In the last two decades, India had become almost unrecognizable to what it was. Increasing consumerism, international brands, increased literacy, more exchange between rural and urban India, these are just the tip of the iceberg of change. Cable T.V. has brought in the revolution of information exchange and culture exchange and thereby changing the urban psyche. For good or for bad will be for the historians to say. Currently, in the era of change the ultimate dynamism has been brought in by the computer. What the internet has done to the world and thus India, cannot even be guessed. One can, however, say that the age of the consumer has started. Acquisition for a good life has become the order of the day.

With all this consumerism, the amenities which were luxuries once upon the time have become the necessities of daily life. For fulfilling these necessities single earning of the head of family is not sufficient. Thus the lady of the home (women) has been forced to come out. They have turned to professional work, not as a pass time, but as a need. This has added a yet another concept in our daily lives – the concept of ‘Working Women’/ dual earner couple.

The representation of women in the post-varied scriptures is not only contradictory but, a clear manifestation of Hindu Society’s dualistic approach to nearly half its population e.g. the sayings of ‘Manu’ has left an indelible impression on conservative sections of Hindu Society even today, On one hand, he exhorts that women be treated with love, respect and relevance, she has to be adored since she is deemed to be the source of all good. He declares that women must be honored and admired by their fathers, brothers and husbands, because where women are honoured, the gods are pleased,
therefore, woman is Devi. On the other hand, he treats women as if they were the scum of the earth, as Manu further recommends that day and night, women be kept in close custody by the males of their families. In childhood, a woman must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband and in old age to her son. The women must never be independent because she is innately impure as false hood. The Lord created women, according to his code, as one full of sensuality, dishonesty, malice and bad conduct.

Under the pressure of economic crisis most of the middle class families expect their women to contribute to the maintenance of the family. In this way the pursuit of a profession by a woman acquires a 'defacto' legitimacy, which results from a situation of economic necessity but which has not yet led to far reaching ideological and structural changes. This situation is therefore particularly precarious for working women: they must work, but at the same time, they must also conform to an image of womanhood. Women still hold the major responsibility of home and child care while contributing to the paid work. This may be due to the internalization of role responsibilities inculcated through socialization and also due to the available role models.

Recent years have increasingly brought a great change in the life of Indian women influencing their attitudes, values, inspirations, feelings, as well as participation in various walks of life. In particular, the forces of urbanization, education and employment, have provided women with new avenues to express and assert themselves. They have come out of the four walls of their homes in search of economic gain as well as fulfillment of their personal hopes and desires as human beings. By gaining employment outside homes they are seeking different identities. Since the inner experiences of women are inextricably embedded in the socio-economic and cultural matrix, it is likely that their role of wage earner will bring a change in the quality of life. In the traditional India every women is born into a well defined community of women with in her particular family. The existence of this
discrete sphere of femininity and domesticity gives women a tangible opportunity to be productive and lively, to experience autonomy and to exercise power. This world is free from patriarchal values of the outside world and other women are shields for these girls against male world.

In the modern period social reforms, legal provisions and feminist activities have been trying to influence and change the status of women. It is, however, to be noted that there is still a wide gap between their legal, political, economic rights and privileges and actual rights and privileges that they enjoy and utilize.

In this context, transformation in the pattern of women’s role has received some research attention. Concern for survival and economic need are found to be one of the main reasons for taking up gainful employment. In addition, non-economic factors have also been reported to be important for female’s participation. It is further noted that though employment gives women more opportunities and choices in many important respects for most, a right to work does not necessarily mean a better status because doing job increases their physical burden, and it may intensify their family responsibilities, now being expected to finance sibling’s education, marriage and the like.

However, as employment of women particularly from the middle class is a new phenomenon, no fixed pattern or redefinition of role of women in terms of the changed context has yet been achieved. Neither working wives, nor their husbands or other relatives, nor society in general in clear about their roles. Women’s role and position at present are, therefore, not clearly defined and thus the situation leads to role conflict. Family’s greater demand on women takes a higher tall on women’s mental health in the dual-earner family as compared to males.

Historically, the entry of unmarried women in professional occupation did not involve much of a problem till they were single. But once they got
married, the problem started. Now from one role they were entering into conflicts between various roles, like the roles of a wife, a mother and an employee. By taking up employment they had to play a dual role as housewife and earner.

Combining the roles of work and home successfully is not an easy task. It requires not only skill but physical and psychological acceptance, besides some sacrifices and adjustments to the changes brought about by this combination. Along with physical and psychological acceptance, an important area where working women constantly suffer is guilt. Guilt and anxiety place an added burden on these career women.

The internalization of gender role ideology prescribes different life options for men and women. For men, this life option implies a prioritization of work over family whereas for women it implies a prioritization of family over work. Given that men identify with the work role more than the family role, they will be motivated to invest more time and resources to enhance their performance in the work role. Although investment in the work role will lead to conflict with the family roles. Women, on the other hand, are expected to identify with the family and therefore invest more time and energy resources to enhance performance in that role.

Gender role ideology has been used to explain the traditional division of work where the paid work of the market place was the predominantly the domain of men, and the unpaid work of the family was the primary domain of women. Work family conflict develops when the demands of one domain
conflicts with the demands of another. When women began to share the provider role by moving into the paid work of the market place, men were forced by necessity to assume more responsibility for the work of the family. In turn, this role shift created the necessity for balance between work place demands and family demands. Conflict between the demands of work and family was an inevitable result as both men and women struggled to fulfill the responsibilities of these two, often-competing roles.

The combination of work and family roles create additional opportunities for fulfillment of women. However, it can also create competing demands between the workplace and home, as well as work overload. Two-thirds of all mothers are currently in the labour force, and most married couples work two jobs. Most employed mothers do not have the option of staying home because either their families depend on two incomes or they are the sole breadwinners. As changes are occurring in our society, where by the process of modernization is taking place, Indian husbands are supportive of their wives’ participation in the work force, they have yet to assume responsibility for sharing domestic chores.

In the present scenario, behind every successful women is a man who refuses to be the typical husband by defying all stereotypes associated with his role, who’s unwavering support has helped his significant other climb the ladder of success. Sometimes it is active help, at other time, it’s just being there. Mumbai has a string of such
examples – right from ace shooter Anjali Bhagwat and Hubby Mandar to the couple that has stood the test of times, author Shobhaa De and her industrialist husband Dilip, Nita and her husband Business tycoon Mukesh Ambani. These successful women pointed out that “life can be stressful for women who have a family and career to manage. If you don’t have an understanding partner, things are going to be tough.” On the other side, most of the men do not share the workload of home. This situation has caused many women to experience a double burden between home and the work place.

Interest in family-related issues by industrial psychologists is relatively new, manifesting itself primarily in the past 15 years. For many years psychologists tended to limit their focus to work-related issues (e.g. tasks, jobs, occupations, organizations) and left the subject of domestic matters (e.g. family) to other areas of professional study. However industrial psychologist began to see legitimate linkages or connections between the two spheres of work and family and thus have expanded areas of inquiry. It is a topic of interest at international level also.

Work-family conflict is a type of inter-role conflict in which the role demands stemming from one domain (work or family) are incompatible with role demands stemming from another domain (family or work) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964). According to Kahn et al. (1964) roles are the result of expectations of others about appropriate behaviour in a particular position. Role conflict is described as the psychological tension that is aroused by conflicting role pressures and it occurs when individuals engage in multiple role that are incompatible (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Work-family conflict can be time-based, strain-based or behaviour based (Greenhause & Beutell, 1985). Time-based conflict occurs when role pressures stemming from the two different domains compete for the
individual's time. For example requiring employees when required to work late at short notice might make it difficult for employees to meet family obligations like picking up a child at daycare. Strain based conflict occurs when the strain experience in one role domain interferes with effective performance of role behaviours in the other domain. For example, a father who is anxious about his child illness might not be able to fully concentrate on his job as copy editor, causing him to make mistakes in his work. Behaviour based conflict is described as conflict stemming from incompatible behaviour demanded by competing roles. For example, a manager in a financial services firm might be expected to be aggressive, unemotional and hard-driving, but their same behaviours in the family domain would most likely lead to conflict with family members. The time-based conflict the most common type of work-family conflict that is based on the scarcity hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that the sum of human energy is fixed and that multiple roles inevitably reduce the time and energy available to meet all role demands, creating strain (Goode, 1960) and thus the work-family conflict (Marks, 1977).

Zedeck (1992) has described the three topics as targets of research with regard to work family conflict:

- **The effect of work on family**: This area examines what impact work factors have on family matters. To express this relationship in term of research design, work is regarded as the independent variable and family is the dependent variable. A common finding is that aspects of work (such as job-stress and work schedules) have negative effects on families.

- **The effect of family on work**: This perspective is the opposite of the former and generally focuses on how structural or developmental aspects of the family have an impact on work behaviour. For example, some researches have viewed family life as a “shock absorber” in that, if home life is positive,
it blocks disappointment at work. Others views family responsibility as a major determinant of work absenteeism and tardiness.

- **The family-work interaction**: The third perspective views work and family as interacting. It concludes that there is no simple or direct casual link between work and family matters. One view of the family-work interaction concerns the compatibility or incompatibility of family work relationships and their impact on other processes, such as the transition between roles.

  Regardless of which of these three perspectives are emphasized, researchers have offered conceptual models to explain the relationship between work and family. Wilensky (1960) hypothesized three possible models to explain the relationship between work and family domains of life: *spill over*, *compensation* and *segmentation*, which represent different perspective on how one can fill both work and family roles.

**Spill Over Model**

The spill over model asserts that there is similarity between what occurs in the work environment and what occurs in the family environment. It proposes that a person’s work experiences influence what he or she does away from work. It is assumed that attitudes at work become ingrained and carried over into home life, affecting a basic orientation towards the self and family members. In general, spill over is a notion of positive relationship between work and family variables such that an individual’s satisfaction with work enhances family life.

**Compensation Model**

The compensation model is most often contrasted with the spillover model. It proposed an inverse relationship between work and family. It further
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assumes that individuals make differential investments of themselves in the two settings so that what is provided by one makes up for what is missing in the other. Thus, deprivations experienced in work are made up or compensated for in non work activities.

Segmentation Model

The segmentation model proposed that the work and non work spheres are distinct so that an individual can be successful in one without any influence on the other. The two spheres exist side by side and for all practical purposes are separated from each other. It maintains that work and family are distinct and unrelated (Dubin, 1956, 1958; Elizur, 1986; Staines, 1980). This separation, in type, space, or function, allows one to effectively compartmentalize one’s life. The dominant view is that the family is the realm of intimacy and empathy, whereas the work world is impersonal and instrumental.

Barling (1990) observed a historical trend in which each of these three models were proposed. Barling concluded that the suggestion that work and family affect each other had emerged by the 1930s; the pervasive assumption during the 1950s was that work and family are independent; by the 1970s the assumption was that work and family roles were interwined and today there is considerable empirical evidence attesting to the overlap between work and family for most individuals.

However, none of the models clearly specifies the psychological processes by which work and family affect each other. Repetti (1987) addressed this shortcoming by proposing four processes through which work and family may be linked. One process is the direct transfer of mood from one sphere to another. Thus, if negative affect develops as a result of stressors in one sphere, it is subsequently transported to the other sphere. The second process is described through role conflict, which is based on the premise that
people have limited supplies of physical, mental and emotional resources and that work and family system must strike a balance in their quest for such resources. The third process is a socialization process, whereby skills and values learned in one sphere, in which they are adaptive and functional, are applied in another setting. The fourth process is somewhat in opposition to the socialization process. Here the skills and values that assist functioning in one sphere do not generalize to the other. Repetti’s process underlying work family linkages are primarily directed to the mechanisms of adaptation to stress and conflict.

Zedeck (1992) believes that reactions to work and non work are not totally stable but vary over time and conditions. Furthermore, the relationship is not the same across families. Friedman, Tucker, Neville and Imperial (1996) offered this description of how the effects of domestic violence do not stay at home. “The battered women who receives threatening calls on units by her abuser at work, or who is suffering from the mental and physical bruises of the night before, is likely to have difficulty fulfilling her employer’s expectation.” However, as Adams, King, and King (1996) reported, the converse can also be true.

More specific models to address the relationship between work and family have also been proposed. One such model was developed by Howard (1992). The model proposes that work and family are mirror images reflected along life’s path. The two spheres are demarcated by the broad horizontal band that culminated in the hopeful expression of life-satisfaction (Fig. 1.1)
Fig 1.1 Proposed Model of Work-Family Relationships, Howard (1992).
The casual flow in figure is from left to right, beginning with individual characteristics and ultimately resulting in life-satisfaction. In between are concepts pertaining to work and family experiences, involvement and satisfaction. Howard conducted two major assessments of the model. One was of the model’s symmetry, which meant that both work and family influences were comparable in affecting overall life-satisfaction. The second assessment was the consistency of the relationship between work and family over the life time of the individual. The model was tested and results revealed complex patterns between work and family over time. Work and family involvement were inversely related, greater absorption in work was accompanied by less involvement in the family. But work and family were found to move in the same direction as the crossroads of satisfaction and stress. Satisfaction with work generalized or spilled over into contentment with the family. However, the overall relationships between work and family were not found to be symmetrical, in that work involvement and satisfaction affected the family but the reverse was not true. Work had more influence on the family than vice versa. The family may be as potent as work only when there is high stress.

Recently a variety of linkage mechanisms have been proposed that explain the nature of the relationship between work-family roles (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), the most-prominent are conflict (or interference), accommodation, compensation, segmentation and enrichment.

Work family conflict of interference refers to simultaneous pressure from the work and family domains that are mutually incompatible in some respect such that meeting the demands of one’s role make it difficult to meet the demands to the other role. Sometimes referred as negative spill over, work family conflict can take different forms. It can originate either in the work-domain or the family domain. Family life may facilitate or enhance
work life or it can make life more difficult and problematic (Crouter, 1984; Kirchmeyer, 1992 & Lambert, 1990).

Work-family accommodation refers to the process by which individuals reduce their involvement in one role to accommodate the demand of the other role (Lambert, 1990). Work-family accommodation can be used as a strategy in response to actual or anticipated work-family conflict such that individual reduce their involvement in a role i.e. less important to them. The reduction in involvement can take either two forms; behavioural (e.g. Curtailing the amount of time devoted role) or psychological (e.g. restricting the level of ego attachment to a particular role).

Another linking mechanism, work-family compensation represent efforts by individuals to offset dissatisfaction in one role by seeking satisfaction in other role (Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992). These efforts can take the form of decreasing involvement in a dissatisfying role and increasing involvement in a more satisfying role. Alternating individuals may respond to dissatisfaction in one role by pursuing rewarding or fulfilling experiences in the other role. The latter form of compensation can be either supplemental or reactive in nature, supplemental compensation occurs when individuals with little autonomy of their work seek more autonomy outside of their work role. On the other hand, reactive compensation represents individuals efforts to redress negative experiences in one role by pursuing contrasting experiences in the other role such as engaging in leisure activities of a fatiguing day at work.

Work family segmentation originally referred to the notion that work family roles are independent of one another such that individuals participate in the role without any influence on the other role (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). More recently, segmentation has been viewed as an intentional separation of work and family roles such that the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of one
role are actively suppressed from affecting the individual’s performance in the other role (Lambert, 1990).

Unlike conflict or interference, work-family enrichment refers to the process by which one role strengthens or enriches the quality of the other role. Work-family enrichment has also been referred to as work-family enhancement, work-family facilitation and positive spillover. These terms describe the notion that a variety of resources from work and family roles have the capacity to provide positive experiences in other role. Satisfaction in one life domain will cause satisfaction in others (Liou, Sylvia & Brunk, 1990).

The definitions of Work Family Conflict (WFC) explicitly portray a bi-directional conceptualization (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985), that is, work can interfere with family (referred to as work-to-family conflict) and family can interface with work (referred to as family-to-work conflict). These dimensions of direction have been identified as distinct, reciprocal constructs that have independent antecedents and outcomes (Frone, Russeell & Cooper, 1992; Frone, Yardley & Markel; 1997). For example, some researches have demonstrated that work-to-family conflict is primarily caused by work-related stressors and characteristics and that it predicts family-related affective and behavioural outcomes while family to work conflict is caused by family-related stressor and characteristics and predicts work-related outcomes (Frone et al, 1997).

The conceptual model of the work family interface has been represented in Fig. 1.2 in which ‘d’ denotes the disturbance term for endogenous variables i.e. job and family distress and \( W \leftrightarrow F \) conflict.
Fig 1.2 Conceptual model of the work family interface (the letter ‘d’ represents the disturbance term for each endogenous variable).

The direct predictors of work-family conflict (WFC) portrayed in this model are job stressors, family stressors, job involvement and family involvement. These four predictors have been identified as an important antecedent of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Moreover, each predictor was expected to be directly related to only one type of WFC.

With regard to job and family stressors, exposure to stressors in a given domain (e.g. Work) may lead to irritability, fatigue, or preoccupation with those problems, thereby limiting one’s ability to meet the demands of other
domains of life (e.g. Family). Job stressors are directly and positively related to W→F conflict, where as family stressors are directly and positively related to F→W conflict.

The second major antecedent of WFC is the psychological importance of work and family roles. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) argued that high levels of psychological involvement may lead to increased WFC in two ways. First, high levels of psychological involvement in one role may be associated with an increase in the amount of time and effort devoted to that role, thereby making it more difficulty to comply with pressure associated with another role. Second, high levels of psychological involvement in a given role may cause one to be mentally preoccupied with that role even when physically attempting to fulfill the demands of a second role. Job involvement is directly and positively related to W→F conflict, whereas family involvement is directly and positively related to F→W conflict.

Frone (2003), Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999), proposed three sets of antecedents of work-family balance – **Personality, Role environment (role overload and social support) and Role involvement.**

Personality characteristics have been noted to not only influence how individuals interpret and react to a situation but also to proactively shape the environment (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Watanabe, Takhashi & Minami, 1997). The three personality characteristics are *proactive personality, neuroticism* and *optimism*. Bateman and Crant (1993), asserted that a prototypical *proactive personality* is an individual who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who effects environmental changes. Proactive individual tends to identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative and preserve until meaningful change occurs. In contrast, less proactive individuals are passive and reactive, preferring to adopt to circumstances rather that to change them. In the context of work-family balance, individuals with proactive personalities will take steps to elicit
support and/or engage in role restructuring or negotiations to minimize work-family conflict and promote work-family facilitation.

One of the Big Five Personality dimensions, has been noted to constitute the negative role of self-esteem (Judge, Locke, Durham & Kluger, 1998) and represents the core trait of negative affectivity (Watson & Clark, 1984). Costa and McCrae (1988) described neurotic individuals as being prone to anxiety and as possessing a tendency to be fearful of novel situations and susceptible to feelings of dependence and helplessness. Empirical research has linked neuroticism (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004) and negative affectivity (Carlson, 1999) to work-family and family-work conflict and to work-family facilitation (Wayne et al, 2004) (Fig. 1.3).

Neuroticism operates as a negative cognitive lens through which life experiences are interpreted. The negative cognitive style of neurotic individuals inhibits efforts to elicit social support to cope with stress or initiate actions that will facilitate the integration of work and family roles.

Fig 1.3  Showing Relationship between negative affectivity and work-family conflict.

Neuroticism operates as a negative cognitive lens through which life experiences are interpreted. The negative cognitive style of neurotic individuals inhibits efforts to elicit social support to cope with stress or initiate actions that will facilitate the integration of work and family roles.
Accordingly, the neuroticism would be expected to be positively related to work-family conflict and negatively related to work-family facilitation.

The *optimism* is a personality characteristic of the extroverts. Zellars and Perrewe (2001) found extraversion to be related to emotional support. On this basis and given the natural tendency the extroverted individuals remain optimistic which urged researchers to focus on optimism. As a disposition, optimism rests on the expectation that one will have positive outcomes in life even if one is at present facing adversity (Carver & Scheier, 1999). Optimistic individuals experience more positive emotions, repair mood more effectively, and are more adapt at regulating emotions and stress. Furthermore, a high level of confidence has been noted to promote a high level of psychological well-being, which in turn, buffers one against life’s stresses and strains. (Baruch, Barnett & Rivers, 1983). Therefore, it is expected that optimism would be negatively related to work-family conflict and positively related to work-family facilitation.

**Role Environment**

The role-related antecedents of work-family balance are role overload and social support. *Role overload* describes a perception of having too many things to do and not enough time to do them. (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison & Pinneau, 1975). Work overload has been found to be positively related to work-family and family-work conflict (Aryee, Leung & Lo, 1999; Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk & Beutell, 1996). Role overload may cause exhaustion or fatigue, which may negatively influence one’s motivation to respond to the demands of other domains. As a negative role experience, role overload undermines an individual’s ability to integrate his or her work and family roles. This is because the fatigue and role related dissatisfaction that role overload precipitates will spill over from work to family, thereby preventing an individual from enjoying his or her participation in that role.
Social Support describes an interpersonal transaction that involves emotional concern, instrumental and information, or appraisal (House, 1981) and is generally conceived of as a coping mechanism in the stress literature (Gore, 1987). Work support has been reported to be negatively related to work family conflict (Frone et al. 1997; Thomas & Ganster 1995). Similarly, family support — from the spouse has been reported to be negatively related to family-work conflict (Adams et al. 1996; Frone et al. 1997; Grywacz & Marks, 2000). Social support may also enhance the integration of work and family roles.

Role Involvement

Role Involvement describes ego or psychological involvement and entails a preoccupation with that domain, making one unavailable to perform the demands or responsibilities of the other domain. High involvement in a role may be related to work-family conflict because it increases the focal person’s awareness of and preoccupation with problems with in that role, thereby increasing the likelihood of perceiving that role as interfering with the demands of other roles. Although role involvement may lead to work-family conflict it can potentially enable individuals to integrate their work and family roles. Individuals who are involved in a role (family) may be able to obtain support from members of that role set that will facilitate the integration of the focal role with that individual’s other role (work). Role involvement will, therefore, motivate individuals to acquire the necessary resources, such as skills and support, that will enhance not only work role performance but also family role performance.

Work-family conflict occurs when participation in the work role and the family role is incompatible in some respect. As a result participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the other role. Work-family conflict can arise from:
1. The time demands of one role that interfere with participation in the other role.

2. The stress originating in one role that spills over into the other role detracting from the quality of life in that role.

3. Behaviour that is effective and appropriate in one role but is ineffective and in appropriate when transferred to the other role.

Amongst the variables, attachment style in the context of individual differences serves special attention for several reasons. First, attachment theory, which is relatively new paradigm for studying close relationships in both childhood and adult life, offers a theoretical foundation for examining people orientation to these relationships. Second, empirical evidence suggests that a person's dominant attachment style, which has been shown to be relatively stable over time, Hazen, Hutt and Marcus (1991) provides a unique perspective for understanding individual differences in interpersonal experiences (Pietromonaco & Barrett, 1997) including how people react to their work environment (Hazen & Shaver, 1994). Third, attachment theory suggests that individuals with different attachment styles will also differ in terms of boundary maintenance between self and others and between work and family (Cassidy & Belsky, 1994). Fourth, and perhaps the most important, attachment theory provides a platform for studying the question of work; non-work relationships from a personality perspective.

Some people typically experience warm, smooth interactions with others and readily establish close, fulfilling relationships, where as other people experience difficulties with these interpersonal tasks. How a relationship is formed, how it develops, and how it is maintained varies for each individual and in marital bonds. Theories on how relationships develops and work have been searched for, tried, and tested. Although there are several prominent social psychological theories, attachment theory is presently among the most common and most cited theory to offer a framework for the
study of interpersonal relationships in adulthood. As a theoretical framework, attachment theory gives a basis for the understanding of the functions and developmental pathways of human affectional bonds, including close relationships between adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

The theory of attachment was originally developed by John Bowlby (1907-1990), a British psychoanalyst who was attempting to understand the intense distress experienced by infants who had been separated from their parents. Bowlby observed that separated infants would go to extraordinary lengths (e.g. Crying, clinging, frantically searching) to either prevent separation from their parents or to reestablish proximity to a missing parents.

Attachment theory's roots life, in part, in object relations theory. Common to both view points is a focus on the development of the self in a relationship context. In his exploration of the early mother-child relationship, Winnicott (1956) theorized that the “good enough mother” is one who creates a “holding environment” for her infant. Within this environment the infant experiences her-himself as being “one” with the mother. It is the mother’s attunement and responsiveness to her baby’s emotional needs that fosters in the child the “capacity to be alone.” The development of such a capacity depends upon the mother’s ability to interpret the environment for her child and meet the child’s needs and demands. The infant begins to develop a sense of a separated self via the mother’s provision of a “mirroring function.” Mirroring is thought to convey to the infant that he or she is seen and recognized, providing evidence that he must, in fact, exist as a separate entity.

Fairburn (1952) also emphasized the importance of a interpersonal context in which human development takes place. Fairburn asserted that libido is not pleasure-seeking, but object seeking. People are not driven primarily by either the pleasure or the death instinct, but by the need to bond with significant others. According to Fairburn, it is our early relationships that form the basis of self and other representations.
John Bowlby (1969) emphasized the importance of the quality of interaction between mother and infant in understanding the development of personality, self-worth, social competence and well-being.

Bowlby (1979) defined attachment as a bond developed with some other differentiated and preferred individual and he defined attachment behaviour as “any form of behaviour that results in a person attaining or retaining proximity” to an attachment figure.

Bowlby theorized that the caregiver’s emotional availability and responsiveness to the infant’s needs, over time and by continued interaction provide the basis for the development of internal working models of relationships. These internal representations contain expectations and beliefs regarding whether the caretaker is loving and responsive, and whether the self is worthy of love, care and attention. Bowlby asserted that these working models endure and therefore have a profound impact upon one’s social competence and well-being throughout the course of one’s life. Additionally, he argued that a permanent loss of an attachment relationship in childhood caused grief, despair and low self-esteem.

Self-esteem refers to an individual’s sense of his or her value or worth or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prize, or likes himself or herself (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The most broad and frequently cited definition of self-esteem within psychology is Rosenberg’s (1965), who described it as a favourable or unfavourable attitude toward the self.

Self-esteem is derived from some of the same sources as the self. Significant others provide one component of self-esteem, with the most significant other providing the most important impetus in to self-esteem. Moreover, social comparisons and self-attributions also contribute to self-esteem. Level of self-esteem is based on the assessment of only those qualities at which they excel.
The theoretical support for the relationship between attachment style and self-esteem is provided by the self-in-relation theorists. A consideration of their theory as it relates to gender difference is attachment style and self-esteem will follow.

Self-in-relation theory has in common with object relations theory an emphasis upon personality development as it takes place within a relational context. In contrast to the Freudian perspective, relational theorists argue that the primary human motivation is to bond with others (object relatedness), rather than the satisfaction of libidinal drives. Thus, relational theorists focus on the reciprocity and mutuality of inter-personal interaction as it influences the developing individual.

As Bowlby (1979) has stated, attachment relations characterize “human behaviour from the cradle to the grave.” Attachment is a special emotional relationship that involves an exchange of comfort, care and pleasure. The roots of research on attachment began with Freud’s theories about love, but another researcher is usually credited as the father of attachment theory. John Bowlby devoted extensive research to the concept of attachment, describing it as a lasting psychological connectedness between human beings. Bowlby shared the psychoanalytic view that early experience in childhood have an important influence on development and behaviour later in life. Our early attachment styles are established in childhood through the infant/caregiver relationship. In addition to this, Bowlby believed that attachment had an evolutionary component, it aids in survival. “The propensity to make strong emotional bonds to particular individuals-a basic component of human nature” (Bowlby, 1988).

Attachment theory implies that how an individual forms an emotional attachment to other individual is primarily developed during infancy and early childhood. Infants relieve anxiety by having their adult caregiver in close proximity. When the adult caregiver is nearby, this elicits feelings of security
and love in the child. With this “felt security” the child usually displays a playful, and more independent behaviour i.e. best exemplified in an active exploration of the environment. If the child does not experience adequate attention, responsibilities and proximity from the caregiver then he or she may become less self assure and less trusting of them and may be at risk for developing insecure attachment relationships.

The attachment relationship between the caregiver and child is described by Bowlby (1988) as having three integral features:
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**Fig. 1.4** Integral features of attachment relationship.

*Proximity* maintenance involves the child’s attempts to stay close to and resist separation from the caregiver. The child uses caregiver as a *secure base* in order to engage in more nonattachment behaviour such as exploration of the surrounding environment and exercising his or her developing motor and/or cognitive skills. Finally, the child uses the caregiver as a *safe haven* for comfort, support, and reassurance, when he or she feels frightened or distressed, the extent to which these three features of attachment are available to the child will lead to his or her primary attachment style. In the relationship with the caregiver, the child learners that he or she can trust the availability of
the caregiver. This primarily emotional experience forms the basis of what Bowlby (1973) called the internal working model (Hazen & Shaver, 1994).

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969), as applied to adult relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Shaver, Hazen & Bradshaw, 1988) provides a framework for understanding such individual differences in interpersonal experiences. According to adult attachment theorists, people develop cognitive representations or internal working models that consist of generalized expectations, beliefs and goals about the self, others and the relation between the two.

The study of relationships is a more recent concern of social psychology than the study of initial attraction. Over the past three decades, the focus of relationship research has increasingly focused on the concept of attachment style. One such new trend in social psychology was the sudden interest in adult attachment style that burst upon the scene near the end of the twentieth century. The concept of attachment originated in the study of the interaction between an infant and his or her caregiver. Bowlby (1973) proposed that in the course of this interaction, the child develops cognitions centering on two crucial attitudes. One basic attitude, evaluation of oneself, is termed self-esteem. In effect, the behaviour and emotional reaction of the caregiver provide information to the infant that he or she is a valued, important, loved individual or, at the other extreme, relatively valueless, unimportant and unloved.

The second basic attitude that babies acquire is an aspect of the social self consisting of one's beliefs and expectancies about other people-interpersonal trust. The general idea is that the infant experiences the caregiver as trustworthy, dependable and reliable or as relatively untrustworthy, undependable and unreliable. As the infant grows and interacts with other people with in and outside of family, constantly and the basic attitude about the caregiver generalizes to other individuals. If long before we
acquired language skills, we are able to form basic schemas about ourselves and about other people, schemas that guide our interpersonal behavior throughout our lives. As a result our interactions with family members, strangers, peer, friends, romantic partners and spouses are to some degree influenced by what we learned in early infancy (Hazen & Shaver, 1990).

Adult attachment theory (Hazen & Shaver, 1987, Shaver et al. 1988) is an extension of Bowlby’s (1969) theory of the bonds between infants and their caregiver. Bowlby (1969) proposed the innate attachment-behavioural system that leads individuals to monitor whether an attachment figure is available and responsive. The fundamental goal of the attachment system is to achieve felt security (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). In the interest of achieving this goal, children are thought to use their day experiences to develop internal working models about the availability and responsiveness of their attachment figures and about their own worth in the ages of their attachment figures (Bowlby, 1973). Similarly, adults are assumed to hold working models that may be based, in part, on those developed earlier in life but that also incorporate experiences in later significant relationships (Carnelly, Pietormonaco & Jaffe, 1994, Hazen & Shaver, 1987). As they do in childhood, these working models are thought to shape how adults interpret and respond to their social interactions.

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 73) proposes that the quality of infant-caregiver interactions results in mental working models that organize cognitions, affects and behavior in later relationships; guide affect regulation and shape self image. Following these ideas, Hazen and Shaver (1987) examined attachment working models in adults, using the tripartite classification of infant attachment style (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978). The secure style is defined by confidence in the availability of attachment figures in times of need, comfort with closeness, interdependence and trust. Children who are securely attached do not experience significant
distress when separated from caregivers. When frightened, these children will seek comfort from the parent or caregiver. Parents of securely attached children tend to play more with these children. Additionally, these parents react more quickly to their children's need and are generally more responsive to their children than the parents of insecurely attached children. These children are also described as less descriptive, less aggressive, and more mature than children with ambivalent or avoidant attachment styles. As adults, those who are securely attached tend to have trusting, long-term relationships. Other key characteristics of securely attached individuals include having high self-esteem, enjoying intimate relationships, seeking out social support and an ability to share feelings with other people.

The avoidant style is characterized by insecurity in other's intentions and preference for emotional distance. The anxious-ambivalent style portrays a strong desire for intimacy together with insecurity about other's responses to their desire and high fear of rejection. Children who are ambivalently attached tend to be extremely suspicious of strangers. These children display considerable distress when separated from a parent or caregiver. According to Cassidy and Berlin (1994), ambivalent attachment is relatively uncommon with only 7% to 15% of infants in the United States displaying this attachment style. As these children grow older, teachers often describe them as clingy and over-dependent. As adults, those with an ambivalent attachment style often feel reluctant about becoming close to others and worry that their partner does not reciprocate their feelings. This leads to frequent breakups, often because the relationship feels cold and distant. These individuals feel especially distraught after the end of a relationship.

In the Ainsworth paradigm, the mother and child are observed in a controlled setting, and the mother is instructed to leave the room briefly on two occasions and then return to her child. The three attachment style can be observed in the child's response to this situation. Secure children are mildly
upset by the mother’s absence but are quickly soothed by her return. Avoidant children tend to reject the mother and to show emotional control and restraint when they are once again with her. Ambivalent children reveal a state of conflict—they cry when separated from the mother, but her return only leads to more crying and to anger.

Attitudes about self and others are important because people are not at all accurate in determining whether they are liked or disliked by strangers (Marcus & Askari, 1999). Those with a positive attitude about self and other people expect to be liked and they usually are. Among both children and adults, a secure attachment style is also associated with adaptive behaviour, such as curiosity about the exploration of one’s environment (Green & Campbell, 2000). As a general summary, secure individuals of whatever age interact well with others, avoidant individuals have the most interpersonal difficulties and ambivalent individuals fall someplace in between.

With regard to adult attachment styles, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) took Bowlby’s idea further and postulated that an internal working model of self and an internal working model of others combine together to form distinct adult attachment styles (Fig. 1.5).

**Model of Self (Dependence)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model of others (avoidance)</th>
<th>Positive (Low)</th>
<th>Negative (High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Low)</td>
<td>Cell I Secure</td>
<td>Cell II Preoccupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy</td>
<td>Preoccupied with relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (High)</td>
<td>Cell IV Dismissive Avoidant</td>
<td>Cell III Fearful Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissing of intimacy</td>
<td>Fearful of intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>counter dependent</td>
<td>socially avoidant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1.5 Model of Adult Attachment (Bartholomew, 1990).**
Fig. 1.6 Types of Attachment Style
The two components of the working models have a positive and a negative form. Specifically, they suggested that a person with a positive model of self, for example, feels worthy of love and support, and with a positive models of others he or she feels that people are trust worthy and available. These two components (self and others), each which vary in terms of being emotionally negative or positive, interact together to form four distinct styles of attachment (Secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful).

Cell I indicates a sense of worthiness (lovability) plus an expectation that other people are generally accepting and responsive. Because this cell corresponds conceptually to categories that investigators call securely attached (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985) has been labeled secure. A person with a secure attachment style has high self-esteem and is positive about other people, so he or she seeks interpersonal closeness and feels comfortable in relationships. For example, secure adults express trust in their partners (Mikulincer, 1998b) and are able to work together to solve problems (Lopez, Gover, Leskela, Saver, Schirmer & Wyssmann, 1997). Compared to those with other attachment styles, secure individuals are less prone to become angry, attribute less hostile intent to others, and expect conflicts to have positive and constructive outcomes. Secure individuals are best able to form lasting, committed, satisfying relationships (Shaver and Brennan, 1992).

Cell II indicates a sense of unworthiness (unlovability) combined with a positive evaluation of others. This combination of characteristics would lead the person to strive for self-acceptance by gaining the acceptance of valued others. This pattern corresponds conceptually to Hazen and Shaver's ambivalent group and is referred to as preoccupied. A preoccupied attachment style is defined by a negative view of self combined with positive expectations that other people will be loving and accepting. As a result, preoccupied individuals seek closeness in relationship but they also experience anxiety and shame because they feel they are not "worthy" of the
other person's love (Lopez et al, 1997). Distress about the possibility of being rejected is extreme. The need for love and approval plus self criticism leads to depression whenever a relationship goes badly (Whiffen, Aube Thompson & Campbell, 2000).

Cell III indicates a sense of unworthiness (unlovability) combined with an expectation that others will be negatively disposed (untrustworthy and rejecting). By avoiding close involvement with others, this style enables people to protect themselves against anticipated rejection by others. Therefore, it is labeled as fearful-avoidant. A person with a fearful-avoidant attachment style is low in self-esteem and negative about other people. Fearful-avoidant individuals describe their parents in negative terms (Levy, Blatt & Shaver, 1998), are hostile and become angry without realizing it (Mikulincer, 1998a), and experience less intimacy and enjoyment in interacting with current or potential romantic partners (Tidwell, Reis & Shaver, 1996). This attachment style is associated with negative interpersonal relationships, feelings of jealousy, and the use of alcohol to reduce their anxiety about social situations (McGowan, Daniels & Byrne, 2000).

Finally, cell IV indicates a sense of love-worthiness combined with a negative disposition toward other people. Such people protect themselves against disappointment by avoiding close relationships and maintaining a sense of independence and invulnerability. This style corresponds conceptually to be detached, or dismissing of attachment attitude described by Rain, Lane and Steiner (1991), so it has been labeled as dismissive avoidant. The dismissing individuals views himself or herself as worthwhile and very much entitled to a close relationship; other people are more likely to view them less positively and to describe them as unfriendly and limited in social ability. A major problem is that they expect the worst of others, so they are likely to fear genuine closeness.
The dimensions in figure can also be conceptualized in terms of dependency on the horizontal axis and the avoidance of intimacy on the vertical axis; dependency can vary from low (a positive self-regard is established internally and does not require external validation) to high (positive self-regard can only be maintained by others' ongoing acceptance). Avoidance of intimacy reflects the degree to which people and close contact with others as a result of their expectations of aversive consequences. The dismissing and fearful style are alike in that both reflect the avoidance of intimacy; they differ, however, in the person's need for others acceptance to maintain a positive self-regard. Similarly, the preoccupied and fearful groups are alike in that both exhibit strong dependency on others to maintain a positive self regard, but they differ in their readiness to become involved in close relationships. Whereas the preoccupied cell implies a reaching out to others in an attempt to fulfill dependency needs, the fearful cell implies an avoidance of closeness to minimize eventual disappointment. Therefore, cells in adjoining quadrants of figure 1.5 are more similar conceptually than those in opposite quadrants.

This refined model of attachment style has resulted in research analyzing the role of attachment styles in relationships and their associations with personality and family contexts. In a study by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) gender differences were found between the attachment styles. Based on interviewer ratings, women received higher preoccupied ratings, whereas men received much higher dismissing ratings, suggesting that negative model of others may result in gender specific reactions and associated attachment styles. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) also found that although the two negative self-image styles (pre-occupied and fearful) indicated higher levels of interpersonal problems, all four styles have their share of them. For example, dismissingly attached individuals very often reported problems in relationship regarding lack of warmth in interactions,
whereas individuals characterized by the preoccupied attachment style were highly dependent on others to facilitate their positive self-regard and tended to act in a controlling and dominant way.

Brennan's (1998) findings suggested that there are two fundamental dimensions with respect to adult attachment patterns (Fig. 1.7).

Fig. 1.7 Dimension of Adult Attachment Patterns.

One critical variable has been labeled attachment-related anxiety. People who secure high on this variable tend to worry whether their partner is available, responsive, attentive etc. People who score on the low end of this variable are more secure in the perceived responsiveness of their partners. The other critical variable is called attachment related avoidance. People on the high end of this dimension prefer not to rely on others or open up to others. People on the low end of this dimension are more comfortable being intimate with others and are more secure depending upon and having others depend upon them. A prototypical secure adult is low on both of these dimensions.

Brennan's findings are critical because recent analyses of the statistical patterning of behaviour among infants in the strange situation reveal two
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functionally similar dimensions: one that captures variability in the anxiety and resistance of the child and another that captures variability in the child's willingness to use the parent as a sage heaven for support. Functionally, these dimensions are similar to the two-dimensions uncovered among adults, suggesting that similar patterns of attachment exist at different points in the life-span.

There are three critical implications of this relationship. First, if adult romantic relationships are attachment relationships, then we should observe the same kinds of individual differences in adult relationships that Ainsworth observed in infant caregiver relationship. For example, to be secure in their relationships—to feel confident that their partners will be there for them when needed, and open to depending on others and having others depend on them. We should respect others adults, in contrast, to be insecure in their relationships.

Second, if adult romantic relationships are attachment relationships, then the way adult relationship “work” should be similar to the way infant-caregiver relationship work.

Third, whether an adult is secure or insecure in his or her adult relationships may be a partial reflection of his or her attachment experiences in early childhood. Bowlby believed that the mental representation on working models that a child holds regarding relationships are a function of his or her care giving experiences. Bowlby, this kind of process should promote continuity in attachment pattern over the life course, although it is possible that a person's attachment pattern will change, if his or her relational experiences are inconsistent with his or her expectations. In short, if we assume that adult relationships are attachment relationships, it is possible that children who are secure as children will grow up to be secure in their romantic relationships.
Recently, the researchers looked at the trait known as "attachment insecurity" characterized by difficulty trusting and depending on others, feeling uncomfortable with emotional intimacy of worrying about being abandoned by loved ones. So attachment style can be seen as fairly stable root that affects a person's response to stressful events. Attachment insecurity affects people's ability to regulate their emotions, including how they perceive and deal with stress which may affect the body's physiological response to stress.

There seems to be little doubt that the work-family linkage and attachment styles contribute to individual's well-being. Individuals continue to seek the balance between work and family ties as important potential source of well being in the form of satisfaction with job, life and ultimately leading to happiness.

Whilst the concept of well-being is acknowledged by WHO (World Health Organization) to be intrinsic to health and to have physical, mental and social dimensions, in the minds of many it is a more explicit recognition that health can be very much more than the absence of disease or disability. To this extent, well being can represent a favourable collective state of body, mind or social situation even when any one of these may be dysfunctional.

Growth in the field of subjective well being (SWB) reflects larger societal trends concerning the value of the individual, the importance of subjective views of evaluating life, and the recognition that well-being necessarily include positive elements that transcend economic prosperity.

Well-being connotes more than an absence of pain distress. It implies that an individual's psychological, security, and behavioural needs are fulfilled.

Subjective well-being is the scientific name of how people evaluate their lives. People can evaluate their lives in terms of a global judgment (such as life-satisfaction or feeling of fulfillment), in terms of evaluating the
domains of their lives (such as marriage or work), or in terms of their ongoing emotional feelings about what is happening to them (feeling pleasant emotions, which arise from positive evaluations of one's experience, and low level of unpleasant feelings, which arise from negative evaluations of one's experience). However, subjective well-being is an umbrella term that includes the various types of evaluation of one's life one might make—it can include self-esteem, joy, feeling of fulfillment and so forth. The key is that the person himself/herself is making the evaluation of life—not by the experts, philosophers, or others. Thus, the person herself/himself is the expert to evaluate his life according to the standards that he choose to use.

Well-being is not simply our present intrinsic state, but whether and how we are affected by the circumstances around us; for example, resilience and whatever is its social-biological basis can allow for well-being. There is evidence that, innately, we have the ability to bounce back in times of loss, with the possible exceptions of the death of a child or life-partner. If a person can overcome a sense of loss, he may be ready to let go of something which makes him unhappy which is a way to enhance well-being. This does, however, beg the question of how coupled happiness is to well-being; probable happiness contributes to well-being, but well-being may not require happiness. Observations and considerations of this kind are amenable to further scientific enquiry which may allow us to institute techniques for the advancement of well-being.

Many philosophers and social scientists have concerned themselves with defining well being or happiness. Definitions of well-being and happiness can be grouped into three categories.

First, well-being has been defined by external criteria such as virtue or holiness. Coan (1977) reviewed the varying conceptions of the ideal condition that have held away in different cultures and eras. In normatic definitions happiness is not thought of a subjective state, but rather as possessing some
desirable quality. Such definitions are normative because they define what is desirable. Thus, when Aristotle wrote that eudemonia is gained mainly by leading a virtuous life, he did not mean that virtue leads to feeling of joy. Rather, he was prescribing virtue as the normative standard against which people’s lives can be judged. Therefore, eudemonia is not happiness in the modern senses of the world, but a desirable state judged from a particular value frame-work. The criterion for happiness of this type is not the actor’s subjective judgment, but the value framework of the observer. A related meaning of happiness given by Tatarkiewicz (1976) is success, which must be defined relative to some standard.

Second, social scientists have focused on the question of what leads people to evaluate their lives in positive terms. This definition of subjective well-being has come to be labeled life-satisfaction and relies on the standards of the respondent to determine what is the good life. Although well-being from a subjective perspective has become a popular idea in the last century, this concept can be traced back several millennia. For example, Marcus Aurelius wrote that “no man is happy who does not think himself so.” Shin and Johnson (1978) have defined this form of happiness as “a global assessment of a person’s a quality of life according to his own chosen criteria.” Andrews and Withey (1976) found that over 99% of their respondents had previously made such as assessment of their lives. A related set of definitions of happiness is that it is the harmonious satisfaction of one’s desires and goals (Chekola, 1975). If one is concerned with the person’s assessment of this, then it clearly falls with in the realm of subjective well-being and is an idea related to satisfaction.

A third meaning of happiness comes closed to the way the term is used in every day discourse-as denoting a preponderance of positive after over negative affect (Bradburn, 1969). This definition of subjective well-being, thus, stresses pleasant emotions during this period of life or that the person is
predisposed to such emotions, whether or not he or she is currently experiencing them.

Satisfaction with life and positive affect are both studied by subjective well-being researchers. How these two components relate to one another is an empirical question, not one of definition. Unfortunately terms like happiness that have been used frequently in daily discourse will necessarily have fuzzy and somewhat different meanings. Nevertheless, as measurement and other work proceeds, the most scientifically useful concepts will be those that can be measured and show within a theoretical framework, interesting relationships to other variables.

The area of subjective well-being has three hallmarks. First, it is subjective. According to Campbell (1981) it resides within the experience of the individual. Notably absent from definitions of SWB are necessary objective conditions such as health, comfort, virtue, or wealth (Kammann, 1983). Although such conditions are seen as potential influences on SWB, they are not seen as an inherent and necessary part of it.

Second subjective well-being includes positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors, as is true to most measures of mental health. However, the relationship between positive and negative indices is not completely understood.

Third, the subjective well-being measures typically include a global assessment of all aspects of a person’s life. Although affect or satisfaction with in a certain domain may be assessed, the emphasis is usually placed on an integrated judgement of the person’s life. Nonetheless, measures may cover a period ranging from a few weeks to one’s entire life.

Well-being will also presumably require a sense of security at the personal, household and societal levels, constituting the broader situation of “Human Security”. Well-being is also likely to be dependent on belief and culture. For example, great emphasis is placed on reducing expectations as an
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approach to happiness in Buddhist societies; material prosperity is often understood not to be the basis of happiness, but reflect various combination of endeavour and "luck". There may be a "treadmill" to ephemeral happiness, epitomized by Daniel Gilbert's notion of "miswanting" instead, social interaction and relationships seem to provide more lasting happiness. Happiness may be underpinned by: sense of personal security, related to expectations, connectedness, recognition, task or project completion, problem solving and conflict resolution.

Fig. 1.8 Treadmill to Ephemeral Happiness
As mentioned earlier, SWB is really an umbrella term that includes several different components such as job-satisfaction, life-satisfaction and happiness and these components are some what independent. That is, one can be high in one and low in another. If one wants to be “happier,” this might mean increasing positive affect or decreasing negative affect—and these two things might require very different actions. Similarly, these are even some behaviours that produce higher satisfaction but produce lower positive affect.

Happiness is important in and of itself because it is how people evaluate their own lives. Certainly, it is hard to imagine a good society in which we think people are living in a desirable way, but they are all unhappy and dissatisfied. So, SWB seems absolutely necessary for the “good society”, although is not sufficient for that society because there are other things we also value and would want in such a place. Thus, it can be said that high SWB is necessary, but not sufficient, for the good life. When people were asked, they say that SWB is extremely important. For example, college students from various nations of the world rated happiness and life satisfaction as very important or extremely important in the 41 nations surveyed. In fact, in only one country did students rate money as more important than life-satisfaction whereas happiness was rated as more important than money in every single country.

Many researchers in the area of subjective well-being avoid the term “happiness” because it has several different meanings. For example, it can mean a joyful state, it can mean long-term positive feelings, or it can mean life-satisfaction. Happiness sometimes is even used to refer to the things that cause one to feel good, as in “Happiness is a good family.” Life-satisfaction refers to a cognitive evaluation or judgement of one’s life. People use information to make conscious judgements when they report “satisfaction”, whereas moods and emotions occur as ongoing reactions to current events. Occasionally we use the term happy or happiness to refer to the affective
components of SWB— a presence of positive affect and an absence of negative affect. A happy person then would be one who has a positive “affect balance.”

Job-satisfaction is one of the most important component of well-being. Are people really so dissatisfied with the work they do? Is it not possible for workers to become happy and prosperous by working hard on a good job? What do people get out of the work they do? Terkel observed in his introduction to working that the youth of modern society are questioning a “work ethic” in which the individual is subjugated by the job. Young people are asking for meaningful work. More recently, job-satisfaction has become an intriguing issue not only to researchers but also to people in industry.

Like any feelings of satisfaction, job satisfaction is an emotional, effective response. Therefore, job satisfaction is the extent to which a person derives pleasure from a job. Locke (1976) defines it as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal or one’s job or job experiences. “Unlike morale, which is a group response, job satisfaction is strictly an individual response. The morale of a group could be high, but a person in the group could be dissatisfied. The converse could also be true. It was initially thought that people could have an overall feeling of liking for a job, ranging from very low to very high. This was known as global job-satisfaction. People can have different feelings about their co-workers and their pay, and both contribute to overall feelings about their jobs. Thus, two people could feel the same level of global job-satisfaction but for different reasons.

Psychologists realized that people can feel differently about various aspects of a job. Because these feelings could be masked by assessing only global satisfaction, psychologists began examining job-facet satisfaction. This involves measuring how people feel about various parts of a job. As Locke (1976) said, “A job is not an entity but a complex interrelationship of tasks, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards. Thus, a thorough
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understanding of job-attitudes requires that the job be analyzed in terms of its constituent elements.

What are the facets of a job, and how many are there? There is no one number that holds for all jobs, jobs differ, and certain facets are more prevalent in some jobs than others. The statistical approach involves analyzing employee responses to job attitude questions. Responses are inter-correlated, and cluster or factors are created based on similarity of response. These factors thus become the facets of a job as perceived by the employees. The conceptual approach involves specifying the facets to be examined in light of the research goals. The facets are identified from the researcher's intuition, perhaps from a theoretical perspective. No matter which method is used, results usually reveal from five to twenty facets that contribute to satisfaction. Some facets are common to all jobs; others are job specific.

While most people tend to report being at least moderately satisfied with their jobs, others do not. This raises an important question: what factors contribute to these differences in job-satisfaction? Researches on this issue indicates that two major groups of factors are important: Organizational factors related to a company's practices or the working conditions it provides and personal factors related to the traits of individual employees.

The organizational factors that influence job satisfaction: people report higher satisfaction when they feel that the reward systems in their companies are fair, when they like and respect their bosses and believe these persons have their best interests at heart, when they can participate in the decisions they affect them, when the work they perform is interesting rather than boring and repetitious, and when they are neither overloaded with too much to do in a given amount of time nor underloaded with too little to do, (Callan, 1993, Melamed, Ben-Avi, Luz & Green, 1995; Miceli & Lane, 1991).

Turning to personal factors, both seniority and status are important. Their longer people have been in a given job and the higher their status, the
greater their satisfaction (Zeitz, 1990). In addition, certain personal traits are closely related to job satisfaction. Empirical findings indicate that differences in what have been termed core self-evaluations—individuals' basic assessment about themselves and their self worth—may play a key role (Judge, Locke & Durham, 1997). Such core self-evaluations involve four basic factors: self-esteem, generalized feelings of self-efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability. The persons with positive core self-evaluations tend to express higher job satisfaction than do those with negative core self-evaluation in many different settings (Judge et al, 1998).

![Diagram showing the relationship between Core Self Evaluation, Job Complexity, Favourable Job Characteristics, and Job Satisfaction]

**Fig. 1.9 Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction**

Additional evidence indicates that this may be so because persons high in core self-evaluation tend to hold more complex, challenging jobs. Such jobs, in turn, offer more autonomy and variety in the tasks they involve and this, in turn, leads to high job satisfaction (Fig. 1.9). Judge, Bono and Locke (2000) provides clear supports for this reasoning so it does appear that core self-evolutions are an important factor in job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction may have an important genetic component, and that, as a result, some individuals have a tendency to express either relatively high or relatively low levels of job satisfaction no matter where they work. The first research pointing to such conclusions was conducted by Arvey and his colleagues (1989) more than eighteen years ago. Although these results remain somewhat controversial (Crapanzano & James, 1990) but they have been replicated in other studies also (Keller, Bouchard, Arvey, Segal &
Thus, it appears that job satisfaction may stem, at least in part, from genetic factors.

One possibility involves genetically influenced differences in affective temperament (Weiss & Crapanzano, 1996). In other words, genetic factors influence temperament—general tendencies to be upbeat, positive and happy at one extreme versus depressed, negative and unhappy at the other. Differences in temperament do indeed seem to stem, from genetic factors in part and are visible even in very young infants (Lemery, Goldsmith, Klinnert & Mrazek, 1999). Such differences may influence how individuals experience emotionally significant events at work and such contrasting experiences in turn, may affect job satisfaction. Because of such stability, persons who express high levels of satisfaction in one job at a given time are likely to express high levels of satisfaction in a different job at a later time, and the same is true for persons who express low levels of satisfaction—they tend to be dissatisfied no matter where they work. This doesn’t in any way imply that job satisfaction can’t be changed—it can.

The behaviour at work can be related to behaviour outside work situation. Many psychologists are interested to study the relationship between work behaviour and behaviour off the job. A particularly large body of literature has been generated by researchers studying the relationship between job satisfaction and other types of satisfaction. Psychologists has been especially interested in non-work satisfaction, or the satisfaction a person experience when engaging in activities away from the job and general life-satisfaction or one’s level of satisfaction considering all aspects of life, including both work and non work.

Dubin (1956) proposed the concept of central life-interest. He defined this as an expressed preference for behaving in a given locale. Some people see work as a central life interest. These individuals, whom Dubin calls job-oriented, should have a high evaluation of work and would score relatively
high on satisfaction measures. Other individuals, whom Dubin calls non-job oriented, have central life interests other than work. A third group may express no clear preference. They have a flexible-focus central life interest for this group, there would be a small relationship between central life-interests and job satisfaction.

Orpen (1978) was of this opinion that differences in job satisfaction cause differences in fulfillment of life satisfaction outside the job. He also concluded that satisfaction in one area spills over into the other. Current thinking on the job satisfaction and life satisfaction relationship suggests that the two concepts have a reciprocal casual relationship, meaning each influence the other (Schmitt & Bederis, 1982).

Jamal and Mitcheell (1980) concluded that individuals who cannot appreciably satisfy their psychological needs in their work environment have either a low or, at best, moderate level of mental health. Individuals whose needs are relatively much more satisfied in the work-environment show either a high or moderately high level of overall mental health. Thus, there appears to be a bond between feelings of satisfaction in the work and non work domain.

The concept of life satisfaction, as it has been used in this study refers to an individual’s sense of well-being about various aspects of his life. The major spheres of life covered are an individual’s personal life in terms of its psychological and materialistic components, health, economic, marital, social and job. The list of domain that contribute to overall settings of life-satisfaction is potentially endless. Although there is no generally accepted theory that may guide the thinking about the importance of particular domains, the seven areas seem to cover the major portion of one’s life space. Life satisfaction or personal adjustment considered an important variable in younger, mature as well as aged people.
In addition to job satisfaction and life-satisfaction, happiness is also a key factor of individual's well-being. Weaver summarized that "happiness seems to be generalized phenomenon, according to which employees are either generally satisfied or generally dissatisfied across a broad totality of life, with relatively few employees experiencing a significant satisfaction happiness relationships in only one of a few aspects of life. The happiness of most employees would rarely come entirely from a satisfying job, with little or no support from satisfaction in other domains of life.

The search for happiness is not new and neither is a academic interest in the topic. In 1776 the American Declaration of independence argued for "certain in alienable rights, that among these all life, liberty and pursuit of happiness." (The American Declaration of Independence, 1776, as cited in Hawke, 1964). As such, nations have been formed on the basis of the search for happiness, and this desire has been put on a par with the right to life and the right to freedom. In U.K. interest in happiness was brought to widespread attention with the moral philosophy of Jeremy Bentham (1789) who argued that the purpose of politics should be to bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people. Political interest in happiness has not diminished in modern times. In a survey Easton (2006) found that 81% of the U.K.
population agreed that the government’s primary objective should be the creation of happiness not wealth.

It seems likely that the current political and media interest in happiness has to a large extent been provoked by a surge of research interest in the topic in economics (Oswald & Powdthavee, 2006) and positive psychology (Diener, 2000). Indeed psychologists have led the call for measures of subjective well-being (SWB) to form the basis of Government policy and the political assessment of a nation’s success. The increasing importance of SWB in comparison to other measures has been reviewed by Diener and Suh (1997) who concluded that “subjective well-being measures are necessary to evaluate a society, and add substantially to the economic indicators that are now favoured by policy makers.” In the literature a major distinction is drawn between brief emotional episodes, periods of joy or acute happiness and an underlying state of happiness. This underlying state is conceptualized as a sense of satisfaction with one’s life, both in general and in specific areas of one’s life such as relationships, health and work.

Happiness is an emotional or affective state that is characterized by feelings of enjoyment and satisfaction. As a state and a subject, it has been pursued and commented on extensively throughout world history. This reflects the universal importance that humans place on happiness.

Freud has stated that there is no doubt that man sought happiness above all other goals in life. He defined happiness as criteria of excellence in the art of living. Altson and Dudley (1987) proposed that happiness is the ability to enjoy one’s experiences, accompanied by a degree of excitement. Argyle, Martin and Crossland (1989) believe that happiness is composed of three related components: a) positive affect b) absence of negative affect and c) satisfaction with life as a whole.
Martin Seligman (2000) gave the positive psychological definition of happiness as consisting of both positive emotions (like comfort) and positive activities (like absorption). He presents three categories of positive emotions.

a) Past: feeling of satisfaction, contentment, pride and serenity.

b) Present: (e.g.) enjoying the taste of food, glee at listening to music, absorption in reading.

c) Future: feeling of optimism, hope, trust, faith and confidence.

These are three categories of present positive emotions:

a) Bodily pleasure, e.g. enjoying the taste of food.

b) Higher pleasure, e.g. glee at listening to music.

c) Gratification, e.g., absorption in reading

The bodily and higher pleasures are “pleasures of moment” and usually involve some external stimulus. An exception is the glee felt at having an original thought. Gratification involves full engagement, flow, elimination of self-consciousness and blocking of felt emotions. But when a gratification comes to an end then positive emotion will be felt.

Thus, these are the different views on happiness. So, it is probably impossible to objectively define happiness as it as an internal experience – it is like a thought, a dream or an idea, we feel in our consciousness it is a part of our awareness or a state of mind.

“A Human being is not one on pursuit of happiness, but rather in search of a reason to be happy.”

— Frankl, 1984
Essentials of Happiness

From the analysis of happiness and unhappiness at different times during the childhood years, three essentials stand out. They are often called “Three A’s of Happiness” and are acceptance, affection and achievement (Fig. 1.10).

Acceptance means not only acceptance of others but also acceptance of self. However, they normally go hand in hand. Children who are accepted by others find it easy to like and accept them. They find it easy to like and accept them. They thus become well adjusted people who are popular with age-mates and adults.

Children who are accepted can count on affection – the second ‘A’ of happiness. The more accepted children are by others the more affection they will receive from them. However, to receive affection, children must in turn show affection. Unless, they do so their acceptance by others will be reduced and, in turn, the amount of affection they receive from them.
The third ‘A’ of happiness is achievement. For children to be happy, their achievement must be an area regarded as important to the members of social groups with which, they are identified. In addition, individual’s happiness depends on their reaching the goal they set for themselves. One of the biggest obstacles to happiness is the setting of unrealistically high goals. Only when the goals are realistic, in the sense that individuals have the capacity to reach them they will feel satisfied and happy.

Not only of these three essentials will, alone, bring happiness. If an individual is to experience the state of well-being and contentment that constitutes happiness they must experience all of them (Hurlock, 2003).

In the Nocomachean Ethics, written in 350 BC, Aristotle stated that happiness is the only thing that humans desire for its own sake. He observed that men sought riches not for the sake of being rich, but to be happy. Those who sought fame desired it not to be famous, but because they believed fame would bring them happiness. Aristotle argued that humans seek everything else such as; fish, bread and children. Many ethicists make arguments for how humans should behave, either individually or collectively, based on the resulting happiness of such behavior. Utilitarians, such as John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham, advocated the greatest happiness principal as a guide for ethical behaviour.

States associated with happiness-being, delight, health, safety, contentment and love. Contrasting states include suffering, depressing, grief, anxiety and pain. Happiness is often associated with the presence of favourable circumstances such as supportive family life, a loving marriage, and economic stability. Unfavourable circumstances such as abusive relationships, accidents, loss of employment, and conflicts, diminish the amount of happiness a person experiences. However, according to several ancient and modern thinkers, happiness is influenced by the attitude and perspective taken on such circumstances.
Happiness is our birthright as human beings. There is no doubt that life can be difficult-living in today’s world is not always easy. But despite life’s inevitable problems and challenges, genuine happiness is still possible. The art of happiness books, tapes, and the workshops can help to show us the way to find the lasting happiness we all seek. There are many facets to leading a happy life. It begins by understanding the true and legitimate source of happiness. The art of happiness is based on a few basic premises:

1. The purpose of life is happiness.

2. Happiness is determined more by the state of one’s mind than by one’s external conditions, circumstances, or events-at least once one’s basic survival needs are met.

3. Happiness can be achieved through the systematic training of our hearts and minds, through reshaping our attitudes and outlook.

4. The key to happiness is in our hands.

The happiest people always had two things-good mental health and good social relationships. Every one of the happiest people had good social relationships in general, although some of the unhappy people also had good social relationships. For this reason, high quality social relationships are necessary for well-being, but not sufficient for it.

Therefore, the subjective well-being is a broad category of phenomenon that includes people’s emotional responses, domain satisfaction and global judgement of life-satisfaction which ultimately leads to happiness. Therefore, subjective well-being is an interesting research area not only because of its inherent value to citizens, but also because individual’s subjective well-being can have positive spillover benefits for the society as a whole.

With this, we may proceed to next chapter dealing with review of the relevant literature.