating in multiple roles can be detrimental and working parents and dual family earners are negatively affected by simultaneously handling work and family roles. Senecal, Vallerand and Guay (2001) found that lower levels of self-determined motivation towards work and family domain facilitate experience of family alienation (negative thoughts that occur when individuals are participating in family activities), which results in work-family conflict. As per Quick et al. (2004), overlap between
work and home does not necessarily lead to conflict and may lead to balance and dynamic interaction.

**Figure 2.1.** Overlapping domains of work, home and self

### 2.4.1 Types of conflict

Combining work and family is the major challenge for the current generation of workers today (Halpern, 2005). This has given rise to different types of work-family conflicts: “Work-Family Conflict” (WFC) and “Family-Work Conflict” (FWC) (Frone, Yardley and Markel, 1997; Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, 1996: 401). Work-Family Conflict occurs when work-role activities interfere with family responsibilities (e.g., long working hours interfering with home roles). Family-Work Conflict occurs when family-role responsibilities impacts performance at work (e.g., attending a sick child on a busy work day).

---

Both WFC and FWC differ from each other significantly (Kossek and Ozeki, 1998; Cinamon and Rich, 2002: 213). Literature has shown that antecedents of work-family conflict and family-work conflict are not similar (Anderson, Coffey and Byerly, 2002; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992: 74; Frone, Yardley and Markel, 1997). Research has shown that WFC surpasses FWC among dual-earner families (Cinamon and Rich, 2002: 218-219; Frone, 2003). WFC is a multidimensional construct having two directions namely work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW). Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) developed a six dimensional measure of WFC i.e., WIF (time based), WIF (strain based), WIF (behaviour based), FIW (time based), FIW (strain based) and FIW (behaviour based) to include three forms of WFC i.e., time based, strain based and behaviour based.

Literature suggests that even WIF and FIW differ from each other. As per Frone, Yardley and Markel (1997), FIW has a direct impact on job satisfaction whereas WIF has an indirect impact on job satisfaction through FIW. A large number of studies suggest that WIF relates to work results and FIW relates to family results, thereby supporting the idea that conflict in one domain does not interfere with conflict in other domain (Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian, 1996: 401).

2.4.2 Sources of conflict

Both work demands and family demands act as antecedents of work-family conflict. As per Frone, Russell and Cooper (1992), job-related variables impacts work interference with family greater whereas family-related variables impacts family interference with work greater. Adekola (2010) in his research used four job-related factors resulting in work-family conflict: 1) Career salience 2) Hours of work 3) Work involvement and 4) Job flexibility. He also used three family-related factors resulting in conflict: 1) Number of children 2) Age of youngest child and 3) Family orientation.
Some of the prime causes of work-family conflict are:

2.4.2.1 Home demands.

2.4.2.1.1 Children at home. Children within the family adds to woes of work-family conflict as in Indian culture the primary responsibility of child care and household chores lies solely with women. Young, dependent and number of children below 5 years are the primary causes of work-family conflict for working parents (Lewis and Cooper, 1998; Lundberg, Mardberg and Frankenhaeuser, 1994; Quick et al., 2004; Cinamon and Rich, 2002: 217). Children living at home increase the difficulty of meeting work and family demands and therefore decrease satisfaction with work-family balance (Valcour, 2007: 1520).

2.4.2.1.2 Material demands. It involves maintaining the house like cooking, cleaning, laundry etc. Keeping staff helps both the spouses, but absence of these resources add to challenges in managing work and family domains (Quick et al., 2004).

2.4.2.1.3 Lack of spousal support. Due to lack of spousal support in family domains makes balance complex, especially for women. It results in more family involvement resulting in less commitment to work activities thereby making balance difficult. Only 30% corporate women opined that their husbands are supportive in sharing household chores and other domestic help (Mukherjee, 2009: 15). Women delay child birth or preferred to have one child, that too male child to balance work and family life and they believe that men are more reluctant to make adjustments and looking after household chores (Chandravathi, 2009).

2.4.2.1.4 Size of family. Work-family exacerbates when family grows larger and more complex (Quick et al., 2004).

2.4.2.2 Work demands.

2.4.2.2.1 Spouse in paid work. Spouses in paid job leave less time for domestic commitments (Voydanoff, 1988).
2.4.2.2 Long working hours. Literature investigated the relationship between work time and work-family conflict and found that working longer hours is related to higher work-family conflict (Frone, Yardley and Markel, 1997). Employees, who have lower control over work time, have less potential to keep up to family demands, particularly unexpected demands (Valcour, 2007: 1513).

2.4.2.3 Length and difficulty of commute. Commuting exacerbate work-family conflict in two ways. First is emotional separation due to travelling and second is additional burden on the spouse at home (Quick et al., 2004).

2.4.2.4 Work load. When work extends beyond time and volume, then it spills into domestic domain and impacts adversely (Quick et al., 2004; Chawla and Sondhi, 2011: 348).

2.4.2.5 Role involvement. Literature advocates that pressures from work or family domain give rise to work-family conflict. High role involvement in one domain decreases the time expected to be utilized in another domain (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985: 78). Job involvement is positively related to job-spouse conflict for individuals high in spousal involvement and unrelated for those low in spousal involvement (Frone and Rice, 1987; 51-52).

2.4.2.6 Career stage. It is still undefined as to which stage of career can pose threat to family. Literature advocates that career in early stage may pose uncompromising pressure on the family (Quick et al., 2004).

2.4.2.7 E-mail irony. E-mail is both boon and bane for employees. One way it streamlines and arranges all important work activities and on the other hand it is a non-stop clock that keeps family life at bay (Quick et al. 2004).

2.4.2.8 Toxic organisational culture. Demanding bosses, no time for energy recovery, longer working hours to boost productivity are some of the complex corporate culture that makes work and family balance difficult (Quick et al., 2004). Non-supportive corporate culture is
related to higher levels of work-family conflict and turnover intentions (Waumsley et al., 2010: 5).

### 2.4.3 Outcomes of conflict

Research has identified several personal and professional outcomes of work-family conflict. The negative outcomes of work-family conflict are well explored, stating that work-family conflict can be only detrimental (Haar, 2004: 36-39). Both work and family demands in the form of work constraints (e.g., lack of adequate resources for task completion) and family responsibilities have a positive effect on WFC (Lu et al., 2010). Allen et al. (2000) linked work-family conflict to three categories of outcomes: 1) work related (e.g., job satisfaction); 2) non-work related (e.g., well-being) and stress related (e.g., frustration).

As per Kossek and Ozeki (1998); Lapierre et al. (2008); Lu et al. (2008); Lu et al. (2010) and Quick et al. (2004), there is negative relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction, family satisfaction as well as life satisfaction. Work-family conflict has given rise to many symptoms like high stress, high depression, absenteeism, increased alcohol consumption, sleep disturbances and lower energy levels (Googins, 1991; Quick et al., 2004); physical ailments like poor health, psychological distress and hypertension (Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1997: 330; and Quick et al., 2004); less organisational commitment and increased turnover intentions (Quick et al., 2004; Eby et al., 2005; Waumsley et al., 2010: 5).

Work-family conflict has been associated with lower marital satisfaction level for both spouses and increased rate of divorce and family clashes (Quick et al., 2004). Conflict between work and family roles has the real impact that significantly affects the quality of marital life and career attainment goal of both men and women (Lockwood, 2003: 4). As per Rice, Frone and McFarlin (1992), work and non-work conflict are negatively related to quality of life variable i.e., global life satisfaction.
Grant-Vallone and Donaldson (2001) found that employees with high levels of work-family conflict experience lower level of positive well-being. As per Frone, Russell and Cooper (1997), FWC has consistent impact on health outcomes and result in depression, poor physical health and hypertension as well as related to absenteeism, tardiness and turnover (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985: 80-81). WFC has destructive behavioral and emotional effects on both work and family domains (Frone, 2003). These negative effects reduce professional motives of professional towards family or work domains (Cinamon and Rich, 2002: 218).

Due to this conflict faced while handling multiple roles, most dual-earner families are seeking companies that offer work-family balance programs and flexibility. Albeit many companies are catering to the needs of employees for better living, many family related issues are still untouched. As per Frone, Russell and Cooper (1992), work and family roles should be studied together in a common framework, for a better understanding of people’s life.

In a nutshell the consequences of work-family conflict are as follows: (Eby et al., 2005; Lapierre et al., 2008: 104; Lu et al., 2008; Madsen, 2003)

- Low job satisfaction and performance
- High absenteeism rates
- Poor organisation and reduced career commitment,
- Increased psychological distress,
- Increased parental conflict and marital distress,
- Increase in child behaviour problems and poor parenting styles
- Lower satisfaction with parenting
2.4.4 Work-family conflict management

Today young adults and dual-career families are aware of the repercussions of work-family conflict on their careers and family life.

- Organisational policies and support - As per Thomas and Ganster (1995), workplace policies like flexible schedules and supportive supervisors were associated with work-family conflict both directly and indirectly. As per Pleck (1992), flexible work schedules has a positive impact on workers, and helps in lowering work-family conflict giving more time for family and household chores (Winett, Neale and Williams, 1982). As per Noor (2006) a sense of internal control originating from workplace may moderate the work-family conflict.

- Social support is a job resource that make the role demands experience seem positive. Managers need to pay more attention in implementing a supervisory support and family supportive work atmosphere. As per Kossek et al. (2011) workplace social support results from multiple sources like supervisors, co-workers and employers.

- Organisational support – It is the degree, to which an employer values employee, cares about their well-being and supports their socio-emotional needs by providing resources to manage a role. Organisational support is designed to reduce conflict and to improve ability to recruit and retain qualified employees (Allen, 2001; Kossek and Ozeki, 1998).

Literature shows that lack of workplace social support impact work-family conflict in the direction of work demands interfering with family demands. Some of the work-family conflict management techniques commonly used are as follows:

2.4.4.1 SOC (Selection, Optimization and Compensation) model. SOC model as proposed by Baltes and Heydens-Gahir (2003), offers strategies to manage both WIF and FIW conflicts. An individual follows the model in following way – an individual first identifies and
set goal (Selection), then he/she refines the means of achieving goals by persistence, practice, learning new skills etc. (Optimization) and finally he/she uses an additional means to maintain desired level of functioning to avoid depletion of resources (Compensation).

2.4.4.2 **Boundary management.** Clearly defining and demarcating the boundaries of work and family domain is inevitable for working professionals. The boundaries of work and family should not overlap each other.

2.4.4.3 **Time management.** Managing time in terms of setting clear and feasible goals, negotiating travelling assignments and delegation of work whenever required (Quick et al., 2004).

2.4.4.4 **Segmentation and Integration.** Segmentation as a strategy by which a person separates work and non-work time, artifacts and activities. Individuals following this strategy completely separate work and home domains and perform work only during work hours and home activities only during home hours. Actual segmentation of work domain from family domain reduces work-family conflict as individual focuses exclusively on one domain at a time (Powell and Greenhaus, 2010: 517).

Integration is a strategy where the person overlaps the work and home role experiences. Individuals following this strategy prioritize their activities as per their importance and make themselves available despite hours of day or physical location.

2.4.4.5 **Personal choice.** If an individual receives more autonomy and flexibility in choosing career and job assignments, then he/she can significantly reduce work-family conflict. There should be personality-job fit in an organization and this is possible when an individual understands his/her needs.

2.4.4.6 **Family support.** Employees whose spouse provides career and personal support as well as child/elder care and domestic chores help experience less difficulty in balancing two
domains (Quick et al., 2004; Cinamon, 2006; Lu et al., 2010: 79-81). Support from family members alleviate individual role stress and enhance well-being.

2.4.4.7 Quality of family time. Research shows that quality and not quantity of time spent with family is far more beneficial in balancing work and life. (Quick et al., 2004). Similarly people, who want to devote more family time, opted for limited working hours (Lundgren & Barnett, 2000).
2.5 Outcomes of Work-Family Balance

If an individual is able to perform better in work roles, the organization provides him/her with bonus, perks, hike in salary and other benefits to ensure continuous success. Similarly meeting family roles successfully also has several advantages. Hall and Richter (1988) holds the opinion that the employee needs to have clearly defined boundaries between the work and non-work and too much overlap between work and family can cause employee burnout and dissatisfaction. Work-family conflict is seen as one such negative outcome of work-family balance. Work has an adverse effect on health and sleep for both men and women and affected their quality of life (Doble and Supriya, 2010: 338).

2.5.1 Organizational outcomes

Literature has provided evidence that work-family balance can be measured relatively in terms of level of work-family conflict. High work-family conflict is counter-productive and indirect, imperfect indicator of work-family balance (Grzywacz, Carlson and Zivnuska, 2009: 6). As per Kossek and Ozeki (1998), work-family conflict is negatively related to job satisfaction and employee commitment, such that job satisfaction is more strongly influenced by work-family conflict than family-work conflict. As per Allen et al. (2000); Aryee, Srinivas and Tan (2005); Kossek and Ozeki (1998) and Grzywacz, Carlson and Zivnuska, (2009), work-family conflict is negatively associated with organizational commitment, job satisfaction and greater turnover intentions (Eby et al., 2005 and Greenhaus and Powell, 2003) and balance is associated with better marital and family satisfaction.

Other organisational outcomes are reduced productivity and creativity, increase in interpersonal problems and resentment (Subramanian, 2009: 39). There is positive relationship between job autonomy, organisational commitment and fairness of rewards and work-family balance (Chawla and Sondhi, 2011: 349).
2.5.2 Family outcomes

As per Allen et al. (2000), work-family balance is associated with better marital and family satisfaction. Clarke, Koch and Hill (2004) stated that greater work–family balance was associated with greater marital satisfaction and more time spent on family roles. Grzywacz, Carlson and Zivnuska (2009) examined the relationship between work-family balance and family outcomes, keeping the effects of conflict and enrichment under control. They found that work-family balance is positively related with family satisfaction, family performance and family functioning and suggested strategies to help employees meet their role-related responsibilities. As per Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw (2003), work-family balance was positively related to well-being, life satisfaction and quality of life. Similarly there is positive relationship between life balance and wellbeing measures when needs are fulfilled (Arye, 1992; Grant-Vallone and Donaldson, 2001: 217-223; Gropel, 2005).

In case or working couples, personal life becomes more demanding if one has kids or elderly parents/ in-laws, financial crisis or other problems in the family (Subramanian, 2009: 38).

2.5.3 Individual outcomes

At an individual level unhealthy work-family balance results in high stress. This stress result in myriad of problems like:-

2.5.3.1 Health related outcomes. Longer working hours is associated with various health outcomes and unhealthy lifestyle like giving to cigarette, alcohol, drugs consumption. Other outcomes include irritability, depression (Googins, 1991), anxiety, insomnia, high blood pressure, obesity, diabetes, frequent headaches, back pain, constipation, frustration, heart ailments, nervous breakdown, ulcer, migraine, increased stress and somatic complaints (Burke, 1988).
Night shifts, ruthless deadlines and unhealthy lifestyle are taking a toll on employees’ health. In outsourcing industry overworked employees suffer from obesity, sleep disorders, depression and broken relationships (Rai, 2009). Nixon et al. (2011) identified eight types of individual symptoms associated with stress: backache, headache, eyestrain, fatigue, dizziness, appetite, sleep disturbance and gastrointestinal problems.

Client burnout (state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion which is perceived as related to the person’s work with clients) affects employees of IT companies to the maximum level due to high customisation level to the customer needs (Jain et al., 2011). Even healthcare sector is not different in terms of high employee burnout (Kumar, 2009: 44-45).

2.5.3.2 Other consequences. Diminished self-confidence, decreased job satisfaction and low productivity (Burke, 1988; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1997: 330-333), high employee turnover, increase in divorce rate, accidents, poor concentration, loss of energy, weaker immune system, poor coping skills, irritability, insecurity, low self esteem and dissatisfaction with life and work (Nelson and Quick, 1985: 211-212), impaired work effectiveness, low involvement, interpersonal conflicts at work, hostile attitude towards work, less self-actualization, reduced work motivation.

2.6 Work-Family Balance programs

With more women entering the workforce and to balance work and family roles of employees, companies have found the implementation of work-family balance programs mandatory. Work-family balance initiatives play an important role in balancing work and family. As per Bloom et al. (2011), there exist positive relationship between firm productivity and family-friendly workplace practices (FFWP) and FFWP is common among firms with more proportion of women and skilled workers. The work-family programs helps to boost morale, enhance productivity and job satisfaction, lowers absenteeism, fosters optimism, reduces turnover intentions, improve employee commitment, reduces likelihood of unethical business practices and enhance corporate image. But in order to make work-family initiatives fruitful, the
organization’s culture should be open and supportive (Lockwood, 2003: 5; Narang, 2011). It is evident from literature that supportive work-family organisation culture help in boosting work performance of employees with children (Brummelhuis and Lippe, 2010: 188).

Work-family programs also require support from the top management. Employees should consider children’s age, number of children and flexibility of working hours while planning for career success and family (Cinamon, 2006: 212). Organizational culture is an important aspect in the success of employee’s attaining work-family balance (Maxwell, 2005). A well managed work-family programs offer a win-win situation for both employers and employees (Lockwood, 2003: 9). Albeit many companies are introducing work-family balance programs in their organization culture, many of these programs are not being used. The reasons quoted are poor communication and improper implementation of these programs (De Cieri et al., 2005).

Work-family balance present a choice that an individual has to make and an organization has to take an initiative to provide well-being of their employees. The growing prevalence of work-family conflicts and concern for work-family issues in organizations present a challenge for Human Resource professionals. Companies are adopting myriad of innovative ways to ensure their employees get enough time for professional and personal life. Nowadays candidates are not looking for a hefty pay package as the first priority, but they are giving priority to parameters like career advancement, flexible work schedule, wellness programme, good medical insurance coverage and longer term leave (Chevalwala and Lobo, 2011). An Indian professional is looking for supportive workplace to reduce attrition rate and enhance job satisfaction to ensure work balance (Chawla and Sondhi, 2011: 341).

Rising level of stress, sickness absenteeism are framing ways for sustainability of current values and changing mode of working and culture (Lewis, Gambles and Rapoport, 2007). With the increase in dual earner couples and women, it has become imperative to make facilities like flex-time, work from options, child care facilities, supportive work environment and part time work mandatory and these would lead towards improving productivity and enriching quality of life (Doble and Supriya, 2010: 339). About 85% of the recruiters say that candidates turn down jobs that are not work-family balance friendly (Taj, 2011).
2.6.1 Individual effort

2.6.1.1 Time management. As per Lakein (1973), time management means an effective use of time and includes activities such as setting goals, prioritizing, planning, scheduling, organizing the workplace and controlling. Gropel (2005) advocated that when time spent in each life area is significantly high then it indicates high balance achieved in one’s life. He proved that spending appropriate time in work and social contact is positively related with satisfaction with relationships, and spending appropriate time in health care was negatively related to health problems like stress, somatic complaints and illness. Subramanian (2009) suggests that work should not be carried home unless it is highly imperative. Delegation of work both at work and home helps.

Time management can also help to avoid work overload (Shrotriya, 2009: 44). Excess work, no work or under work – all are dysfunctional. It is advisable to pre-schedule each day to ensure optimum utilization of time and energy (Shrotriya, 2009: 44).

2.6.1.2 Personality and Planning. One should develop an assertive personality, so that he/she is not dominated with work. Proper planning in life is mandatory where prioritizing and scheduling activities helps (Subramanian, 2009: 40).

2.6.1.3 Time with family. Spending time with family helps in rejuvenating one’s personal life. Sparing some time with family everyday, going out on weekends or holidays, helping spouse in household chores, attending parent-teacher meeting regularly helps in building strong bonds with family members.

2.6.1.4 Honest with self. Some amount of personal time is important for self-analysis, scheduling and future planning (Shrotriya, 2009: 45). One should be 100 percent committed while at work, thereby sparing time for other life events.

2.6.1.5 Good eating habits. Healthy mind lies in a healthy body thus good health is inevitable for balanced life. As per ASSOCHAM 52% of corporate employees suffer from life-
style diseases especially due to unhealthy eating habits. Not skipping meals, eating good food at regular intervals and a big no-no to junk food gives enough energy to handle daily responsibilities.

2.6.1.6 Exercise. Not only 7 – 8 hours of daily sleep, but also 15 – 20 minutes of daily exercise helps. Anger management also helps apart from exercise, as a person should always be in control of his/her temper (Shrotriya, 2009: 44).

2.6.2 Organizational effort

2.6.2.1 Elder care. Researchers points that eldercare will become a major issue in the coming years. It includes eldercare referral service, emergency eldercare, subsidy of eldercare cost and paid eldercare.

2.6.2.2 Job flexibility. Job flexibility is positively related to improved work-family balance after controlling for paid work hours, unpaid domestic labor hours, gender, marital status, and occupational level (Hill et al., 2001).

2.6.2.3 Flexible work arrangements. Employees may require flexible work schedule to meet family and personal needs. Generation Y feel that flexible work conditions positively affect their job satisfaction, job performance and ethical decision making (Smith, 2010: 444-445). Even in public sector units there is a need for flexible work arrangements (Aggarwal, 2012: 8). It also contributes to job motivation and commitment and improves work performance especially among singles (without partner or children) (Brummelhuis and Lippe, 2010: 187-189). Flexible work conditions include the following:-

Flexi-time - It is a work schedule that carries a provision for variability and rescheduling as per work requirements, unlike the standard working time schedules of nine to five job. The employee may be required to work for certain hours per day or week or accomplish certain specific task. It is checked at least by 85% of the candidates. Flexible working time enhance employee morale
and attitude which in turn improve company’s productivity, quality and performance (Golden, 2012).

Telecommuting - Also referred to as e-commuting, e-work and telework. As per Nair (2010a) and Bhatia (2011), telecommuting has become a very attractive option for many, especially women. In India there is a rising trend towards teleworking. Teleworking plays an important role in the work-family balance which significantly helps in ensuring employee loyalty and retention (Joshi, 2008: 28-32).

Work from home option - Work from home option can promise for greater flexibility, reduction in travelling time and better work-family balance, but makes people work for longer hours, including weekends/holidays and late evenings (Nizami and Prasad, 2012). About 50% of people carry work home. Work from home option is a key to long commuting hours and long working hours (Nair, 2010b). It does not mean relaxing and taking a break from work whenever needed. Nair (2010b) advocates that work from home demands better time management, promptness and time prioritisation.

As per Arvinder Soora (HR Head, Planet Retail), there are some disadvantages associated with telecommuting that are as follows: home distractions, low pay, lack of motivation, infringes on home space and absence of colleagues (Appeared in TOI (Ascent) on 31st August, 2011).

2.6.2.4 Paid annual leave. Convention number 132 of ILO, provide for three weeks of paid annual leave for one year of service. Paid annual leave is very important for various reasons (ILO Report, 2011):-

a) Protecting the health and well-being of employees
b) Promoting productivity of employees
c) Limiting working time over a year

2.6.2.5 Job sharing. A job-sharing program is an efficient way to enjoy the best of both worlds: to continue working in a job a person love and giving more time for personal activities. Job sharing here means that if an executive who is working in a team, come across any
emergency (e.g., sick child or elderly person, mishap), then he/she can delegate his/her responsibility for time being to colleague and meet personal obligation.

2.6.2.6 Transportation and company quarters. Most of the companies provide transportation facility to their employees in the form of cabs or buses. Transportation facility helps the employees living far away from organization premises to maintain their schedule and avoid fatigue and stress due to self driving. Company quarters are provided by almost all PSUs that are mostly within radius of 5 kms from company premises. This helps the employees to save on commuting time and maintain punctuality.

2.6.3 Advantages of work-family balance initiatives.

The effective implementation of work-family balance programs helps both the employees and employer. An employee with improved work-family balance will contribute more significantly towards organisational growth and success (Naithani, 2010: 148). A proper balance between personal life and work help to perform better at work (Aggarwal, 2012: 7). The benefits of work-family balance initiatives are as follows (Gunavathy, 2010: 125).

- Symbiotic relationship between employee and employer
- More satisfaction and contentment
- Better job performance
- Helps in employer branding and employee retention
- An effective instrument for competitive advantage
- Career advancement There exist a positive relationship between perception of work-family balance and career advancement potential based on self, peer and supervisor ratings (Lyness and Judiesch, 2008: 798-799).
Some of the advantages of work-family balance initiatives as suggested by Shrotriya (2009), Smith (2010) are as follows:

*Figure 2.2. Advantages of work-family balance initiatives*
2.7 Conceptualizing Locus of Control

Locus of Control has gained considerable importance in today’s scenario in personality psychology. The concept was developed Julian B. Rotter in 1954. Locus of Control is defined as the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events that influence them. Individuals with a high internal locus of control believe that they can control the events resulting primarily from their own behaviour and actions. Those with a high external locus of control believe that control lies primarily in the hand of powerful others, fate, or chance. Locus of control can be regarded as uni or multidimensional construct. Unidimensionality refers to a global control belief whereas multidimensionality refers to different control beliefs in different areas of life.

Internal versus external control of reinforcement, often referred to as Locus of Control has gained considerable importance in today’s scenario. It is one of the important factors of personality trait. The concept was developed by Rotter in 1954, and since then it has become an important aspect of personality literature. As per Rotter (1966, 1990), locus of control is a broad construct meant to study human behavior in different situations and it is the extent to which people can deal with or control events that affect them. Locus of control is a psychological construct that encourages change in individuals or groups and help in interpreting behavioral problems and domain specific measures (Lefcourt, 1992). Locus of control is the extent to which an individual determine the outcomes by internal factors (i.e., personal effort and ability) as opposed to external factors (i.e., fate or chance or destiny). It reflects the degree to which individuals actually have control over the environment.

Rotter (1966) used the empirical law of effect stating that people are motivated inherently to look for positive stimulation and avoid negative stimulation. Rotter (1966) used Skinner’s concept of reinforcement which states that if an individual’s outcome of responses are favorable or unfavorable then the likelihood of the occurrence of the response in the future is either increased (positive reinforcement) or decreased (negative reinforcement). Rotter (1975) regards locus of control as a hierarchical construct with internal or general locus of control occupying the highest level.
Judge and colleagues (Judge, Locke and Durham, 1997; Judge, Bono and Locke, 2000; Judge and Bono, 2001 and Judge et al., 2005) introduced the term core self-evaluation concept and identified locus of control as one of the four traits to qualify as a core-trait. Four dispositional traits are included in the concept of core self-evaluation: self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. According to Judge, Locke and Durham (1997), these specific traits indicate a single, higher order factors that forms the basis for other. The concept signifies assessment that people make about their worthiness, competence and capabilities ranging from positive to negative self-appraisals. People with positive core self-evaluations struggle for right reasons and get the right results and both these increases job and life satisfaction (Judge et al., 2005: 257-266). Core self-evaluation has a direct relationship with job complexity and perception of job characteristics (e.g., task variety, autonomy, feedback and identity) such that job characteristics and job complexity mediate the relationship between core self-evaluation and job satisfaction (Judge, Bono and Locke, 2000: 237-247). Locus of control means person’s belief about control over events occurred in life (Findley and Cooper, 1983).

Some people believe that they are master of their fate and life. They are referred to as internals. While some people believe that they are puppets of fate or whatever happens to them are due to external factors or chance. Such people are known as externals. Individuals with internal locus of control are more active in their lives to pursue career goals (Rotter, 1966: 9-16). Internals actively seek for useful cues in the environment to determine their positions and to adapt and guide their behaviors accordingly.

Literature provides evidence for the beneficial nature of locus of control. Locus of control acts as a moderator for stress and work-family conflict (Parkes, 1994; Noor, 2006: 57). The study conducted by Noor (2006) showed that even with work-family conflict as the outcome measure, possessing an internal locus of control is advantageous. A number of studies has shown that locus of control is an important predictor of opportunistic behaviour, motivation and personal effectiveness. Loosemore and Lam (2004) found locus of control as an important component of opportunity management in areas of health and safety.
Many similar constructs were developed during 1960s apart from locus of control such as perceived control, self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), personal causation, helplessness and explanatory style, causal attribution and personal competence each of which deals with perceived casualty and control (Lefcourt, 1992). Though there is some overlap in the meaning among these variables, locus of control helps in understanding individual’s perception of causes of events in life and perceived control over success or failure.

2.7.1 Social Learning Theory.

The concept of internal versus external control of reinforcement was developed by Rotter (1966) and is based on Rotter’s (1954) social learning theory (SLT). Rotter (1954) named his theory as social learning since it is focused on human behaviour in social situations as well as needs required for their satisfaction by reinforcements. SLT is a molar theory of personality that aims to unite two significant theories of psychology: the stimulus-response or reinforcement theory and cognitive or field theory (Rotter, 1975: 57). The theory provides a conceptual framework for the development of the nature and effects of reinforcement. Rotter’s social learning theory (1954) consists of four components: behavioural potential, expectancy, reinforcement value and psychological situation. In SLT, the concept of reinforcement acts to strengthen the expectancy that a particular behaviour will be followed by that reinforcement in the future. Once the expectancy for such a behaviour-reinforcement sequence is built up, the failure of the reinforcement to occur will reduce the expectancy.

The concepts that are related to SLT are needs and goals as well as the determination and effects of behaviour. The goals of an individual direct the behaviour and the direction of behaviour is related to personal needs. The concepts underlying SLT is similar to that of motivational theory. SLT is based on the assumption that human behaviour is changeable i.e., it is possible to change behaviour by changing the external environment or the cognitive process of the person.
The SLT provides model to be used in the prediction of behaviour. This model consists of four components: behaviour, expectancy, reinforcement and psychological situation. The general formula for behaviour is that the probability for behaviour to occur in a specific situation is a function of expectancy that the behaviour will lead to a particular reinforcement and the value of that reinforcement.

2.7.1.1 Behaviour. It is defined as the probability for behaviour to occur in a specific situation by an individual. The behaviour used is the one with the highest potential for reinforcement.

2.7.1.2 Expectancy. It is defined as the probability for behaviour to occur in a specific situation is a function of expectancy that the behaviour will lead to a particular reinforcement. Rotter (1954) defines it as “a probability held by the subject that any specific reinforcement or group of reinforcements will occur in any given situation or situations”. Expectancies in each situation are determined not only by specific experiences in that situation but also, to some varying extent, by experiences in other situations that the individual perceive as similar (Rotter, 1975: 57).

Expectancies can be generalized or specific. Expectancies generalise from a specific situation to a series of related situations. A generalised expectancy for related situations has functional properties and constitutes one of the important classes of variables in psychology. A generalised expectancy regarding the nature of the relationship between one’s own behaviour and its results might affect a variety of behavioural choices in life situations. Generalised expectancy when combined with specific expectancy determines behaviour and the reinforcement value.

There are two types of generalised expectancies. One of these involves expectancies for a particular kind of reinforcement like achievement, dependency, social approval etc. The other generalised expectancy involves a series of situations involving problem solving where the reinforcement may vary.
2.7.1.3 **Reinforcement.** Reinforcement acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behaviour will lead to reinforcement in future. When reinforcement is contingent upon the individual’s behaviour, then its occurrence will increase expectancy and conversely its non-occurrence will reduce expectancy. Rotter (1954) distinguished between internal and external reinforcement. Internal reinforcement is individual’s experience that a past event is valuable for him while external reinforcement is the occurrence of an event that has some reinforcement value for an individual.

2.7.1.4 **Psychological situation.** It determines both expectancies and reinforcement values. The probability of occurrence of a particular behaviour in some particular situations must take into account alternative behaviours available in the same situation.

Apart from Rotter, Bandura (1977) is also accredited for his contribution towards social learning theory. Bandura (1977) focused on outcomes resulted from individual’s perception of control.

2.7.2 **Internals Vs. Externals**

Locus of control is one of the most prominent personality variable studies in a number of work and organisational settings. According to Julian Rotter (1954, 1966, 1975), ‘internal control’ is defined as the concept embodying belief that control of future outcomes lies primarily in oneself or the event is contingent upon his own behavior, while ‘external control’ refers to the concept that reinforcement or outcome is a function of fate/chance/destiny or is unpredictable. Rotter (1966) identified four types of beliefs in externals: powerful others, luck or chance, fate and a belief that the world is too complex to be predicted. This definition clearly draws a line between two categories of individuals: internals and externals. In other words locus of control is often regarded as ‘internal-external’ attitudes. As per Spector (1988), individual’s success, failures and outcomes are controlled by individual’s actions and behaviours is referred to as internals whereas individual’s success, failures and outcomes are controlled by other forces like chance, luck or fate is referred to as externals.
Locus of control has gained considerable importance in several sub-disciplines of psychology including clinical, developmental and social psychology. Locus of control is related to variety of variables like entrepreneurship (Hansemak, 1998; Goksel and Aydintan, 2011; Fuller, Spears and Parker, 2010), accounting (Nasution and Ostermark, 2012), risk management (Loosemore and Lam, 2004), investment behaviour (Kasilingam and Sudha, 2010), religiosity (Fiori et al., 2006), life satisfaction (Klonowicz, 2001; April et al., 2012 and Fiori et al., 2006), social skills (Lefcourt et al., 1985), ethical behaviour (Suryaningrum et al., 2012), marital problem solving (Miller, Lefcourt and Ware, 1983), stressful circumstances (Spector, 1982; Spector and O’Connell, 1994; Khan et al., 2012), assertiveness (Cooley and Nowicki, 1984) and parental characteristics (Nowicki and Segal, 1974).

According to Weiss and Sherman (1973), when internal faces differences between acceptable standards and actual standards of performance, they increase their efforts to match their actual performance to the set standards of performance. Past studies have confirmed that internal control has a beneficial effect on well-being of individual (Frese, 1989; Ross and Mirowsky, 1989 and Noor, 2006: 57). As per Specter (1982), internals perform better than externals as well as internals are more satisfied with their job and are more successful in organizations. Ducette and Wolk (1972) found that externals tend to exhibit less persistence at tasks than internals.

According to Judge, Locke and Durham (1997), internals can control a broad series of factors in their lives. Internals possess better social behavior and can communicate better than externals (Lefcourt et al., 1985: 756-758), on the other hand externals are hesitant to go against others due to normative reasons (Spector, 1983: 200-201). People with internal locus of control are more assertive than people with external locus of control (Cooley and Nowicki, 1984: 85-86). Internals are better capable of controlling their negative moods or securing positive outcomes and feelings or of both (Klonowicz, 2001: 33-44). Internals prefer participative management and took part in goal setting more confidently than externals (Yukl and Latham, 1978: 308-321). In a study conducted on social work professionals, Singh (2006) found that role efficacy and emotional intelligence were positively associated with their internal locus of control but negatively related to their external locus of control. Internals express less need, but obtain more benefits from
social support provided than do internals who express more need but extract lesser benefits from such support (Lefcourt, 1984: 387-388)

Boone, Olffen and Witteloostuijn (2005) conducted research at team level to find team potency (collective belief of team members that the team can be effective). They found that internals are better at information processing even at group level than externals. Adding internals to a team increases the team’s information processing capacity resulting in more information acquisition behaviour and finally better team performance. They also found that external teams benefit from having leaders. This research outlines the importance of leaders in external team.

In a nutshell, locus of control is a unidimensional construct that stretches from internal to external. The question that arises is whether an internal or external locus of control is sought after. Literature suggests that it is psychologically healthy to have control over the things or events that one can change. Hence, internal locus of control seems to be mostly sought after. Research has found the following trends:

a) Males are more internal than females.

b) As people grow older, they tend to become more internal (Fry, 2000; Specht, Schmukle and Egloff, 2013: 360).

c) People in higher positions tend to be more internal (Mamlin, Harris and Case, 2001).

### 2.7.3 Relationship between Locus of Control and key variables.

Literature shows evidence of linkage between locus of control and key work variables. Previous research has also tried to link these two mechanisms (Spector, 1982; Judge, Locke and Durham, 1997; Judge and Bono, 2001; Noor, 2006). Spector (1982) was first to link locus of control with number of work outcomes like: internals have higher levels of job satisfaction, job performance, leadership, organisational commitment, absenteeism and job motivation than externals. The current study also aims to link locus of control with work-family balance.
2.7.3.1 Job satisfaction and job performance. Job satisfaction is basically an individual concern, job satisfaction experienced by an employee is the result of various attitudes and are concerned with various factors like salary, working conditions, recognition, advancement opportunities, fair evaluation of work and other benefits.

Individuals with Type B personality and having internal locus of control are satisfied with their jobs and individuals with Type A personality and having external locus of control are dissatisfied with their jobs (Hanif and Sultan, 2011: 90-94). Research has proved that internals perform well to be given more autonomy and are more satisfied with their jobs than those who perform poorly (Spector and Jex, 1991: 51; Spector, et al., 2002: 454-461; Gurusamy, Velsamy and Rajasekar, 2011: 69-72; Srivastava, 2011: 342-343). Previous research by Spector (1982) and Spector and O’Connell (1994) found that internals are more satisfied with their jobs and enjoy longer job tenures than externals. Judge and Bono (2001) found that internal locus of control displayed positive relation with both job satisfaction and job performance, thus emerging as significant predictors of both job satisfaction and job performance. This is because internals are aware of their circumstances and can better control situations in their administration.

Ng, Sorensen and Eby (2006) in their study on locus of control at work found that internal locus of control is positively related to task performance; job satisfaction and its specific aspects like pay, promotion, supervisor and co-workers. Locus of control has an effect on job performance and career success by triggering motivational process (e.g., goal setting and goal commitment) (Daniels and Guppy, 1992: 321-329).

Locus of control has an effect on job performance and career success by triggering motivational process (e.g., goal setting and goal commitment). For example internals are more inclined to set challenging goals for themselves and pursue those goals in adverse situations (Yukl and Latham, 1978: 321; Erez and Judge, 2001: 1270-1278; Ng, Sorensen and Eby, 2006:1062-1073).

2.7.3.2 Career success. Career success include variables like salary and organisational level. Research has shown that internals hold jobs of higher status and advance rapidly in their
career (Yulk and Latham, 1978). According to Mamlin, Harris, and Case, (2001), people in higher positions in organizational structures tend to be more internals as their belief on themselves increases than externals. Internal locus of control is positively linked to organisational level (Ng, Sorensen and Eby, 2006: 1061-1072).

2.7.3.3 Achievement, autonomy and ethical behaviour. As per Rotter (1966), the need for achievement and locus of control are regarded as socially learned. Internality is related positively to higher achievement and larger number of extracurricular activities (Nowicki and Segal, 1974: 34-36). People with an internal locus of control and higher need for achievement set higher goals (Yukl and Latham, 1978: 321).

Suryaningrum et al. (2012) conducted a study on accounting students and lecturers to find their ethical inclination. They found that individuals with internal locus of control are less inclined towards unfair or unethical behaviour than individuals with external locus of control and ethical attitude encouraged ethical behaviour as well.

2.7.3.4 Perceptions of work environment. As per Judge, Locke and Durham (1997), internals perceive work environment to be positive, whereas externals perceive work environment to be negative. Ng and Butts (2009) found that both work environment features and individual differences play a prominent role in retaining employees and that people with internal locus of control tend to be more loyal to the organizations and respond more favorably to HR practices that promote power, information, reward and knowledge than people with external locus of control. The study conducted by Noor (2006) showed that having internal locus of control is advantageous in moderating work-family conflict.

Work Locus of control scale (WLCS) in organisational setting was developed by Spector (1988). In organisational domain, rewards include promotion, salary increments and career advancement (Spector, 1988: 335). Work locus of control is strongly related to work-related criteria (e.g., job satisfaction, affective commitment, burnout etc.) than general locus of control (Wang et al., 2010: 762). Wang et al. (2010) defined general locus of control as the extent to which an individual attributes success to one's own behaviour rather than to external situations.
whereas work locus of control as the extent to which an individual attributes work related success to one’s own behaviour.

Swarnalatha and Suresh Krishna (2012) in their study found that work locus of control were positively related to variables of job satisfaction like creativity, independence, company policies and advancement which in turn advocated that work locus of control is positively related to job satisfaction.

2.7.3.5 Stressful circumstances and conflict management. The perception of stress has long been identified as a mediator of stress. Role stress arise from time pressure, excessive work demand, role conflict, lack of communication among the members of the organisation and problematic customer relationships. There is evidence which shows that internals cope better with stressful circumstances by having a control over self. Internals experience lower levels of job stressors and work anxiety than externals (Spector, 1982: 484; Spector and O’Connell, 1994: 3; Khan et al., 2012: 160-166), on the other hand externals are more vulnerable to the effects of stressful workplace and foster workaholism (Parkes, 1994; Yuksel and Akdag, 2011: 389-396). High internal locus of control can be viewed as a resource itself as it motivates individuals to go out and accumulate resources to deal with stressful circumstances.

Internals are less likely to respond to frustration with counterproductive behaviour i.e., sabotage, withdrawal or regression than externals (Spector and Storms, 1987: 232-233). Internals are better capable of controlling their negative mood and securing positive results (Klonowicz, 2001: 41-44). Locus of control is an effective factor to reduce job stress by fostering job satisfaction, promotion, self-esteem, increasing salary and quality of life. Individuals with internal locus of control are more capable to adapt themselves to problems and events that they experience at workplace (Karimi and Alipour, 2011: 232-235).

Taylor (2010) incorporated three conflict management strategies in his research. 1) Solution oriented – It involves compromise and people look for creative, integrative solutions. 2) Non-confrontational – It involves indirect avoidance and concealing important issues. 3) Control – It involves persistent argument along with non-verbal messages. He found that individuals with
higher internal locus of control make use of solution oriented strategies and offer creative solutions to conflict whereas those with higher external locus of control make use of non-confrontational strategies and less use of solution oriented strategies.

2.7.3.6 Commitment. Internal locus of control is related to number of variables related to commitment. Internal LOC is positively related to organisational commitment and number of hours worked while it is negatively related to absenteeism and turnover intentions (Ng, Sorensen and Eby, 2006: 1072-1073; Spector, 1982: 493).

2.7.3.7 Well-being and Life satisfaction. A myriad of research has demonstrated locus of control as a predictor of well-being (Spector et al., 2002: 454-461; Fiori et al., 2006). The general well-being or self-worth includes the variables of life satisfaction, mental well-being and physical health. Literature proves the importance of internal locus of control in fostering well-being. Judge and colleagues (Judge, Locke and Durham, 1997; Judge, Bono and Locke, 2000; Judge and Bono, 2001 and Judge et al., 2005) took the research in this regard a little further. They identified locus of control as one of the four traits to qualify as a core-trait. The concept signifies assessment that people make about their worthiness, competence and capabilities ranging from positive to negative self-appraisals. People with external locus of control are less satisfied with their current life than with internal locus of control i.e. externals experience less subjective well-being (Klonowicz, 2001: 32-44; Fiori et al., 2006: 244-259; Hamarta et al., 2013: 148). Internal locus of control was positively linked to mental well-being, life satisfaction and physical health (Ng, Sorensen and Eby, 2006: 1072-1073).

2.7.3.8 Job attitudes. Job attitudes influence the withdrawal intention of employees (Spector, 1982: 490). Perceived work environment buffer the relationship between locus of control and job attitudes (Judge, Locke and Durham 1997).
2.7.4 Scales to measure Locus of Control.

Many researchers argue about the dimensionality of the locus of control construct as a result of which different locus of control scales emerged with the passage of time. Some of the common scales used to measure people’s locus of control are:

**2.7.4.1 Rotter Internal - External Locus of control scale.** Rotter’s scale (1966) was largely based on the work of Bandura (1977) who developed social learning theory. The Rotter’s scale also known as Internal - External locus of control scale consists of 29 items (23 forced choice items and 6 filler items) to assess whether a person think that events are under their control or under the control of external influences or chance. Each question has two options for respondents to choose from: one option indicating attitude of internal expectancy and other indicating attitude of external expectancy. This is a forced-choice scale in which a person chooses between an internal or external items that most matches with their own personal beliefs. In this scale, high score indicates external locus of control while low score indicates internal locus of control. Rotter’s scale was not designed to measure specific domains (e.g., health domains, academic domains etc.), but to give a weak predictability of a person’s interpretation across all domains. Despite Rotter’s (1966) scale is criticized for containing forced-choice format, many irrelevant items and difficult reading level; it is useful for measuring personality variable.

Collins (1974) rejected the 23 – item, forced choice format and redeveloped into 46 – item Likert format scale. It include four format structure a) the easy-difficult world b) the just-unjust world c) the predictable-unpredictable world and d) the politically responsive-unresponsive world.

**2.7.4.2 Levenson IPC scale.** In response to Rotter’s unidimensional I-E general locus of control scale (1966), Levenson proposed a three dimensional scale: internality, control by powerful others and control by chance forces to measure believe in chance or fate orientation as separate from a powerful others orientation like God, parents or political leaders. The need for this scale stemmed from a logic that people who believe that the world is unordered (chance) would think differently than people who believe that the world is ordered and powerful others
are in control (Levenson, 1973a: 398). This scale is validated by Levenson (1972) who found that respondents who rated high on chance scale shared traits that could not be differentiated by internal or powerful others scale. In a follow up study Levenson (1973) showed that splitting of externality into multiple dimensions was justified.

This scale scored better on continuum aspect. Levenson (1973, 1973a) had used the concept of locus of control to develop locus of control scale in Organisations. This scale developed by Levenson (1973, 1973a) is popularly known as Loco Inventory and intends to establish a relationship between locus of control and seven aspects: general, effectiveness, influence, acceptability, career, advancement and rewards. Levenson developed Likert - 6 point scale with 24 items divided under internality, externality (others) and externality (luck) with 8 items under each factor. In determining parental antecedents of locus of control and analysis of male personality traits of men and women together, Levenson’s scale (1973, 1973a) is found to be fruitful. In spite of growing popularity of Levenson’s scale in various research fields, it suffered from certain criticism regarding its effectiveness. There were certain claims that Levenson’ s IPC scale is not applicable for all age groups since it was tested only on undergraduate students.

**2.7.4.3 Multidimensional - Multiattributitional Causality scale (Lefcourt et al., 1979: 286 - 302).** This scale was designed to assess the locus of control for affiliation and achievement. It consists of 24 - item Likert scales, one concerning affiliation and other concerning achievement. Each scale comprised of 12 items concerning success and other 12 concerning failure experiences. The 24 items are distributed equally under four attributes:-

1) Internal and stable (6 - items attributed to ability and skills)
2) Internal and unstable (6 - items attributed to effort and motivation)
3) External and stable (6 - items attributed to context)
4) External and unstable (6 - items attributed to luck or chance)
Half of the items in this scale deal with internality and half with externality, hence this scale can be used to measure internality and externality separately. The score ranges from 0 – 48 under internality and 0 – 48 under externality.

Thus the measures of locus of control are based primarily on its conceptualizations. Some of the commonly used measures are mentioned here. None of the above mentioned scales are without any controversy as some of the scales are domain-specific and can be applied only within specific domains instead of generalising across different domains. Hence, the locus of control measures should be developed based on rigorous theoretical framework and validation (Carton and Nowicki, 1994).

2.7.4.4 The locus of control inventory (Udai Pareek, 1998). The LOCO inventory is a psychometric instrument that was developed by Udai Pareek in 1998. The instrument links locus of control to seven areas:-

1. General
2. Success or effectiveness
3. Influence
4. Acceptability
5. Career
6. Advancement
7. Rewards

The LOCO inventory was based on Levenson (1972) concept of locus of control. The scale appears to be a superior measure than Levenson (1972). It is 30 – item scale with 10 items each under internality, externality (others) and externality (chance). The 5 - point scale is used in scoring responses ranging from “hardly feel” (0) to “strongly feel” (4). An example item is “My success or failure depends mostly on the amount of effort I put in”. The three dimensions of LOCO inventory are: Internal (I), External-Others (E-O) and External-Chance (E-C). Scores will range from 0 – 40 for each of the three columns for internality, externality (others) and externality (chance).
**Purpose.** The LOCO inventory can be used for both training and research purposes in human resource development and training packages. Levenson’s (1972) scale was not developed specifically for organisations, therefore need arose for LOCO inventory by Pareek.

2.7.5 Increasing internal locus of control.

Locus of control or motivators refers to the causes that individuals attribute their success, failure and outcomes to. These motivators may be internal (desire for job satisfaction, self-esteem and quality of life) or external (better jobs, promotions and higher salary provided by managers and organisations). If the employees feel that locus of control helps them to gain success, they will be more creative, innovative and productive in their work. So promotion, job satisfaction, quality of life, self-esteem and high salary can increase locus of control.

Internality can be developed by creating educational and work environments characterized by freedom to set goals, personal growth opportunity and opportunity to influence important circumstances.