ABSTRACT

In the present study an attempt has been made to study the Quality of Relationship, Subjective Well-Being and Human Values among Single and Dual Career Couples. Single career couples are those in which the husband works outside and the wife looks after the household tasks and responsibilities. Dual career couples are those in which both husband and wife pursue their respective careers.

The present research is systematically designed in accordance with the following major objectives:

1. To examine the quality of relationship among single career couples and dual career couples.

2. To examine the quality of relationship among working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples.

3. To examine the quality of relationship among non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples.

4. To examine the subjective well-being among single career couples and dual career couples.

5. To examine the subjective well-being among working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples.
6. To examine the subjective well-being among non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples.

7. To identify the hierarchy of terminal values among single career couples and dual career couples.

8. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on terminal values.

9. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

10. To identify the hierarchy of instrumental values among single career couples and dual career couples.

11. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on instrumental values.

12. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.
In the present study following hypotheses were formulated:

1. There will be significant difference between single career couples and dual career couples on quality of relationship.

2. There will be significant difference between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on quality of relationship.

3. There will be significant difference between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on quality of relationship.

4. There will be significant difference between single career couples and dual career couples on subjective well-being.

5. There will be significant difference between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

6. There will be significant difference between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

7. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between single career couples and dual career couples on terminal values.
8. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on terminal values.

9. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

10. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between single career couples and dual career couples on instrumental values.

11. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on instrumental values.

12. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.

The present study was conducted on two hundred couples (N=200). They were selected from different faculties of Aligarh Muslim University, and Aligarh city through random purposive sampling. The sample was also split into 100 single career couples (100 working husbands and 100 non-working wives) and 100 dual career couples (100 working husbands and 100 working wives). The age of the respondents varied from 30 to 50 years. Three instruments were used in the present investigation. (I) **Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI)** as developed by Pierce, Sarason, and Sarason (1991). The current version of QRI includes 25
items that assess the amount of support, conflict and depth in a broad range of close relationships. The QRI items are rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1= “Not at all” to 4= “Very much”. Accumulating evidence suggests that the QRI is a reliable, valid measure of these three aspects of close relationships (support, conflict and depth). (II) **Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)** was used for measuring the subjective well-being. The SWLS is a 5-item scale measures global life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Individuals responded to items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1= "Strongly Disagree" to 7= "Strongly Agree." Responses were summed to produce a total SWLS score, with higher scores indicating more life satisfaction. Internal consistency (.87), test-retest reliability (.82 eight weeks), and validity of the SWLS are good (Diener et al., 1985). The total SWLS scale ranges from 5 to 35. Internal consistencies of .85 and test-retest coefficients of .84 was reported. (III) **Rokeach Value Survey Form (RVSF)** developed by Rokeach (1973) was used for measuring the human values in the present study. The RVSF measures 18 terminal values i.e., *A world at peace, Family security, Freedom, Equality, Self-respect, Happiness, Wisdom, National security, Salvation, True friendship, A sense of accomplishment, Inner harmony, A comfortable life, Mature love, A world of beauty, Pleasure, Social recognition, and An exciting life*, and 18 instrumental values i.e., *Ambitious, Broadminded, Capable, Cheerful, Clean, Courageous, Forgiving, Helpful, Honest, Imaginative, Independent, Intellectual, Logical, Loving, Obedient, Polite, Responsible, and Self-controlled*. He has demonstrated good reliability over time (i.e. r = .88 to .51 for the terminal values; r = .70 to .45
for the instrumental values) and sound validity when compared to other similar value scales (Braithwaite & Law, 1985).

The data were collected individually from the subjects. The investigator first of all apprised to the respondents about the utility of the study and then the couples were asked to fill up the questionnaires according to the instructions printed on top of the questionnaires. They were assured that their responses would be kept confidential. The data were analyzed with the help of student t-test and Rank difference correlation coefficients. Median ranks were also computed to examine the level of preference of subjects on terminal and instrumental values of all groups.

The main findings of the present study were:

- Significant differences existed between the mean score of single career couples and dual career couples on quality of relationship.
- Significant differences existed between the mean score of working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on quality of relationship.
- Significant differences existed between the mean score of non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on quality of relationship.
- Significant differences existed between the mean score of single career couples and dual career couples on subjective well-being.
Significant difference was found to exist between the mean scores of working husbands of single career couples and the working husbands of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

Significant differences existed between the mean score of non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

Non-significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($p$) was found between the single career couples and dual career couples on terminal values.

Insignificant rank difference correlation coefficient ($p$) was found between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual careers couples on terminal values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($p$) was not found between the non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($p$) was found between the single career couples and dual career couples on instrumental values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($p$) was not found between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.
Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was found between the non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.

Working husbands of dual career couples and working wives of dual career couples attached highest importance to terminal values i.e., *A word at peace* and *Salvation*.

*Mature love* and *Equality* terminal values were given highest priority by working and non-working wives.

Working husbands and wives of dual career couples and non-working wives of single career couples gave most preference to *Responsible* terminal values.

Working wives of dual career couples and non-working wives of single career couples gave highest preference to *Loving* instrumental values.
A STUDY OF QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP, SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND HUMAN VALUES AMONG SINGLE AND DUAL CAREER COUPLES

THESIS
SUBMITTED FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
Doctor of Philosophy
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

BY
AQEEL KHAN

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF
DR. MOHD. ILYAS KHAN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY
ALIGARH (INDIA)
2005
Dedication

To My

ADORABLE PARENTS
CONTENTS

Acknowledgements
Supervisor’s Certificate

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

- Psychological Problems of Men and Women
- Quality of Relationship and Related Concepts
- Meaning and Nature of Subjective well-being
- Components of Subjective well-being
- Theories of Well-Being
- Factors Influencing Subjective Well-Being
- Meaning and Nature of Human Values
- Consequences and Importance of Human Values
- Factors Influencing Human Values
- Significance of the Present Study

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY.................................................................60

• Subjects.................................................................60
• Tools........................................................................61
• Demographic Data Sheet.................................62
• Procedure.................................................................63
• Data Analysis.............................................................63

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.............................................64

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS & FURTHER RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS.....85

• Conclusions.........................................................85
• Further Research Suggestions.................................86

REFERENCES...............................................................89

APPENDICES

• Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI).................i
• Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)....................... iii
• Rokeach Value Survey Form (RVSF)....................... iv
• List of Publications of the Author.......................... vii
• List of Conferences/Seminars and
  Workshops Attended by the Author.................. ix
Acknowledgements

Behind every success there is certainly the unseen power of Almighty God, the most Beneficent, the most Merciful. But an aim is the eternal condition of success, which is attainable at perfection in everything by those who preserve with the association of their predecessors, teachers, family, friends and colleagues.

It was good fortune and a matter of pride and privilege for me to have the brilliant supervision of Dr. Mohd Ilyas Khan, Department of Psychology, A.M.U., Aligarh, who has inculcated in me the interest and inspiration to undertake research. I gratefully acknowledge my deep indebtedness to him for his able guidance and cordial cooperation from the inception to the completion of this research work. I owe him much for all that I learnt and gained from him.

My indebtedness is also due to Prof. Akbar Husain, Chairman, Department of Psychology, A.M.U., Aligarh, who shared with me his intellectual rigor offering his valuable personal time in the editing process. His commitment to excellence is inspiring and he gave me several key insights on many occasions. I am also thankful to him for providing the necessary facilities in the department for carrying out the work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Qamar Hasan, former Chairman, Department of Psychology,
AMU, Aligarh, for his worthy suggestions and constructive criticism at various junctures of my research work.

It would be an injustice if I fail to express my special thanks to all the teachers in the Department of Psychology, whose concern about the progress of my work boosted my morale. They were instrumental in bringing the study to completion.

To my parents, I owe indebtedness. They always stressed the importance of learning and exploration. They helped me through thick and thin alike to keep me focused towards my goal. Their love, moral support, cooperation and sacrificial devotion towards my studies are the base of my every success. I feel humbled by their love, affectionate and blessings.

I also express my thanks to all the members of the technical and non-teaching staff, Department of Psychology AMU, Aligarh, for their support and cooperation.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi whose help provided the needed continuity to my research work.

Ageel Khan
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “A STUDY OF QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP, SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND HUMAN VALUES AMONG SINGLE AND DUAL CAREER COUPLES” submitted by Aqeel Khan is his original work and was carried out under my supervision. This work is quite fit for submission to the examiner for the evaluation of Ph.D thesis.

(Mohd. Ilyas Khan)
5.10.2005
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Women are the best and true companions of man. By birth she is gifted with equal physical and mental capacities as man. Everywhere in the world, tradition dictates that the primary role assigned to women is to perform household task and responsibilities. “In primitive society, while men fought, hunted and went to sea, the less dangerous and more circumscribed occupations, such as maintenance of home, cooking and care of children, were left to be managed by women” (Giri, 1958).

PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF MAN AND WOMAN

In India mostly the wife keeps the house and socialises the children while the husband provides the money. Yet, patterns are changing; more often girls and women are encouraging to develop their talents and possibilities, and increasingly they are pursuing professional careers. Although, there are several studies which indicate that having a job increases the general well being of women. (Crohan, Antonucci, Adelmann, & Coleman, 1989; Kandel, Davies, & Raveis, 1985; Kessler & McRae, 1982; McLanahan & Glass, 1985). There is considerable evidence that dual careers may lead to tension in the marital relationship (Babbington, 1973; Burke & Weir, 1976; Galambos & Silbereisen, 1989; Keith & Schafer, 1980; Scinovacz, 1977; Sexton & Perlman, 1989; Ulbrich, 1988; Winter, Stewart, & McClelland, 1977). Barnett and Hyde (2001) suggest: “work also
provides men and women a buffer for the stresses in the home, a network of social relations, and opportunities for meaningful engagement and success that are not available to those who are not employed."

With the increasing literacy rate and social awareness, the women either married or unmarried participate equally in going out of home for gainful employment to support their families. Thus women's employment provides spouses with common concerns and experiences, encouraging the development of marital solidarity (Spitze, 1988). It is also suggested by Sefton (1987) that today’s trend is for both the parents to work in order to live a healthy life. Women's employment provides them an opportunity to utilize their education and satisfy the psychological needs to develop their self-identity (Nieva, 1985).

In modern society, career is an important factor, which gives status to persons and helps each one to have a self-image and identity. Relationship within and outside the family may be influenced by one’s employment status. Salaried employment has also problems attached to it, especially in case of woman who is a wife, a mother, a housekeeper and a employee. The different roles can interfere with one another, and hence proper fulfillment of these roles and functions can be affected. This, in turn can cause stress and strain, which may spill over to family life.

Modern women have the dual responsibilities of raising the family and also to look after the workplace. Married women hold greater responsibility within the family when compared with the unmarried ones. A married working women has to
fulfill the roles of wife, mother, daughter-in-law, sister-in-law, daughter and sister within the family and an employee, as a subordinate, colleague, supervisor and friend outside the family and at work.

As Rani (1976) points out that Indian working women encounter numerous difficulties as compared to their counterparts in many other countries. She cannot pick up ready to eat food packets on her way home and has few gadgets to depend on. However, in every society women have the primary responsibility of performing the household tasks and childcare. This is even when her employment responsibilities outside the home are now becoming comparable to those of men. It is suggested by Higgins, Duxbury and Lee (1994); Marshall and Barnett (1993); Roehling, Moen and Batt (2003) that work-family conflict is particularly acute among dual-earner couples, for whom no one is readily available to take care of the needs of the family. Among dual earner couples, wives typically experience higher levels of work-family conflict than husbands, particularly when young children are in the home.

Women all over the world work longer hours than men (Tavis & Wade, 1984). Working mothers spend longer hours than anyone else because their family responsibilities to household and children are not equally shared by fathers – anywhere. (Scarr, Philips & McCartney, 1989).

If a woman carries out all the traditional duties and traditional responsibilities at home along with duties of her job, she overstrains herself and after sometime finds herself constantly in a tired and irritable state of body and
mind. On the other hand if she does not carry out efficiently her role as a wife and mother, apart from getting accused of being inefficient, useless, she suffers from the feeling of guilt. In such circumstances where family members do not cooperate and change their attitude and behavior patterns of working living life, family tensions arise and create social and psychological as well as inter and intra-personal problems at home. Deutch and Sexon (1998) viewed that when both members of the couple are at home, the caregiving usually falls to the wife.

Rani (1976) describes five major dilemmas faced by the couples in dual career families. These are: dilemmas produced by over load work, dilemmas arising from the discrepancy between personal and social norms. Personal norms are what the couple felt was right and proper for themselves, while social norms are those held by people around them. In case of any discrepancy between the two roles, it is the job role, which is sacrificed mostly. Dilemma of personal identity and self-esteem is there in most women. The fourth dilemmas faced by the dual career families in the social network dilemma, such families have a larger network as it includes both husband’s and wife’s acquaintances. The fifth and the last is the role cycling dilemma, which arises from the conflicts between roles that may vary in these demands at different points or periods of time. For example: marital role demands in relation to the work demands of each partner at different points in the life cycle.

Today women have entered in diverse fields, attained success, and gained popularity. Women have joined the jobs of teachers, nurses, office assistants, doctors, engineers, lawyers, social workers and also armed forces, and the police
forces. They are giving a different, perhaps a more benevolent face to these systems, which were considered as purely for male contribution. Women have carved out for themselves a ‘niche’ in the contemporary, modern society and the world has seen numerous women leaders too.

With the increase in the number of roles played and with additional responsibility at work, in case of married working women, there are numerous chances for conflicts in the role performances for which lead to dissatisfaction, and face stressful situation in role fulfillment. Here she needs maximum support from her intimate partner – the husband. If she gets it, the level of conflicts and stress decreases and depth of understanding between the couple tends to increase, this in turn affects the quality of their relationships, so the need of support is much required in dual career couples.

**QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP AND RELATED CONCEPTS**

In marital happiness, quality of relationship depends upon support, conflict and depth shared by the spouse with each other. One form of support that has received a good deal in life is emotional support, which is very necessary in married life. It provides the aid and security during times of stress that leads a person to feel he or she is cared for by others (Cutrona & Russell, 1990). Growing bodies of evidence show that the minor hassles, disappointments and hurts people routinely experience are major determinants of moods and psychological well-being of couples.
The emotional support provided through the comforting activities of social networks members affords substantial help as people attempt to manage the stresses associated with everyday hassles and disappointments. Supportive actions that express concern and solidarity prompt the articulation of feelings, display sympathy and understanding and provide new information or alternative perspectives on a distressful situation significantly contribute to feelings of well-being, acceptance, and control over events. These feelings in turn, are important predictors of functional modes of coping with stress and several indices of physical and emotional health. The comfort and emotional support people receive from others thus helps them to feel better, relieves from stress and improves the quality of life and relationships of the couples. They may also express compassion and love. Comforting acts and other emotional supportive actions are thus relatively significant in marital life.

Support is supposed to be the central function in intimate relationships. Across the life span, people look to friends and romantic partners as primary providers of support, because comforting acts, signal care interest, caring, liking and concern, play a central role in the formation and development of intimate relationships. In sum, people certainly seem to value the comfort and emotional support they receive from friends, family and spouse. These activities play important roles in the development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships and help individuals cope with a variety of common stresses and upsets. Thus comforting and emotional support serves several significant functions in every day life of every married man and woman. Traditional marriage vows remind couples
that they will encounter adversity and stress during the course of their lives together. Husbands and wives are expected to provide each other with comfort, encouragement, advice and assistance in times of misfortune. The spouse is frequently the first person from whom support is sought during crises (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Burke & Weir, 1977) and evidence suggests that support from other sources cannot compensate for a lack of intimate of marital support. Brown and Harris (1978) found that confiding relationships with a parent, sister or friend did not compensate for the lack of confiding relationships with one’s spouse in preventing depressive reactions to negative life events. Among parents who have lost a child, there was no association between social support and well being beyond the contribution of spousal support (Lieberman, 1982). Spousal support has been associated with a variety of positive outcomes, including adaptation to parenthood, adjustment following myocardial infarction, vulnerability to depression, and compliance with medical regimes among heart transplant patients (Brown, 1978; Rogers, 1987.)

A spousal support is important no doubt, but the process through which partners communicate to one another is not less important. Communication involves much more than generating an interesting dialogue and a desire to confide, and an ability to express one’s self without fear of harsh judgments. It becomes a matter of listening to another’s thoughts, ideas and feeling and opinions and involves trust.

Intimacy is at the core of loving relationships and is a major bonding force in marriage (Beck, 1988; Levinger, 1988). Intimacy is valued in marriage because
Intimacy is defined as those feelings in a relationship that promote
closeness, bondedness and connectedness (Sternberg, 1987). Weingarten (1992)
conceptualizes intimacy as a quality of a particular interaction rather than a
relationship and defines intimate interaction as "occurring when people share
meaning or concrete meaning and they are able to coordinate their actions to
reflect their mutual meaning-making." Waring (1981, 1988) defines marital
intimacy as "a multi-faceted interpersonal dimension, which describes the quality
of a marital relationship at a point in time." He conceptualizes intimacy as a
continuum of relational facets measured by quantity, degree, and intensity.

Intimacy is often described as a dynamic process. Hatfield (1988) suggests
that intimacy involves a process in which people try to become close and explore
their similarities and differences in feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. Some
clinicians distinguish between closeness, the experience of contact with and focus
on one's partner, and intimacy (Malone & Malone, 1987; Schnarch, 1991; Wynne
& Wynne, 1986). Schnarch (1991) conceptualizes intimacy as the process of being
in touch with or knowing oneself as well as the disclosure of self in the presence
of a partner. Schaefer and Olson (1981) conceptualize intimacy as a process and
an experience that is the outcome of the disclosure of intimate topics and sharing
intimate experiences, and an intimate relationship as two people who share
intimate experiences over time and who expect continuity of the relationship and
those experiences. Byrne and Murnen (1988) believe that similarity is of central importance in maintaining a loving relationship.

Social support may be women’s most valuable resource in fighting stress (Lu, 1995). Most research in the area of social support has shown that perceived support enhances physical and mental health or adjustment (Kessler, Kendler, Neale & Eaves, 1992). Kessler et al. (1985) have noted that this is accompanied by a sense of caring of what goes on in the lives of friends and family. There are essentially two ingredients of social support, the ‘give’ and ‘take’ of intimate sharing relationships. Mutuality or reciprocity of support giving a key ingredient in successful supportive relation has been found by (Hobfoll, 1985). How much is expected of a person how much she gets makes the cost Vs reward equation of social support. Both women and men have been found to benefit from the quality of supportive social interactions, especially intimate ones (Pearlin, 1981).

Aneshensel (1986) argues that both working women as well as housewives experience stress due to the role versus reward character of their lives. Housewives may receive support from their spouses and others due to their role conformity but may feel that they do not receive respect from them. Employed women may feel both lack of support at home due to her career and lack of support at work for her advancement.

Demand of support is much required by the dual earner couple support process that arises between married couple on those occasions when one of the partners experiences conflict between the demands of work and the demands of
family life. When woman starts her journey to the work place, she, directly or indirectly indulge into stressful situations. Here she needs maximum support from her intimate partner – the husband. If she gets it, the level of conflict and stress decreases and depth between the couple tends to increase. That in turn affects the quality of their relationship.

Employed mothers face much-more hardships in day-to-day life. Episodes of conflict between the demands of work and family frequently occur and therefore present multiple occasions for the mobilization of the spouse’s support. The physical labour and emotional drain entailed in simultaneously working inside and outside the home make the expression or absence of spousal support highly consequential for both the women’s well being and for the state of the relationship between husband and wife. Particularly when both spouses are employed, there are many complex influences on the division of labour in the home and the ways work and family demands are played out.

**MEANING AND NATURE OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING**

Subjective well-being (SWB) is a field of psychology that attempts to understand people’s evaluations of their lives, these evaluations include both cognitive judgments of life satisfaction and affective evaluations of moods and emotions. If a person reports that his life is satisfying, that he is experiencing frequent pleasant affect and that he is infrequently experiencing unpleasant affect, he is said to have high subjective well being.
Subjective well-being is only one aspect of psychological well-being. Nevertheless, the subjective frame of reference implicit in the concept of SWB has the strength of being based on the respondent's own internal perspective, and thus gives priority and respect to people's own views of their lives. Rather than a standard imposed by a mental health professional, SWB grants importance to the experience of people. The focus on an internal perspective means that other criteria of well-being recognized by the community, philosophers, or by mental health professionals may not be met in every individual who has high SWB. Although we cannot say whether high SWB is essential for mental health, we can say that most people consider it to be a desirable characteristic.

Since the dawn of civilization, great thinkers have discussed the quality of human existence, and "the good life." To some individuals the ideal state is one of wealth, to others, having significant relationships, while some report helping those in need is central. These individuals vary in external circumstance, yet they may share a subjective feeling of well-being.

Subjective well-being especially life satisfaction is likely to reflect the person's fulfillment of his or her values and goals, and involves the search for meaningfulness in one's life. The work on subjective well-being or psychological well-being is carried out under the broad topic of quality of life. Well-being is viewed as a harmonious satisfaction of one's desires and goals (Chekola, 1975). Perhaps, health not only freedom from illness but also ensure that all physical, mental and social well-being involves subjective satisfaction and individual
pleasure, depending upon the psychological status of the individual and his environmental condition.

Currently, subjective well-being has a close connotation with ‘Quality of life’. Campbell and others (1970) have conceptualized that quality of life is a composite measure of physical, mental and social well-being. Happiness and satisfactions involving many life situations, such as health, marriage family work, finance, educational opportunities, self-esteem, creativity, belongingness and trust in others. The three primary features of subjective well-being include subjectively positive measure and global assessment of all aspects of a person’s life. Milbrath (1979) explain that, subjective studies of quality of life typically have shown that most people derive their greatest sense of quality from their home and family life and from the close supportive relationship they have with friends and colleagues” provides environmental and psychological interpretation of ‘Quality of life’ or ‘Social well-being’. Although the subjective well-being or psychological well-being is a very important aspect of quality of life.

Levi(1987) defined well-being as a dynamic state of mind characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an individual abilities, needs and expectations and environmental demands and opportunities. Three features of subjective well-being have been identified:

(a) It is based on subjective experience instead of the objective conditions of life.

(b) It has positive as well as negative affect, and (c) It is a global experience as apposed to experience in particular domains such as war (Okun & Stock, 1987).
The general well-being is defined as “the subjective feeling of contentment, happiness, satisfaction with life experience and of one’s role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry, etc.” (Verma & Verma, 1989). They defined and conceptualized, the psychological or the general well-being which may show some degree of positive correlation with quality of life, job satisfaction or general satisfaction level, sense of achievement etc. and negatively related with neuroticism, psychoticism and other such variables. However, the degree of overlap with such variables should not be high if this concept has a separate independent entity is to be considered as a valid one. Also, it should show relative stability over time (reasonable time gap without any significant life events intervening). Its utility will depend upon these relationships or a network of relationship with other variables.

Cutter (1986) defined “Quality of life as an individual’s happiness or satisfaction with life and environmental including needs and desires, aspiration and life style preferences and other tangible and intangible factors which determine over the well-being”. However, when an individual’s quality of life is aggregated to the community level, well-being is linked to social and environmental condition such as economic activity, climate or the quality of culture institution. As such it is the active concern for the rights and individuality of others that determine degree and dimension of well-being social or individual.

According to Diener (2000) “SWB refers to people’s evaluations of their lives-evaluations that are both affective and cognitive. People experience abundant SWB when they feel many pleasant and few unpleasant emotions, when they are
engaged in interesting activities, when they experience many pleasures and few pains, and when they are satisfied with their lives’. Diener, Sapyta, and Suh (1998) says that SWB is not sufficient for the good life but it appears to be increasingly necessary for it.

**Components of Subjective Well-Being:** There are a number of separable components of subjective well-being: life satisfaction (global judgments of one’s life), satisfaction with important domains (e.g., work satisfaction), positive affect (experiencing many pleasant emotions and moods), and low levels of negative affect (experiencing few unpleasant emotions and moods). Each of the three major facets of subjective well-being can broken into sub divisions. Global satisfaction can be divided into satisfaction with the various domains of such as recreation; love marriage, friendship and these domains can be divided into facts. Pleasant affect can be divided into specific emotions such as joy, affection and pride. Finally, unpleasant or pleasant effect can be separated into specific emotions and moods such as shame, guilt, sadness, anger, and anxiety. Each of the subdivisions of affect can also be subdivided even further. Subjective well-being can be assessed at the most global level, or at progressively narrower levels, depending on one's purposes. For example, one researcher might study life satisfaction, whereas another might study the narrower topic of marital satisfaction. The justification for studying more global levels (rather than just focusing on the most molecular concepts) is that the narrower levels tend to co-occur. In other words, there is a tendency for people to experience similar levels of well-being across different aspects of their lives, and the study of molar levels can
help us understand the general influences on SWB that cause these covariations. A justification for studying narrower definitions of SWB is that we can gain a greater understanding of specific conditions that might influence well-being in particular domains. Furthermore, narrower types of measures are often more sensitive to causal variables.

**Cognitive Theories of Well-Being:** The attributional theory of depression is well known among the cognitive theories. Depressed individuals are more likely to believe that negative events are caused by global and stable causes, such that negative are very likely to continue to happen to them. Beck (1967) popularized the idea that depressed people think about the world in self-defeating ways. In the area of subjective well-being, researchers find that one can dampen or amplify one’s emotions by what one thinks, and thereby experience more or less intense emotions (Larsen, Diener & Croponzano, 1987). Happy people are likely to experience more events that are considered desirable in the culture, but also have a propensity to interpret and recall ambiguous events as good. (Lyubomirsky & Ross, 1996, Seidlitz & Diener, 1993). People with high subjective well-being may not only experience objectively more positive events, but they also seen to perceive events more positively than do people who are low in SWB.

**Coping Theories:** This theory is based on the idea that in order to cope with problems, happy people initiate thoughts and behaviors that are adaptive and helpful, where as unhappy people cope in more destructive ways. For example, happy people are more likely to see the bright side of affairs, pray, directly struggle with problems, and seek help from others, whereas unhappy people are
more likely to engage in fantasy, blame others and themselves, and avoid working on problems (McCrae & Costa, 1986). What is not yet known is whether these coping styles are the cause or effect of SWB.

People might increase their SWB by the control of their thoughts. For example, perhaps SWB can be increased by believing in a larger meaning or force in the universe. Support for this proposition comes from findings showing that on average religious people are happier than non-religious people (e.g., Pollner, 1989; Ellison, 1991; Myers, 1992). Further, SWB is higher if a person concentrates on attainable goals, and does not focus attention exclusively on distant, difficult goals (Emmons, 1986, 1992). Finally, one can heighten SWB by being optimistic about one's future (Scheier & Carver, 1993). It is not known whether these cognitive factors correlate with SWB because of the influence of some third variable such as temperament, or whether the cognitions have an independent long-term influence on SWB.

Context Theories: Veenhoven (1991) posits that SWB is caused by the satisfaction of basic, universal human needs. He maintains, for example, that people can only be happy if needs such as hunger, warmth, and thirst are fulfilled. In contrast, context theories emphasize that the factors that influence SWB are variable across both time and individuals, and that how good or bad life events are considered to be is based on the circumstances in which people live. The relevant context varies in different theories. In adaptation theory, for example, the relevant context is the person's past life, whereas in social comparison models the context is considered to be social others of whom the target individual is aware. Other
contexts that could influence SWB are the person's ideals, and imagining counterfactual alternative situations. Finally, in the goal approach, the context is believed to be the person's conscious aims. In each of the context models, whether something is good or bad, and how good or bad it is, thought to be based on changeable factors rather than on biological universals.

**Telic Theories:** This group of theorist posits that SWB is gained when goals and needs are reached (Diener, 1984). Thus, the causes of SWB are not universal, but differ depending on people’s values and desires. Different aspects of goals are related to different components of SWB. For example, individuals high in SWB perceived their goals as more important and as higher in their probability of success (Emmons, 1986), whereas those low in SWB perceived more conflict between their goals (Emmons & King, 1988). Carver and Scheier (1990) further postulated that progress toward goals at a rate higher than the standard leads to positive affect, whereas progress at a rate lower than the standard leads to negative affect. Consistent with Carver and Scheier’s hypothesis, Brunstein (1993) found in a longitudinal study that perceived progress toward goals caused positive changes in SWB rather than vice versa. Brunstein (1993) further found that a higher level of commitment, along with a sense of progress, contributed to higher SWB. According to this theory, to the extent that people have different goals, the causes of SWB ought to differ. There are now studies that find variations between people in terms of what covaries with SWB. For example, the exact resources (e.g., money and social skills) that most strongly predict SWB for an individual are likely to be those that are required to gain his or her specific aims (Diener &

**Factors Influencing Subjective Well-Being**

Diener (1999) and his colleagues point out that there are some variables, which play an important role in influencing subjective well-being.

**Genetic Factors** seem to play a role, some people, it appears; have an inherited tendency to have a pleasant, easy-going temperament and this contributes to their personal happiness (e.g., Lykken & Tellegen, 1996). Because of this tendency they get along well with others, and this can help pave the way to happiness.

**Personality Factors** are important, people who are emotionally stable (low on what in some times termed neuroticism, who are high in affiliation the tendency to want to relate to other people and in perceived control) they feel that they are ‘incharge’ of their own lives, tend to be happier than those who are not emotionally stable, who are lower in affiliation, and low in perceived control. (DeNeve, 1999). In addition some findings suggest – not surprisingly that people who are optimistic, extraverted, and avoid undue worrying also tend to be happier than those who are pessimistic, introverted and prone to worry excessively. (e.g., DeNeve & Cooper, 1998).
Goals and Resources involve personal and economic factors. Many studies indicate that people who have concrete goals, especially goals that they have a realistic chance of reaching and happier than person looking for such goals. (Cantor & Senderson, in press).

Finally, external conditions over individual have varying degrees of influence also play a role in personal happiness.

Not surprisingly, people living in wealthy countries, are happier than those in poor nations. In general married people tend to be happier than single people—although this finding varies with how the particular culture views marriage. (Diener et al., 1998). Also people who are satisfied with their jobs and careers tend to be happier than those who are not. (e.g., Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Rich people on an average are happier than poor people. (Diener, Horwitz & Emmons, 1985).

MEANING AND NATURE OF HUMAN VALUES

Values represent basic convictions that “a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.” Values contain a judgmental element in that they carry on individual’s ideas as to what is good or desirable. Values have both content and intensity attributes. The content attribute says that a mode of conduct or end – state of existence is important. The intensity attributes specifies how important it is. When we rank as individual’s values in terms of their intensity, we obtain that person’s value system. All of us have a hierarchy of
Values that forms our value system. This system is identified by the relative importance.

Values occupy an important place to start when assessing viewer perceptions because values serve as criteria for judgment, preference, and choice, and determine decisions in behavior—they underlay our knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes (Rokeach, 1968, 1979). Rokeach argued that 36 independent values sufficiently represent all human values, including 18 instrumental "to be" values and 18 terminal "to have" values. Human values have been defined as "cognitive constructs that explain individual differences in regard to aims in life and behavior principles and priorities" (Renner, 2003).

Values are one of the most important dispositions motivating human beings and setting them apart from non-human life forms. Values lie at the core of all human behavior and pervade each and every aspect of there live. Initially, it was believed that human behavior can be best explained in terms of one’s personality system needs, motives, beliefs, goals and attitudes. But eventually the emphasis is shifting towards values, as there are many aspects of human behavior which cannot be attributed to the former concept, but where values play a role. Value system develop bit by bit over the life cycle of individual and hence is intricately interwoven with instinctual and habitual behavior (Joshi, 1983).

Morris (1956) has conceived of values in three forms i-e., Operative values, which are the behaviours of the organism in which they show a preference for one object rather than the other. Conceived values, which are the preference of an
individual for a symbolized object. *Objective values*, which refer to what is objectively preferable whether or not it is sensed or conceived of as desirable. A considerable amount of work on values has been done by Spranger (1928). He classified values into six categories i.e., theoretical, aesthetic, economic, social, political, and religious.

Schwartz (1992) defined values “as desirable goal that vary in their importance and that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives.” He presented a model of ten motivational values. They are: Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity and Security. He distinguished between values in terms of the motivational goals that they express. The content of values was linked to three basic requirements of human existence that were assumed to pre-exist for all individuals and societies, namely, to satisfy biological needs, to achieve coordinated social interaction, and to meet social institutional demands for group welfare and survival.

A Value is conception of something that is socially or personally preferable. It is an interesting property of values that it can be employed with extraordinary versatility in everyday life. Values may be shared or not shared. Values may be intended to apply equally to oneself or others, to others but not to oneself, to oneself more than the others, or to others more than to oneself (Rokeach, 1973).
Kluckhohn (1951), Rokeach (1973), Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) defined human values as a desirable goal varying in importance that serves as a guiding principle in one’s lives. Allport (1935) viewed values as “enduring attitudes about a class of observation (as opposed to a single object) held by a mature individual, one who had thought about and organized the attitudes into a comprehensive system”. Murray (1938) defined values, as cognitive representation of internal needs mediated by external possess. Ackerman and Humphreys (1991) advocated that John Watson (1878-1958) also said that values came from environmental interaction i.e., by studying what environmental condition caused people to act.

Allport (1928) explored how people develop attitudes and motives, which in turn, produced values, and both together produced behavior. Allport viewed that people learned everything from their environment because they were born tabula rasa, which translate into blank slate (Allport, 1955). On the basis of his work Allport. Allport and Vernon (1931) constructed a 6-category taxonomy of values: political, social, economic, theoretical, religious and aesthetic.

England (1969) defined values as a “relatively permanent perceptual framework, which shapes and influences the general nature of an individual’s behavior”. England’s theoretical model of values divided values into two types, operative and intended or adoptive. Operative values are the one’s with the greatest influence on behavior. On the other hand, intended or adoptive values are those that are professed but do not directly influence behavior.
Rokeach (1976) states that these values combine over time to form people’s personalities. In the words of Rokeach: “value as a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes means and ends of actions.”

Erickson (1950) stated that values are enduring, but if they were completely stable, individual and social change would be impossible. If values were completely unstable, continuity of human personality and society will be impossible. Thus all conceptions of human values have to account for both their enduring as well as dynamic character. Values persist in the individual because they become a part of his sense of identity.

Values can be posited as the reference framework of individual actions at the level of environment apprehension and interpretation. Hofstede, one of the most prominent theoreticians in this area, defined values as broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others, and considered them to be at the core of culture (Hofstede, 1991; Wade, 2003). Values can therefore be described as the standards we strive for and see as our objective or ideal (Musek, 1993). For individuals, our values are the internal criteria against which we judge our actions. On that basis, we distinguish right from wrong and rank alternative actions. Although we are often not aware of them, they serve us as internal control (Kavcic, 1998). Our families and society contribute most to the shaping of our values (Maclagan, 1998) and for this reason they can only be changed over a long period of time, hardly overnight.
Sapna and Upinder (2004) defined values narrowly in terms of object attractiveness and broadly as abstract principles guiding social life. They are principles for action encompassing abstract goals in life and modes of conduct that an individual prefers across different situations. Certain variables are valued because they are fundamental characteristics or needs to make a better society and facilitate to differentiate between desirable and desired, delectable and electable, short term and long term, and pleasant and good. Values develop in early years. The lifelong behavioural pattern, attitude and perception of individuals are guided and directed by these values. They are most often reinforced by society, since sources of values are national culture, family, teachers, friends and other environmental factors.

**The Indian Context of Human Values**

Human values in the context of Indian scene can be discussed in terms of religion and philosophy, socialization practices that transmit values from one generation to the other. It may be mentioned that Hinduism, Islam, and Buddhism have been the mother religions and sources of values. Values such as love, compassion, selflessness, service, duty and responsibility, equanimity, detachment and caution against desires are seen as highly desirable in all the religions.

**Western Context of Human Values**

In the western context also, values have always occupied a central position. Morris (1956) has commended that “it is one of the great words of our language, its meanings are multiple and complex”. Williams (1968a) Writes, “Problems of
values appears in all fields of social sciences, and value elements are potentially important as variables to be analyzed in all major areas of investigation.” Thus, across all social sciences values is a widely used term with a number of meanings.

**Consequences and Importance of Human Values**

The consequences of human values can be manifested in virtually all phenomenons that social scientists might consider worth investigating and understanding. These act as the main guiding force for an individual’s philosophy of life and direct his or her behavior and perceptions under different circumstances. Values make one’s life meaningful and give sense of direction (Garrett, 1958). Human life is guided by pairs of opposites held as good or bad, right or wrong, nice or nasty, wise or foolish. We may apply in contemporary terms ‘Value’ and ‘disvalue’ to these pairs of opposites. On the basis of ‘Manusmriti’, it may be inferred that social good cannot exists without social evil, and vice versa, as pleasure cannot exist without pain. There is no good without non-good. Thus, value seems to be a comparative judgment in view of the corresponding disvalue or simply expressive of the intention to make disvalue non-existing. Hence, good and non-good are a pair of opposites likewise, merits and demerits. Human life as a whole, philosophy, sciences, state, civil, society, and religion are all instruments for realizing values. A familiar answer to the question, ‘why do we live’? is simply: to negate disvalue and to realize values. That is the purpose of human life. On this point, all Indian school of thoughts is unanimous. The study of human values is important not only to the understanding of culture and socialization, but also to the understanding of the psychological
Factors Influencing Human Values

Personality

It is one of the most important factors that influence on human values. Personality determines the impact of various other sources on one’s value system. It is because of the unique personality of every person that even if exposed to similar influences, his internalization of values is unique. There exists considerable empirical evidence about, both for and against, the influence of personality on values. MaClelland (1995), Astin (1958), Atkinson and Litwin (1960), Pal (1967), Southern and Walter (1968), and Rim (1970, 1971) have reported that the value system of one person differs from the others due to the differences in their personalities. Paramesh (1973) found that low extraverts were higher in theoretical value. In a factor analytic study of personality correlate of life values, Mitchell (1984) identified 10 factors displaying common-factor variance between life values and 16 PF variables. Oles and Oles (1981) pointed out that the values chosen and realized by an individual, as well as, the ways of adopting them and behaving according to them, are closely related to personal growth and mental health of an individual.
Age

Age of the person also emerges as an essential individual factor influencing one’s values. Empirical evidence suggests that value system of a person evolves and changes with age. It may be because of increase in exposure to various socialization agents, wider, horizon, increased capacity of reasoning, systematic integration of experiences, and maturity etc. Hence, there exists a considerable difference in value priorities of the young and the old, often giving rise to ‘generation gap’. Reddy and Rao (1966) in a study on adolescents reported that older students gave higher ranks to sense of accomplishment, inner harmony, and responsibility, and lower ranks to the world of beauty, National security and being cheerful, clean and loving as compared to younger students. Ryff and Baltes (1976) support the existence of self-acknowledged transitional or reorganization phases in adulthood. As a result of these phases, with increasing age there is a decreasing preference for values of instrumentality and a parallel increase in preference for values of terminality. Greenstein (1978) found that older individual tends to be more religious, placing greater value on peaceful and ideological relationships. Ying and Zhang (1992) reported that old rural women were more traditional or internal and norm abiding as compared to the young urban male respondents. Keller (1993) found significant correlation between value orientations of women and their age. Musek (1993) also reported that there was a shift from hedonistic and potency values towards moral and spiritual values with age.
Gender

In most of the societies males and females have been subjected to differential child rearing practices, preparing for the different roles to be played by the two genders in later life. This results into variety of gender differences which social scientist has been focusing on. Empirical evidence since 1940’s have proved that gender plays a crucial role in disguising the value patterns of individuals. Many latter studies also supported this finding (Hogan & Mookherjee, 1981; Linder & Bauer, 1984; Speicher, 1992; Musek, 1993; Tsao, 1981). Men scored higher than women on theoretical, economic and political values. (Anantharaman, 1980; Egan, 1977; New, 1977; Shanker et al., 1979). Chakraborti et al. (1981) found males scoring high on political and theoretical values, while females scored higher on economic and aesthetic values. McKernan and Russell (1980) reported that females placed higher value on mature love, family security and obedience than males. Females were also found to be more morality oriented than males. (Truhon, 1980). Narayanan et al. (1994) found that men were more oriented to instrumental values while women to terminal values. Whereas Elizur (1994) reported that women ranked affective outcomes as well as some of the instrumental values higher than men, while men ranked some other cognitive and instrumental items higher than the women.

Family

Right from the time of birth, family affects and governs the internalization of values in the child. The association between values and family has been proved
by various researchers (Barclay and Sharp, 1982; Cooper, 1983; Deb, 1982; Fredrickson, 1968; Neugarten & Hegsted, 1982; Solibio, 1981; Speicher, 1994; Tierney, 1983). Family as a variable exerts its influence on the inculcation of values in varied manners like through family structure, determined by the size, joint or nuclear, one parent or parents, order of birth (Gerson, 1965; Nye, 1967; Rim, 1993), family environment, determined by the parent-child relationships, interactions between siblings (Gessner et al., 1993; Nye, 1967; Penn, 1973; Speicher, 1992). Besides the child rearing practices adopted by the parents (Grusec, 1994; Rosen, 1964); parents’ education and occupation (Singh & Thapar, 1984; Skarzynska, 1993; Thompson, 1965) also influenced the child’s internalization of values.

Peer Group Influence

Peer group pressure has a tremendous impact on internalization of values, either independently or in combination with other preference groups. Peer group emerges as the strongest challenge to the familiar influences, and can be from both inside and outside the educational institutions. The influence of peer group vis a vis the family is likely to be more in the present times as the urban children tend to spend relatively more times with the peer groups. Greater freedom accorded to the children to move out, increased mobility, smaller families, dual career families – are some of the factors explaining the fact that children spend more time with their peers. But contrarily, Anant (1976) and Gessner (1993) also reported that personal value patterns differed from those believed to be the characteristics of the peers.
Education and its Related Influences

Innumerable empirical evidence exists regarding the influence of school or college on the values of individuals (Feather, 1973; Friesen, 1974; Gordon, 1967; Herrick, 1978; Keller, 1993). On the other hand, many studies also deny this influence. According to them, in general, either there is none, or just a little impact of college or school on the values of the children, as other reference groups i-e., parents or peer tend to have more crucial role to play (Schubert, 1967; Sherman, 1969; Skelton, 1971; Wright, 1973). The situation is further complicated with the fact that the influence of educational institutions is multifaceted. It is not just the climate of the educational institution or its policies but the individual teachers (Crabfree, 1974; Weimayer, 1970; Zern, 1985); and also the syllabi or major subjects of study that exert an influence, (Arsanion, 1970; Chakraborti & Kundu, 1981; Diff & Cotgrove, 1982; Pal, 1968; Silverman, et al., 1976; Singh, 1969). The finding of Sherman (1969) challenge the impact of these reference groups as well.

Media

The print media, and the audiovisual media, both are very important reference groups affecting our value systems. But with the present fast paced technological developments, it is the audio-visual media which has successfully brought the world closer, initially in the form of radio and television, and now also as satellite channels and internet. Therefore, this media-value relationship is a well-researched field, highlighting both the positive and the negative influences of
media (Eisler & Loye, 1980; Kavanaugh, 1983; McCarty & Shrum, 1993; Prisuta, 1978; Roche, 1982; Seel & Bort, 1984; Tierney, 1983; Thornton, 1977; Toohey, 1982). Whereas, Kang (1992) in a study on students (13-18 years) found that viewing of American television programmes did not have any strong association with Korean viewer’s conception of social reality. Hence, there existed no conflict with their traditional Korean values.

**Socio-Economic Background**

A large number of investigators such as Adikari (1986), Ganguli (1967), Gaur (1974), Girija and Bhadra (1986), Kalia and Mathur (1985) and Raddy et al. (1996) have evinced the effect of socio-economic background on the values of their subject significant differences existed amongst people coming from different socio-economic strata of the society and also between those from the rural or urban background.

**Religion**

In spite of the vast scientific and technological impact, religion still has a strong hold in molding the value structure of the people. Studies like the one by Thorton, (1969) found religion to be at par with parental influence, in the internalization of values. Other findings (Fredrickson, 1968, Zern, 1985) also support the above results. Finally, it is clear that there is a complex interaction of all these reference groups, from which a person acquires his value system. This comprehensive cultural effect varies from culture to culture, and is brought out in

**Significance of the Present Study**

If we all maintain the quality of relationship, subjective well-being and attach importance of human values, there would be no room for the discordant relationships. Since each individual's behaviour is governed by the positive psychological states. Similarly we can expect the behaviour of single and dual career couples. Following this assumption the present investigator examined the differences between single and dual career couples on quality of relationship, subjective well-being and human values.
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Before exploring new phenomenon, it is essential to look into various aspects already studied in the past. As research is a continuous process and it must have some continuity with earlier facts. The knowledge gathered in the past should be consolidated to keep it on record for future use. This chapter attempt to present a brief resume of research findings related to quality of relationship, subjective well-being and human values among single and dual career couples in India and abroad.

Burke and Weir (1976) studied the personality structures of 189 pairs of married man and women from single career and dual career families using the Fundamental / Interpersonal Relations Orientations Behavior. Results indicated that working wives wanted less inclusion, control and affection than did the non-working wives. Husbands of working wives were characterized as less assertive and less concerned with power and authority than husbands of non-working wives. Overall, members of dual career families were more self reliant and self-sufficient.

Feinauer and Williams (1989) investigated the relationship between marital adjustment and congruency of couple preference regarding wife employment in 101 couples. In 58 couples both spouses were employed, while in the remaining 43 only the husband was employed. Four work pattern categories (Dual-
work, Incongruent Pre-dual-career, Incongruent traditional single-career) were perceived as undesirable by one spouse, in conflict with the other spouse. Marital adjustment was negatively influenced only when the wife wanted to work in her career, was not employed, and her husband did not want her to be employed at time of interview or in the future.

Buies (1991) reported that professional ‘managerial mothers were found to give work a higher priority in their lives. Conversely, working class women tended to give their families the higher priority, and family concerns were more likely to intrude upon work than work upon family, largely due to structural disadvantages, such as, inadequate childcare and inflexible work schedules.

Rani and Khandelwal (1992) carried out a study to identify and examine the perception of family environment and the nature or interpersonal need structure of family members in 20 dual and 20 single career families. Four members of each family were tested: father, mother, son and daughter. The data were collected by means of ‘Moos’ Family Environment Scale and Shultz Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation Behavior. It was found that dual career family environment lay significantly more emphasis on cultural and recreational pursuits, independence and organization compared to single career families. Moreover, the daughter from the two types of families does not perceive differential family environments, as compared to other family members. Mothers from dual career as compared to single career families express significantly higher control and want less control in interpersonal relationships. Female scores significantly lower on expressed control and higher on wanted control, as compared to males.
Higgins and Duxbury (1992) conducted a study of work-family conflict on dual career and traditional -career men and viewed that work family-conflict is a form of interrole conflict that takes place when the demands of work and family are mutually incompatible in some respect. This study examined differences in the antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict for two groups of career-oriented men: 1. Traditional men, those who have a homemaker wife, and 2. Dual-career men, those who have a spouse in a career – oriented job. The responses of 136 dual- career men and 137 traditional – career men indicate that maternal career employment has a significant effect on the antecedents of work-family conflict. Dual–career men experience a significant negative spillover from their work domain. It is suggested that this spillover is due to a lack of structural flexibility in the workplace, outdated organizational policies that operate on the ‘myth of separate words,’ and a lack of social support for the male dual career role that contradicts societal norms.

Wiersma (1994) investigated that specific behavioral strategies used by dual-career couples to solve work-home role conflicts in each of 7 broad areas were cataloged. The areas were: 1. Domestic chores 2. Maintaining social relations, 3. Role cycling, 4. Job relocations, 5. Sex-role socialization, 6. Social pressure, and 7. Direct competition between spouses. Using the critical incident method, 24 men and women from dual-career families were interviewed. For each incident, a participant was asked to tell a story in which they were to describe the surrounding circumstances of the incident, the specific behaviors used to solve the problem, and the consequences of the action undertaken. Findings indicated that
dual-career couples must cope with two types of work-home role conflict, namely, time-based issues of role overload and psychological issues of role quality. Results showed that the six or seven dimensions could be supported empirically with behaviorally defined solutions, the exception being sex-role socialization.

Shukla and Gupta (1994) studied internalized beliefs and attitudes and involvement of married employed men and women in various life roles. 52 dual career couples reported that they attach to various life roles and their personality characteristics. Results revealed a few significant differences related to gender and marital career stage in life role salience. Positive correlations were found between self-realization and salience of occupation role and between norm favoring and salience of various marriage and family roles, particularly among the wives. Dual career couples seen to perceive various life roles as very rewarding, but someone lack the motivation to be committed to these roles.

Pradhan and Mishra (1995) carried out a study on spouse support and quality of marital relationship as correlates of stress among 50 doctors couples. Males as compared to females showed higher tendency on the relationship between family stress and spouse support though not at the significant level. Quality of marital relationship was found to be related with the stress, specifically with work stress in males, but not in females. Family stress on the other hand, was found to be related with quality of marital relationship in both males and females.
Srivastava (1995) compared role stress and mental health of 120 male partners in three types of dual career couples i.e., both partners engaged in similar jobs, partners in different types of job and female partners in part-time jobs, and 80 who were husbands of full-time housewives. Results obtained from ANOVA and correlation revealed that husbands of fulltime employed women experienced higher role stress and manifest more symptoms of psychoneurosis compared to those whose wives were in part-time jobs or full-time housewives. The lifestyle of the four types of couples had significant variance in their level of role stress and mental health. Role stress and mental ill-health were significantly correlated for all four categories of Ss. However, the intensity of the relationship was lower for the husbands of full-time employed women.

Srivastava and Shukla (1995) examined interpersonal compatibility in relation to marital adjustment among 75 couples in which only the husbands were employed. Subjects completed a questionnaire that included items from the FIRO-B Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Scales and from 3 marital adjustment scales. Results indicate that interpersonal compatibility in the areas of inclusion and affection was more important than that in the control area. In these areas, reciprocal compatibility was more important for the marital adjustment of dual-career couples, while interchange compatibility was more important for the marital adjustment of single career couples. Results are discussed in the context of traditional roles in Indian society and how these roles are changing as women enter the work force.
Thakar and Misra (1995) examined the pattern of daily hassles experienced in relation to perceived control, social support, mental health and life satisfaction. The dual career women reported significantly greater incidence of daily hassles. Dual career women displayed greater degree of life satisfaction as compared to housewives. Older dual career women from nuclear families perceived greater degree of control, while social support was shared similarly across the groups.

Noller, Feeney and Ward (1997) report two studies of the structure of marital quality that were based on Lewis and Spanier’s (1979) theories, particularly about rewards from spousal interaction. In study 1, 355 married Australians completed an evaluative measure of marital satisfaction and questionnaires based on 38 propositions about the links between spousal interaction and marital satisfaction. Higher marital quality was reported by those in earlier and later stages of marriage with some effects for presence of children. In study 2, a questionnaire based on a larger item set was completed by 84 married Australians that focused more clearly on the separate roles of each spouse in the relationship. Five quality factors were obtained that were similar in several respects to the factors found in Study 1, and were again highly predictive of global satisfaction. Effects of the structural variables were similar across studies. Results suggest that most of the behaviors identified in Lewis and Spanier's model are still important in the 1990s, although issues of role fit seem less so.
Kinnunen and Pulkkinen (1998) used structural equation modeling to test the mediators of economic circumstances on marital quality in a sample of married or cohabiting 36-year-old Finnish 133 men and 117 women. The model tested was an adapted version of that presented by Conger, Ge and Lorenz (1994). For the men, mail questionnaire and interview results were consistent with the proposed model: poor employment status caused economic strain and affected personal lives to the extent that current economic strain increased expected financial strain, leading to greater depression greater hostility in the marriage, both of which, in turn, predicted poor marital quality. For the women, poor economic circumstances and in particular, an unstable career line had direct effects on depression, marital hostility, and poor marital quality. These sex differences are related to the different roles played by economic matters and careers in men's and women's lives.

Pillai and Sen (1998) investigated the life of working women with regard to their dual role, as professional and care takers. A sample of 100 professional women representing- doctors, lawyers, media women and executives were examined to see how many were successfully able to combine these two roles. Job involvement, family support and sex life aspects that is: (a) Personal time (b) Physical strain (c) Psychological conditions (d) Marital life (e) Physical life and (f) Professional commitment, were assessed. Results indicated that only as low as 7 percent of working women were able to harmonize their dual roles. Most of the strategies suggested as solutions by the women, resolved around government
initiatives, family-friends organizational schemes and a general societal reorientation.

Keith and Schafer (1998) interviewed from 112 couples Multivariate analysis indicates that those in equal and junior-partner marriages were most advantaged. Equal financial responsibility was less important in sustaining well-being for women than work itself. When husbands held more constricted views of work roles of women, but felt inequity in earning, wives had the lowest self-esteem. The typology differentiated the quality of life.

Broman (2001) focussed on stressors related to the work of African Americans and how they relate to family life. The article discusses how black adults are more likely to be unemployed or suffer economic hardship and to have jobs with less job enrichment and more job pressure, which create lower marital quality. The study attempts to discover specific aspects of job-related stressors that have a negative impact on family life. The data are from two surveys conducted in 1986 and 1989 using face-to-face interviews. The data measure marital quality and parental well-being. The article shows how job-related stressors have a negative impact on family life and concludes that perhaps jobs need to be redesigned to assist families.

Amato, Johnson, Booth and Rogers (2003) used data from two national surveys of married individuals - one from 1980 and the other from 2000 to understand how three dimensions of marital quality changed during this period. Marital happiness and divorce proneness changed little between 1980 and 2000,
but marital interaction declined significantly. A decomposition analysis suggested that offsetting trends affected marital quality. Increases in marital heterogamy, premarital cohabitation, wives' extended hours of employment, and wives' job demands were associated with decline in multiple dimensions of marital quality. In contrast, increases in economic resources, decision-making equality, nontraditional attitudes toward gender, and support for the norm of lifelong marriage were associated with improvements in multiple dimensions of marital quality. Increase in husbands' share of housework appeared to depress marital quality among husbands but to improve marital quality among wives.

Hubley, Hemingway and Michalos (2003) compared the quality of life, health, and social support of caregivers and non-caregivers age 65 or older. A secondary purpose was to examine age identity in these two groups. This sample was taken from a large quality of life survey of 875 individuals age 55 or older living in communities in northern British Columbia, Canada. The sample was restricted to (1) individuals 65 years or older because we were particularly interested in seniors, (2) married individuals because preliminary analyses indicated that marital status was a potentially confounding variable in the caregiver/non-caregiver comparisons. Thus, our sample consisted of 239 married, community-dwelling respondents ranging in age from 65 to 86 years, with an average age of 71.8 years. Of these respondents, 48.5% were females & 26.4% were caregivers. Generally speaking, caregivers & non-caregivers were not significantly different in terms of quality of life, self-reported health, and most aspects of social support and age identity. Seniors, whether they were caregivers
or not, reported positive levels of quality of life and health status. Caregivers and non-caregivers, however, did differ in terms of (a) their satisfaction with their romantic relationships, with caregivers being less satisfied, and (b) the age they felt mentally, with caregivers feeling slightly older mentally than non-caregivers. Thus, caregiver status alone does not appear to result in lower levels of quality of life, poorer mental and physical health, lower levels of social support, or older age identities overall in older, married adults living in non-metropolitan areas.

Haring, Hewitt and Flett (2003) examined the associations among perfectionism, marital coping, and marital functioning in a community sample of 76 couples. A theoretical model was tested in which maladaptive coping mediates the relationship between trait perfectionism and poorer marital functioning. As predicted, one of the interpersonal dimensions of perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism, was associated with maladaptive marital coping and poorer marital adjustment for both the self and the partner, even after controlling for depression and neuroticism. Finally, the use of negative coping strategies mediated the relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and poorer marital functioning for both the self and the partner. Overall, this study highlights the importance of spouse-specific forms of perfectionism in marital adjustment.

Young (2004) reviewed research on healthy couple relationships from the past decade. Few research articles exist targeting healthy relationships within the context of couple relationships. The existing research on healthy relationships targets a variety of populations other than couples, for example, relationships involving adolescent sexual assault and teacher-child relationships. To obtain a
description of a healthy couple relationship, the review was expanded to include concepts such as marital happiness, marital stability, and marital quality. The existing literature on couple relationships has focused more on the use of stability or quality as a means of defining couple relationships than on examining healthy couples specifically. Research on marital quality is reviewed, and the results are compared in an attempt to describe a healthy couple relationship.

Iqbal, Nadeem and Fatima (2004) observe the presence of anxiety in working and non-working women with reference to their education, family system and the number of their children. A purposive sample of 50 working women and 50 non-working women was taken. Both groups were matched on their age, education, occupation and socioeconomic background. Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale was administered on all women to assess their anxiety. They were also interviewed to record the demographic information. Results showed that anxiety was observed in 57% of sampled women, 74% of non-working women and 36% of working women. A statistically significant association between anxiety in women and education and number of their children was found. No significant association was observed between women anxiety and their family system. It is concluded that all non-working women should be supported morally and socially to spare some time for their entertainment and pleasurable activities outside homes to distract the monotony of routine work.

Sharon, Priscilla and Jennifer (2005) examined: (1) differences in perceived decision-making, gender-role attitudes, division of household labor and perceived marital equity in dual-earner husbands and wives (n = 233); and (2) the impact of
perceived decision-making, gender-role attitudes, and division of household labor on perceived marital equity. Findings indicated that decision-making, low-control household labor, and high-control household labor differed significantly between husbands and wives. Wives spent more time in household labor and were much more likely to be involved in low-control household tasks. Perceptions of marital equity were influenced by decision-making and time spent in low-control household tasks for both husbands and wives.

Gary and Jennifer (2005) suggested that the effect of marital status on personal happiness was declining, meaning that the “happiness gap” between married and never-married persons was diminishing. Speculations about the causes of this diminishing positive effect of marriage ranged from changing values to the increasing role overload of married women. But there was some evidence that the decline in the “happiness gap” had reversed by the end of the 1980s. This paper uses General Social Survey data from 1972 through 2002 to show that this decline did indeed reverse, such that in recent years the difference in the happiness of married and never-married persons is as great as it has been since the inception of the GSS. Although women who are employed and/or have children in the home are slightly less happy than others, the positive effect of marriage on the happiness of these women is as strong as it has ever been.

**SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING**

Nathawat and Mathur (1993) compared marital adjustment and subjective well-being in 200 adult Indian housewife and 200 adult women working outside
the home. Subjects were administered a Marital Adjustment Questionnaire (P.Kumar and K. Rastogi, 1978) and measures of subjective well-being (e.g., General Health Questionnaire, Self-Rating Depression Questionnaire Scale). Results indicate significantly better marital adjustment and subjective well-being for the subjects working outside the home than for housewives. Subjects working outside the home reported higher scores on general health, life satisfaction, and self-esteem measures and lower scores on hopelessness, insecurity and anxiety. However, housewives had lower scores on negative effects than did subjects working outside the home.

Gohm, Oishi, Darlington and Diener (1998) examined the association between parental marital status, marital conflict, and culture (individualism-collectivism, divorce rate), and the subjective well-being of young adults. Study 1 assessed 2,625 men and 4,118 women from 39 countries on 6 continents. Subjective well-being was negatively associated with marital conflict among offspring of never-divorced and remarried parents. The association of marital status and the subjective well-being of offspring differed across individualism-collectivism and divorce rate. Collectivism lessens the impact of divorce after a high-conflict marriage and the impact of marital conflict when a parent remarries. Study 2 examined the association of parental marital status and conflict among 76 adopted and 87 non-adopted young adults. The negative association of divorce and of marital conflict with the life satisfaction of the offspring did not differ by adoption. The selection hypothesis was not supported.
Garrison (1998) identified the socioeconomic / demographic determinants of the quality of life of rural families, computer-aided telephone interviewing via random digit dialing procedures was used to collect data in spring 1996 from 510 rural (both farm & non-farm) respondents. Quality of life was measured by five subscales: finances; home, family, and friends; household; community; and environment. Regression analyses indicated that the independent variables - gender, race, marital status, employment status, residence, age, family income, & household size - differentially affected the quality of life subscales. Among the independent variables, household size was the most important predictor of subjective well-being. Findings support dimensional, rather than global, measurement of subjective well-being.

Lee (1998) explores the effects of marital status and gender on the subjective quality of life in Korea, drawing on national scale data from 955 married or single adults. Results indicate that gender is a stable predictor of the quality of life regardless of one's marital status; men are better off than women. Being married appears to affect the level of general happiness positively. Analyses with other measures of quality of life suggest that the effect of marital status is moderated by gender; for men, being married negatively affects the quality of life, while the effect is positive for women.

Hughes and Thomas (1999) demonstrated that the subjective well-being of African American’s in the fare as well as better than whites, suggesting a change in the pattern observed for nearly 40 years. Using data from the general society survey for the period 1972 to 1996, it is shown that quality of life continues to be
worse for Africans than whites, although animosity and mistrust have increased a little more rapidly in recent years for whites than for blacks. Racial disparities in quality of life do not vary and are not explained by SES. Although racial inequality appears to be the primary cause of these differences the exact processes producing them are as yet unknown.

Gallagher (2000) examined well-being and the contribution of intimacy and marital satisfaction to well-being in long term survivors of childhood cancer (LTSCC). In addition, self-esteem, warmth and gregariousness were included to test for mediating effects. 207 adult LTSCC were assessed using the Rand Well-Being Measure, Miller’s Social Intimacy Scale, the Dyadic Adjustment Survey, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the NEO-PI Warmth and gregariousness subscales, and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C) each of these is a well established and well validated self-report measure. Survivors’ scores on each of these measures were contrasted with those of a control led group of adults who did not have a cancer history (N=169). Each of the variables, as well as several socio-demographic and medical variables, were utilized in regression and path analysis to determine their ability to predict well-being. LTSCC reported significantly less overall well-being (F=78.9, P<.001), significantly more anxiety (F=194.2, P<.001), and depression (F=1262.3, p<.001), health (F=137.0, p<.001), and self-control (F=88.3, p<.001) than controls. LTSCC had higher scores on the M-C (F=26.7, p<.001). An omnibus stepwise multiple regression analysis accounting for 27% of the variance, revealed that self-esteem and the interaction of warmth and intimacy were the best predictors of well-being. Group membership was a non-significant
predictor of well-being. Finally, path analysis was employed and different models fit the LTSCC and the controls. The best path model (NET=.94) for the LTSCC indicates that well-being predicts intimacy. The best path model (NET=.98) for the controls, on the other hand, indicates that intimacy predicts well-being. These results are discussed in terms of developmental and social support theories.

Hilleras, Aguero, Hedda and Winblad (2001) examined the factors that either increase or decrease well-being of both young and old people. Many factors have been studied in relation to well-being but only some have been found to be associated with it. These factors are demographic (Age, Sex, Culture, marital status), Social (Socio economic status, having children, religion, social contacts) all are related to personality, life events, health and activities. However some of these factors have a stronger association than others.

Diener, Lucas, Oishi and Suh (2002) conducted two large international studies on subjective well-being, the authors examined that whether happy and unhappy individuals weighted 8 life domains (health, finances, family, friends, recreation, religion, self and education) differently when constructing life satisfaction judgments. In both studies, regression equations predicting life satisfaction showed that there were significant interactions between happiness and a person's best and between happiness and a person's worst domain, even after controlling for participants weightier their best domains more heavily than did unhappy individuals, whereas unhappy individuals weighted their worst domains more heavily than did happy individuals. Thus happy and unhappy people used different information when constructing satisfaction judgments.
Kim and McKenry (2002) examined the relationship between marriage and psychological well-being using a sample from the National Survey of Families and Households panel data. Eight different marital status groups were identified and used to test two competing perspectives explaining the relationship between marriage and individual psychological well-being (protection vs. selection). Findings confirmed the strong effects of marital status on psychological well-being, supporting the protection perspective. The effect of the quality of marital (cohabiting) relationship on psychological well-being was significant, but the strong effect of marital status remained unchanged after controlling for relationship quality. Findings also indicated that the transition to cohabiting did not have the same beneficial effects as marriage for psychological well-being, suggesting that the protective effects of marriage are greater than those of cohabiting relationships. The selection effects of psychological well-being were found to be weak and inconsistent. The findings generally did not vary by gender.

Subbakrishna (2003) studied with the aim to examine the role of work-related factors, availability of support and coping styles as predictors of well-being. Sixty married working women were individually interviewed with regard to reasons for employment and support availability, and administered the Coping Checklist and Subjective Well-being Inventory. Results: On stepwise multiple regression analysis, greater use of social support seeking and less use of denial as coping styles, absence of multiple role strain, working to be financially independent, availability of support and refusal of job promotion were significant predictors of well-being.
Khan (2004) examines the differences between mean scores of married working and non-working women on subjective well-being. The sample consisted of 100 working women and 100 non-working women from different departments of Aligarh Muslim University and residence of Aligarh city by using random sampling. Diener’s (1985) Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) was used to measure the subjective well-being of the subjects. The data were analyzed by means of t-test. Results revealed that significant difference was found between the mean scores of married working and non-working women on subjective well-being.

**Human Values**

Sikula (1973 a) investigated values and value systems of government executives. He administered Research’s Value Survey to 54 male federal government executives. Medians and rankings for the 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values are presented. The value profile indicated that subjects gave the highest priority to the goals of family security, self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, freedom and equality. The lowest goal priority included pleasure and comfortable life. The instrumental values of honesty, responsibility, capability and self-control were rated highest, while the lowest ratings included obedience and politeness. The use of Rokeach’s Value survey in selection and placement procedures in training and development and in determining comparison is considered.
Sikula (1973 b) studied Values and value system of industrial personnel managers. He administered the Rokeach’s value survey to 59 personnel managers of industrial corporations. All subjects held positions of upper or middle managerial responsibilities and had at least of two years of experiences in personal work. Result were compared with previous studies of other managerial and employees group, personnel managers were found to hold values generally similar to other managerial groups, except for ambition, logical, forgiving, harmony and wisdom, which they valued more than any other managerial groups. Managers in general attach more importance to security and decorum than industrial workers.

Furnham (1984 b) examined and administered Rokeach’s Value Survey and anomie scale to subjects from Africa, India and Europe to see the similarities and differences in their value systems and its relationship to anomie. Results showed that African’s assigned more values to equality and peace and Europeans more to friendship and love. Although there were large significant differences between black and white groups on anomie, these scores did not correlate significantly with the instrumental and terminal values.

Firdous and Husain (1989) determined the role of instrumental values in spouse selection. A value scale consisting of 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values was administered on 45 female and 25 male graduate students. Sex differences existed in self-evaluation on four values, ‘Broadminded’, ‘Honest’, ‘Imaginative’, and ‘Independent’. ‘Cheerful’, ‘Independent’ and ‘Intellectual’ were the values rated highest by the female subjects in comparison with male subjects for other evaluation.

Schwartz and Sagie (2000) the authors tested hypotheses regarding causal impacts of socioeconomic development and political democratization on both value importance and value consensus in a society. Data are from matched samples of teachers from 42 nations (N = 7,856) who completed a survey that measures 10 distinct types of values. Both development and democratization correlate positively with the importance of openness and self-transcendence values, and negatively with the importance of conservation and self-enhancement values. Development and democratization have opposite relations to value consensus, suppressing one another’s effects. Development increases overall value consensus, whereas democratization decreases it. Differences between effects on specific value types are discussed.

Jalilvand (2000) investigated and found that working women appear to have a personal-value structure different from that of nonworking women;
economic and political values are more prominent among women who work, while social and religious values play a greater role for women who stay at home.

Schwartz and Bardi (2001) hierarchical order of values representative and near representative samples from 13 nations exhibit a similar pattern that replicates with school teachers in 56 nations and college students in 54 nations. Benevolence, self-direction, and universalism values are consistently most important; power, tradition, and stimulation values are least important; and security, conformity, achievement, and hedonism are in between. Value hierarchies of 83% of samples correlate at least .80 with this pan-cultural hierarchy. To explain the pan-cultural hierarchy, the authors discuss its adaptive functions in meeting the requirements of successful societal functioning. The authors demonstrate, with data from Singapore and the United States that correctly interpreting the value hierarchies of groups requires comparison with the pan-cultural normative baseline.

Asthana and Alka (2004) studied the values of women belonging to four communities—Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian. A sample of 200 women (50 from each community) from Varanasi was taken. The age range was 25 to 35 years. ‘Study of Values’ by Kulshreshtha (1971) was administered to the total sample individually. The only significant difference obtained was regarding political value. Christian women had a higher political value in comparison to Hindu, Muslim and Sikh women. Sikh women also scored higher than Hindu women with regard to political value. Value hierarchy for different communities is non-similar: Hindu and Muslim women place social values at the highest, while
Sikh and Christian women place religious and political values at the highest level. All the subjects have placed economic and aesthetic values at the lowest level of value hierarchy.

Khan and Khan (2005) examined the human values among working and non-working women. Rokeach (1973) Value Survey form was administered on 100 working and 100 non-working women of different departments of Aligarh Muslim University, and Aliagrh city. The subjects ranked 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values separately according to their personal importance. The data were analyzed by median rank. The results of terminal values revealed that ‘equality’ and ‘mature love’ were ranked higher by both working women and non-working women. The ‘responsible’ value was given highest preferences by both working women and non-working women on instrumental values in their lives.

Khan (2005) measured the human values, Rokeach Value Survey form was administered on 100-employed husbands and 100 employed wives of different faculties of Aligarh Muslim University, and Aliagrh city. The subjects were asked to rank 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values separately according to their personal importance. The data were analyzed by median rank. The results of terminal values revealed that ‘A world at peace ‘and’ Salvation’ were ranked higher by both working husband and working wives. But working wives also gave higher priority to ‘equality’, ‘happiness’, ‘national security’, ‘mature love’, and ‘an exciting life. The results of instrumental values revealed that ‘responsible’ were gave highest preferences by both spouses. Cheerful and loving were ranked
higher by working husband whereas working wives ranked values ‘clean’ higher in their life.

Frans and Geert (2005) examined relative effects of both spouses' educational levels on the value parents place on children's conformity. Eight General Social Survey samples, covering the 1970's and 1980's, containing information on 3,005 mothers, 2,634 fathers, and their spouses were analyzed simultaneously. Application of “diagonal reference models” showed symmetric influence. Although own educational level had the larger effect on conformity, the effect of spouse's educational level, particularly the father's, was substantive. Among mothers, interdependence was moderated by mother's employment, and marital happiness. Education of mothers who are the sole breadwinners had a smaller effect on own child-rearing values, than education of mothers who are not the sole breadwinners. In addition, education of happily married mothers had a smaller effect on own child-rearing values, than education of unhappily married mothers.
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RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Specifically the main aims of the present study are as follows:

1. To examine the quality of relationship among single career couples and dual career couples.

2. To examine the quality of relationship among working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples.

3. To examine the quality of relationship among non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples.

4. To examine the subjective well-being among single career couples and dual career couples.

5. To examine the subjective well-being among working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples.

6. To examine the subjective well-being among non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples.

7. To identify the hierarchy of terminal values among single career couples and dual career couples.
8. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on terminal values.

9. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

10. To identify the hierarchy of instrumental values among single career couples and dual career couples.

11. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on instrumental values.

12. To determine the rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.

**HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses were formulated:

1. There will be significant difference between single career couples and dual career couples on quality of relationship.

2. There will be significant difference between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on quality of relationship.
3. There will be significant difference between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on quality of relationship.

4. There will be significant difference between single career couples and dual career couples on subjective well-being.

5. There will be significant difference between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

6. There will be significant difference between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

7. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between single career couples and dual career couples on terminal values.

8. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on terminal values.

9. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

10. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between single career couples and dual career couples on instrumental values.
11. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on instrumental values.

12. There will be significant rank difference correlation coefficient between non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.
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Methodology is the key element in carrying out any kind of research. Methodology is of a paramount importance in any scientific inquiry, as the validity and reliability of the facts primarily depend upon the system of investigation. The various aspects concerning the methodology have been described under the following heads:

SUBJECTS

The present study was conducted on two hundred couples (N=200). They were selected from different faculties of Aligarh Muslim University, and Aligarh city through random purposive sampling. The sample was also split into 100 single career couples (100 working husbands and 100 non-working wives) and 100 dual career couples (100 working husbands and 100 working wives). The age of the respondents varied from 30 to 50 years.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUBJECTS

N= 200 Couples

100 Single Career Couples

100 Working Husbands 100 Non-Working Wives

100 Dual Career Couples

100 Working Husbands 100 Working Wives
TOOLS

The present study employed the following tools for measuring the quality of relationship, subjective well-being and human values.

Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI)

QRI was developed by Pierce, Sarason and Sarason (1991). The current version of QRI includes 25 items that assess the amount of support, conflict and depth in a broad range of close relationships. The QRI items are rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 4 = “very much”. Accumulating evidence suggests that the QRI is a reliable, valid measure of these three aspects of close relationships (support, conflict and depth). QRI scale also has a high test retest reliability with correlations between scores in each scale across the 4-month period ranging from .66 to .82 with an average correlation of .75. Infect these test retest correlations are close to the internal consistency estimates, indicating that nearly all of the reliable variance in the QRI scales is attributable to a stable conception of the relationship.

Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)

Subjective well-being was measured by using the 5-item Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS). The SWLS was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985). Individuals responded to items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 7 = "strongly agree." Responses were summed to produce a total SWLS score, with higher scores indicating more life satisfaction.
Internal consistency (.87), test-retest reliability (.82, eight weeks), and validity of the SWLS are good (Diener et al., 1985). The total SWLS score ranged from 5 to 35. Internal consistencies of .85 and test-retest coefficients of .84 were reported.

**Rokeach Value Survey Form (RVSF)**

The RVSF developed by Milton Rokeach (1973) was used for measuring the human values in the proposed study. The value test measures 18 terminal values i.e., *A world at peace, Family security, Freedom, Equality, Self-respect, Happiness, Wisdom, National security, Salvation, True friendship, A sense of accomplishment, Inner harmony, A comfortable life, Mature love, A world of beauty, Pleasure, Social recognition, An exciting life,* and 18 instrumental values i.e., *Ambitious, Broadminded, Capable, Cheerful, Clean, Courageous, Forgiving, Helpful, Honest, Imaginative, Independent, Intellectual, Logical, Loving, Obedient, Polite, Responsible, and Self-controlled.* He has demonstrated good reliability over time (i.e., $r = .88$ to .51 for the terminal values; $r = .70$ to .45 for the instrumental values) and sound validity when compared to other similar value scales (Braithwaite & Law, 1985).

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET**

Demographic data sheet includes information regarding age, sex, occupation, income, education and religion of subjects.
PROCEDURE

Prior to administration of the test the investigator apprised to the respondents about the utility of the study and then the couples were asked to fill up the questionnaires by themselves according to the instructions written on each of the questionnaires. They were assured that their responses will be kept confidential. The investigator did scoring for the entire three questionnaires manually.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data was analyzed with the help of the student t-test to determine the significance of difference between the mean scores of comparison groups (a) Single Career Couples and Dual Career Couples (b) Working Husbands of Single Career Couples and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples (c) Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples on quality of relationship and subjective well-being. Rank difference correlation coefficients were computed to see the significant rank difference correlation coefficient on human values. Median ranks were also computed to see the level of preference of subjects on terminal and instrumental values of all groups.
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The raw scores were obtained in the four groups i.e., Working Husbands of Single Career Couples (WHSCC), Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples (WHDCC), Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples (NWWSCC) and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples (WWDCC) on three major variables i.e., Quality of Relationship, Subjective Well-Being and Human Values.

The abbreviations used in the tables while reporting the results are as follows:

SCC - Single Career Couples
DCC - Dual Career Couples
WHDCC - Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples.
Table 1 Comparison between the mean scores of Single Career Couples (SCC) and Dual Career Couples (DCC) on Quality of Relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>134.29</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130.69</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Comparison between the mean scores of Working Husbands of Single Career Couples (WHSCC) and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples (WHDCC) on Quality of Relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHSCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHDCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.96</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Comparison between the mean scores of Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples (NWWSCC) and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples (WWDCC) on Quality of Relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWWSCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWDCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Comparison between the mean scores of Single Career Couples (SCC) and Dual Career Couples (DCC) on Subjective Well-Being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44.61</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>7.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Comparison between the mean scores of Working Husbands of Single Career Couples (WHSCC) and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples (WHDCC) on Subjective Well-Being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHSCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHDCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Comparison between the mean scores of Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples (NWWSCC) and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples (WWDCC) on Subjective Well-Being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWWSCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWDCC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 Median score and ranking given by the subjects on Terminal Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Terminal Values</th>
<th>Single Career Couples (SCC)</th>
<th>Dual Career Couples (DCC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A world at peace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>National security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>True friendship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Inner harmony</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A comfortable life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mature love</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A world of beauty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Social recognition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>An exciting life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No.</td>
<td>Terminal Values</td>
<td>WHSCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A world at peace</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>National security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>True friendship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Inner harmony</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A comfortable life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mature love</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A world of beauty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Social recognition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>An exciting life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 Median score and ranking given by the subjects on Terminal Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Terminal Values</th>
<th>NWWSCC</th>
<th>WWDCC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A world at peace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>National security</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>True friendship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Inner harmony</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A comfortable life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mature love</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A world of beauty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Social recognition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>An exciting life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 Median score and ranking given by the subjects on Instrumental Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Instrumental Values</th>
<th>Single Career Couples (SCC)</th>
<th>Dual Career Couples (DCC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Broadminded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Median score and ranking given by the subjects on Instrumental Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Instrumental Values</th>
<th>WHSCC</th>
<th>WHDCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Broadminded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 Median score and ranking given by the subjects on Instrumental Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Instrumental Values</th>
<th>NWWSCC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WWDCC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Broadminded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13 Rank Difference coefficient of correlation ($p$) between rankings of Terminal Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Rank difference coefficient of correlation ($p$)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SCC &amp; DCC</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>WHSCC &amp; WHDCC</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NWWSC &amp; WWDCC</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14 Rank Difference coefficient of correlation ($p$) between rankings of Instrumental Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Rank difference coefficient of correlation ($p$)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SCC &amp; DCC</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>WHSCC &amp; WHDCC</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NWWSC &amp; WWDCC</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Median Ranks of Terminal Values for Single Career Couples and Dual Career Couples

Figure 2: Median Ranks of Terminal Values for Working Husbands of Single Career Couples and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples
Figure 3 Median Ranks of Terminal Values for Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples

Figure 4 Median Ranks of Instrumental Values for Single Career Couples and Dual Career Couples
Figure 5 Median Ranks of Instrumental Values for Working Husbands of Single Career Couples and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples

Figure 6 Median Ranks of Instrumental Values for Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples
QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP

The result of Table 1 revealed that single career couples scored significantly higher than the dual Career Couples on quality of relationship (t=2.47, p<.05). It is clear from this study that the husbands and wives of single career couples found maximum support from his/her counterpart than working husband/wives of dual career couples. As Rani (1976) points out that the Indian working woman encounters numerous difficulties as compared to her counterpart. She cannot pickup ready to eat food packets on her way home and has few gadgets to depend on. It is also suggested by Higgins, Duxbury and Lee (1994); Marshall and Barnett (1993); Roehling, Moen and Batt (2003) that work-family conflict is particularly acute among dual-earner couples, for whom no one is readily available to take care of the needs of the family. Among dual earner couples, wives typically experience higher levels of work-family conflict than husbands.

From Table 2, it may be inferred that the Working Husbands of single career couples scored significantly higher than the Working Husbands of dual career couples on Quality of Relationship. (t=3.22, p<.01). This finding suggests that working husbands of single career couples perceived significantly greater quality of relationship than working husbands of dual career couples. It is clear from the result that husbands of single career couples, when they return home from their hectic schedule, the wives act as a ‘pillar’ of strength and support; while in case of husbands belonging to dual career couples, when the husband returns
home he feels tired and fatigued due to which they hardly consider each others problems. This in turn affects their quality of relationship.

From table 3, it is found that the Non-working Wives of Single Career Couples scored significantly higher than the Working Wives of Dual Career Couples on Quality of Relationship (t=2.33, p<.05). This finding suggests that working husbands of single career couples experienced significantly greater quality of relationship than non-working wives of single career couples. The findings of the present study can be corroborated by the findings of Barnett and Hyde (2001), in which they suggest that the work gave the opportunity to the working husbands or wife a buffer for the stresses in the home, a network of social relations, and opportunities for meaningful engagement and success that are not available to those who are not employed.

**SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING**

It has been noticed from Table 4, that Single Career Couples and Dual Career Couples differ significantly on Subjective well-being (t= 2.83, p< .05). The result revealed that working husbands of dual career couples perceived greater subjective well-being than single career couples. It is clear from this finding that dual career couples becoming more and more prevalent today. However the perception of the working people have changed in respect of meeting the monthly expenses and to become economically stable. Sefton (1987) has suggested that today’s trend is for both parents need to work in order to live a healthy life. Burke and Weir (1976) suggested that members of dual career families are more self-
reliant and self-sufficient. Rani and Khandelwal (1992) found that dual career family environment lays significantly more emphasis on cultural and recreational pursuits, independence and organization compared to single career families. Non-working women do not get the opportunity to utilize their education and satisfy the psychological needs to develop their self-identity this in turn negatively affects the subjective well-being. The poor subjective well-being of single career couples indicates that they experience more anxiety in their daily lives. Dual career couples perceived greater social interaction and buffer to avoid stress and gain more satisfaction from their lives.

Table 5 shows the significant difference between the Working Husbands of Single Career Couples and the Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples on Subjective Well-being (t=4.14, p<.01). It is clear from this finding that husbands of single career couples perceived greater subjective well-being than husbands of dual career couples. This finding implies that caring on the part of wives in terms of preparing the healthy and nutritious food for their husbands and marital intimacy to look after each others. This in turn, improves the quality of life and subjective well-being among spouses but this is not so in the case of husbands of dual career couples. Spouses of dual career couples neglect each other due to excess work and in performing household tasks and responsibilities which in turn builds up tension, anxiety among partners and perhaps this leads to a deteriorating subjective well-being among spouses. The present findings can be supported by the findings of Fox and Dwyer, (1999); Higgins, Duxbury and Irving (1992), that some factors associated with increased work-family conflict among dual-earner
couples are high level of job involvement, a heavy work load, conflict at work or at home.

Table 6 shows the significant difference between the mean scores of non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on subjective well-being ($t=6.59$, $p<.01$). The result indicates that working wives of dual career couples perceived greater subjective well-being than traditional women. It is clear from this finding that there is greater acceptance and satisfaction in working women from their employment than ever before. The result seems to conform with the results of studies conducted by Kessler and McRae (1982). Subjective well-being for employed women is important because they faced stress due to multiple roles. Resources generated by employment (income, status etc.) appear adequate not only to cope with stresses emanating due to multiple roles but also to enhance well-being. If women are able to contribute more to the society through employment, as human beings this right cannot be denied to them. Women’s employment provides them an opportunity to utilize their education and to satisfy the psychological needs to develop their self identity (Nieva, 1985) and serve as better role models for children especially daughters. It also provides additional income for the family and these things in turn positively affect the subjective well-being of the women. Nye and Hoffman (1963) also found that a relationship exists between wives’ employment and their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The findings indicate that those who combined household and employment roles were more satisfied with their daily work, family
income, home and relationships with elderly community and recreational life as compared to household wives.

HUMAN VALUES

Table 11 reveals that Rank difference correlation coefficient (ρ) was found to be non-significant between single and dual career couples on terminal values. (ρ = .438, p > .05). It can be observed from the figure 1 that Single Career Couples gave most importance to ‘Equality’, ‘Family-security’, ‘Wisdom’, ‘Salvation’, ‘A comfortable life’ ‘A World of beauty’ and ‘Social recognition’ respectively, while Dual Career Couples gave most importance to ‘A World at Peace’, ‘Salvation’, and ‘Mature love’.

Table 11 reveals that Rank difference correlation coefficient (ρ) was found to be non-significant between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values (ρ = -.115, p > .05). Median Ranks on Terminal Values are shown in figure 2 that Working Husbands of Single Career Couples gave most preference to ‘Wisdom’ while Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples gave most preference to ‘A World at Peace’ and ‘Salvation’.

Non-significant Rank difference correlation coefficient (ρ) was found between non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on terminal values. (ρ = .315, p > .05). It has been observed from the figure 3 that Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples gave most importance to ‘Equality’, ‘Inner Harmony’, ‘Mature love’, ‘A World of Beauty’ and ‘An exciting life’ while Working Wives of Dual Career Couple gave most importance to

On **Instrumental Values**, the rank difference correlation coefficient \( (\rho) \) was found to be significant between the single career couples and dual career couples on instrumental values. \( (\rho = .510, p<.05) \). Median Ranks of Instrumental Values are shown in Figure 4, Single Career Couples (SCC) gave highest importance to ‘Responsible’, ‘Capable’, ‘Clean’, ‘Helpful’ and ‘Independent’ whereas Dual Career Couples (DCC) attach importance to ‘Loving’, and ‘Responsible’ values.

Rank difference correlation coefficient \( (\rho) \) was found to be non-significant between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values. \( (\rho = .474, p>.05) \). Median Ranks on Instrumental Values are shown in Figure 5 that Working Husbands of Single Career Couples gave highest importance to ‘Capable’, and Working Husbands of Dual Career Couples gave ‘Cheerful’, ‘Loving’, and ‘Responsible’ values as the most important in their life.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient \( (\rho) \) was found between non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on all instrumental values \( (\rho = .541, p<.05) \). It is observed from the figure 6 that Non-Working Wives of Single Career Couples gave more importance to ‘Independent’, ‘Loving’, and ‘Responsible’ and Working Wives of Dual Career Couples attached more importance to ‘Clean’, and ‘Responsible’ values.
A World at Peace and Salvation terminal values were ranked highest by working husbands of dual career couples and working wives of dual career couples. While ‘Mature love’ and ‘Equality’ were ranked highest by non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples in their lives.

The value of ‘Responsible’ was ranked highest by non-working wives of single career couples, working husbands of dual career couples and working wives of dual career couples. The ‘Loving’ value was given highest preference by non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples.

Most of the terminal and instrumental values were found to be non-similar among single and dual career couples. Each group or individuals has its own system of values, which represents the ideal and the desirable goal of the individual concerned. This may be the reason for the prevalence of non-similar value in couples.
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Conclusions

The finding of the present study can be summarized as:

- Significant differences existed between the mean score of single career couples and dual career couples on quality of relationship.

- Significant differences existed between the mean score of working husbands of single career couples and working husbands of dual career couples on quality of relationship.

- Significant differences existed between the mean score of non-working wives of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on quality of relationship.

- Significant differences existed between the mean score of single career couples and dual career couples on subjective well-being.

- Significant difference was found to exist between the mean scores of working husbands of single career couples and the working husbands of dual career couples on subjective well-being.
Significant differences existed between the mean score of non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on subjective well-being.

Non-significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was found between the single career couples and dual career couples on terminal values.

Insignificant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was found between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was not found between the non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on terminal values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was found between the single career couples and dual career couples on instrumental values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was not found between the working husbands of single career couples and working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.

Significant rank difference correlation coefficient ($\rho$) was found between the non-working wives of single career couples and the working wives of dual career couples on instrumental values.
Working husbands of dual career couples and working wives of dual career couples attached highest importance to terminal values i.e., *A world at peace* and *salvation*.

*Mature love* and *equality* terminal values were given highest priority by working and non-working wives.

Working husbands and wives of dual career couples and non-working wives of single career couples gave most preference to *responsible* terminal value.

Working wives of dual career couples and non-working wives of single career couples gave highest preference to *loving* instrumental value.

**FURTHER RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS**

The present study highlight the difference among single and dual career couples on quality of relationship, subjective well-being and human values. In future there is need to identify the mediators and moderators of quality of relationship, subjective well-being and human values.

Due to certain practical constraints, the study was confined only to single and dual career couples of urban area and literate ones, thereby hampering the generalization of results for the overall married populace. Therefore, it would be a worthwhile effort to cover a large sample encompassing different sociodemographic variables i.e., area of residence, age (i.e., younger and older couples), socioeconomic status and length of marriage etc.
Further studies could be done by conducting indepth interviews with the spouses of single and dual career couples. Such qualitative analysis can through more light on the spouses’ quality of relationship, subjective well-being and value profiles.

Since cognitive and personality variables play an important role in determining the quality of relationship in couples, therefore in the prospective studies these may be taken into account.
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APPENDIX: A
QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY (QRI)

Instructions

Given in this questionnaire are a set of twenty-five questions aimed at assessing the nature of your relationship with your spouse. Please use the scale given below to encircle the appropriate response.

1 = Not at all
2 = A little
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Very much

1. To what extent can you turn to this partner for advice about problems?
2. How often do you need to work hard to avoid conflict with this person?
3. To what extent could you count on this person for health with a problem?
4. How upset does this person sometimes make you feel?
5. To what extent can you count on this person to give you honest feedback, even if you might not want to hear it?
6. How much does this person make you feel guilty?
7. How much do you have to "give in" in this relationship?
8. To what extent can you count on this person to help you if a family member very close to you died?
9. How much does this person want you to change?
10. How opposite a role does this person play in your life?
11. How significant is this relationship in your life? 1 2 3 4
12. How close will your relationship be with this in 10 years? 1 2 3 4
13. How much would you miss this person if the two of you could not
    see or talk with each other for a month? 1 2 3 4
14. How critical of you is this person? 1 2 3 4
15. If you wanted to go out and do something this evening, how confident
    are you that this person would be willing to do something with you? 1 2 3 4
16. How responsible do you feel for this person’s well-being? 1 2 3 4
17. How relationship do you depends on this person? 1 2 3 4
18. To what extent can you count on this person to listen to you to when you
    are very angry at someone else? 1 2 3 4
19. How much would you like this person to change? 1 2 3 4
20. How angry does this person make you feel? 1 2 3 4
21. How much do you argue with this person? 1 2 3 4
22. To what extent can you really count on this person to distract you from
    your worries when you feel under stress? 1 2 3 4
23. How often does this person make you feel angry? 1 2 3 4
24. How often does this person try to control or influence your life? 1 2 3 4
25. How much more do you give than you get from this relationships? 1 2 3 4
APPENDIX: B

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE (SWLS)

Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open in responding.

1 = strongly disagree.
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

The five statements are:

1. _____ In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. _____ The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. _____ I am satisfied with my life.
4. _____ So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. _____ If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
APPENDIX: C

HUMAN VALUE SURVEY FORM (HVSF)

Given below are certain values, which are important in the development and organization of personality and in the development of relationships and social interaction in day-to-day life. You are required to rank the 18 Terminal values and 18th Instrumental values separately from 1 (most important) to 18 (least important). In order to importance.

Terminal Values

1. _____ A world at peace (free of war and conflict)
2. _____ Family security (taking care of loved ones)
3. _____ Freedom (independence, free choice)
4. _____ Equality (equal opportunity for all)
5. _____ Self-respect (self-esteem)
6. _____ Happiness (contentedness)
7. _____ Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)
8. _____ National security (protection from attack)
9. _____ Salvation (saved, eternal life)
10. _____ True friendship (close companionship)
11. _____ A sense of accomplishment (a lasting contribution)
12. _____ Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)
13. _____ A comfortable life (a prosperous life)
14. _____ Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
15. ______ A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)
16. ______ Pleasure (an enjoyable leisurely life)
17. ______ Social recognition (respect, admiration)
18. ______ An exciting life (a stimulating active life)

**Instrumental Values**

1. ______ Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)
2. ______ Broadminded (open-minded)
3. ______ Capable (competent, effective)
4. ______ Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
5. ______ Clean (neat, tidy)
6. ______ Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)
7. ______ Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
8. ______ Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
9. ______ Honest (sincere, truthful)
10. ______ Imaginative (daring, creative)
11. ______ Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
12. ______ Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
13. ______ Logical (consistent, rational)
14. ______ Loving (affectionate, tender)
15. ______ Obedient (dutiful, respectful)
16. ______ Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
17. ______ Responsible (dependable, reliable)
18. ______ Self-controlled (restrained, self-discipline)
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