Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports

7(4): 1-16, 2019; Article no.AJARR.53298
ISSN: 2582-3248

Marital Adjustment, Love, Personal Intimacy, Personality, Dyadic Coping and Spirituality on Marital Stability

S. Priyadharshini[1] and Rejani Thudalikunnil Gopalan[2*]

[1]Institute of Behavioral Science, Gujarat Forensic Sciences University, Gandhi Nagar, Gujarat, India.
[2]Department of Clinical Psychology, Mahatma Gandhi Medical College and Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Author RTG designed the study. Author SP performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author RTG supervised the data collection and the analyses of the study. Author SP managed the literature searches. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJARR/2019/v7i430186
Editor(s):
(1) Dr. Müge K. Davran, Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Çukurova, Adana, Turkey.
Reviewers:
(1) Gaurav Sankalp Soms Uprtou, India.
(2) Euclides Maurício Trindade Filho, Brazil.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/53298

Original Research Article

Received 20 October 2019
Accepted 24 December 2019
Published 03 January 2020

ABSTRACT

Marital Stability is interpreted as whether a couple in a marriage remains together, instead of separating or getting divorced. It is also called as marital longevity or duration of marriage. The aim of the study is to find the relationship between different psychosocial factor (marital adjustment, love, personal intimacy personality, dyadic coping, and spirituality) and marital stability. For the purpose of sampling, thirty married couples were randomly selected using stratified random sampling. The measuring tools used were Locke-Wallace marital adjustment questionnaire (Marital adjustment), Love scale (Love), Personal assessment of intimacy in relationship (Personal intimacy), Big five inventory (personality), Dyadic coping inventory (Dyadic coping) and the daily spiritual experience scale (Spirituality).Six null hypotheses were raised and tested using descriptive and inferential statistics (Percentage, mean, standard deviation and correlation). The research finding shows that there is a significant negative correlation between sexual intimacy

**Corresponding author: Email: rejanigopal@yahoo.co.in;*

and marital stability(r= -.44 and p<.01). All other variables (Marital adjustment, love, personal intimacy, personality, dyadic coping and spirituality) are not shown to be contributing to marital stability.

Keywords: Dyadic coping; personality; marital adjustment; love; personal intimacy; spirituality; marital stability; marital longevity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Marriage or as it is called in Indian tradition "Vivaham" is one of the most important and sacred event in Indian culture [1]. Marriage is uniquely beneficial to society because it is the foundation of the family and the basic building block of society. It brings significant stability and meaning to human relationships. It remains the ideal for raising of children. It plays an important role in transmitting culture and civilization to future generations. Marriage is not merely a private contract, but a social institution of great public value and concern. It also provides support to the economy of the country. The gain from marriage includes (a) division of labour and specialization within the family which increases the couple's productivity; (b) the pooling of risks; (c) economies of scale (e.g. cooking a meal for two people cost less than cooking two separate meals; and (d) public goods (e.g. both partners enjoy the same home) [2,3]. By this it can be understood that the longevity of this institution becomes an important factor.

Marriage is a life time relationship. Any relationship has to be maintained. For the marriage to last long it has to be maintained. Here, where the concept of marital stability come in. [4] discovered that marital success is usually defined as "marital stability" or "marital satisfaction". Marital stability is interpreted as whether a couple in a marriage remains together, instead of separating or divorcing. Marital satisfaction, in contrast, refers to how marital partners evaluate the quality of their marriage.In the past, many theorists have tried explaining the reason or the process behind lasting marriage or marital stability. In the literature, there are three theories that try to explain the process. The first was the process theory that said, marital satisfaction seems to decline sharply at the early years and then get levelled out in the middle years and then improves in the later years of marriage. The second was Cascade theory of marital dissolution. According to this theory, "lasting marriage results from a couple's ability to resolve the conflicts that are inevitable in any relationship" [5].The third was the vulnerabilities – stress adaptation model, which said that, enduring vulnerabilities, adaptive process and stressful life event influences marital quality, that in turn influence marital stability of the married couples [6].

Snyder defined marital satisfaction or marital adjustment as a construction including a variety of dimensions that included quality of communication, leisure interactions, cohesiveness on matters relevant to the relationship and family history of distress. Marital satisfaction is one of the most often studied constructs in marital research. Some researchers have perceived marital satisfaction as a multidimensional construction comprised of various components [7]. However, some others have treated marital satisfaction as a one-dimensional construction. Though research on relation between marital adjustment and marital stability is not much but there are some evidence where a positive relation is established.

There is a lot of significance that lies in understanding the relationship between love and marriage, as both are critical elements of humanity. Understanding love as a functioning agent in maintaining marital stability allows us to better understand an important part of who we are as humans. Hence, as a basic building block of human social structure, romantic ·love and its role in the maintenance of marital relationship is an incredibly important area of research [8].

According to Reis and shaver [9], intimacy is an (often momentary) experiential outcome of an interpersonal, transactional intimacy process reflecting two principal components: self-revealing disclosure and partner responsiveness. The intimacy process is initiated when one partner (the speaker) communicates personally relevant and revealing information to another partner (the listener). In return, the listener must emit disclosures and behaviours that are responsive to the specific content of the initial disclosure and that convey understanding, validation, and caring for the speaker (i.e., partner responsiveness). For the interaction to be experienced as intimate by the speaker, the

speaker must also perceive the listener's responses as demonstrating understanding, acceptance, validation, and care (i.e., perceived partner responsiveness). Thus, an important mechanism that mediates the link between a speaker's self disclosure and corresponding experience of intimacy is the degree of partner responsiveness that is perceived by the speaker. The roles of speaker and listener in this process are dynamic and fluid. Because of the transactional nature of this process, as each partner's self becomes known and validated by the other, the experience of mutual intimacy is increased. Many researchers have found that this phenomenon is helpful in satisfaction in marital relationship and stability [10].

Every individual have enduring and prolonged set of characteristics which remains the same in all the situations in life. According to the meditational model given by [6] personality exerts influence on marital satisfaction through marital interaction. Personality includes stable and enduring traits that reveal themselves in various situations. Global assessments of personality have shown that the personality characteristics found among satisfied couples are different from those found among dissatisfied couples. Although research has shown how personality is generally associated with marital satisfaction (e.g., [11,12]) the main part of this study addresses the impact of certain personality characteristics on marital satisfaction. The behaviours associated with specific personality characteristics can contribute to tranquility or conflict in the relationship [13]. In comparison to other models of personality, the five-factor model (FFM) encompasses the most basic dimensions of personality [14]. According to [15] the FFM consists of five aspects of personality (called the Big Five): neuroticism, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness. Previous research has demonstrated robust relationships between romantic relationship quality, functioning, and outcomes and broad personality traits such as the Big Five ([16,17]). Scholars have used a variety of paradigms to investigate the relationship between the Big Five dimensions and satisfaction in an intimate relationship. The strongest and most consistent finding to emerge from these studies is that high neuroticism or frequent experience of negative emotion in either or both partners is toxic in a marriage [18,6,19]. Totally, numerous studies have suggested that the highest levels of neuroticism have been associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction [20,21,22,23,24,25,26].

Bodenmenn experimentally induced stress in dyadic interaction (EISI – Experiment). This experiment showed that when couples are under stress there is a marked decrease in their quality of communication. Dyadic coping is a process in which three factors operate and interact: the stress signals of one partner, the perception of these signals by the other partner, and the reaction of this partner to the stress signals. Different forms of dyadic coping are distinguished: Common dyadic coping (It is effort taken by partners when exposed to stress encounter), Supportive coping (It is the support given by one partner when the other is under stress.), Delegated coping (where one partner takes over tasks and problem-solving in order to alleviate the stress of the other partner). These different forms of coping can be emotion-oriented or problem-oriented and can be of positive or negative nature. Negative supportive dyadic coping refers to hostile (offensive, insulting, not respectful), ambivalent (tentative, regretful) or superficial (shallow, undedicated) dyadic coping reactions [27,28]. One Indian study found that there is no significant difference between husband and wives marital quality and problem focused coping [29].

Many studies have found that individual's daily spiritual experience can exert an influence on individual's perception of marital relationship. Spirituality in layman term is defined as the aesthetic connection between or otherwise known as 'god'. Lichter and Carmalt [30] found that it may be more important that couples share the same beliefs compared to simply the same religious affiliation. Couples who participated together and were actively engaged in their faith communities reported higher quality relationships. Although it has been important to gain an understanding of religiosity and marital satisfaction, spirituality has been explored less and may have stronger implications for relationship processes.

The reviews show that numerous variables have relationship with marital satisfaction [31,32,33,34,35]. Among these variables we are focusing on marital adjustment love, intimacy, personality, spirituality and dyadic coping. Considering the existing literature, it is seen that there has been no research done in India on the relationship between these variables and marital stability. Although Personality and dyadic

coping is studied in the in different part of the world but very few researches has bee5n done in the relationship of these variables with marital stability.

2. METHEDOLOGY

2.1 Objective

The objective of the study was to assess the influence of marital adjustment, love, personal intimacy, personality, dyadic coping and spirituality on marital stability.

2.2 Procedure

The research was done as a part of thesis submission of M Phil Clinical Psychology course. The research was carried out after the ethical clearance of the university board. The research design used in this study was cross sectional design and the sampling method was random sampling method. The sample consisted of 30 married couples who were selected by stratified random sampling. As the research was done as a part of dissertation, minimum sample size of 30 was finalized as acceptable. The samples were selected randomly from the list of married couples provided by the marriage registration office on the basis of years they have been in the marital relationship. In the sample, ten couples w5ere in marital relationship for 10 to 20 years, 10 couples were in marital relationship for 21 to 30 years 5 and 10 couples were in marital relationship for 31 to 40 years. The study was conducted in Gandhinagar, Gujarat in the year 2015. The researcher took appointment with every couple after explaining the research to the couple and getting the consent form signed. The questionnaires were given to b5oth husband and wives separately and data was collected from thirty couples. Confidentiality of data was ensured to the participants.

2.3 Inclusion Criteria

Couples should be legally married

Couples should be in marital relationship for minimum of 10 years

10 to 40 years of marital relationship

2.4 Exclusion Criteria

Separated, divorced and living together couples

Physically challenged

2.5 Tool Used

- **Dyadic Coping Questionnaire** [36]**:** The dyadic coping questionnaire, is 41 item self report questionnaires. It provides score for five type of coping: stress communication, supportive dyadic coping, delegated dyadic coping, common dyadic coping, and negative dyadic coping. At the end this questionnaire also gives the measure of marital satisfaction. Each item is rated on 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was .62 to .89. Construct validity was done correlating the questionnaire with marital quality measured by the relationship questionnaire and communication behaviour, assessed by the communication pattern questionnaire. The dyadic coping questionnaire was found to be significantly correlated with both relationship questionnaire and CPQ.
- **Big Five Inventory:** The Big five inventory by [37]. It is a 44-item inventory that measures an individual on the Big Five Factors (dimensions) of personality [16]. There are 5 major personality is assessed by this inventory. They are: a) Extraversion; b) Agreeableness; c) Conscientiousness; d) Neuroticism and e) openness to experience.
- **The Daily Spiritual Experience Scale** [38]: The DSES is 16 item self report questionnaires. Each item is rated on 6 point likert scale.The internal consistency reliability estimates with Cronbach's alpha were very high, .94 and .95 for the 16-item version of the scale and .91 for the 6-item scale used in the GSS.
- **Locke – Wallace Marital Adjustment Questionnaire*:*** The MAS consists of 23 items of varying formats. Some items ask the respondents to rate the extent of agreement between spouses on such issues as "handling family finances" and "amount of time they spend together." Another item consists of several potential areas of difficulty in the marriage such as "adultery" and "constant bickering". The final item of the MAS requires the subject to indicate the degree of happiness in their marriage on a scale ranging from very unhappy to very happy. Scores on the MAS are slightly different for men and women. Husband's total score can range from 48 to 138, and for wives 50 to 138. A total score less than 80 is thought to be

indicative of marital distress. Average scores on the MAS range from 100 to 110. Internal consistency has been calculated at .77 [39]. Test-retest reliability has ranged from .60 to .77 for men, and .76 to .78 for women [40]. [41] found the MAS highly correlated with the Marital Interaction Coding System [42] a measure of behaviour suggesting marital dissatisfaction such as criticism, disagreement and interruption.

- **Love Scale** [43]: The love scale is a measure of romantic love. The item on the love scale address issues such as feeling close to one's partner and feelings of shared understanding. The love scale consists of 13 items, for which respondents were asked to state their degree of agreement. Items are rated on a 9 point Likert scale 1 (not at all true) to scale 9 (definitely true). Total score was calculated to summing the scores of each item. The love scales have been shown to have internal consistency of .84 for women and .86 for men [43]. Love scores have been correlated with depth of romantic involvement.
- **Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationship (PAIR)** [44]: The PAIR is a 36 item self report questionnaire. It provides the scores for five type of intimacy: emotional, social, sexual, intellectual and recreational as well as a 6 item subscale measuring social desirability. The PAIR measures both how intimate is the relationship at the present and the level of intimacy each spouse will prefer. Each item is rated on 5 point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all true) to 4 (Completely true). Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient range from a low of .70 for intellectual and recreational scale to the high of .77 for sexual intimacy scale. No test retest reliability analyses have been conducted. In order to test the validity of the PAIR, it was correlated with Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale [45], and the cohesion, expressiveness, conflict and control subscales of the moos family environment scale [46]. The PAIR was found to be significantly correlated with both MAS and Moos.

2.6 Statistical Tools

As the data obtained was in the interval scale, arithmetic mean and standard deviation was used as descriptive statistics. Then, based on the research problem and research design, Pearson correlation was used as inferential statistics. To aid data analysis SPSS software was used.

3. RESULTS

This section will be focused on the results derived from the data analyzed by using appropriate statistical procedures. The results will be presented under the following headings: Socio-demographic details, Dyadic coping, Love, Personal Intimacy, Marital adjustment, personality and spirituality.

The following tables present the description of the participants.

In Table 1 the overall mean age of participants is 48.96 (10.8) years. The overall education level mean of participants were 13.8 (3.0) years of education. The overall mean of income of the participants is Rs.38433, this indicates that the sample is middle class sample. The overall age of marriage of the participants is 24.5 years. Lastly the mean duration of marriage is 24.2 years.

3.1 Marital Stability and Dyadic Coping

From the Table 2, it is evident that among the three groups, males from group 1 have better stress communication, supportive dyadic coping, delegated dyadic coping, common dyadic coping with the mean and standard deviation of 28.6 (3.9), 40.5 (4.8), 14.7 (3.2) and 23.9 (3.8) respectively. They were also comparatively high in negative dyadic coping with the mean and

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation of socio-demographic of overall sample

N = 30	Age (years)	Education(years)	Income (Rupees)	Age at marriage(years)
Measurement	**M ± SD**	**M ± SD**	**M**	**M ± SD**
Group 1	38.5± 4.1	14.7 ± 3.2	70300	23.6 ± 5.6
Group 2	47.5 ± 3.7	14.7 ± 3.2	43650	24.5 ±5.8
Group 3	60.8 ± 6.2	12.0 ± 2.3	36500	23.6 ± 4.4
Total	48.96 ± 10.7	13.8 ± 3.0	38433.3	24.5 ± 4.1

standard deviation of 20.3 (9.8). Group 3 has the highest marital satisfaction with the mean and standard deviation of 8.8 (0.8). In females, group 2 has a better stress communication, supportive dyadic coping, delegated dyadic coping and common dyadic coping with the mean and standard deviation of 31.3 (4.4), 42.2 (5.9), 16.0 (2.9) and 24.8 (2.4) respectively. Here again negative dyadic coping was more in group 1 females with the mean and standard deviation of 20.7 (7.5). Group 2 females have the highest marital satisfaction with the mean and standard deviation of 9.5 (1.1). Overall, group 2 was better in stress communication, supportive dyadic coping, delegated dyadic coping, common dyadic coping and has a better marital satisfaction as compared to other groups with the mean and standard deviation of 29.7 (4.9), 41.1 (4.3), 14.8 (2.3) and 24.2 (3.3) respectively. Group 1 was high in negative dyadic coping with mean and standard deviation of 20.5 (8.6). Including the whole sample together, it was found that females have better stress communication, supportive dyadic coping, delegated dyadic coping, and common dyadic coping with the mean and standard deviation of 28.9 (5.7), 40.3 (4.7), 14.7 (2.8) and 24.3 (2.9) respectively. Both male and female were similar in negative dyadic coping with the mean and standard deviation of 19.1 (7.7) for males and 19.3 (7.7) for females. Male and female were both similarly satisfied with marital relationship with mean and standard deviation of 8.3 (1.4) for males and 8.2 (1.6) for females.

3.2 Marital Stability and Marital Adjustment

From the Table 3, it is evident that males have higher marital adjustment than females in group 1 with the mean and standard deviation of 111.8 (25.6) for males and 104.5 (29.9) for females. In group 2, it is seen that females have higher marital adjustment than males with the mean and standard deviation of 114.0 (23.9) for females and 105.5 (22.4) for males. In group 3, the results again show that males have higher marital adjustment than females with the mean and standard deviation of 122.6 (8.4) for males and 113.1 (22.3) for females. When participant's overall marital adjustment was calculated, it was seen that males have higher marital adjustment than females with the mean and standard deviation of 113.3 (20.8) for males and 110.5 (25.0) for females. Among the groups, 3rd group has the highest marital adjustment with the mean and standard deviation of 117.8 (15.3) and 1st group has the lowest marital adjustment with the mean and standard deviation of 108.1 (27.7). Overall, the participant's are better martially adjusted with the mean and standard deviation of 111.9 (22.9).

3.3 Marital Stability and Personality

From the Table 4, it is evident that males in group 1 are higher in agreeableness and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 34.1 (4.6) and 21.3 (5.5) respectively and the females in group 1 are higher in conscientiousness and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 36.1 (4.1) and 25.1 (3.5) respectively. Overall in group 1 participants are more in conscientiousness and very less in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 35.0 (5.0) and 23.2 (4.5) respectively. In group 2, it is seen that males are more in openness to experience and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 36.2 (3.9) and 17.5 (6.1) respectively and the females are more in agreeableness and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 36.3 (3.7) and 24.2 (5.2) respectively. Overall, in group 2 participants are more in agreeableness and low in neuroticism with mean and standard deviation of 35.5 (3.7) and 20.8 (5.6) respectively. In group 3, males are more in agreeableness and conscientiousness and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 36.9 (3.8), 36.4 (4.3) and 21.5 (4.5) respectively and females are more in conscientiousness and very low in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 38.4 (3.8) and 22.7 (4.6) respectively. Overall, in group 3 participants are more in conscientiousness and less in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 37.4 (4.0) and 22.1 (4.5) respectively. On comparing all the three group with each other, it was seen that Group 2 is more extrovert with mean and standard deviation of 29.2 (5.2), group 3 is more agreeable with mean and standard deviation of 35.8 (4.5), group 3 is more conscientious with the mean and standard deviation of 37.4 (4.0), group 1 is more in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 23.2 (4.5) and group 2 is more in openness to experience. Overall the married males were more in agreeableness and conscientiousness and very less in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 35.3 (4.1), 35.3 (4.9) and 20.2 (5.5) respectively and married females were more in conscientiousness and less in neuroticism with the mean and standard deviation of 35.8 (4.9) and 24.0 (4.4)

respectively. Overall the participants of this study are more conscientious and less neurotic with the mean and standard deviation of 35.5 (4.9) and 22.1 (4.9) respectively.

3.4 Marital Stability and Romantic Love

From the Table 5, it is evident that males are higher in romantic love than females in group 1 with the mean and standard deviation of 92.0 (20.6) for males and 91.5 (21.8) for females. Overall in group 1, participants are weak in romantic love with the mean and standard deviation of 91.7 (21.2). In group 2, it is seen that females are higher in romantic love than males with the mean and standard deviation of 92.9 (9.0) for females and 90.7 (13.3) for males. Overall in group 2, participants are weak in romantic love with the mean and standard deviation of 91.8 (11.1). In group 3, the results again show that males are higher in romantic love than females with the mean and standard deviation of 96.2 (10.7) for males and 86.2 (12.0) for females. Overall in group 3, participants are weak in romantic love with the mean and standard deviation of 91.2 (11.3). When participant's overall romantic love was calculated, it was seen that males are higher in romantic love than females with the mean and standard deviation of 92.9 (15.1) for males and 90.2 (15.0) for females. Among the groups, it was found that all of them were equal in there romantic love with the mean and standard deviation of 91.7 (15.1), 91.8 (11.1), and 91.2 (11.3). Overall, the participants are weak in romantic love with the mean and standard deviation of 91.5 (15.0).

3.5 Marital Stability and Intimacy

From the Table 6, it is evident that males in group 1 are higher in emotional intimacy and sexual intimacy and very low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 17.7 (4.6), 17.0 (5.2) and 11.6 (2.3) respectively and the females in group 1 are higher in sexual intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 19.1 (2.0) and low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 12.3 (2.8). Overall, in group 1 participants have more emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 17.1 (4.8) and less social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 11.9 (2.5). In group 2, it is seen that males have more

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of dyadic coping questionnaire

Male	**Group 1**	**Group 2**	**Group 3**	**Overall**
	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD
Communication	28.6 ± 3.9	28.2 ±5.5	26.5 ±5.0	27.8 ±4.8
Supportive D C	40.5 ±4.8	40.1 ±2.7	39.6 ±4.0	40.0 ±3.8
Delegated DC	14.7 ±3.2	13.6 ±1.8	14.4 ±2.1	14.1 ±2.4
Common D C	23.9 ± 3.8	23.6 ±4.3	22.8 ±4.2	23.9 ±3.7
Negative D C	20.3 ±9.8	18.8 ±6.9	18.3 ±6.6	19.1 ±7.7
Marital Satisfaction	7.4 ±1.3	8.7 ±1.4	8.8 ±0.8	8.3 ±1.4
Female	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
Communication	28.8 ±5.4	31.3 ± 4.4	26.6 ± 6.6	28.9 ± 5.7
Positive D C	39.3 ±3.8	42.2 ± 5.9	39.3 ± 4.1	40.3 ± 4.7
Delegated D C	13.8 ±2.3	16.0 ± 2.9	14.3 ± 3.1	14.7 ± 2.8
Common D C	18.6 ±6.4	24.8 ± 2.4	24.5 ± 2.9	24.3 ± 2.9
Negative D C	20.7 ±7.5	18.1 ± 8.5	19.2 ± 7.5	19.3 ± 7.7
Marital Satisfaction	7.7 ±1.4	9.5 ± 1.1	7.9 ± 1.8	8.2 ± 1.6
Total	N=20	N=20	N=20	N=60
Communication	28.7 ± 4.6	29.7± 4.9	26.5 ± 5.8	28.3 ± 5.2
Positive D C	39.9 ± 4.3	41.1± 4.3	39.4 ± 4.0	40.1 ± 4.2
Delegated D C	14.2 ± 2.7	14.8 ± 2.3	14.3 ± 2.6	14.4 ± 2.6
Common D C	21.2 ± 5.1	24.2 ± 3.3	23.6 ± 4.0	24.1 ± 3.3
Negative D C	20.5 ± 8.6	18.4 ± 7.7	18.7 ± 7.0	19.2 ± 7.7
Marital Satisfaction	7.5 ± 1.3	9.1 ± 1.2	8.3 ± 1.3	8.2 ± 1.5

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage)*

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of marital adjustment scale

	Group 1 M±SD	Group 2 M±SD	Group 3 M±SD	Overall M±SD
Male (N=10)	111.8 ±25.6	105.5±22.4	122.6± 8.4	113.3±20.8 (N=30)
Female (N=10)	104.5 ± 29.9	114.0±23.9	113.1± 22.3	110.5±25.0 (N=30)
Total (N=20)	108.1±27.7	109.7± 23.1	117.8±15.3	111.9±22.9 (N=60)

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage)*

Table 4. Mean and standard deviation of big five inventory of personality

	Group 1 M±SD	Group 2 M±SD	Group 3 M±SD	Overall M±SD
Male	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
Extraversion	25.6 ± 6.0	31.4 ± 2.9	25.0± 6.5	27.3± 5.9
Agreeableness	34.1± 4.6	34.8 ± 3.8	36.9 ± 3.8	35.3 ± 4.1
Conscientiousness	33.9 ± 5.9	35.6 ± 4.6	36.4 ± 4.3	35.3± 4.9
Neuroticism	21.3 ± 5.5	17.5 ± 6.1	21.5 ± 4.5	20.2± 5.5
Openness to experience	32.1 ± 7.7	36.2 ± 3.9	32.0 ± 6.4	33.4 ± 6.3
Female	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
Extraversion	28.2± 5.4	27.0± 7.5	30.2 ± 4.9	28.5 ± 5.9
Agreeableness	33.1 ± 4.9	36.3± 3.7	34.8 ± 5.3	34.7± 4.5
Conscientiousness	36.1± 4.1	32.8 ± 5.2	38.4 ± 3.8	35.8 ± 4.9
Neuroticism	25.1 ± 3.5	24.2 ± 5.2	22.7 ± 4.6	24.0± 4.4
Openness to experience	33.8± 5.9	32.4 ± 6.0	33.7± 6.3	33.3 ± 5.9
Total	N=20	N=20	N=20	N=60
Extraversion	26.9± 5.7	29.2 ± 5.2	27.6 ± 5.7	27.9± 5.9
Agreeableness	33.6 ± 4.7	35.5± 3.7	35.8 ± 4.5	35.0± 4.3
Conscientiousness	35.0 ± 5.0	34.2± 4.9	37.4 ± 4.0	35.5 ± 4.9
Neuroticism	23.2 ± 4.5	20.8 ± 5.6	22.1 ± 4.5	22.1 ± 4.9
Openness to experience	32.9 ± 6.8	34.3 ± 4.9	32.8 ± 6.3	33.3 ± 6.1

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage)*

Table 5. Mean and standard deviation of romantic love scale

	Group 1 M±SD	Group 2 M±SD	Group 3 M±SD	Overall M±SD
Male	92.0 ±20.6(N=10)	90.7 ±13.3(N=10)	96.2 ±10.7)(N=10)	92.9 ±15.1(N=30)
Female	91.5 ±21.8(N=10)	92.9 ±9.0(N=10)	86.2 (12.0)(N=10)	90.2 ±15.0 (N=30)
Total	91.7 ±21.2(N=20)	91.8 ±11.1(N=20)	91.2 (11.3)(N=20)	91.5 ±15.0(N=60)

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage)*

emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 19.7 (3.3) and less recreational intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 14.5 (4.2) and the females have more in emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 19.5 (3.3) and low in social intimacy and recreational intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 14.2 (3.9) and 14.6 (4.7) respectively. Overall, in group 2, participants have more emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation 19.6 (3.3) and less recreational and social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 14.5 (4.4) and 14.9 (3.3) respectively. In group 3, males have high emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 19.6 (3.0) and low sexual intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 12.9 (4.7) and females have high emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 17.4 (4.5) and low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 11.9 (3.3). Overall, group 3 participants have more emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 18.5 (3.1) and low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 7.7 (3.4). On comparing the entire three group with each other, it was seen that Group 2 is higher in emotional intimacy, social intimacy, intellectual intimacy and conventionality with the mean and standard deviation of 19.6 (3.3), 14.9 (3.3), 16.0 (3.7) and 18.0 (4.3) respectively. Group 2 is high in sexual intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 18.0 (3.6). The recreational intimacy is same in the entire three group with the mean and standard deviation of 14.2 (2.8) for group1, 14.5 (4.4) for group 2 and 14.2 (3.3) for group 3. Among the groups, the 2nd group experiences the highest personal intimacy with the partner. In the

overall sample, males have high emotional intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 19.0 (3.7), they are also relatively high in conventionality i.e. they are prone to give socially desirable answers with the mean and standard deviation of 17.9 (3.3) and low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 13.6 (3.3). Females also have high emotional intimacy and very low social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 17.8 (4.4) and 12.8 (3.4) respectively. Totally, the population is high in emotional intimacy and low in social intimacy with the mean and standard deviation of 18.4 (4.0) and 13.2 (3.3) respectively.

3.6 Marital Stability and Spirituality

From the Table 7, it is evident that females have higher daily spiritual experience than males with the mean and standard deviation of 42.7 (10.7) for males and 41.7 (13.3) for females. In group 2, it is again seen that females have higher daily spiritual experience than males with the mean and standard deviation of 40.4 (11.3) for females and 44.5 (16.0) for males. In group 3 results also show that females have higher daily spiritual experience than males with mean and standard deviation of 39.8 (13.8) for females and 41.1 (11.1) for males. When participant's overall daily spiritual experience was calculated, it was seen that females have higher daily spiritual experience than males with the mean and standard deviation of 40.6 (12.4) for males and 42.7 (12.5) for females. Among the groups, 3rd group has the highest daily spiritual experience with the mean and standard deviation of 40.4 (12.4) and 2nd group has the lowest daily spiritual experience with the mean and standard deviation of 42.4 (13.6). Overall, the participant's have better daily spiritual experience as a whole with the mean and standard deviation of 41.6 (12.4).

Table 6. Mean and standard deviation of personal assessment of intimacy in relationship

	Group 1 M±SD	Group 2 M±SD	Group 3 M±SD	Overall M±SD
Male	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
Emotional	17.7 ± 4.6	19.7± 3.3	19.6 ± 3.0	19.0 ± 3.7
Social	11.6± 2.3	15.7 ± 2.8	13.6 ± 3.6	13.6 ± 3.3
Sexual	17.0 ± 5.2	15.2 ± 5.4	12.9 ± 4.7	15.0 ± 5.2
Intellectual	14.7 ± 3.3	15.7 ± 2.7	15.5 ± 2.9	15.0 ± 2.8
Recreational	14.6 ± 3.3	14.5 ± 4.2	14.1 ± 2.7	14.4± 3.3
Conventionality	17.5 ± 3.8	17.9 ± 4.3	18.3 ± 1.9	17.9± 3.3
Intimacy	90.7± 18.9	98.7 ± 19.4	94.0± 9.8	94.5 ± 16.4
Female	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
Emotional	16.6± 5.1	19.5 ± 3.3	17.4 ± 4.5	17.8 ± 4.4
Social	12.3 ± 2.8	14.2± 3.9	11.9 ± 3.3	12.8 ± 3.4
Sexual	19.1 ± 2.0	15.5± 4.5	13.1 ± 3.2	15.9± 4.1
Intellectual	13.4± 2.8	16.4 ± 3.4	13.9 ± 4.4	14.6± 3.7
Recreational	13.9 ± 2.4	14.6 ± 4.7	14.4 ± 4.0	14.3± 3.7
Conventionality	16.0 ± 5.4	18.1 ± 4.3	15.4 ± 4.7	16.5± 4.8
Intimacy	91.3 ± 15.2	98.3 ± 19.5	86.1 ± 15.8	91.9± 11.1
Total	N=20	N=20	N=20	N=60
Emotional	17.1 ± 4.8	19.6 ± 3.3	18.5 ± 3.7	18.4 ± 4.0
Social	11.9 ± 2.5	14.9 ± 3.3	7.7 ± 3.4	13.2 ± 3.3
Sexual	18.0 ± 3.6	15.2 ± 4.9	13.0 ± 3.9	15.4 ± 4.6
Intellectual	14.0 ± 3.0	16.0 ± 3.7	14.7 ± 3.6	14.8± 3.2
Recreational	14.2 ± 2.8	14.5± 4.4	14.2 ± 3.3	14.3 ± 3.5
Conventionality	16.7 ± 4.6	18.0 ± 4.3	16.8± 3.3	17.2 ± 4.0
Intimacy	91.0 ± 17.0	98.5 ± 19.4	90.0 ± 12.8	93.2 ± 13.7

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage)*

Table 7. Mean and standard deviation of daily experience of spirituality scale

	Group 1M±SD	Group 2M±SD	Group 3M±SD	OverallM±SD
Male	42.7 ±10.7(N=10)	44.5 ±16.0(N=10)	41.1± 11.1(N=10)	42.7 ± 12.5(N=30)
Female	41.7 ± 13.3(N=10)	40.4 ± 11.3(N=10)	39.8 ± 13.8(N=10)	40.6 ± 12.4(N=30)
Total	42.2 ± 12.0(N=20)	42.4± 13.6(N=20)	40.4 ± 12.4(N=20)	41.6 ± 12.4(N=60)

**Group 1 (10 – 20 years of marriage), Group2 (21 – 30 years of marriage), Group 3 (31 – 40 years of marriage).*

4. RESULTS OF CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Correlation analyses were conducted to study the relationships between Marital adjustment, love, personal intimacy, personality, Dyadic coping, Spirituality and marital stability.

4.1 Marital Adjustment

There has been significant correlation established between marital adjustment and love (r= .70, p<.01),marital adjustment and spirituality (r= .58, p<.01), marital adjustment and emotional intimacy (r=.58, p<.01), marital adjustment and intellectual intimacy (r= .34, p<.01) marital adjustment and recreational intimacy (r= .47, p<.01), marital adjustment and personal intimacy (r= .58, p<.01), marital adjustment and supportive dyadic coping (r= .31, p< .05), marital adjustment and delegated dyadic coping (r= .38, p<.01), marital adjustment and marital satisfaction (r= .27, p<.05), marital adjustment and negative dyadic coping (r= -.31, p< .05) and marital adjustment and agreeableness (r= .53, p<.01).

4.2 Personality

In Table 9 it is seen that extraversion has a significant negative correlation with Neuroticism (r= -.27, p< .05). It is also seen that there is significant positive correlation between agreeableness and age (r= .28, p< .05), agreeableness and marital satisfaction (r= .35, p< .05), agreeableness and conscientiousness (r= .27, p< .05), neuroticism and occupation (r= .25, p< .05), neuroticism and age at marriage (r= .38, p< .01), neuroticism and negative dyadic coping (r= .31, p< .05), openness and education (r= .32, p< .05), and negative correlation between agreeableness and negative dyadic coping (r= -.38, p< .01), conscientiousness and neuroticism (r= -.29, p< .05), neuroticism and social intimacy (r= -.37, p< .01), neuroticism and personal intimacy (r= -.28, p< .05), neuroticism and extraversion (r= -.27, p< .05).

Table 8. Marital adjustment scale and its significant correlations with psychosocial variables

Variables	Marital adjustment
Love	r= .70**
Spirituality	r= .38**
Emotional Intimacy	r= .58**
Intellectual Intimacy	r= .34**
Recreational Intimacy	r= .47**
Personal intimacy	r= .58**
Supportive Dyadic Coping	r= .31*
Delegated Dyadic Coping	r= .38**
Negative Dyadic Coping	r= -.31*
Marital Satisfaction	r= .27*
Agreeableness	r= .53**

***p< .01, *p< .05*

Table 9. Personality dimension and its significant correlations with psychosocial variables

Variables	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
Age	-	r= .28*	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-	-	r= .32*
Occupation	-	-	-	r= .25*	-
AM	-	-	-	r= .38**	-
NDD	-	r= -.38**	-	r= .31*	-
MS	-	r= .35*	-	-	-
Extraversion	-	-	-	r= -.27*	-
Agreeableness	-	-	r= .27*	-	-
Con.	-	r= .27*	-	r= -.29*	-
Neuroticism	r= -.27*	-	r= -.29*	-	-

*(a) AM – Age at marriage, NDD – Negative Dyadic Coping, MS – Marital satisfaction and Con. – Conscientiousness; (b) **p< .01 and *p<.05*

4.3 Love

There has been significant positive correlation established between Love and marital adjustment (r= .70, p<.01), love and emotional intimacy (r=.58, p<.01), love and intellectual intimacy (r= .26, p<.05), love and recreational intimacy (r= .34, p<.01), love and personal intimacy (r= .62, p<.01), love and communication (r= .28, p< .01), love and supportive dyadic coping (r= .35, p< .01), love and delegated dyadic coping (r= .27, p<.05), love and agreeableness (r= .53, p< .01) and negative correlation between love and negative dyadic coping (r= -.30, p< .05).

4.4 Dyadic Coping

In Table 11 it is seen that there is significant positive correlation between communication and supportive dyadic coping (r= .50, p< .01), communication and delegated dyadic coping (r= .54, p< .01), communication and common dyadic coping (r= .35, p< .01), communication and marital satisfaction (r= .26, p< .05), supportive dyadic coping and delegated dyadic coping (r= .67, p< .01), supportive dyadic coping and common dyadic coping (r= .45, p< .01), supportive dyadic coping and marital satisfaction (r= .49, p< .01), delegated dyadic coping and common dyadic coping (r= .45, p< .01), delegated dyadic coping and marital satisfaction (r= .28, p< .05), marital satisfaction and age at marriage (r= .25, p< .05), Agreeableness and marital satisfaction (r= .35, p< .05) and negative correlation between supportive dyadic coping and negative dyadic coping (r= -.38, p< .01), common dyadic coping and age (r= -.25, p< .05).

4.5 Personal Intimacy

Table 12 shows significant positive correlation between sexual intimacy and length of marriage (r= .44, p< .01), emotional intimacy and love (r= .58, p< .01), emotional intimacy and marital adjustment (r= .58, p< .01), emotional intimacy and sexual intimacy (r= .26, p< .05), emotional intimacy and intellectual intimacy (r= .44, p< .01), emotional intimacy and recreational intimacy (r= .44, p< .01), emotional intimacy and personal intimacy (r= .76, p< .01), emotional intimacy and marital satisfaction (r=.34, p< .01), social

Table 10. Love and its significant correlations with psychosocial variables

Variables	Love
Marital adjustment	r= .70**
Emotional Intimacy	r= .58**
Intellectual Intimacy	r= .26*
Recreational Intimacy	r= .34**
Personal intimacy	r= .62**
Communication	r= .28*
Supportive Dyadic Coping	r= .35**
Delegated Dyadic Coping	r= .27*
Negative Dyadic Coping	r= -.30*
Agreeableness	r= .53**

***p< .01, *p< .05*

Table 11. Dyadic coping dimensions and its significant correlations with socio demographic factors

Variable	C	SDC	DDC	CDC	NDC	MS
Age	-	-	-	r= -.25*	-	-
AM	-	-	-	-	-	r= .25*
C	1	r= .50**	r= .54**	r= .35**	-	r= .26*
SCD	r= .50**	1	r= .67**	r= .45**	r= -.38**	r= .49**
DDC	r= .54**	r= .67**	1	r= .44**	-	r= .28*
CDC	r= .35**	r= .45**	r= .49**	1	-	-
NDC	-	r= -.38**	-	-	-	-
MS	r= .26*	r= .49**	r= .28*	-	-	-
Agreeable	-	-	-	-	-	r= .35*

*(a) C – Communication, SDC – Supportive Dyadic Coping, DDC – Delegated Dyadic Coping, CDC – Common Dyadic Coping, NDC – Negative Dyadic Coping, MS – Marital satisfaction; (b) **p< .01 and *p< .05*

Table 12. Personal intimacy and its significant correlation with psychosocial variables

Variable	E I	So I	Se I	In I	Re I	P I
LM	-	-	r= .44**	-	-	-
Age	-	-	r= -.36**	-	-	-
Education	r= -.27*	-	-	-	-	-
Love	r= .58**	-	-	r= .26*	r= .34**	r= .62**
Spirituality	-	-	r= -.26**	-	-	-
MA	r= .58**	-	-	r= .34**	r= .47**	r= .58**
E I	1	-	r= .26*	r= .44**	r= .44**	r= .76**
So I	-	1	-	r= .45**	-	r= .48**
Se I	r= .26*	-	1	-	r= .44**	r= .61**
In I	r= .44**	r= .45**	-	1	r= .32*	r= .66**
Re I	r= .44**	-	r= .44**	r= .32*	1	r= .63**
P I	r= .76**	r= .48**	r= .61**	r= .66**	r= .63**	1
C	-	-	r= .30*	-	r= .29*	r= .27*
SDC	-	-	r= .36**	r= .35**	-	r= .49**
DDC	-	-	-	-	r= .33**	r= .29*
CDC	-	r= -.36**	r= .41**	r= -.40**	r= .37**	r= .36**
NDC	-	-	-	r= .25*	-	r= -.42**
MS	r=.34**	-	-	-	-	r= .36**
A	-	r= .32*	-	-	-	r= .34**
N	-	r= -.37**	-	-	-	r= -.28*

(a) E I – Emotional Intimacy, So I – Social intimacy, Se I – Sexual Intimacy, In I – Intellectual Intimacy, Re I – Recreational Intimacy, P I – Personal Intimacy, LM – Length of marriage, MA – Marital Adjustment, C – Communication, SDC – Supportive Dyadic Coping, DDC – Delegated Dyadic Coping, CDC – Common Dyadic Coping, NDC – Negative Dyadic Coping, MS – Marital Satisfaction, A – Agreeableness, and N – Neuroticism.
*(b) ** p< .01 and *p< .05*

Table 13. Spirituality and its significant correlations with psychological variables

Variables	Spiritual
Marital adjustment	r= .38**
Sexual Intimacy	r= .26*
Agreeableness	r= .30*
Conscientiousness	r= .35**
Openness of experience	r= .27*

***p< .01, *p< .05*

intimacy and intellectual intimacy (r= .45, p< .01), social intimacy and personal intimacy (r= .48, p< .01), social intimacy and agreeableness (r= .32, p< .05), sexual intimacy and recreational intimacy (r= .44, p< .01), sexual intimacy and personal intimacy (r= .61, p< .01), sexual intimacy and communication (r= .30, p< .05), sexual intimacy and supportive dyadic coping (r= .36, p< .01), sexual intimacy and common dyadic coping (r= .41, p< .01), intellectual intimacy and love (r= .26, p< .05), intellectual intimacy and marital adjustment (r= .34, p< .01), intellectual intimacy and recreational intimacy (r= .32, p< .05), intellectual intimacy and personal intimacy (r= .66, p< .01), intellectual intimacy and supportive dyadic coping (r= .35, p< .01), intellectual intimacy and negative dyadic coping (r= .25, p< .05), recreational intimacy and love (r= .34, p< .01), recreational intimacy and marital adjustment (r= .47, p< .01), recreational intimacy and personal intimacy (r= .63, p< .01), recreational intimacy and communication (r= .29, p< .05), recreational intimacy and delegated dyadic coping (r= .33, p< .01), recreational intimacy and common dyadic coping (r= .37, p< .01), personal intimacy and love (r= .62, p< .01), personal intimacy and marital adjustment (r= .58, p< .01), personal intimacy and communication (r= .27, p< .05), personal intimacy and supportive dyadic coping (r= .49, p< .01), personal intimacy and delegated dyadic coping (r= .29,p< .05), personal intimacy and common dyadic coping (r= .36, p< .01), personal intimacy and marital satisfaction (r= .36, p< .01), personal intimacy and agreeableness (r= .34, p< .01) and negative correlation between

emotional intimacy and education (r= -.27, p< .05), Social intimacy and common dyadic coping (r= -.36, p< .01), social intimacy and neuroticism (r= -.37, p< .01), sexual intimacy and age (r= -.36, p< .01), sexual intimacy and spirituality (r= -.26. p< .01), intellectual intimacy and common dyadic coping (r= -.40, p< .01), personal intimacy and negative dyadic coping (r= -.42, p< .01), personal intimacy and neuroticism (r= -.28, p< .05).

4.6 Spirituality

There is significant correlation established between spirituality and marital adjustment (r= .38, p< .0), spirituality and sexual intimacy (r= .26, p< .05), spirituality and agreeableness (r= .30, p< .05), spirituality and conscientiousness (r= .35, p< .01), and spirituality and openness of experience (r= .27, p< .05).

5. DISCUSSION

The result of the study revealed that sexual intimacy is negatively correlated with marital stability. This finding was in contradiction with [10] who examined interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage. The results suggests that Global marital satisfaction, relationship intimacy, and demand–withdraw communication were related to daily levels of intimacy but not the length of marriage. In order to investigate possible sources of the different result of the present study, there is no obvious evidence in the literature; however, a possible reason might be the influence of other factors such as challenges for adapting to a social environment [47,48].

The result also shows that personality, marital adjustment, love, intimacy, dyadic coping and spirituality has no significant correlation with marital stability. This study shows that these variables do not directly influence length of marriage in india. The result was in line with study done by [49] on personality and marital stability, [50,51] on marital adjustment and marital stability, [52] on love and marital stability, [10] on intimacy and marital stability. These studies say that these factors do not directly influence stability of marriage. According to Lazaridies et al. [53] personality behaves as a moderator between marital satisfaction and marital stability. Therefore, it is seen that there is no direct influence of these factors on marital stability. Although, there are some studies which do contradict this finding. According to Karimi et al. [54], factors like personality, dyadic coping and spirituality can be an influencing factor on marital stability. In order to investigate possible sources of the different result of the present study, there is no obvious evidence in the literature; however, a possible reason might be that all of those studies were done keeping these factors as mediators. So, there is a possibility that personality, dyadic coping and spirituality as such might not influence the length of marriage directly.

6. CONCLUSION

From the present study, it can be concluded that there is no significant influence of couple's psychosocial factors on marital stability. Combining the finding, it is seen that the way in which husband and wife communicate, cope with stressful situation, show love or intimacy and their personalities is not the sole component that impact the length of marriage in the Indian married couple. Although one Indian study says that personality works as moderating factor but not a direct impact factor [29].

The study is limited primarily by the small sample size and the tools which were used for data collection. Since the tools used were self report inventory, there is a possibility of participants giving socially desirable answers. The study has a great implication in the way Indian society views institution of marriage. The study is stepping stone towards a major understanding of the psychology behind Indian couples deciding to remain married.

CONSENT

The researcher took appointment with every couple after explaining the research to the couple and getting the consent form signed.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The research was carried out after the ethical clearance of the university board.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Kotwal DA, Narayanacharya PV, Shastri JC, Venkatacharvulu S, Data NB. Vivaha

Samskara: The Hindu Ceremony. World Hindu Council of America (VHPA); 2011.

2. Becker Gary S. 1981 Treatise on the family. *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press. Enlarged edition; 1991.
3. Weiss RL, Heyman RE. A clinical–research overview of couple's interactions. In WK Halford and HJ Markman (Eds). Clinical Handbook of Marriage and Couples Interventions. 1997;13-41. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
4. Fitzpatrick MA, Ritchie LD. Communication theory and the family. Chapter From Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods: A Contextual Approach. 1993; 565 –589.
   DOI: 10.1007/978-0-387-85764-0_22
5. Gottman JM. A theory of marital dissolution and stability. Journal of Family Psychology. 1993;7(1):57-75.
6. Karney BR, Bradbury TN. The longitudinal course of Marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method and research. Psychological Bulletin. 1995;118:3–54.
7. Sousou SD. The role of agreeableness and neuroticism in marital satisfaction: Actor and partner contribution. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. State University of Newyork at Albany; 2004.
8. Jankowiak W, Fischer EF. A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love. Ethnology. 1992;31(2):149.
9. Reis HD, Schaver P. Intimacy as an interpersonal process: In S. Duck; D.F. Hay, S.E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, & B. M. Montogomary (Eds). Handbook of personal relationship: Theory, Research and Intervention. 1988;367-389. John Wiley & Sons.
10. Laurenceau JP, Barret LF, Rovine MJ. The interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage: A daily diary and multilevel modelling approach. Journal of Family Psychology. 2005;19(2):314-323.
    Avalaible:https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.314
11. Amiri S, Khousheh M, Ranjbar F, Fakhari A, Mohagheghi A, Farnam A, Alizadeh A. Factors related to marital satisfaction in women with major depressive disorder. Iranian Journal of Psychiatry. 2012;7(4): 164-169
12. Decuyter M, Bolle MD, Fruyt FD. Personality similarities, perceptual accuracy and relationship satisfaction in dating and married couples. Personal Relationship; 2012.
    DOI:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01344.x
13. Craig RJ, Olson RE. 16PF Profiles and typologies for patient seen in marital therapy. Psychology Reports; 1995.
    Available:http://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.77.1.187
14. Costa PT, McCrae RR. Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory. Psychological Assessment. 1992;4(1):5-13.
    Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.5
15. McCrae RR, Costa PT. The NEO personality inventory: Using the five factor model in counselling. Journal of Counselling and Development. 1991;69(4): 367-372.
    Available:https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01524.x
16. Goldberg LR. The structure of phenotype personality traits. American Psychology. 1993;48(1):26-34.
    Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.48.1.26
17. Letzring TD, Noftle EE. Predicting relationship quality from self –verification of broad personality traits among romantic couples. Journal of Research in Personality. 2010;44(3):353-362.
    Available:http://doi.org/10.1016/j/jrp.2010.03.008
18. Barelds DPH. Self and partner personality in intimate relationships. European Journal of Personality. 2005;19(6):501-518.
    Available:http://doi.org/10.1002/per.549
19. Shiota MN, Levenson RW. Birds of a feather don't always fly farthest: Similarity in big five personality predicts more negative marital satisfaction trajectories in long term marriages. Psychology and Ageing. 2007;22(4):666-675.
    Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.666
20. Botwin MD, Buss DM, Shackelford TK. Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality. 1997; 65(1):107-136.
    DOI:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1997.tb00531.x
21. Caughlin JP, Huston TL, Houts RM. How does personality matter in marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity and marital satisfaction; 2000. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514:78.2.326

22. Davila J, Krney BR, Hall JW, Bradbury TN. Depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction: Within subject association and the moderating effect of gender and neuroticism. Journal of Family Psychology. 2003;17:557-570.
23. Gattis KS, Berns S, Simpson LE, Christensen A. Birds of a feather or strange birds? Ties among personality dimensions, similarity and marital quality. Journal of Family Psychology. 2004;18(4): 564-574
24. Hayes N, Joseph S. Big 5 correlated of three measures of subjective well being. Personality and Individual Differences. 2003;34:723-727.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(02)00057-0
25. Kelley EL, Conley JJ. Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1987;52(1):27-40.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.27
26. Stroud CB, Durbin CE, Saigal SD, Knobloch – Fedders LM. Normal and abnormal personality traits are associated with marital satisfaction for both men and women*:* An actor-partner interdependence model analysis. Journal of Research in Personality. 2010;44:466-477.
27. Bodenmann G. Dyadic coping, a systemic – transactional view of stress and coping among couples: Theory and empirical findings. European Review of Applied Psychology. 1997;47(2):137-141.
28. Bodenmann G. Dyadic coping and its significance for marital functioning. In TA Revenson, K Kayser, G Bodenmann (Eds). Decade of behaviour, couple coping with stress: Emerging Perspective on Dyadic Coping. 2005;33-49.
29. Banerjee S, Basu J. Personality factors, attachment style and coping strategies in couples with good and poor marital quality. Psychological Studies. 2014;59(1):59-67.
30. Lichter DT, Carmalt JH. Religion and marital quality of low income couples. Social Science Research. 2009;38(1):168 187.
31. Kaslow F, Robinson JA. Long term satisfying marriages: Perceptions of contributing factors. The American Journal of Family Therapy. 1996;24(2).
Available:https://doi.org/10.1080/01926189608251028
32. Litzinger S, Gordon KC. Exploring relationship among communication, sexual satisfaction and marital satisfaction. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy. 2005; 31(5):409-424.
33. Mattson RE, Rogge RD, Johnson MD, Davidson EKB, Fincham FD. The positive and negative semantic dimensions of relationship satisfaction. Personal Relationship. 2013;20(2):328-355.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01412.x
34. Timm TM, Keiley MK. The effects of differentiation of self adult attachment and sexual communication on sexual and marital satisfaction: A path analysis. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy. 2011; 37:206-223.
Available:https://doi.org/10.3109/01612849 1090578207
35. Waldinger RJ, Schulz MS, Hauer ST, Allen JP. Reasing other's emotions: The role of intuitive judgments in predicting marital satisfaction, quality and stability. Journal of Family Psychology. 2004;18:58-71.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.18.1.58.
36. Bodenmenn G. Stress and coping in couples. Gottingen, Germany: hogrefe; 2000
37. John OP, Srivastava S. The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Parvin & O.P. John (Eds). Handbook of Personality Theory and Research. 1999;102-138. Guildford Press.
38. Underwood LG, Teresi JA. The Daily Spiritual Experience Scale: Development, theoretical description, reliability, exploratory factor analysis, and preliminary construct validity using health-related data. Annals of Behavioral Medicine. 2002; 24(1):22-33
Available:https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324796ABM2401_04
39. Spanier GB. Measuring dyadic measurement: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and The Family. 1976; 38(1):1528.
Available:https://doi.org/10.2307/350547
40. O'Leary KD, Fincham F, Turkewitz H. Assessment of Positive feeling towards spouse. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1983;51(6):949-951.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.51.6.949

41. Haynes SN, Follingstad DR, Sullivan JC. Assessment of marital satisfaction and interaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1979;47:789-791.
42. Patterson GR, Weiss RL, Hops H. Training of marital skills: Some problems and concepts. In H. Leitenberg (Ed.), Handbook of behaviour modification. NeW York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; 1974.
43. Rubin Z. Measurement of Romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1970;16(2):265-273.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029841
44. Schaefer MT, Olson DH. Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. Journal of Marital Family Therapy. 1981;7(1):47-60.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752.0602.1981.tb01351.x
45. Kimmel C, Vander Veen F. Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's marital adjustment test. Journal of Marriage and The Family. 1974;36:57-63.
46. Moos RH, Moos BS. A topology of family social environments. Family Process. 1976;15(4):357-371.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545/5300.1976.00357.x
47. Dao T, Donghyuck L, Chang H. Acculturation level, perceived English fluency, perceived social support level and depression among Taiwanese international students. College Student Journal. 2007; 42(2):287-296.
48. Tananuraksakul N, Hall D. International student's emotional security and dignity in an Australian context: An aspect of psychological well being. Journal of Research International Education. 2011; 10(2):189-200.
Available:https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1475240911410784
49. Lucas RE. Personality and subjective well-being in M. Eid and R.J. Larsen eds. The Science of Subjective Well-Being. New York, Guilford Press. 2008;171-94.
50. Ebenuwa-okoh EE. Personality variables as correlates of marital adjustment among married persons in delta state of Nigeria. Eduaction Research and Review. 2008;3: 275-279.
Available:https://www.academicjournal.org/ERR
51. Ghoroghi S, Hassan SA, Baba M. Function of Family – of – origin experiences and marital adjustment among married Iranian students of university Putra Malasyia. International Journal of Psychological Studies. 2012;4(3):94.
52. Acevedo BP, Aron A. Does a long term relationship kill romantic love? Review of General Psychology. 2009;13(1):59-65.
53. Lazaridies, Belanger C, Sabourin S. Communication behaviours as predictions of long term dyadic adjustment: Personality as a moderator of long term dyadic adjustment. International Journal of Human and Social Science. 2010;5:10.
54. Karimi R, Bakhtiyari M, Arani AM. Protective factors of marital stability in long-term marriage globally: A systematic review. Epidemiology and Health.2019;41. DOI: 10.4178/epih.e2019023

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/53298