

MONEY INFLUENCE ON WOMEN LIVING IN JOINT AND NUCLEAR FAMILIES

Naveed Shibli¹ and Abeer Tahir²

¹Department of Psychology Riphah International University Faisalabad

²Affiliation not available

September 12, 2019

Abstract

The relationship of family types with money influence, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship of women living in joint and nuclear families were studied in a randomized group design. 100 women tested. It was assumed that family types can influence study variables? Money Attitude Scale, Self-assessment Scale, Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, Social Relationship Scale were administered. The SPSS analysis revealed significant response differences between joint and nuclear family system participants in terms of the variables; moreover, the means of all variables were found higher among joint family system. Some context information about mediating interaction between the variables came in light. More cultural context studies would reveal further.

Introduction

The human relation with money is historic and it is available in an anthropological context (Argyle & Furnham, 2013; Maurer, 2006). From the times of Sigmund Freud in Doyle (1992) psychologists have been discussing money because money is related with positive experience and its need is universal (Hassenzahl, Diefenbach&Göriz, 2010). Money as a motivator is related to many attitudes (Mitchell, & Mickel, 1999) and with personality as has been discussed with reference to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Oleson, 2004). Money plays a role of satisfier and improves wellbeing (Howell, Kurai& Tam, 2013); love for money is related to satisfaction (Tan & Waheed, 2011).

Money as a factor in human life could make different types of influences, but its influence in human interaction and 'social system' is essential (Zhou, Vohs & Baumeister, 2009). Money is a kind of power (Baldwin, 1971) and has proven influence on human strengthens. Self-esteem is a human strength and it is related to mental and physical health and with attitudes, even criminal attitudes are related with it as well as economic attitudes (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, Moffitt, Robins, Poulton&Caspi, 2006).

The influence of self-esteem is related to different factors (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger & Vohs, 2003). Money and self-esteem interact in multiple ways in decision and other situations to the extent that in some cases such effects influence entire personality (Zhang, 2009) as compulsive spending reflects low self-esteem (Hanley & Wilhelm, 1992). Money creates stress (Norvilitis, Merwin, Osberg, Roehling, and Young& Kamas 2006) and the role of self in various kinds of investments play a role (Zhang & Baumeister, 2006) moreover subjective well-being is related to money (Diener&Biswas-Diener, 2002) as are feelings of inadequacy (Christopher, Marek& Carroll, 2004).

Money is related to gender; it influences women's gender roles (Atzmon & Izraeli, 1993) and found influencing women's roles in the subcontinent (Borthwick, 2015). Men value money more as compared with women (Edwards, Allen & Hayhoe, 2007). Perhaps because of the reason that men and women receive generally different socialization positions and patterns (Rinaldi, & Todesco, 2012): like age factor influences women

more as compared with men, moreover, so far as self-esteem is concerned (McMullin&Cairney, 2004) body consciousness among women is more (Fitzsimmons-Craft, Harney, Koehler, Danzi, Riddell, & Bardone-Cone, 2012), in the similar manner some other economic interests are also related to women (Gilman, 2017).

Social relations are not always related to health (Cohen, 2004). Family types however reveal relationship (Chow & Lum, 2008). Money, health and relationships are related to the happiness of married couples (Dakin & Wampler, 2008). Moreover, spouses' segregated and joint roles (Spillius, & Bott, 2014), values (Scott, 2006), children and family process (Mayer, 1997), child development (Yeung, Linver & Brooks-Gunn, 2002), child pleasantness (Allen, Edwards, Hayhoe & Leach, 2007) as well as parenting and parent attitudes towards children (Aquilino, 2005) are related to money.

Method and Procedure

The role of money in an individual's life, its gender influence and its relationship with various aspects of self was so convincing that it was relevant to assume that money may be playing a role to influence women living in nuclear and joint families? It was also convincing to assume that such money influence in family life may reflect on self-assessment, social relations and self-esteem of the women, those may participate as voluntary subjects belonging to both types of nuclear and joint family systems in the study, and it may provide useful information about the role of money in both family types? 100 randomly selected voluntarily women participants were tested? For randomization, the city in which the study was conducted was divided into approximate 10 equal areas using the available map of the city. The researcher visited the marked residential areas to approach various resident units, informed the residents about the purpose of the study, on their willingness to participate obtained a written consent and then at the convenience of the volunteers conducted the study. 10 volunteers each from the demarcated 10 areas inducted and tested each. Among these 5 were belonging to nuclear families and 5 were belonging to joint families.

Following criterion was adopted to determine both family types.

Joint Family: was a family that included parents, children, grandparents, close relatives' uncles and aunts and children of the families living together in a single household.

Nuclear Family: was a family where husband and wife were living with their dependent children.

Following tests in following sequence were administered to each participant.

1. Money attitude scale (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982).
2. Self-assessment Scale
3. Rosenberg self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965).
4. Social relationship Scale (McFarlane, Neale, Norman, Roy & Streiner, 1981).

Results and Findings

The analysis of participants' scores with the help of SPSS revealed significant difference between joint and nuclear family system in terms of money (attitude) influences, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship, moreover, the means of money attitude, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship were higher among joint family system participants than nuclear family system. It was also come in light that the participants' money attitude was significantly positively correlated with self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship whereas self-assessment was significantly positively correlated with self-esteem and social relationship. Moreover, self-esteem was also found significantly positively correlated with social relationship, further self-esteem endured significant positive role of a partial mediator between money attitude and social relationship. Further, money attitude significant positive direct and indirect (through self-esteem) impact was also found on social relationship scores of the participants. 'Riphah Research Ethics Committee' Riphah International University Faisalabad Pakistan earlier accorded the approval for the conduct of the study.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Money orientation as MAS scores hinted as a role player to influence self-assessment, self-esteem and social

relationship of women belonging to nuclear and joint families. Such influences could be due to structural or relational influences of the families of women, or could be due to ‘financial literacy’ (Gudmunson & Danes, 2011) or because the family structure influences on the communication (Geuens, De Pelsmacker & Mast, 2003), self (Ljungqvist, Topor, Forssell, Svensson & Davidson, 2016), self-esteem (Lejoyeux, Richoux-Benhaim, Löhnardt & Lequen, 2011), mental health (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, Moffitt, Robins, Poulton & Caspi, 2006) and psychological well-being (Landry, Kindlein, Trépanier, Forest, Zigarmi, Houson & Brodbeck, 2016). However, money influences on different groups are different (Cunningham, Frauman, Ivy & Perry, 2004).

Multiple factors contributed in the emergence of nuclear families and living in nuclear families positively influence women’s health (Ruggles, 1994; Allendorf, 2013), whereas, joint and nuclear families are structurally different and joint families are more than that of economic demography? Perhaps the present work reflects an important hint towards the influence of money on both families and women in social-personal context?

The study flourished valuable information about the influence of money related to external factors and factors related with woman’s family life encompassing various aspects, social and personal, however, varied cultural influences required to be investigated for generalizing. Moreover, certain system related context information also came in light, especially about the role of money. The study provided useful information about family types and their relationship with money as an external influence and its system effects.

References

- Allen, M. W., Edwards, R., Hayhoe, C. R., & Leach, L. (2007). Imagined interactions, family money management patterns and coalitions, and attitudes toward money and credit. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* , 28 (1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-006-9048-1>
- Allendorf, K. (2013). Going nuclear? Family structure and young women’s health in India, 1992–2006. *Demography* , 50 (3), 853-880. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0173-1>
- Aquilino, W. S. (2005). Impact of family structure on parental attitudes toward the economic support of adult children over the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Family Issues* , 26 (2), 143-167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x04265950>
- Argyle, M., & Furnham, A. (2013). *The psychology of money* .Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2655406>
- Atzmon, Y., & Izraeli, D. N. (Eds.). (1993). *Women in Israel* (Vol. 6). Transaction Publishers.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1971). Money and power. *The Journal of Politics* , 33 (3), 578-614. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0026318400028649>
- Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles?. *Psychological science in the public interest* , 4 (1), 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1529-1006.01431>
- Borthwick, M. (2015). *The changing role of women in Bengal, 1849-1905* .Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400843909>
- Christopher, A. N., Marek, P., & Carroll, S. M. (2004). Materialism and Attitudes Toward Money: An Exploratory Investigation. *Individual Differences Research* , 2 (2). [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(04\)00097-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(04)00097-2)
- Chow, N. W. S., & Lum, T. Y. S. (2008). Trends in family attitudes and values in Hong Kong. *Trends in family attitudes and values in Hong Kong: final report* .
- Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American psychologist* , 59 (8), 676. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.59.8.676>
- Cunningham, P. H., Frauman, E., Ivy, M. I., & Perry, T. L. (2004). The value of money and leisure and college student’s choice of major. *SCHOLE: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education* , 19 (1), 65-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1937156x.2004.11949526>

- Dakin, J., &Wampler, R. (2008). Money doesn't buy happiness, but it helps: Marital satisfaction, psychological distress, and demographic differences between low-and middle-income clinic couples. *The American Journal of Family Therapy* , 36 (4), 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180701647512>
- Diener, E., &Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being?. *Social indicators research* , 57 (2), 119-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6_6
- Doyle, K. O. (1992). Toward a psychology of money. *American behavioral scientist* , 35 (6), 708-724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764292035006007>
- Edwards, R., Allen, M. W., &Hayhoe, C. R. (2007). Financial attitudes and family communication about students' finances: The role of sex differences. *Communication Reports* , 20 (2), 90-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934210701643719>
- Fitzsimmons-Craft, E. E., Harney, M. B., Koehler, L. G., Danzi, L. E., Riddell, M. K., &Bardone-Cone, A. M. (2012). Explaining the relation between thin ideal internalization and body dissatisfaction among college women: The roles of social comparison and body surveillance. *Body image* , 9 (1), 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2011.09.002>
- Geuens, M., De Pelsmacker, P., & Mast, G. (2003). How family structure affects parent-child communication about consumption. *Young consumers* , 4 (2), 57-62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610310813825>
- Gilman, C. P. (2017). *WOMEN & ECONOMICS: A Study of the Economic Relation between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution: From the famous American feminist, social reformer, sociologist and the author of The Yellow Wallpaper and Herland* . Musaicum Books. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2140648>
- Ginat, Joseph. *Women in Muslim rural society* .Routledge, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315135854>
- Gudmunson, C. G., & Danes, S. M. (2011). Family financial socialization: Theory and critical review. *Journal of family and economic issues* , 32 (4), 644-667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-011-9275-y>
- Hanley, A., & Wilhelm, M. S. (1992). Compulsive buying: An exploration into self-esteem and money attitudes. *Journal of economic Psychology* , 13 (1), 5-18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870\(92\)90049-d](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870(92)90049-d)
- Hassenzahl, M., Diefenbach, S., &Göritz, A. (2010).Needs, affect, and interactive products–Facets of user experience.*Interacting with computers* , 22 (5), 353-362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intcom.2010.04.002>
- Howell, R. T., Kurai, M., & Tam, L. (2013). Money buys financial security and psychological need satisfaction: Testing need theory in affluence. *Social Indicators Research* , 110 (1), 17-29.. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9774-5>
- Landry, A. T., Kindlein, J., Trépanier, S. G., Forest, J., Zigarmi, D., Houson, D., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2016). Why individuals want money is what matters: Using self-determination theory to explain the differential relationship between motives for making money and employee psychological health. *Motivation and Emotion* , 40 (2), 226-242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-015-9532-8>
- Lejoyeux, M., Richoux-Benhaim, C., Löhnardt, H., & Lequen, V. (2011). Money attitude, self-esteem, and compulsive buying in a population of medical students. *Frontiers in psychiatry* , 2 , 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2011.00013>
- Ljungqvist, I., Topor, A., Forssell, H., Svensson, I., & Davidson, L. (2016). Money and mental illness: A study of the relationship between poverty and serious psychological problems. *Community mental health journal* , 52 (7), 842-850. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9950-9>
- McFarlane, A. H., Neale, K. A., Norman, G. R., Roy, R. G., & Streiner, D. L. (1981). Methodological issues in developing a scale to measure social support. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* , 7 (1), 90-100. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/7.1.90>

- McMullin, J. A., & Cairney, J. (2004). Self-esteem and the intersection of age, class, and gender. *Journal of aging studies* , 18 (1), 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2003.09.006>
- Mayer, S. E. (1997). *What money can't buy: Family income and children's life chances* . Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/76.2.707>
- Maurer, B. (2006). The anthropology of money. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* , 35 , 15-36. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123127>
- Mitchell, T. R., & Mickel, A. E. (1999). The meaning of money: An individual-difference perspective. *Academy of management review* , 24 (3), 568-578. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202138>
- Norvilitis, J. M., Merwin, M. M., Osberg, T. M., Roehling, P. V., Young, P., & Kamas, M. M. (2006). Personality factors, money attitudes, financial knowledge, and credit-card debt in college students 1. *Journal of applied social psychology* , 36 (6), 1395-1413. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00065.x>
- Oleson, M. (2004). Exploring the relationship between money attitudes and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *International journal of consumer studies* , 28 (1), 83-92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2004.00338.x>
- Rinaldi, E., & Todesco, L. (2012). Financial literacy and money attitudes: Do boys and girls really differ? A study among italian preadolescents. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education* , 4 (2).
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE). *Acceptance and commitment therapy. Measures package* , 61 , 52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t01038-000>
- Ruggles, S. (1994). The transformation of American family structure. *The American Historical Review* , 99 (1), 103-128. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2166164>
- Ruggles, S. (2010). Stem families and joint families in comparative historical perspective. *Population and Development Review* , 36 (3), 563-577.
- Scott, J. (2006). Family and gender roles: how attitudes are changing. *Arxius de Ciencies Socials* , 15 , 143-154.
- Spillius, E., & Bott, E. (2014). *Family and social network: Roles, norms and external relationships in ordinary urban families* . Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2798178>
- Tan, T. H., & Waheed, A. (2011). Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian retail sector: The mediating effect of love of money.
- Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M. B., Moffitt, T. E., Robins, R. W., Poulton, R., & Caspi, A. (2006). Low self-esteem during adolescence predicts poor health, criminal behavior, and limited economic prospects during adulthood. *Developmental psychology* , 42 (2), 381. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.381>
- Yamauchi, K. T., & Templer, D. J. (1982). The development of a money attitude scale. *Journal of personality assessment* , 46 (5), 522-528. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4605_14
- Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child development* , 73 (6), 1861-1879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.t01-1-00511>
- Zhang, L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2006). Your money or your self-esteem: Threatened egotism promotes costly entrapment in losing endeavors. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* , 32 (7), 881-893. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206287120>
- Zhang, L. (2009). An exchange theory of money and self-esteem in decision making. *Review of General Psychology* , 13 (1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014225>

Zhou, X., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). The symbolic power of money: Reminders of money alter social distress and physical pain. *Psychological Science*, 20 (6), 700-706. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02353.x>

MONEY INFLUENCE ON WOMEN LIVING IN JOINT AND NUCLEAR FAMILIES

Table-1

Distribution of Demographic Variables (N= Frequency 100)

Respondent's Characteristics	Respondent's Characteristics	f (%)
Education	B.A/ B.Sc. M.A/ M.Sc. M. Phil.	19 (19.0) 60 (60.0) 21 (21.0)
Home Residence	Rural Urban	29 (29.0) 71 (71.0)
Family System	Joint Family Separate (Nuclear)	42 (42.0) 58 (58.)
Profession	Family Teacher House wife Banker	40 (40.0) 32 (32.0) 28 (28.0)

Table-2

Independent Sample t-test Comparison between Joint and Nuclear Family System Sample for all variables (N=100)

Variable	Joint (n = 42)	Joint (n = 42)	Nuclear (n = 58)	Nuclear (n = 58)			95%CI	95%
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	t	p	LL	UL
Money Attitude	117.83	18.48	103.29	21.94	3.49	.00	6.27	22.81
Self-assessment	54.83	7.30	48.07	15.00	2.70	.01	1.79	11.74
Self-esteem	24.17	5.89	20.48	4.62	3.50	.00	1.60	5.77
Social Relationship	19.26	2.86	17.07	4.48	2.79	.01	.63	3.76

The table shows a significant difference between joint and nuclear family system in term of money attitude, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship, the mean of money attitude, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship found higher among joint family participants than the nuclear family system participants.

Table-3

Independent Sample t-test Comparison between Joint and Nuclear Family System Sample for all variables (N=100)

Variable	Joint (n = 42)	Joint (n = 42)	Nuclear (n = 58)	Nuclear (n = 58)			95%CI	95%
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	t	p	LL	UL
Money Attitude	117.83	18.48	103.29	21.94	3.49	.00	6.27	22.81
Self-assessment	54.83	7.30	48.07	15.00	2.70	.01	1.79	11.74
Self-esteem	24.17	5.89	20.48	4.62	3.50	.00	1.60	5.77
Social Relationship	19.26	2.86	17.07	4.48	2.79	.01	.63	3.76

The table shows a significant difference between joint and nuclear family system in term of money attitude, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship, the mean of money attitude, self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship found higher among joint family than the nuclear family system

Table-4

Correlation between Money Attitude, Self-assessment, Self-esteem and Social Relationship (N=100)

	Money Attitude	Self-assessment	Self-esteem	Social Relationship
Money Attitude	-	.51**	.68**	.62**
Self-assessment		-	.49**	.54**
Self-esteem			-	.45**
Social Relationship				-

**p < .01

This table shows that money attitude was significantly positively correlated with self-assessment, self-esteem and social relationship whereas self-assessment found significantly positively correlated with self-esteem and social relationship and self-esteem found significantly positively correlated with social relationship.

Effect of Money Attitude and Self-esteem on Social Relationship (N=100)

		Social Relationship	Social Relationship
Predictors	Model 1 B	Model 2 B	Model 2 95% CI
Constant	5.51**	5.38**	[2.07, 8.69]
Money Attitude	.10**	.11**	[.07, .15]
Self-esteem		.04*	[.01, .08]
R ²	.37	.38	
F	60.04**	29.91**	?;?
R ²		.46	?;?
F		85.00**	

**p < .01; *p < .05; β = Unstandardized regression coefficient; CI = Confidence interval

The results show that self-esteem endures significant positive partial mediation between money attitude and social relationship. Further, money attitude significantly positively in direct and indirect (through self-esteem) manner impacts social relationship.

Table 5

Effect of Self-assessment and Self-esteem on Social Relationship (N=100)

		Social Relationship	Social Relationship
Predictors	Model 1 B	Model 2 B	Model 2 95% CI
Constant	9.39**	7.33**	[4.19, 10.47]
Self-assessment	.17**	.13**	[.07, .19]
Self-esteem		.18**	[.04, .32]
R ²	.29	.33	
F	39.65**	24.38**	?;?
R ²		.24	?;?
F		30.33**	

**p < .01; β = Unstandardized regression coefficient; CI = Confidence interval

The results show that self-esteem endures significant positive partial mediating role between self-assessment and social relationship. Further, self-assessment found to be significantly positively direct or indirect (through self-esteem) way impacting social relationship.