

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT, LOVE, PERSONAL INTIMACY, PERSONALITY, DYADIC COPING, AND SPIRITUALITY ON MARITAL STABILITY

Priyadharshini, S¹ & Rejani Thudalikunnil Gopalan²

¹Institute of Behavioral Science, Gujarat Forensic Sciences University, Gandhi Nagar, Gujarat India

²Professor & HOD, Department of Clinical Psychology, Mahatma Gandhi Medical College and Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India(rejanigopal@yahoo.co.in Corresponding Author)

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 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.

Key words: Dyadic Coping, Personality, Marital adjustment, love, personal intimacy, spirituality, marital stability, marital longevity

BACKGROUD OF THE STUDY

Marriage or as it is called in Indian tradition “Vivaham” is one of the most important and sacred event in Indian culture. (Vivaha Samskara: The hindu ceremony, 2011). 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) (Becker 1991; Weiss 1997). 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. Fitzpatrick and Ritchie (1993) 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 (1990). 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” (Gottman, 1993). 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 (Karen & Bradbury, 1995)

Snyder (Sousou, 2004) 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 (Sousou, 2004). 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. (Jankowiak 1992 and Fischer 1992).

According to Reis and Shaver (1988), 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. (Laurenceau, 2005)

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 Karen and Bradbury (1955) **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., Amiri et al., 2011; Decuyper et al., 2012), 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 (Craig &

Olson, 1995). In comparison to other models of personality, the five-factor model (FFM) encompasses the most basic dimensions of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). According to McCrae (1991), 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 (Goldberg, 1993; in Letzring & Nofhle, 2010). 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 (Barelds, 2005; Karenly & Bradbury, 1995; Shiota & Levenson, 2007). Totally, numerous studies have suggested that the highest levels of neuroticism have been associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction (Botwin et al., 1997; Caughlin et al., 2000; Davila et al., 2003; Gattis et al., 2004; Hayes & Joseph, 2003; Kelly & Conley, 1987; Robinson et al., 2000, in Stroud et al., 2010).

Bodenmann 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 (Bodenmann, 1997, 2005). One Indian study found that there is no significant difference between husband and wives marital quality and problem focused coping. (Banerjee S. & Basu J. 2014)

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 (2008) 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. (Kaslow & Robinson 1996; Litzinger & Gordan, 2005; Matson, Rogge, Johnson, Davidson & Fincham, 2013; Timm & Kieley, 2011; Waldinger, Schultz, Hauer & Allen, 2004). 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 been done in the relationship of these variables with marital stability.

METHEDODOLOGY

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

Procedure

The research was done as a part of M Phil Clinical Psychology course. the research was carried on with 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. The samples were selected on the basis of years they have been in the marital relationship. In the sample 10 were in marital relationship for 10 to 20 years, 10 were in marital relationship for 21 to 30 years and 10 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. Then on the appointment time the questionnaires were given to both husband and wives separately. 30 samples were collected. Confidentiality of data was ensured to the participants. After collecting the data, the tools were scored and the above mentioned statistics was applied.

Tool Used

- ***Dyadic Coping Questionnaire (Bodenmann, 2000):*** 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 John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). It is a 44-item inventory that measures an individual on the Big Five Factors (dimensions) of personality (Goldberg, 1993). 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* (Underwood & Teresi, 2002):** 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 (Spanier, 1976). Test-retest reliability has ranged from .60 to .77 for men, and .76 to .78 for women (Kimmel & Vander Vee). Haynes, Follingstad and Sullivan (1979) found the MAS highly correlated with the Marital Interaction Coding System (Patterson, Weiss and Hops, 1977) a measure of behaviour suggesting marital dissatisfaction such as criticism, disagreement and interruption.
- ***5. Love Scale (Rubin, 1970):*** The love scale is a measure of romantic love. The items 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 are 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 is calculated by summing the scores of each item. The love scales have been shown to have internal consistency of .84 for women and .86 for men (Rubin, 1970). Love scores have been correlated with depth of romantic involvement.
- ***6. Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationship (PAIR) (Schaefer and Olson 1981):*** The PAIR is a 36 item self report questionnaire. It provides the scores for five types 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 (Kimmel & Van der Veen, 1974), and the cohesion, expressiveness, conflict and control subscales of the Moos Family Environment Scale

(Moos & Moos, 1976). The PAIR was found to be significantly correlated with both MAS and Moos.

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

Exclusion Criteria

Newly weds (Below 10 years of age)

Separated, divorced and living together couples

Physically challenged

Statistical Tools

SPSS - 17 versions was used for data analysis. As the data obtained is 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.

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

Table No.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of socio-demographic of overall sample

N = 30	Age	Education	Income	Age at marriage
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)

In Table no.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. Lastly the mean duration of marriage is 24.2.

Marital Stability and Dyadic Coping

Table No. 2: Mean and standard deviation of Dyadic Coping Questionnaire

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Overall
Male	N=10	N=10	N=10	N=30
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).

From the table no.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 also are high comparatively in negative dyadic coping with the mean and 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 are 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 are 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.

Marital Stability and Marital Adjustment

Table No. 3: Mean and standard deviation of Marital Adjustment Scale

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

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

From the table no.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).

Marital Stability and Personality

Table No.4: Mean and standard deviation of Big Five Inventory of Personality

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Overall
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).

From the table no.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.

Marital Stability and Romantic Love

Table No. 5: Mean and standard deviation of Romantic love scale

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

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

From the table no.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).

Marital Stability and Intimacy

Table No. 6: Mean and standard deviation of Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationship.

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Overall
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).

From the table no.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 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.

Marital Stability and Spirituality

Table No.7: Mean and standard deviation of Daily Experience of Spirituality Scale

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Overall
Male	N=10 42.7 (10.7)	N=10 44.5 (16.0)	N=10 41.1 (11.1)	N=30 42.7 (12.5)

Female	N=10 41.7 (13.3)	N=10 40.4 (11.3)	N=10 39.8 (13.8)	N=30 40.6 (12.4)
Total	N=20 42.2 (12.0)	N=20 42.4 (13.6)	N=20 40.4 (12.4)	N=60 41.6 (12.4)

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

From the table no.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).

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.

Marital Adjustment

Table No.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

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).

Personality

Table No 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

In table no. 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).

Love

Table No. 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	$r = .53^{**}$

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

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 ($r = -.30$, $p < .05$).

Dyadic Coping

Table No.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 * $p < .05$

In table no. 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 ($r = -.25, p < .05$).

Personal Intimacy

Table No 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 No 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 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 ($r = -.28, p < .05$).

Spirituality

Table No. 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	$r = .27^*$

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

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 ($r = .27$, $p < .05$).

DISCUSSION

The result of the study revealed that sexual intimacy is negatively correlated with marital stability. This finding was in contradiction with Laurenceau, et.al (2005) 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 (Dao, Donnghyuck, & Chang, 2007; Tananuraksakul & Hall, 2011).

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 Lucas (2006) on personality and marital stability, Ebenuwa-okah (2008), Ghoroghi, hasan & baba (2008) on marital adjustment and marital stability, Aren & Acevedo (2009) on love and marital stability, Laurenceau (2005) on intimacy and marital stability. These studies say that these factors do not directly influence stability of marriage. According to Lazaridies et. al (2010) 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 Balietical, dao donnghuyuch & chang (2007), fitchemen and ajayi (2011) the 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.

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 (Banerjee, S. & Basu, J. 2014).

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.

REFERENCE

1. Acitelli, L.K., Douvan, E. & Veroff, J. (1997). The changing influence of interpersonal perceptions on marital well-being among black and white couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 291-304.
2. Ahmetoglu, G., Swami, V. & Pemuzi, T. C. (2010). The relationship between dimensions of love, personality and relationship length. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 39, 1181-1190.
3. Agarwal, P. & Srivastava, S. (1989). Sex-role conception, ego development and marital harmony. *Indian Journal of Current Psychological Research*, 4(2), 75-79.
4. Antill, J.K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 145-155.
5. Antill, J.K. & Cotton, S. (1987). Self disclosure between husbands and wives: Its relationship to sex roles and marital happiness. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 39(1), 11-24.
6. Altrocchi, J. (1988). Happy traditional and companionship marriages. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work*, 69, 434-442.
7. Amato, P.R. & Rogers, S.J. (1999). Do attitudes towards divorce affect marital quality? *Journal of Family Issues*, 20, 69-86.
8. Anderson, S. A., Russell, C. S., & Schumm, W. R. (1983). Perceived marital quality and family life cycle categories: A further analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 45, 127-139.

9. Apt, C., Hurlbest, D. F., Pierce, A. P. & White, L. C. (1996). Relationship satisfaction, sexual characteristics, and the psychosocial well being of women. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 5, 195-210.
10. Apt, C. & Hurlbert, D.F. (1993). The sexuality of women in physically abusive marriages: A comparative study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 8, 57-69.
11. Archer, J. (1996). Sex differences in social behavior: Are the social role and evolutionary explanations compatible? *American Psychologist*, 51, 909-917.
12. Aube, J. & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and relationship adjustment: Another look at the similarity-complementarity hypothesis. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 879-904.
13. Aube, J., Norcliffe, H., Craig, J.-A. & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and adjustment-related outcomes: Questioning the masculinity model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 284- 295.
14. Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relationship schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 461-484.
15. Bodenmann, G. (1995). Dyadic coping and marital satisfaction. *Psychological Beitrage*, 37, 1 – 2.
16. Bodenmann, G., Pihet, S., Cina, A., Widmer, K. J. & Shantinath, S. (2004). Improving dyadic coping in couples with a stress oriented approach: A 2 year longitudinal study. *Behaviour Modification*, 27, 1 – 12.
17. Bouchard, G., Lusseir, Y., & Sabourin, S. (1999). Personality and marital adjustment: utility of the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 651 – 660.
18. Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. (2000). Research on nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 964 – 980.
19. Bryk, A. S. & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). Hierarchical linear model: Application and data analysis methods. New York Park: Sage.
20. Call, V. R. & Heaton, T. B. (1997). Religious influence on marital stability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 382 – 399.
21. Chakravarti, N. & Sinha, V. K. (2002). Marriage consummated after 22 years: A case report. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 28, 301-304.
22. Caughlin, J. P., Huston, T. L., & Houts, R. N. (2000). How does personality matter in marriage: An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 326 – 336.
23. Cherlin, A. (1979). Work life and marital dissolution. In G. Levinger, O. C. Moles (Eds), *divorce and separation: context, causes and consequences*, New York: Basic books.
24. Cristense, A. (1988). Dysfunctional interaction patterns of couples. *Perspectives in Marital Interaction*, 1, 31 – 52.

25. Donnelly, D. A. (1993). Sexually inactive marriages. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 171-179.
26. Donnellan, M. B., Conger, R. D., & Bryant, C. M. (2004). The big five and enduring marriage. *Journal of research in Personality*, 38, 481 – 504.
27. Eysenk, H. J. & Wakefeild, J. A. (1981). Psychological factors as predictors of marital satisfaction. *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 3, 151 – 192.
28. Fincham, F. D., Hall, J. & Beach, S. R. H. (2007). Transformative process in marriage: An analysis of emerging trends. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 46, 539 – 549.
29. Gilford, R. & Bengston, V. (1979). Measuring marital satisfaction in three generations: positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 41, 387-398.
30. Greeff, A. P. & Bruyne, T. D. (2000). Conflict management style and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 26, 321-334.
31. Guo, B. & Huang, J. (2005). Marital and sexual satisfaction in chinese families: exploring the moderating effects. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 31, 21-29.
32. Hasserbrauck, M. & Fehr, B. (2002). Dimension of relationship quality. *Journal of Personal Relationship*, 9, 253-270. Doi: 10.1111/1475-6811.00017.
33. Karimzadeh, A. (2007). Investigation of relations, personality factors and coping style. Unpublished dissertation. Tehran University, Tehran.
34. Karney, B. R. & Bradbury, T. N.(1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3 – 34.
35. Kelly, E. L., & Conley, J. J. (1987) Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 27 – 40.
36. Knoester, C. & Booth, A. (2000). Barriers to divorce: When are they effective? When are they not? *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 78-99.
37. Knee, C. R. (1998). Implicit theories of relationship: Assessment and prediction of romantic relationship initiation, coping and longevity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 360 – 370.
38. Kamo, Y. (1993). Determinants of marital satisfaction: A comparison of United States and Japan. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*, 10, 551-568.
39. Karney, B. R., Mc Nulty, J. K. & Frye, N. E. (2001). A social cognitive model of relationship maintenance. In J. H. Harvey & A. E. Wenzel (Eds), *Close romantic relationships: Maintenance and enhancement*. Mahwah, NJ.
40. Litzinger, S. & Gordon, K. C. (2005). Exploring relationships among communication, sexual satisfaction and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 31, 409-424.
41. Lawrence, K. & Byers, E. S. (1995). Sexual satisfaction in long term heterosexual relationship: The interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Personal Relationship*, 2, 267-287.

42. Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Schutte, N. S., Bhuller, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2010). The factor model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 124 – 127.
43. Mock, S. (1995). A comparison of marriages and cohabiting relationship. *Journal of Family Issues*, 16, 53 – 76.
44. Morokoff, P. J. & Gilliland, R. (1993). Stress, sexual functioning and marital satisfaction. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 43-53.
45. Najarpourian, S. (2012). Personality types and marital satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5, 1 – 5.
46. Neff, L. A. & Karney, B. R. (2002). Judgments of a relationship pattern: specific accuracy. *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1433-1446.
47. Nemecek, S. & Olson, K. R. (1996). Personality and marital adjustment. *Personality Reports*, 78, 26 – 36.
48. Rhyne, D. (1981). Bases of marital satisfaction among men and women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 43, 91-95.
49. Rindfuss, R. R. & Hewd, A. V. (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 7, 56-64.
50. Rusbult, C. E., Verette, J., Whitney, G. A., Slovick, L. F., & Lipkus, I. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationship: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 53 – 78.
51. Stack, S. & Eshlman, J. R. (1998). Marital status and happiness: A 17 nation study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 527-536.
52. Stephen, B. L. (2005). What is love anyway?. *Journal Sex and Marital Therapy*, 31, 143-151.
53. Vandervast, J. (2000). The association between marital satisfaction and length of marriage: A literature overview. Unpublished licenciate thesis, Katholieke University Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.
54. Wunderer, E. & Schneewind, K. A. (2008). The relationship between marital standards, dyadic coping and marital satisfaction. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 462 – 476.
55. Vollrath, M. & Torgerson, S. (2000). Personality types and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 367 – 378.
56. Zill, N. et. al. (1993). Long term effect of parental divorce on parent child relationship, adjustment and achievement in young adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 7, 91 – 103.

