

**PERSONALITY AND SPOUSAL AGE DIFFERENCE AS PREDICTORS  
OF MARRITAL ADJUSTMENT ON GODFREY OKOYE UNIVERSITY  
GROUP OF INSTITUTION.**

**BY  
KUKAH AUGUSTINA YOHANNA  
U15/MSS/PSY/027**

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY  
GODFREY OKOYE UNIVERSITY, UGWUOMU-NIKE,  
ENUGU STATE.**

**JULY, 2018**

**TITLE PAGE****PERSONALITY AND SPOUSAL AGE DIFFERENCE AS PREDICTORS  
OF MARRITAL ADJUSTMENT ON GODFREY OKOYE UNIVERSITY  
GROUP OF INSTITUTION**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
SOCIOLOGY/PSYCHOLOGY, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT AND  
SOCIAL SCIENCE, GODFREY OKOYE UNIVERSITY, ENUGU IN  
PARTIAL FUFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD  
OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE (B.Sc) HONOURS IN  
PSYCHOLOGY**

**BY  
KUKAH AUGUSTINA YOHANNA  
U15/MSS/PSY/027**

**SUPERVISOR: PROF EDWIN ONYENEJE**

**JULY, 2018**

**APPROVAL PAGE**

The project has been approved as having met the requirement for the award of Bachelor of Science Degree (B.Sc) in Psychology, Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu State.

-----  
**PROF, EDWIN ONYENEJE**  
**PROJECT SUPERVISOR**

-----  
DATE

-----  
**DR. ANICHE ALEX**  
**HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

-----  
DATE

-----  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER**

-----  
DATE

## **DEDICATION**

This research work is dedicated to “THE ALMIGHTY GOD” for his grace, mercies and enabling strength that He bestowed on me for the completing the work.

## ACKNOWLEDEMENT

I am grateful to God Almighty for giving me the strength to successfully conduct my research work and for sustaining my effort.

I appreciate my amiable supervisor, Prof. Edwin Onyeneje, for making out time out of his busy schedule to see that this work was a success.

I am deeply indebted to Mr. Godwin Umeobi for not giving up on me, his patience, support and guide brought all this to success; not forgetting Mr. Sampson Nwonyi for his wonderful contributions to my academic success.

To my parent HRH Yohanna S. Kukah (the Chief of Ikulu land), Most Rev Dr. Matthew Hassan Kukah (Catholic Bishop of Sokoto Dioceses) and my siblings for your financial support and prayers; I cannot fully express how much I love you all. I appreciate you all.

My gratitude also goes to Rev Sr. Dr. Mary Slivia Nwachukwu (Director Academic Planning Godfrey Okoye University Enugu) for always being there; my lecturers, for your time and effort to see that I achieve my academic goals, I am grateful. Also to my research participants, I thank you for responding positively to this study. And to those whose names are not mentioned here, may God reach each of you at the point of your needs. Thank you.

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of personality dimensions and spousal age difference on marital adjustment of married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions. Two hundred and six (206) married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions (the University, the Institute of Ecumenical Education, the Secondary School, and the Primary School) formed the participants of the study. The study employed simple random sampling technique (simple balloting) to select participants to this study and the Big Five Personality Inventory and the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale were used to collect data for the study. Correlation result indicated that all the five personality dimensions extraversion ( $r = -.13$ ,  $p < .05$ ), agreeableness ( $r = -.36$ ,  $p < .001$ ), conscientiousness ( $r = -.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ), neuroticism ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and openness to experience ( $r = -.33$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were significantly related to marital adjustment. Among these five dimensions of personality, only agreeableness ( $\beta = -.244$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and openness to experience ( $\beta = -.201$ ,  $p < .05$ ) made statistically significant negative contribution in predicting marital adjustment, while the other three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting marital adjustment. Recommendations were made as well as suggestions for further studies.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Title page	2
Approval	3
Dedication	4
Acknowledgement	5
Abstract	6
Table of Contents	7
List of Tables	9
<b>Chapter One</b>	
Introduction	10
Statement of Problem	13
Purpose of the Study	14
Operational Definitions of Terms	15
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review</b>	
Theoretical Review	17
Expectancy Violation Theory	17
Dynamic Goal Theory of Marital Satisfaction	19
Social Learning Theory	20
Social Exchange Theory	21
Behavioral Theory	22
Identity Theory	23
Intra-Personality Approach	24

The Big Five Personality Model	25
Empirical Review	27
Summary of Literature Review	30
Research Hypotheses	33
<b>Chapter Three: Method</b>	
Participants	34
Instruments	34
Procedure	36
Design/Statistics	36
<b>Chapter Four</b>	
Result	37
Summary of Finding	39
<b>Chapter Five</b>	
Discussion	40
Implications of Findings	41
Limitations of Study	42
Suggestions for Further Study	42
Summary and Conclusion	42
References	44
Appendix A: Big Five Personality Inventory	51
Appendix B: Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)	52
Appendix C: SPSS Result Output	53



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables	37
Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression predicting marital adjustment by gender, which spouse is older, spousal age difference and personality	38

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Marriage which brings together two typically different individuals- different in so many ways, in choices and preferences, opinions and stances, background and orientations, perceptions and some of the times in cultural and religious background- require of parties to properly handle their similarities and differences in order to live happily and be satisfied with the marriage and with each other. According to Kumari (2017), marriage is an institution whereby men and women are joined in a special kind of social and legal dependency for the purpose of founding and maintaining a family. Marriage, indeed is an important factor of our family system. This is based upon the need for being and living together and the emotional security, this provides, upon the needs for sexual expression and upon the desire for the begetting of off spring and an ideal union is one that fulfils most effectively these sexual requirements (Kumari, 2017). People marry for many reasons, like; love, happiness, companionship and the desire to have children, physical attraction or desire to escape from an unhappy situation (Bernard, 1984).

Couples who are able to understand themselves and positively cope with their uniqueness as well as their similar qualities are said to have positive marital adjustment and vice versa. Every married person and couple anticipates satisfaction- with spouse and the marriage- and feelings of happiness in the

marriage as it progresses. These feelings of happiness, satisfaction with marriage and spouse are the components of a well-adjusted married life.

Marital adjustment has been given different definitions. Thomas (1977) and Sinha and Mukerjee (1990) viewed it as a state of living and defined it as "the state in which there is an overall feeling between husband and wife, of happiness and satisfaction with their marriage and with each other"; while Hashmi, Khurshid, and Hassan, (2007) saw it as a condition and defined it as the condition in which there is usually a feeling of pleasure and contentment in husband and wife and with each other. Nugent (2013) saw it as a process in which partners in a marriage adapt and change to their new roles complementing each other, acting as a team opposed to two separate units.

These definitions point out that a well-adjusted married life is that in which there is satisfaction and feelings of wellness among partners with the marriage and the spouse. With this, marital adjustment can be seen as the state in which couples understand and cope with their spouse's unique as well as similar qualities and the challenges of married life in order to bring about feelings of wellness between them and to have a relatively satisfactory marriage.

According to Lazarus (1983), there are six areas of marital adjustment such as, religion, social life, mutual friends, in-laws, money and sex. A study conducted by (Margolin, 1980) found that there are ten areas of marital adjustment namely, values, couple growth, communication, conflict resolution, affection, roles, cooperation, sex, money and parenthood. Marital adjustment therefore calls for

experiencing, satisfactory relationship between spouse characterized by mutual concern, care, understanding and acceptance (Kumari, 2017).

Marital distress has been associated with a host of psychological difficulties, particularly depression (Beach, Whisman & O'Leary, 1994). The ultimate measurement of successful marriage is the degree of adjustment achieved by the individuals in their marriage roles and interaction with one another. Whether or not a marriage is successful is determined by the interaction between the two partners over the time span of their marriage (Kumari, 2017).

Bouchard, Lussier and Sabourin (1999) made a good contribution to the understanding of the relationship between personality and marital adjustment by using the five factors model of personality. Many researchers believe this model is a comprehensive framework for organizing personality traits (Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990; Digman, 1990; McCrae 1991; Montag & Levine 1994). The five factor model postulates that the normal personality is multidimensional, composed of five dimensions: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and conscientiousness (Kumari, 2017).

Spousal age difference is the age gap between couple. One of the features in the marriage studies is that individuals match in assorted ways on age and that the most common pairing is one in which the husband is a few years older than the wife (Presser, 1975; Glick & Lin, 1986). While this pattern of matching on age is well known, the underlying mechanism that generates this sorting is not well understood. For example, some studies suggest that marital gains are largest in

older husband-younger wife pairs (Bergstrom & Bagnoli, 1993) while others find that marital gains are largest for similarly-aged couples (Choo & Siow, 2006). A number of theoretical models assume that men (and in some models, women) prefer younger spouses for their “fitness” or fecundity (Siow, 1998; Coles & Francesconi, 2011; Diaz-Gimenez & Giolito, 2013), while analysis using online and speed dating data suggest that both men and women instead prefer similarly-aged partners (Belot & Francesconi, 2013, Hitsch, Hortascu & Ariely, 2010).

The drive of the present study is to examine the effect of the five dimensions of personality namely, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and conscientiousness and spousal age difference on marital adjustment among staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions.

### **STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

The rate of dissatisfaction and maladjustment in today’s marriages is alarming leading to dissolutions of marriages, separation and other counter-togetherness outcomes. This makes investigating the dimensions of personality that predispose married men and women to adjust to their marriage an important fit. Studies have shown that personality dimension such as Neuroticism and Extraversion have relationship with marital adjustment (Bouchard et al, 1999; Kosek, 1996; Lester et al, 1989; Russell & Wells, 1994). There is however need to find out the contribution of all the five dimensions of personality -

Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness – on marital adjustment.

People – men and women alike, when making choice of partner consider their age differences. Older men tend to either chose same/closely aged women or chose younger or even much younger (than them) aged women. Some even do not mind older (than them) women. Women chose most often, older men, same/closely aged and rarely younger (than them) men. This choice is usually accompanied with certain feelings. Therefore, it will be important to look into the ability of spousal age difference (how many years old one spouse is older than the other) in predicting marital adjustment and equally see how it works together with personality dimensions to predict marital adjustment.

Specifically, the problem of this study are as follow:

1. Will the five dimensions of personality predict marital adjustment?
2. Will spousal age difference predict marital adjustment?

### **Purpose of the Study**

This study seeks to find out whether the five dimensions of personality and spousal age difference can be used to predict marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu.

Specifically, this study will seek to:

- i. Determine the influence of Neuroticism on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu

- ii. Determine the influence of Extraversion on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu
- i. Determine the influence of Openness on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu
- ii. Determine the influence of Agreeableness on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu
- iii. Determine the influence of Conscientiousness on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu
- iv. Determine the influence of spousal age difference on marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions, Enugu

## **OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS**

### **Marital adjustment**

This is the state in which there is usually a feeling of pleasure and contentment in husband and wife with each other and with their marriage measured using the 14-item Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS) by Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson (1995).

### **Personality**

This is the set of habitual behaviours, cognition and emotional patterns that characterize an individual and differs him/her from others as measured by a 44-item big five factor scale regarded as the NEO FFI by Costa and McCrae (1992).

**Spousal age difference**

This is defined as the number of years with which one spouse is older than the other as indicated by the participants.



## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter is divided into two sections, namely theoretical and empirical reviews relevant to the present study.

#### **Theoretical Review**

The following theories are reviewed under this section: Expectancy Violation Theory, Dynamic Goal Theory of Marital Satisfaction, Social learning theory, Social exchange theory, Behavioral theory, the Identity theory, Intra-personality Approach and the Big Five Personality Model.

#### **Expectancy Violation Theory**

Before or even while in the marriage, people have expectations from the marriage, their spouse and even other elements of the environment. Burgoon (1993) argues that people have expectations about how others should act in a given situation. Some expectations are based on individual, relationship or situation. Other expectations are based on rules of social and cultural appropriateness. When a spouse's behavior deviates from these expectations as held by the other, an expectancy violation occurs. This theory explains how people respond to unexpected communications (Nzenweaku, 2012), behaviors and attitudes, which may even result in serious disagreement. For instance, if a wife complains to the husband of a problem she is having and the husband overlooked it and never said anything concerning it; the wife will be angry because she was expecting him to do something or respond to her and that could

lead to conflict, meaning that her expectancy has been violated. Burgoon (1993) found that in intercultural marriages, the diverse world perception, beliefs and values based on couples' different cultural background produce inconsistent expectancies. He proposed that greater understanding of marital interaction in intercultural marriage can be achieved through the effects of culture expectancy to marriages of in-group members, positive or negative violation to couple expectancies derived from their background to mate selection (Nzenweaku, 2012).

Expectancy violation theory involves socially normative pattern of behavior which are of two types - predictive and prescriptive component patterns (Nzenweaku, 2012). Predictive components pattern refer to communicative acts that are typical in given culture or conflict behavior that is known for a particular culture or people and setting. Example, the way traditional Yoruba people communicate their greetings is different from that of the Igbo people and conflict behavior is not same as the both shall regard it. On the other hand, prescriptive component pattern refers to the degrees to which a behavior is regarded as appropriate, desired or preferred. All cultures have communications that are the guidelines for human conduct that carry associated anticipations for how others will behave so as to avoid conflict (Nzenweaku, 2012). Whenever any partner in a relationship perceives a breach in this prescribed pattern of behavior, conflict which could lead to not adjusting to the marriage will arise.

## **Dynamic Goal Theory of Marital Satisfaction**

Marital goal - the goals people want to attain in their marriage - is one of the core elements in the dynamic goal theory of marital satisfaction (Li & Fung, 2011). The theory argues that whether marital goals, especially the prioritized ones, are achieved in the marriage is the most essential determinant of marital satisfaction (Li & Fung, 2011) and hence, adjustment. In more specificity, the four key elements of the dynamic goal theory of marital satisfaction according to Li and Fung (2011) are as follow:

- i. People have multiple goals that they want to achieve in their marriage.
- ii. The priority of different marital goals changes dynamically across adulthood.
- iii. Whether the prioritized marital goals in a certain developmental stage are met in the marriage determines marital satisfaction.
- iv. Other factors can also affect marital satisfaction by either changing the priority of different marital goals or by facilitating the achievement of the prioritized marital goals. (Li & Fung, 2011: 247)

The implication of this theory is that people will be well adjusted in or satisfied with their marriages if their goals of getting into the marriage are successfully met and achieved. People set certain goals which if met would lead to good adjustment and vice versa. This theory is almost the same in meaning with the expectancy violation theory.

## **Social Learning Theory**

This theory was proposed by Bandura (1977) and it gives the explanation of human behavioral and environmental determinants of behavior. According to Bandura (1993), highly complex behaviors are not easily imitated as quickly or as readily as are simpler behaviors. Consistently, adults and children alike tend to imitate responses that are hostile and aggressive. Children grow up in the environment watching their parents and other people and if they communicate well with love and kind tone, the children and adults learn it, again, if conflict like fighting and nagging is the order of the day in a given family, they learn it faster too (Nzenweaku, 2012).

Bandura recommended that reinforcement factor may fasten one's learning. He says that many significant model in one's world, for instance, friends, boss, teachers, parents etc., are also in-charge of reinforcement schedules, for example, when one acts aggressively and receives praise, the person will continue in like manner since the behavior was rewarded (Bandura & Walter, 1963).

Social learning theory explains human continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral and environmental influences. Social learning theory can be applied in this present study to understand why people behave in ways that make them not adjust in their marriage. They may be coming from a background where couples rarely agree or may be imitating a model around

who almost disagrees with the spouse seemingly everything thereby leading to maladjustment in marriage.

### **Social Exchange Theory (Thibault & Kelly, 1952)**

This theory posits that all human relationships are formed by the use of subjective cost-benefit analysis and comparison of alternatives. The roots of this theory are in economics, psychology and Sociology. Costs are the elements of relational life that have negative value to a person, such as the effort put into a relationship and the negative responses of a partner; it can be time, money, effort, and so on (Nzenweaku, 2012). The social exchange perspective argues that people calculate the overall worth of a relationship by subtracting its costs from the rewards. It provides:  $Worth = Rewards - Costs$ . The worth of a marriage relationship determines its outcome, whether someone will or not value or feels happy and satisfied with it. According to Stafford (2008) economic exchange and social exchange has some differences. Social exchanges involve trust, and not legal obligation, while economic exchanges involve explicit bargaining. The guiding force of inter-personal relationships is the advancement of both parties' self-interest (Rolloff, 1981). With social exchange theory, both parties take in responsibilities of one another also and the benefits here include things such as materials or financial gains, social status and emotional comforts; while, costs generally consist of sacrifices of time, money or lots of opportunities; and outcome is referred to as the difference between the benefits and the costs (Nzenweaku, 2012). Note that because

individuals have different expectations of relationships, an individual's satisfaction with a relationship depends on more than just one outcome. For any two people with the same outcome, their level of satisfaction may differ based on their expectations; one person may not expect very large outcomes, and therefore would be more easily satisfied in relationships than someone who expects more (Nzenweaku, 2012). As a result, the relationship has to be mutually rewarding and bring maximum benefits for both sides so that it would be attractive and would stay intact.

### **Behavioral Theory**

B. F. Skinner of behaviorism school of psychology developed this theory (Karney & Bradbury, 1996). Behavioral psychology is basically interested in how our behavior results from stimuli both in the environment and within the human person. Behavioral psychology (Operant conditioning or stimulus-response psychology) explains all behavior in terms of its rewards and avoid punishment, individuals (organisms, subjects, and units) create sets of strategies that they believe will increase odds in their favor (Nzenweaku, 2012).

According to behavior theory of marriage, destructive behaviors result in negative evaluation of marriage and declines in marital satisfaction and stability, whereas constructive behaviors lead to improvements in evaluations of marriage and increases in marital stability (Karney & Bradbury, 1996). This implies that if someone will evaluate a marriage as working thereby adjusting normally, depends on the behavioral dispositions of the spouse. If he/she perceives the

spouse's behaviors as negative could lead to maladjustment or negative adjustment in marriage and vice versa.

### **Identity Theory**

This theory is a micro sociological theory, which links self-attitudes or identities, to the role relationship and role-related behaviors of individuals (Nzenweaku, 2012). The theory states that the self consists of identities, each of which is based on occupying a particular role (Stryker & Burk, 2000). The answer to the question "who am I" defines identity in simple terms. The man may see himself as the boss in any case of conflicting decision and the woman may see herself as just a helper in times of who brings the money to solve some basic household problems. These role identities influence behavior because; each role has a set of associated meanings and expectations for the self. One's behavior for instance, is in relation to what he or she feels about himself or herself; while some people may easily tolerate insults, others cannot, depending on what he/she feels about him/herself and some can manage conflict while others cannot because of the same individual differences.

Stryker & Burk (2000) emphasized that identity salience is important in understanding the theory. They proposed that the salience an individual attached to one's identity influences how much effort one puts into each role and how well one performs in each role. The identity theory has also made use of the assumption that a man's performance of the role also fulfills his family role as society has deemed a man's primary role to be that of providing for the family,

whereas, for women, there is no overlap between the two identities, work is seen as the salient role identity of men, and family as the salient role identity of women (Nzenweaku, 2012). So adjustment to a marriage depends on one side, if one is perceiving himself or herself as being laden with more than required role or responsibility according to who he/she thinks he/she is and on the other side if he/she perceives the partner as meeting up to him/her role identity requirements. Within society, women's primary role is considered to be that of looking after children and the household (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Identity theory states that stress and conflict between roles would arise when individuals attempt to maintain a salient role identity in a situation that requires performance of another identity and role; therefore, women who have a high investment in both work and family would experience a great deal of work-family conflict (Stryker & Burker, 2000).

### **Intra-personality Approach**

Studies regarding marital stability in the area of inter-personality approach are mainly focused on interactional patterns or behavioural exchange between the couples (Cirac, 2001). These patterns could be labelled either dysfunctional or functional. While functional interaction patterns provide rewarding satisfactory outcomes to marriage, dysfunctional interaction patterns bring distress and misery, eventually leading to dissolution of the unity (Cirac, 2001).

The relationship between personality and marital success has attracted the interests of marriage scholars since the early studies of marriage (Terman,



1938). A group of researchers has invested their interest in similarities of personalities as far as the research related to personality and marriage is concerned (Eysenck & Wakefield, 1981; Bentler & Newcomb, 1978). According to this group of researchers, people seem to be attracted to others who had similar characteristics, such as intelligence, attitudes and psychopathology. Furthermore, personality similarities have been seen as indices of relationship compatibility. Also, they stated that unstably married couples are less similar in their personality characteristics than stably married ones (Cirac, 2001).

### **The Big Five Personality Model**

The Big Five personality model is one of the most famous models in modern psychology to describe the most significant features of personality. The title “big five” is selected not to reflect their intrinsic greatness but to emphasize that each of the factor is extremely broad (Goldberg, 1981, 1990; Costa & McCrae, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999). As John and Srivastava (1999), pointed out that each of “these five dimensions represent personality at the broadest level of abstraction, and each dimension summarizes a large number of distinct more specific personality characteristics. The big five traits can be found in almost any measure of personality (McCrae & John, 1992), including the analysis of trait adjectives in many languages and these data strongly suggest that personality trait structure is universal (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Research evidence also indicated that the big five traits are highly stable over time

(Gosling et al., 2003) and appear to be shaped by biological (genetic) factors (Digman, 1989), although the environment also plays its role. McCrae and John (1992) concluded that long history, cross-cultural replication, empirical validation across many methods and instruments make the five-factor model a basic discovery of personality psychology.

The big five personality dimensions are divided into five factors: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999).

**Extraversion** implies an energetic approach to the social and material world and includes traits such as sociability, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotionality.

**Agreeableness** contrasts a prosocial and communal orientation toward others with antagonism and includes traits such as altruism, tender-mindedness, trust, and modesty.

**Conscientiousness** describes socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates task and goal-directed behavior, such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, planning, organizing, and prioritizing tasks.

**Neuroticism** contrasts emotional stability and even-temperedness with negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous, sad, and tense.

**Openness to experience** (versus closed-mindedness) describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life. (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999).

## **EMPIRICAL REVIEW**

Madugah and Kwakye-Nuako (2016) explored the relationship between personality and marital adjustment in a sample of Nungua residents in Ghana. The study involved a sample of one hundred (100) persons who were examined for the relationship between personality traits and marital adjustment using the Big Five Inventory and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The results revealed that married persons with different personality traits adjusted in marriage differently. Married persons with some personality traits like Extroversion, Agreeableness and surprisingly, Neuroticism, adjusted better in marriage than married persons with personality traits like Openness and Conscientiousness. However, they equally found that the number of children and the number of years married did not have any influence on the marital adjustment of the participants.

From the results it was found the persons high on agreeableness were better at consensus than persons with conscientiousness personality traits. It showed that for consensus score for married persons with agreeableness personality trait (mean = 19.786, SD = 15.243) and for married persons with conscientiousness personality trait, (mean = 12.350, SD = 4.614) when subjected to the Independent samples t-test, revealed that there was a significant difference,  $t(32) = 2.063$ ,  $p = 0.047$ . Also, those who were high on openness personality trait

scored higher on affection (as a component on the Marital Adjustment Scale) than persons who were high on neuroticism. Also males who were high on openness and agreeableness were more martially adjusted. Husband's openness was positively related to their wives' marital adjustment. The reason for this is that persons high on Openness may tolerate and respect differences in behavior and thought of partner which would reduce the number of conflicts and increase the consensus between spouses (Madugah & Kwakye-Nuako, 2016).

Mohan and Singh (1985) studied marital adjustment of rural and urban couples in relation to their personality in terms of extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. The analysis shows that rural couples were better adjusted than urban couples. Extroversion, neuroticism and psychoticism showed negative correlation with marital adjustment. Nemechek and Olson (1996) studied 99 married couples. The result reveals that the marital adjustment was related to elevated scores on extraversion and openness to experience on a measure of the five-factor personality model.

Bouchard et al., (1999) also came to the same conclusion in their study to examine the contribution of personality traits to marital adjustment. Data were gathered from questionnaires administered to a sample of 466 couples, in which the personality traits of neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were measured. The results reveal that the self-reported and partner-reported personality traits were important predictors of self-reported marital adjustment in both men and women. The findings of this study

demonstrate that neuroticism significantly predicts both self-reported and partner reported marital adjustment for both men and women.

Heaton (2002) in a study divided participants into one of four groups: (a) husbands older than 5 years, (b) husbands between 2-4 years older, (c) husbands between 0-2 years older, and (d) all wives older than their husbands. Using these categories, Heaton observed that marriages in which husbands were older than their wives were more stable, yet age differences themselves were not viewed as leading to more or less marital dissolution. Various researchers have also used similar categorization techniques (Chan & Halpin, 2003; Lehrer, 2008; Vera et al., 1985), which certainly have value in identifying differences between the varying groups, yet such techniques do not identify at what point, or even if, age differences become an important factor in marital quality and stability.

Realizing that using age differences as a continuous scale may have some value. Lehmiller and Agnew (2008) used it during their post-analysis, in which they divided their participants into two groups, women-older or women-younger, and compared these groups using age-differences. They were not able to observe any differences in outcomes, such as satisfaction or commitment, when using a continuous scale of age differences until the age gap became sizable (for them, this gap was ten years, which also coincided with the original age difference they selected for finding their study participants). One concern of the nature of this study by Lehmiller and Agnew is that it did not include married women.

The women were defined as being within a romantic relationship, which could include a dating, cohabiting, or marital relationship. Although Groot and Van Den Brink (2002) did not find an increase in marital instability due to age differences, Booth and Edwards (1992), Heaton (2002), and Krippen et al (2010) all found age-differentiated couples exhibited a greater propensity towards divorce proneness than did couples more similarly aged. Furthermore, Bumpass and Sweet (1972) reported higher than expected rates of divorce or separation in which age differences were large, particularly when wives were older than husbands.

### **Summary of Literature Review**

Expectancy Violation Theory, according to Burgoon (1993) argues that people have expectations about how others should act in a given situation. Some expectations are based on individual, relationship or situation. Other expectations are based on rules of social and cultural appropriateness. When a spouse's behavior deviates from these expectations as held by the other, an expectancy violation occurs and this violation of expectation could lead to marital maladjustment.

The dynamic goal theory held that marital goal - the goals people want to attain in their marriage - is one of the core elements of marital satisfaction (Li & Fung, 2011). The theory argues that whether marital goals, especially the prioritized ones, are achieved in the marriage is the most essential determinant of marital satisfaction (Li & Fung, 2011) and hence, adjustment. The implication of this

theory is that people will be well adjusted in or satisfied with their marriages if their goals of getting into the marriage are successfully met and achieved.

Social Learning Theory was proposed by Bandura (1977) and it gives the explanation of human behavioral and environmental determinants of behavior. According to Bandura (1993), highly complex behaviors are not easily imitated as quickly or as readily as are simpler behaviors. Children grow up in the environment watching their parents and other people and if they communicate well with love and kind tone, the children and adults learn it, again, if conflict like fighting and nagging is the order of the day in a given family, they learn it faster too (Nzenweaku, 2012).

Social Exchange Theory by Thibault & Kelly (1952) posits that all human relationships are formed by the use of subjective cost-benefit analysis and comparison of alternatives. The theory which took its roots from economics, psychology and Sociology stated that costs are the elements of relational life that have negative value to a person, such as the effort put into a relationship and the negative responses of a partner; it can be time, money, effort, and so on (Nzenweaku, 2012). As a result, the relationship has to be mutually rewarding and bring maximum benefits for both sides so that it would be attractive and would stay intact.

Behavioral Theory of B. F. Skinner according to Karney & Bradbury (1996) is basically interested in how our behavior results from stimuli both in the environment and within the human person. According to behavior theory of

marriage, destructive behaviors result in negative evaluation of marriage and declines in marital satisfaction and stability, whereas constructive behaviors lead to improvements in evaluations of marriage and increases in marital stability (Karney & Bradbury, 1996; Kelly, 2003).

Identity Theory states that the self consists of identities, each of which is based on occupying a particular role (Stryker & Burk, 2000). The answer to the question “who am I” defines identity in simple terms. Stryker & Burk (2000) on this emphasized that identity salience is important in understanding the theory. They proposed that the salience an individual attached to one’s identity influences how much effort one puts into each role and how well one performs in each role. So adjustment to a marriage depends on one side, if one is perceiving himself or herself as being laden with more than required role or responsibility according to who he/she thinks he/she is and on the other side if he/she perceives the partner as meeting up to him/her role identity requirements.

Intra-personality Approach mainly focused on interactional patterns or behavioural exchange between the couples (Cirac, 2001). These patterns could be labeled either dysfunctional or functional. While functional interaction patterns provide rewarding satisfactory outcomes to marriage, dysfunctional interaction patterns bring distress and misery, eventually leading to dissolution of the unity (Cirac, 2001). One of the key positions of this approach is that, personality similarities are indices of relationship compatibility. They held that



unstably married couples are less similar in their personality characteristics than stably married ones (Cirac, 2001).

The big five personality dimensions are divided into five factors: Extraversion (sociability, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotionality), Agreeableness (altruism, tender-mindedness, trust, and modesty), Conscientiousness (thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, planning, organizing, and prioritizing tasks), Openness to experience (as opposed to closed-mindedness which describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life) and Neuroticism (negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous, sad, and tense ). (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

### **Research Hypotheses**

1. Personality dimensions (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to experience, and Neuroticism) will significantly predict marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye Group of Schools, Enugu.
2. Spousal age difference will significantly predict marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye Group of Schools, Enugu.

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHOD

#### **Participants**

A total of two hundred and six (206), 81 male and 125 female staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions formed the participants of the study. The Godfrey Okoye group of institutions is made up of Godfrey Okoye University, Institute of Ecumenical Education, Godfrey Okoye University Secondary School, and Godfrey Okoye University Primary School, Thinkers corner, Enugu. The study employed simple random sampling technique (simple balloting) to select participants to this study.

#### **Instruments**

A structured questionnaire composing of three sections was used for data collection. The section A elicited demographic data from the participants while the Big Five Personality Inventory and the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale formed the contents of sections B and C respectively. Below is a brief description of the scales.

#### **Big Five Inventory (BFI) (Appendix A)**

Personality type was measured with the big five personality inventory (BFI) by McCrae & Costa (1999). The five factor model, otherwise known as the big five personality inventory by McCrae and Costa (1999) is a 44 item measure assessing the big five personality factors (and underlying facets) extraversion (assertiveness, activity), neuroticism (anxiety, depression), conscientiousness

(order, self-discipline), agreeableness (altruism, compliance) and openness (aesthetics, ideas) (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The respondents answer on a 5-point likert scale, ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). John et al. (2008) obtained an internal consistency of .83 for the BFI scales and Rammstedt & John (2007) reported a three months test-retest reliability of .84 including all scales. For the sake of the present study, a pilot study was carried out and a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .76 was obtained.

### **Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS) (Appendix B)**

The RDAS by Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson (1995) is a 14-item scale designed to measure relationship satisfaction. The RDAS is a revised version of the original Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). The revised version offers improved psychometric properties, is shorter, and includes only 3 of the original 4 subscales: (1) Dyadic Consensus - degree to which respondent agrees with partner (2) Dyadic Satisfaction - degree to which respondent feels satisfied with partner (3) Dyadic Cohesion - degree to which respondent and partner participate in activities together. The items have varying response scales. See the appendix for detail on the response scales as well as items. The RDAS includes only 14 items, each of which asks the respondents to rate certain aspects of her/his relationship on a 5 or 6 point scale. Scores on the RDAS range from 0 to 69 with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction and lower scores indicating greater relationship distress. The cut-off score for

the RDAS is 48 such that scores of 48 and above indicate non-distress and scores of 47 and below indicate marital/relationship distress. The RDAS has been found to have a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .90 (Busby et al. 1995). A pilot study conducted for the present study showed that RDAS have a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .59.

### **Procedure**

A sample size of 243 was arrived at using an online sample size calculator at <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>. Ballot papers were printed for the selection of participants (243 "YES" and 415 "NO") such that if someone pick "YES" from the shuffled bag, a copy of the questionnaire was given and if a "NO", he/she was not given a copy of the questionnaire. The researcher employed the services of one research assistant. The team walked through all the offices in the mentioned institutions starting from the Secondary school. The process took three weeks and four days to complete. 217 completed copies were retrieved but 11 of them were rejected for not being properly responded to. This left the 206 (84.77%) which was used for the study.

### **Design/Statistics**

The study is a cross-sectional design using the survey instrumentation approach of data collection. Using Multiple Regression analyses to test the hypotheses, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v23) was used to analyze the data generated from the respondents.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULT

The data obtained for this present study were screened and invalid ones were removed. In testing for spousal age difference and personality as factors that predict marital adjustment among married people, the data obtained from the participants were analyzed by computing the means, standard deviations and correlations among the variables of study as well as the demographic variables. Regression analysis was also ran to find out how spousal age difference and personality dimensions predict marital adjustment.

**Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables**

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	MARITAL ADJUSTMENT	27.23	7.64	–							
2	GENDER	1.62	.49	-.05	–						
3	OLDER SPOUSE	1.01	.09	-.01	.08	–					
4	AGE DIFFERENCE	6.07	4.47	-.04	-.12	-.04	–				
5	EXTRAVERSION	24.65	3.97	-.13	-.08	-.07	-.01	–			
6	AGREEABLENESS	33.35	6.72	-.36	.08	.07	.20	.14	–		
7	CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	33.63	6.99	-.26	.03	.11	.02	.21	.57	–	
8	NEUROTICISM	21.16	5.09	.24	.13	-.02	-.13	-.22	-.44	-.50	–
9	OPENNESS	33.38	5.93	-.33	.09	.07	.01	.23	.47	.55	-.27

Correlation result indicated that all the five personality dimensions extraversion ( $r = -.13$ ,  $p < .05$ ), agreeableness ( $r = -.36$ ,  $p < .001$ ), conscientiousness ( $r = -.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ), neuroticism ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and openness to experience ( $r = -.33$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were significantly related to marital adjustment. While neuroticism is positively related, the other four dimensions are negatively related. Gender ( $r =$

-.05,  $p > .05$ ), which spouse is older ( $r = -.01$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and spousal age difference ( $r = -.04$ ,  $p > .01$ ) showed insignificant negative relationship with marital adjustment.

**Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression predicting marital adjustment by gender, which spouse is older, spousal age difference and personality (as well as dimensions).**

	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Δ	B	Beta(β)	t	Sig
<b>STEP 1</b>	.047	.002	.002				.801
GENDER				-.715	-.046	-.652	.515
OLDER SPOUSE				-.451	-.006	-.083	.934
<b>STEP 2</b>	.067	.005	.002				.489
SPOUSAL AGE DIFFERENCE				-.084	-.049	-.693	.489
<b>STEP 3</b>	.412	.170	.165				.000
EXTRAVERSION				-.069	-.036	-.528	.598
AGREEABLENESS				-.277	-.244**	-2.849	.005
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS				.041	.037	.407	.685
NEUROTICISM				.137	.091	1.154	.250
OPENNESS				-.259	-.201*	-2.476	.014

Note: \*\* $P < .01$ ; \* $P < .05$

Result of Step wise multiple regression analysis showed that the gender and which of the spouse is older entered in step one of the equation accounted for 4.7% statistically non-significant variance as a predictor of marital adjustment ( $R = .047$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Spousal age difference was entered in step two of the equation, and it accounted for 0.2% insignificant variance in predicting marital adjustment ( $\Delta R^2 = .002$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The five dimensions of personality were entered in step three of the equation, and they collectively accounted for 16.5% (statistically significant) variance in predicting marital adjustment ( $\Delta R^2 = .0165$ ,  $p < .001$ ). However only agreeableness ( $\beta = -.244$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and openness to experience ( $\beta = -.201$ ,  $p < .05$ ) made statistically significant negative contribution in predicting marital adjustment. Extraversion ( $\beta = -.036$ ,  $p > .05$ ),

conscientiousness ( $\beta = .037, p >.05$ ) and neuroticism ( $\beta = .091, p >.05$ ) did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting marital adjustment.

### **Summary of Finding**

1. Correlation result indicated that all the five personality dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience) were significantly related to marital adjustment. Neuroticism is positively related and the other four dimensions are negatively related. Gender, which spouse is older and spousal age difference showed insignificant negative relationship with marital adjustment.
2. Among the five dimensions of personality, only agreeableness and openness to experience made statistically significant negative contribution in predicting marital adjustment, while the other three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting marital adjustment.
3. It was also found that spousal age difference, gender and which of the spouse is older did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting marital adjustment.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION

This study examined personality dimensions and spousal age difference as predictors of marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions.

The first hypothesis tested in the study stated that personality dimensions (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to experience, and Neuroticism) will significantly predict marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye Group of Schools, Enugu. The result of the study showed that among the five dimensions of personality, only agreeableness and openness to experience supported this hypothesis as they turned out a significant negative predictor of marital adjustment; while the other three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism) did not support this hypothesis as hence they did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting marital adjustment. This outcome contradicts in part the result of Madugah and Kwakye-Nuako (2016). Madugah and Kwakye-Nuako (2016) revealed that Extroversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism positively predicted marital adjustment. On the contrary, the present study showed that agreeableness negatively predicted marital adjustment while Extroversion and Neuroticism even though their ability to predict marital adjustment is positive but is not statistically significant. The findings also partly contradicts the findings of Nemechek and Olson (1996) that extraversion and openness to experience



positively predict marital adjustment. The prediction by openness to experience in the present study tends to the negative against that of Nemechek and Olson (1996) that held a positive prediction.

The second hypothesis tested in the study stated that spousal age difference will significantly predict marital adjustment among married staff of Godfrey Okoye Group of Schools, Enugu. The result of this study did not support this hypothesis as spousal age difference turned out not to make a statistically significant contribution in predicting marital adjustment. However, spousal age difference showed slight insignificant negative correlation with as well as prediction of marital adjustment.

### **Implications of Findings**

The present findings have some implications. The findings on gender, which spouse is older and spousal age difference show that marital adjustment does not depend on gender, whether one is older or younger than his/her spouse and age difference between spouses. Men and women experience both marital adjustment and maladjustment.

Regarding age difference, the implication of the finding for counsellors could be that age difference between spouses have very little to contribute to marital adjustment.

Regarding the findings in the dimensions of personality, the implication for counselors, priests, marriage advisors and researchers can be to use the outcome of the study to understand maladjustment and adjustment in marriage from the

view side of their personality and offer necessary help and guidance for improvement since environment and nurture can play certain role in personality development.

### **Limitations of Study**

The present study has some limitations. It is limited to samples from Godfrey Okoye group of institutions and not to be generalized to the wider population of married couple in Enugu. Another limitation is the method applied for the data collection. Quantitative methods using survey instrumentation is usually not enough to find out people's feelings and subjections. A qualitative method such as in-depth interview or focus group discussion can help to find out how people really feel.

### **Suggestions for Further Study**

The following are suggested for future research. Researchers interested in the same variables as this study, should reflect on using participants from more than one type of organization, institution, locality, state and/or region and increase the number of participants for the study. In other words, the scope should be widened to achieve a more inferable result.

The study may also be carried out comparing partner's rating of spouse's personality than use self-ratings.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

This study examined the influence of personality dimensions and spousal age difference on marital adjustment of married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of

institutions. Two hundred and six (206) married staff of Godfrey Okoye group of institutions (Godfrey Okoye University, Institute of Ecumenical Education, Godfrey Okoye University Secondary School, and Godfrey Okoye University Primary School, Thinkers corner, Enugu) formed the participants of the study. The study employed simple random sampling technique (simple balloting) to select participants to this study and used the Big Five Personality Inventory and the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale to collect data for the study.

Correlation result indicated that all the five personality dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience) were significantly related to marital adjustment. Neuroticism is positively related and the other four dimensions are negatively related. Gender, which spouse is older and spousal age difference showed insignificant negative relationship with marital adjustment.

Among the five dimensions of personality, only agreeableness and openness to experience made statistically significant negative contribution in predicting marital adjustment, while the other three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting marital adjustment.

It was also found that spousal age difference, gender and which of the spouse is older did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting marital adjustment.

## REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. (1963). *Social learning and personality Development*. New York: Reinhart & Winston.
- Beach, S. R. H., whisman, M. A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Marital therapy for depression: Theoretical foundation, current status, and future directions. *Behaviour Therapy*, 25, 345- 371.
- Belot, M., & Francesconi, M. (2013). Dating Preferences and Meeting Opportunities in Mate Choice Decisions. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 48, 474-508.
- Bentler, P. M., & Newcomb, M. D. (1978). Longitudinal study of marital success and failure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1053-1070.
- Bergstrom, T. C. & Bagnoli, M. (1993). "Courtship as a Waiting Game" *Journal of Political Economy* 101(1), 185-202.
- Bernard J. (1984). *Work and family: Changing roles of men and women*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Booth, A., & Edwards, J. N. (1992). Starting over: Why remarriages are more unstable. *Journal of Family Issues*, 13, 179-194.
- Bouchard, G., Lussier, Y., & Sabourin (1999). Personality and marital adjustment: Utility of the five-factor modal of personality. *Journal of marriage and family*, 61, 651- 660.

- Bouchard, G., Lussier, Y., & Sabourin, S. (1999). Personality and marital adjustment: Utility of the five factor model of personality. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*, 651-660.
- Bumpass, L. L., & Sweet, J. A. (1972). Differentials in marital instability: 1970. *American Sociological Review, 37*(6), 137-147.
- Burgoon, J. L. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 12* (1-2), 30-48.
- Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, D. R., & Larson, J. H. (1995). A revision of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for use with distressed and non-distressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 21*(3), 289-308.
- Chan, T. W. & Halpin, B. (2003). Union dissolution in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Sociology, 32*(4), 76-93.
- Choo, E. & Siow, A. (2006). *Lifecycle marriage matching: Theory and evidence*. Paper presentation at the annual meeting for the Canadian Economic Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Cirak, S. (2001). *Premarital and Marital Problems of Turkish Professionals*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University, UK.
- Coles, M. G., & Francesconi, M. (2011). "On the Emergence of Toyboys: The Timing of Marriage with Aging and Uncertain Careers." *International Economic Review, 52*(3): 825–853.

- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory professional manual. Odessa, FL: *Psychological Assessment Resources*.
- Diagman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure, Emergence of the five factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.
- Diaz-Gimenez, J. & Giolito, E. P. (2013). Forthcoming. "Accounting for the Timing of First Marriages." *International Economic Review, 2*, 74-82.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Wakefield, J. A. (1981). Psychological factors as predictors of marital satisfaction. *Advances in Behavior Research and Therapy, 3*, 151-192.
- Glick, P. C., & Lin, S. (1986). More young adults are living with their parents: Who are they? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48(1)*, 107-112.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). "Language and Individual Differences: The Search for Universals in Personality Lexicons." in *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, ed. L. Wheeler, 141-165. Sage: Beverly Hills, CA.
- Goldberg, S. (1991). Recent developments in attachment theory and research. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry 3(6)*, 393-400.
- Groot, W., & Van Den Brink, H. M. (2002). Age and education differences in marriages and their effects on life satisfaction. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 153-165.

- Hashmi, A. H., Khurshid, M., Hassan, I. (2007). Marital Adjustment, Stress and Depression among working and non-working married women. *Internet Journal of Medical Update*, 2 (1), 19-26.
- Heaton, T. B. (2002). Factors contributing to increasing marital stability in the United States. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 392-409.
- Hitsch, G., Hortascu, A. & Ariely, D. (2010). "Matching and Sorting in Online Dating". *American Economic Review*, 100(1): 130-63.
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). "The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement and Theoretical." in *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, eds. Lawrence A. Pervin & Oliver P. John, 102-38. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Karney, B. R. & Bradbury, T. N. (1996). The longitudinal cause of marital quality and stability. A review of theory, methods, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3-34.
- Kosek, R. B. (1996). The quest for a perfect spouse: Spousal ratings and marital satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 731-735.
- Krippen, R., Chapman, B., & Yu, P. (2010). *What's love got to do with it? Homogamy and dyadic approaches to understanding marital instability* (Discussion Paper No. DP631). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University, Centre for Economic Policy Research.

- Kumari, C. (2017). A Study of Personality and Marital Adjustment among House Wives and Working Women. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 4* (3), DIP:18.01.245/20170403.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Delingis, A. (1983). Psychological Stress and coping in aging.
- Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2008). Commitment in age-gap heterosexual relationships: A test of evolutionary and socio-cultural predictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 74-82.
- Lehrer, E. L. (2008). Age at marriage and marital instability: Revisiting the Becker-Landes-Michael hypothesis. *Journal of Population Economics, 21*, 463-484.
- Lester, O., Haig, C., & Monell, R. (1989). Spouse's personality and marital satisfaction. *Personality and Individual difference, 10*, 253-256.
- Li, T., & Fung, H. H. (2011). The dynamic goal theory of marital satisfaction. *Review of General Psychology, 15*(3), 246-234. doi: 10.1037/a0024694.
- Margolin, G. (1980). Behavior exchange in happy and unhappy marriages. A family life cycle perspective. *Behavior therapy, 12*:329-43.
- McCrae, R. R. (1991). The five-factor modal and its assessment on clinical setting. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology, 51*, 161-169.
- Montag, I., & Levin, J. (1994). The five-factor personality modal in applied settings. *European Journal of Personality, 8*, 1-8.
- Nemecek, S., & Olson, K. R. (1996). Personality and marital adjustment. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 26-36.



- Nugent, P. M. S. (2013). Marital adjustment," in *Psychology Dictionary*  
Accessed May 18, 2018 from <https://psychologydictionary.org/marital-adjustment>.
- Nzenweaku, J. U. (2012). *Role of communication, age and education in marital conflict*. Master's Thesis Submitted to the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Presser, H. B. (1975). Age differences between spouses: Trends, patterns and social implications. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 19(2), 190-205.
- Rollof, M. (1981) *Interpersonal Communication: The Social Exchange Approach*. Beverly Hills.
- Russell, R. J., & Wells, P. A. (1994). Predictors of happiness in married couples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17, 313-321.
- Sinha, S. P., & Mukherjee, N. (1990). Marital adjustment and personal space orientation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 130 (5), 633-639.
- Siow, T. (1998). Differential fecundity, markets and gender roles. *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(2): 334—354.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15-28.
- Standford, L. (2008). Social exchange theories. In L. A. Engaging theories in Interpersonal Communication. Multiple perspective (PP 377 – 389). Thousand Oaks.

Stryker, S. & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present and future of identity theory.

*Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 284 –272.

Terman, L. M. (1938). *Psychological factors in marital happiness*. New York:

Mcgraw-Hill.

Thibault J. W. & Kelly, H. H. (1952). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New

York John Wiley & Sons.

Thomas, E. J. (1977). *Marital communication and decision making*. New York:

Free Press.

Vera, D. H., Berardo, D. H., & Berardo, F. M. (1985). Age heterogamy in

marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 553-566.

## APPENDIX A: BIG FIVE PERSONALITY INVENTORY

**INSTRUCTION:** The following are statements people often use to describe themselves.

Read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which it is a true description of you as you see yourself by writing only one of the numbers 1,2,3,4 or 5 in the space provided after each statement. It is not a test, so there are no rights or wrong answers. Work rapidly.

The numbers stand for:

**1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree Strongly**

### I see myself as someone who:

1. Is talkative \_\_\_\_\_ 23.
2. Tends to find fault with others \_\_\_\_\_ 24.
3. Does a thorough job \_\_\_\_\_ 25.
4. Is depressed, blue \_\_\_\_\_ 26.
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas \_\_\_\_\_ 27.
6. Is reserved \_\_\_\_\_ 28.
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others \_\_\_\_\_ 29.
8. Can be somewhat careless \_\_\_\_\_ 30.
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well \_\_\_\_\_ 31.
10. Is curious about many different things \_\_\_\_\_ 32.
11. Is full of energy \_\_\_\_\_ 33.
12. Starts quarrels with others \_\_\_\_\_ 34.
13. Is a reliable worker \_\_\_\_\_ 35.
14. Can be tense \_\_\_\_\_ 36.
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker \_\_\_\_\_ 37.
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm \_\_\_\_\_ 38.
17. Has a forgiving nature \_\_\_\_\_ 39.
18. Tends to be disorganized \_\_\_\_\_ 40.
19. Worries a lot \_\_\_\_\_ 41.
20. Has an active imagination \_\_\_\_\_ 42.
21. Tends to be quiet \_\_\_\_\_ 43.
22. Is generally trusting \_\_\_\_\_ 44.

### I see myself as someone who:

23. Tends to be lazy \_\_\_\_\_
24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset \_\_\_\_\_
25. Is inventive \_\_\_\_\_
26. Has an assertive personality \_\_\_\_\_
27. Can be cold and aloof \_\_\_\_\_
28. Perseveres until the task is finished \_\_\_\_\_
29. Can be moody \_\_\_\_\_
30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences \_\_\_\_\_
31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited \_\_\_\_\_
32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone \_\_\_\_\_
33. Does things efficiently \_\_\_\_\_
34. Remains calm in tense situations \_\_\_\_\_
35. Prefers work that is routine \_\_\_\_\_
36. Is outgoing, sociable \_\_\_\_\_
37. Is sometimes rude to others \_\_\_\_\_
38. Makes plans and follows through with them \_\_\_\_\_
39. Gets nervous easily \_\_\_\_\_
40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas \_\_\_\_\_
41. Has few artistic interests \_\_\_\_\_
42. Likes to cooperate with others \_\_\_\_\_
43. Is easily distracted \_\_\_\_\_
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B: Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)

**INSTRUCTION:** Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

		Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Agree	Frequent ly Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1.	Religious matters						
2.	Demonstrations of affection						
3.	Making major decisions						
4.	Sex relations						
5.	Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)						
6.	Career decisions						

		All the Time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occasio nally	Rarely	Never
7.	How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?						
8.	How often do you and your partner quarrel?						
9.	Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?						
10.	How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?						

		Everyday	Almost Everyday	Occasion ally	Rarely	Never
11.	Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?					

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

		Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
12.	Have a stimulating exchange of ideas						
13.	Work together on a project						
14.	Calmly discuss something						



Conscientiousnes	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206
Neuroticism	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206
Openness	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206

**Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Who is Older, GENDER <sup>b</sup>		. Enter
2	Age Difference <sup>b</sup>		. Enter
3	Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness, Agreeableness <sup>b</sup>		. Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Marital Adjustment

b. All requested variables entered.

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			df2	Sig. F Change
					R Square Change	F Change	df1		
1	.047 <sup>a</sup>	.002	-.008	7.66870	.002	.222	2	203	.801
2	.067 <sup>b</sup>	.005	-.010	7.67854	.002	.480	1	202	.489
3	.412 <sup>c</sup>	.170	.136	7.10105	.165	7.838	5	197	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER

b. Predictors: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER, Age Difference

c. Predictors: (Constant), Older spouse, gender, Age Diff., Extraversion, Consc., Neuroticism, Openness, Agreeableness

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.069	2	13.035	.222	.801 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11938.207	203	58.809		
	Total	11964.277	205			
2	Regression	54.356	3	18.119	.307	.820 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	11909.921	202	58.960		
	Total	11964.277	205			
3	Regression	2030.570	8	253.821	5.034	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	9933.707	197	50.425		
	Total	11964.277	205			

a. Dependent Variable: Marital Adjustment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER

c. Predictors: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER, Age Difference

d. Predictors(Constant), Older spouse, gender, Age Diff., Extraversion, Consc, Neuroticism, Openness, Agreeableness

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound

1	(Constant)	28.833	5.684		5.073	.000	17.626	40.041
	GENDER	-.715	1.097	-.046	-.652	.515	-2.879	1.448
	Who is Older	-.451	5.466	-.006	-.083	.934	-11.230	10.327
2	(Constant)	29.583	5.793		5.106	.000	18.160	41.006
	GENDER	-.804	1.106	-.052	-.727	.468	-2.986	1.377
	Who is Older	-.549	5.475	-.007	-.100	.920	-11.345	10.247
	Age Difference	-.084	.121	-.049	-.693	.489	-.322	.155
3	(Constant)	41.219	7.885		5.228	.000	25.670	56.768
	GENDER	-.389	1.050	-.025	-.371	.711	-2.461	1.682
	Who is Older	1.772	5.114	.023	.347	.729	-8.313	11.857
	Age Difference	.027	.116	.016	.234	.815	-.201	.255
	Extraversion	-.069	.131	-.036	-.528	.598	-.328	.190
	Agreeableness	-.277	.097	-.244	-2.849	.005	-.469	-.085
	Conscientiousness	.041	.100	.037	.407	.685	-.157	.239
	Neuroticism	.137	.119	.091	1.154	.250	-.097	.371
	Openness	-.259	.104	-.201	-2.476	.014	-.465	-.053

a. Dependent Variable: Marital Adjustment

#### Excluded Variables<sup>a</sup>

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	Age Difference	-.049 <sup>b</sup>	-.693	.489	-.049	.985
	Extraversion	-.132 <sup>b</sup>	-1.883	.061	-.131	.990
	Agreeableness	-.358 <sup>b</sup>	-5.430	.000	-.357	.989
	Conscientiousness	-.264 <sup>b</sup>	-3.869	.000	-.263	.989
	Neuroticism	.246 <sup>b</sup>	3.581	.000	.244	.982
	Openness	-.327 <sup>b</sup>	-4.888	.000	-.325	.986
2	Extraversion	-.133 <sup>c</sup>	-1.897	.059	-.133	.989
	Agreeableness	-.364 <sup>c</sup>	-5.384	.000	-.355	.945
	Conscientiousness	-.263 <sup>c</sup>	-3.849	.000	-.262	.988
	Neuroticism	.244 <sup>c</sup>	3.514	.001	.241	.969
	Openness	-.326 <sup>c</sup>	-4.866	.000	-.325	.986

a. Dependent Variable: Marital Adjustment

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Who is Older, GENDER, Age Difference

## Reliability

### Scale: BFI

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.757	44

### Scale: RDAS

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.586	14