



Study To Assess The Impact Of Individual Personality Traits On Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual And Recreational Intimacy Of Married And Unmarried Couples.

K.Sagar

Master's In Counselling Psychology

SEMESTER – 4th (2021-2023)

A1503621016

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:

Dr. Kaushlendra Mani Tripathi

Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences

Amity University, Uttar Pradesh, Sector-125,

Noida, May

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to investigate the impact of individual personality traits on emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy in married and unmarried couples. A total of 102 heterosexual couples from India participated in the study, comprising 51 married and 51 unmarried couples. The minimum age requirement for participants was set at 21 years. The research design employed a quantitative approach, combining co-relational and cross-sectional methods. The analysis utilized Pearson correlation and linear regression, conducted using IBM SPSS version 26.0. The results indicated significant relationships and impacts of personality traits on intimacy. Emotional intimacy was significantly predicted by openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Recreational intimacy showed significant impacts from openness to experience and agreeableness. Intellectual intimacy was significantly impacted by openness to experience, agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. Sexual intimacy was significantly

influenced by openness to experience, extraversion, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. Finally, social intimacy showed a significant impact from agreeableness. These findings highlight the important role of individual personality traits in shaping various dimensions of intimacy in romantic relationships. The research provides valuable insights into understanding the connections between personality and intimacy, which can contribute to the development of interventions and strategies aimed at enhancing relationship quality and satisfaction.

Key Words: - Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual and Recreational Intimacy, Openness to experience, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability and Conscientiousness.

CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Romantic Relationships in Couples

Love is regarded as one of the most intense feelings that can be experienced by a human being. There are many different forms of love, but the majority of individuals want for it to be expressed in a romantic relationship with a partner (or partners) who are compatible with them. These people get a significant amount of meaning and satisfaction from their love relationships, which they consider to be one of the most important elements of their lives. A relationship can move ahead and the couples may eventually decide to recognise their bond legally leading to a marriage. The dynamics of a married relationship differ from an unmarried relationship, but the major values guiding the relationship are mostly same. While it may seem that the yearning for human connection is natural, the capacity to build happy, loving relationships is something that must be mastered. There is some evidence to indicate that the capacity to create stable relationships begins to develop in infancy, in a child's early interactions with a carer who consistently satisfies the infant's requirements for food, care, warmth, protection, stimulation, and social contact. This is the time when a kid is exposed to a carer for the first time. These kinds of connections are not predetermined, but they are thought to provide the groundwork for profoundly established patterns of how people relate to one another. The dissolution of a romantic partnership, on the other hand, may often be the cause of significant emotional suffering

1.2 Relationship and Intimacy

Intimacy within a romantic partnership is characterised by a sense of proximity, emotional bonding, and mutual support. This concept pertains to the capacity to communicate a diverse spectrum of cognitive and affective states and events that are inherent to the human condition. The process entails displaying openness and engaging in dialogue regarding one's thoughts and emotions, exhibiting vulnerability by lowering one's guard, and conveying to another individual one's sentiments, aspirations, and objectives. The development of intimacy is a gradual process that necessitates perseverance and diligence from both parties in order to establish and sustain. Exploring the depths of emotional and physical closeness with a significant other can prove to be a highly fulfilling facet of a romantic partnership. In addition to emotional and sexual intimacy,

individuals can engage in various forms of intimacy such as intellectual, recreational, financial, spiritual, creative, and during times of crisis, where they work collaboratively as a team to overcome challenges. Intimacy is attained through the process of establishing emotional closeness with another individual, which results in a sense of security and affirmation of unconditional love and acceptance towards one's authentic self. Typically, children undergo a process of developing intimacy with both their parents and peers. As mature individuals, we endeavour to establish intimacy within proximate relationships with other mature individuals, including acquaintances, kin, and significant others. Certain couples may encounter challenges in attaining intimacy within their romantic partnership. Some individuals may observe that following the attainment of intimacy, it appears to gradually diminish. There exist several factors that may impede individuals from attaining intimacy within their romantic relationships. Frequently, this outcome arises from issues such as:

- Communication breakdowns can impede the effective exchange of emotions and desires between partners, resulting in unmet needs. The establishment or sustenance of intimacy can be challenging if one perceives a lack of comprehension from their partner. Engaging in open communication with one's partner regarding individual needs and regularly assessing their emotional state is a crucial aspect of maintaining a healthy relationship. The establishment of a connection and intimacy can be facilitated by this singular action. However, the presence of persistent conflict within a relationship may impede the development of intimacy. Experiencing emotional intimacy with an individual with whom one is engaged in a disagreement can be a challenging task. Various emotional factors such as anger, hurt, resentment, lack of trust, or a sense of being unappreciated can significantly impact the level of intimacy in a relationship. In the event that conflict is having an impact on your relationship, it is advisable to seek assistance.
- Practical issues, including but not limited to financial concerns, occupational pressures, childcare responsibilities, and time constraints, may impede the development of intimacy in interpersonal relationships. During certain periods of a romantic partnership, it may be necessary to prioritise more urgent matters over the needs of the couple. Nevertheless, it is crucial to make an effort to allocate time for shared activities, even if it involves a brief 5-minute exchange or a simple tea break. The accumulation of brief instances of emotional proximity contributes to an enhanced sense of intimacy.
- Intimacy can be compromised when one partner exercises inappropriate power over the other, resulting in abuse or violence. The occurrence of abuse or violence within a relationship can lead to the erosion of trust and serve as an indicator that the relationship is experiencing difficulties.
- Adverse childhood experiences
- Historical and contemporary traumatic experiences.
- The individual is experiencing financial strain and health concerns.
- Individuals commonly experience obstacles to achieving intimacy. It is commonplace for partners to collaborate in surmounting these impediments.
- Both verbal and nonverbal communication are viable avenues via which emotional closeness may be conveyed. It's possible that two people's emotional closeness may be gauged by how comfortable they

are with one another, how successful their interactions are, and how closely they feel they are physically connected. Communication between close friends may be either overt (for example, by conversing) or covert (for example, by sitting close together on a park bench in quiet).

1.3 Types of Intimacy In Relationships

- **Emotional Intimacy:-** The degree of physical proximity between two people is the primary determinant of emotional intimacy. Other factors, such as the nature of the relationship and the culture in which it is practised, are also important. Emotional intimacy is a psychological phenomenon that takes place between two individuals when the levels of trust and communication between them are such that it encourages the reciprocal sharing of one another's most private aspects of themselves. Disclosure of one's ideas, feelings, and emotions throughout the course of an emotionally intimate relationship may be necessary in order to arrive at a shared understanding, provide mutual support, or develop a sense of community, but this is highly dependent on the participants' histories and social norms. Alternatively, it may include dividing up a responsibility without providing any remark.
- **Social Intimacy:-** The degree to which a couple spends time together as a unit and has interests that are similar to those of one another is an indicator of their social closeness. What types of activities do they participate in while they are together? Do they spend quality time together and enjoy themselves? Now, this does not imply that the two of you should do everything together or that each partner should constantly do their own thing. Intimacy in social relationships is achieved through spending time together engaging in enjoyable activities while also making time for oneself; one must have both. When it comes to having a good time with others, it's not always the case that more is better, nor is it always the case that less is more. Experimenting something new together is a fantastic method to bring people closer together socially. When you come together on the same playing field with no prior experience, you are able to be vulnerable and embrace the discomfort of something new. This may be achieved via activities such as taking cooking lessons, learning how to dance salsa, checking out a new restaurant, or taking a new yoga class together.
- **Sexual Intimacy:-** Physical contact or closeness are two aspects of sexual intimacy. It may take the form of an action or a response between two or more individuals, such as the expression of sentiments (which may include feelings of intimate friendship, platonic love, romantic love, or sexual desire). Being in someone else's personal space, holding hands, embracing, kissing, and touching another person are all examples of physical intimacy. Sexual activity is another example. The true meaning or aim of a conversation may often be conveyed via sexual intercourse in a manner that cannot be accomplished by the accompanying discourse. The exchange of sexual intimacy is possible between any two individuals; however, since it is often used to convey positive and personal thoughts, it most frequently takes place between people who already have some kind of connection with one another, whether it familial, platonic, or romantic, with romantic partnerships having a greater degree of physical intimacy. Holding hands, embracing, kissing, snuggling, and other types of physical contact, such as touching and massage, have been identified as examples of romantic touch. A high level of

physical affection is strongly connected with overall relationship satisfaction as well as partner happiness. It is possible to be physically intimate with someone without really touching them; nevertheless, a certain closeness is essential. Despite the absence of actual physical contact, it is possible to be physically intimate with someone.

- **Intellectual Intimacy:** - Sharing one's thoughts, as well as one's knowledge and abilities, is an essential component of intellectual closeness. One's aspirations, dreams, anxieties, and experiences may all contribute to your intellectual closeness. When one's spouse lets one in on who they are on the inside and establishes an intellectual connection with the significant other, they are entrusting them with their most private thoughts and feelings. They have taken down the barrier that formerly protected their hearts. A romantic connection that involves sex may exist between several individuals even in the absence of intellectual veneration, as is the case in a casual or one-night stand relationship. Couples that share the same activity, employment, passion, or addiction are a perfect example of intellectually close partnerships. Some examples of such relationships include fishing, becoming a bondsman, cooking, and controlled drug addictions. As a result, an intellectual level of closeness, whether positive or negative, is essential to the success of a relationship. A pair may become friends and form a relationship even without a physical or sexual connection by engaging in intellectual closeness with one another.
- **Recreational Intimacy:-** This is a level that can be reached by a significant number of your allies. The concept of "recreational intimacy" refers to the relationships that develop as a result of spending time together, participating in activities such as going to the movies or shopping, or exchanging typical gifts. It is really necessary to have distinct workouts in addition to the fundamental ones. In point of fact, married couples need hobbies that they may participate in either alone or with friends, but not with their life partner. This enables each person in the partnership to maintain his or her own unique personality while still being a part of the relationship. Finding enough things that you have in common with the other person so that you can enjoy spending time with them is the goal of the kind of intimacy known as recreational closeness.

1.4 Personality

The English word "personality" comes from the Latin word "personal," which refers to a theatrical mask used by players in order to either portray multiple characters or hide their identity. The term "personality" is whence we get the English word "personality." At its most fundamental level, personality refers to the distinctive habits of thinking, feeling, and behaving that define an individual and set them apart from other people. It is generally accepted that an individual's personality develops from inside them and is rather stable throughout the course of their life.

1.5 Big-Five Personality Model

Trait theories of personality have endeavoured to precisely determine the number of traits that exist for a considerable period of time. Previous theories have posited different numerical values. Several prominent psychologists have proposed different models for understanding personality traits. Gordon Allport's model

included a comprehensive list of 4,000 traits, while Raymond Cattell's model identified 16 personality factors. Hans Eysenck's model, on the other hand, posited a three-factor theory. Numerous scholars held the view that Cattell's theory was excessively intricate, while Eysenck's was excessively restricted in its ambit. Consequently, the Big 5 personality traits have surfaced and are employed to delineate the overarching characteristics that function as fundamental components of an individual's personality. The Big Five personality test is a prevalent personality assessment theory that has gained widespread acceptance. The Big Five personality test, also referred to as the OCEAN personality test, is grounded in the Big Five model, which posits that human personality consists of five distinct personality traits or factors. These factors are Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism, thus forming the acronym OCEAN. The Big Five personality test employs a continuum that involves the ranking of individuals on a scale between two polar extremes. Based on the Big Five model the following are the personality factors that individuals exhibit:-

- **Open Mindedness:-** The Big Five personality characteristic scientific model defines creativity, aesthetic interest, and intellect (especially verbal intelligence) as openness to experience. Openness to experience reflects curiosity in novelty, art, literature, abstract thinking, philosophy, and aesthetic feelings and beauty. Moderately closed-minded individuals are conservative. They seldom seek innovation or change. They prefer to cling to what they know and are less interested in learning. They seldom think philosophically about belief systems and ideologies. They sometimes attend movies, concerts, dance recitals, plays, poetry readings, gallery openings and art displays, but they don't need to. They avoid complicated topics and abstract thoughts and dislike writing. They read less and prefer popular books. Their interests and vocabulary are more limited. They can think abstractly and learn when required, but they don't like it. They seldom have fresh ideas and may have trouble communicating them, especially if they are average or below in extraversion. Moderately closed people (especially those high in orderliness) like the tried-and-true. They usually shun intellectual difficulties. Moderately closed people have restricted interests. Unless they are particularly high or low in neuroticism and/or conscientiousness, this makes it simpler for them to choose a career, specialise, and form an integrated identity. Moderately open people (especially those with average or below neuroticism) are less likely to challenge their own opinions. They're not intellectual revolutionaries or protesters. Having seen a person with little openness to experience, you may better comprehend how a person with high levels sees the world: creative, able to come up with unique solutions, interested in abstract concepts, and able to manage abstract ideas. Openness to experience predicts political affiliation, followed by conscientiousness, especially orderliness. Liberals are significantly more open-minded than conservatives. Despite aspect disparities, trait-level openness to experience is similar among men and women. Intellectual and experiential openness are traits.
- **Extroversion:-** The Big Five personality characteristic scientific model defines pleasant emotion as extraversion. Extraversion is sensitive to positive feelings like optimism, joy, anticipation, and approach, especially in social contexts. Moderately extraverted people are sociable, outspoken, aggressive, and enthusiastic. They are frequently hungry for social interaction. They like throwing

parties, telling jokes, and volunteering. They have happy recollections of the past, above-average self-esteem (especially if they are low in neuroticism), and optimism about the future. Moderate extraverts, especially those with poor agreeableness, dominate social settings. Low-conscientious pleasant extraverts might be self-centered. Liberals are less extroverted than conservatives. Women are somewhat extraverted.

- **Conscientiousness:-** The Big Five scientific approach defines dutiful success as conscientiousness. Conscientiousness involves duty, attention to detail, hard effort, tenacity, cleanliness, efficiency, and following norms, standards, and procedures. Conscientious individuals plan and organise. Failure seldom bothers diligent people. They forgive themselves and others. When jobless, especially through no fault of their own, they will feel shame and remorse. Average conscientious people are relatively responsible but also think life is more than diligence, orderliness, and obligation. They believe hard effort will pay off, but luck and chance also matter. They are neither micromanagers or too concerned about cleanliness, morality, or accomplishment. Typical conscientious people are equally likely to be political conservatives or liberals (although they will lean conservative if openness is low and liberal if high). Women somewhat outperform males in conscientiousness.
- **Agreeableness:-** The Big Five personality characteristic scientific paradigm prioritises agreeableness in interpersonal interactions. Agreeable people are friendly, cooperative, caring, naively trusting, and conciliatory. They typically lie to avoid confrontation. Low-agreeable people are obstinate, rude, sceptical, competitive, and even predatory. They're forthright, so you know where they stand. Low-agreeable people are perceived as competitive, chilly, harsh, and less sympathetic. They don't see the best in others and aren't tolerant, something pleasant people respect. They seldom care about others' emotions, like fighting, and will forgo peace and harmony to make a point or (if conscientious) get things done. They're brutally honest. They prefer dominance over submission, especially if neuroticism is minimal. Low-agreeable people don't forgive. They're inflexible, harsh, and intolerant. They blame weakness for exclusion, punishment, and loss. They are also unlikely to be used by unsavoury, manipulative, or predatory characters. Their scepticism protects them, but it might make it hard to trust or work with decent people. They also don't acknowledge positive behaviour. They collaborate when it's in their self-interest yet love competition with clear victors and losers. They like conflict and don't back down. They are skilled at bargaining for themselves and lobbying for greater authority or recognition, hence they usually earn more and have better wages. Thus, low agreeableness reduces resentment and invisible wrath. They say what they think. Low-agreeable individuals also don't forgo long-term stability and function for short-term peace since they're more likely to fight. This implies that issues that should be dealt in the present are typically solved and do not pile up counterproductively over time, even if individuals near to extremely low agreeable people may find them domineering and uncaring. Low-agreeable people don't forgive. They're inflexible, harsh, and intolerant. They don't take rejection, punishment, or loss well and blame weakness. They are unlikely to be used by unsavoury, manipulative, or predatory characters. Their scepticism helps, but it may also hinder their capacity to trust and collaborate with decent people. They also fail to acknowledge positive behaviour. They collaborate when it's in their self-interest, but they prefer competition with clear

victors and losers. They won't back down and can fight. They are skilled at bargaining for themselves and negotiating for greater authority or recognition, which makes them more successful and wealthy. Low-agreeable people are less prone to hold resentment or rage. They say what they think. p-agreeable individuals also don't trade medium- to long-term stability and function for short-term peace since they're willing to fight when required. This implies that problems that should be tackled now are typically solved and do not build counterproductively over time, even if individuals near them may find them overpowering and uncaring. Agreeableness is not substantially related with political liberalism or conservatism since its opposites cancel one other out. Conservatives are more courteous, liberals more compassionate. Agreeableness particularly compassion predicts political correctness. This suggests that pleasant individuals sympathise with oppressed people and demonise oppressors as cruel, soulless predators.

- **Neuroticism:-** In the scientific model of personality traits known as the Big Five, neuroticism is the major component that represents negative emotion. A person's sensitivity to unpleasant feelings in general, such as pain, grief, irritated or defensive rage, fear, and anxiety, may be measured using the trait of neuroticism. People who have low degrees of neuroticism tend to pay less attention to the unfavourable aspects, fears, and unknowns of the past, the present, and the future. Unless they are dealing with a significant issue that has persisted for a significant amount of time, they almost never have periods of time in which they are sad, nervous, or irritated. Even in the most difficult circumstances, they are able to manage effectively, don't worry an excessive amount, and bounce back swiftly from stress. They are skilled at maintaining composure in the face of adversity and seldom exaggerate the significance of minor issues. People who are average or above average in extraversion often have substantially greater levels of self-esteem than those who are average or below average in extraversion alone. They have a minimal chance of getting anxiety disorders and depression (especially if their extraversion scores are average or above).

Having a mental image of someone with a low level of neuroticism can help you grasp the opposite of this trait better. The degree to which someone is neurotic is not a very reliable indicator of their political beliefs, whether they conservative or liberal. Neuroticism is more common in women than in men, generally speaking. The average woman has a greater level of neuroticism than sixty percent of the whole population, which includes both men and women. It's possible that this is one of the reasons why, on average, women report being less happy in their relationships, at work, in school, and with their health than men do, and why women are the ones who start 70 percent of all divorces. It would seem that puberty is the time when men and women begin to develop their distinct neurotic tendencies. It is particularly prevalent in nations like Norway and Sweden, which have put forth the greatest effort to ensuring that men and women have equal opportunities in all aspects of life. This gives significant evidence that the dissimilarity may be attributed to biological reasons rather than the environment and learning. The characteristics of withdrawal and volatility are what make up the trait of neuroticism.

CHAPTER-2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

After analysing papers and studies in journals and books, the researcher completed an exhaustive Review of Literature. Some studies are detailed below:-

Yana Hoo (2013)- When given little information, couple therapists may not know which facet of intimacy (e.g., emotional or sexual) disturbed couples lack. The current study used Bowen's (1978) concept of differentiation to examine how distressed treatment-seeking couples (clinical couples) and satisfied non-treatment-seeking couples (community couples) experience emotional/sexual intimacy and whether it is associated with relationship satisfaction. 46 clinical and 46 community couples were studied. MANOVA and independent t-tests examined differences in differentiation, emotional and sexual closeness, and relationship satisfaction between clinical and community couples. Structural equation modelling and group invariance comparison methodologies examined differentiation, emotional/sexual closeness, and relationship satisfaction comparing groups. Distressed treatment-seeking couples had much lower differentiation, emotional and sexual closeness, and relationship satisfaction than pleased, non-treatment-seeking couples. However, clinical and community connections were essentially comparable. In both groups, emotional and sexual closeness were positively correlated with relationship distinctiveness, except for female sexual intimacy. Emotional/sexual intimacy and relationship satisfaction differed by gender and group (clinical or community), revealing surprising results. Clinical male partners had a stronger connection between distinction and male sexual intimacy than community male partners. Male sexual intimacy and male relationship satisfaction were only significant in clinical couples, not community couples. This research found that relationship difference affects partners' intimacy and relationship happiness, proposing "how to intervene" with troubled couples' intimacy issues.

Darota, Ewa, Natalia, Aclija, Katarzyna & Bernadetta (2019)- This study investigated how proximity to parents, attachment, identity style, identity commitment, relationship type, and having children influence intimacy in young women and men. Many studies show relationship involvement, communication, and satisfaction vary. 227 persons were studied: 114 women ($M = 29.99$; $SD = 4.36$) and 113 males ($M = 30.00$; $SD = 4.33$). 40% were married, 60% were in casual partnerships, and 101 had children. The Miller Social Intimacy Scale, closeness/attachment questionnaires, and Identity Style Inventory were employed. The significance of the differences and the stepwise regression analysis were performed. The survey found that women had more intimate relationships than males. Intimacy is independent of relationship type. However, childhood and adolescent attachment to parents, interpersonal interactions model, and identity type impact relationship intimacy. Preventive and instructional programmes on family life and happy relationships may utilise the research findings.

Jacques, Nele, Viviane, Marieke & Peter (2018)-The assumption is that emotional intimacy is a significant factor in sustaining sexual desire and partnered sexual engagement in romantic relationships that have endured for a considerable period. The precise nature of the relationship between intimacy and sexual contact among partners remains ambiguous, as it is uncertain whether the former exerts a direct influence or an indirect one through its effects on sexual desire. According to the findings of Baumeister and Bratslavsky, there exists a gender difference in the relationship between emotional intimacy and sexual desire, whereby

men experience a greater increase in sexual desire than women in response to a certain level of emotional intimacy. The objective of the current investigation was to examine the potential mediating function of sexual desire in the relationship between perceived intimacy and sexual partner interaction, while also exploring the gender effect as postulated by Baumeister and Bratslavsky. The study employed the experience sampling methodology within the natural environment of the participants. Over the course of seven consecutive days, a total of 134 participants were asked to report their levels of emotional intimacy, sexual desire, and sexual activity at 10 quasi-random intervals throughout each day. The study found that while there was no significant direct impact of intimacy on sexual partner interaction, there was an observed indirect impact through sexual desire. The correlation between intimacy and sexual desire exhibited a decline in potency as time progressed, with the most pronounced impact observed when measuring intimacy, sexual desire, and sexual activity concurrently, and a minor yet noteworthy impact noted at an average temporal delay of 3 hours. No significant effects were observed at longer time intervals. It was found that the sexual desire in men was more than women whereas the link strength between sexual desire and intimacy was the same. The study's results indicate that increased levels of intimacy in both male and female partners engaged in long-term romantic relationships are positively correlated with heightened sexual desire. This heightened sexual desire, in turn, increases the likelihood of partnered sexual activity. There seems to be no gender difference in the temporal correlation between escalating intimacy and consequent sexual desire.

John, Einar, Nicola, Navjot & Sally (2010)- Scores on four of the Five-Factor Model personality characteristics were shown to have a significant correlation with the amount of relationship satisfaction reported by intimate heterosexual partners in a meta-analysis that included 19 samples and a total of 3848 individuals. Low levels of neuroticism, high levels of agreeableness, high levels of conscientiousness, and high levels of extraversion were the four personality traits. The relationships between an individual's personality qualities and the level of relationship satisfaction experienced by that individual's intimate partner did not differ significantly between men and women, nor did they differ significantly between married and unmarried people. The findings of the meta-analysis provide credence to the idea that the Five-Factor Model of Personality may be useful in gaining an understanding of an essential facet of human existence: close personal connections.

Kartin, Veronica & Alexander (2014)-The current research analyses how perceptions of personality are connected to relationship satisfaction in a sample of romantic partners that varies in age. The couples were all in committed, committed relationships. Separate analyses were conducted for each of the Big Five personality characteristics, looking at both the self- and partner-perceptions, as well as perceived similarity and self-other agreement. The findings of the actor-partner-interdependence models demonstrated significant impacts of partner-perceived personality in each of the Big Five qualities on the degree to which both partners were satisfied with their relationship. On the other hand, the impacts of one's self-perceived personality on the pleasure of their relationships were minimal. Perceiving one's spouse as having a personality similar to one's own contributed a minor but distinct contribution to relationship satisfaction in couples. This contribution was made in addition to self- and partner-rated personality. The implications of these findings for the outcomes of

relationships highlight the significance of combining one's own impressions of personality with those of one's partner.

Diya (2022)- Every single person has the fundamental need to love and be loved. A connection with another person is what we mean when we talk about having a relationship with them. Communication, love, trust, intimacy, and respect are the five pillars on which the health and longevity of every relationship are built. The topic of 'Trust, Intimacy, and Relationship Satisfaction among Young Adults' is investigated in the current research. The purpose of this research was to determine the nature of the relationships between trust and relationship satisfaction, intimacy and relationship satisfaction, and trust and intimacy; as well as to determine whether or not there are any variations between men and females with regard to trust, intimacy, and relationship satisfaction correspondingly. The information came from young persons between the ages of 18 and 24 who filled out a Google form. 186 young adults who are presently dating, in a serious relationship, in a live-in relationship, engaged, or married make up the study's sample size. The purpose of this research is to better understand the factors that influence young people's romantic relationships. The Trust in Close Relationships Scale (Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna, 1985), the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schafer and Olson, 1981), and the Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrik, 1988) were the instruments that were used in this study. In order to conduct an analysis of the data using SPSS 26.0, the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation technique and the t-test were used. According to the findings, there seems to be a substantial positive association between trust and relationship satisfaction ($r = .644$), intimacy and relationship satisfaction ($r = .671$), and trust and intimacy ($r = .661$), and this correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. The results of the t-test indicated that there are no significant differences between men and females in terms of trust ($t = -.312$), intimacy ($t = -.783$), or relationship satisfaction ($t = .329$), indicating that the significance level is more than or equal to 0.05. The purpose of this study was to understand and explore the relationship of trust, intimacy, and relationship satisfaction among young adults who are currently involved in a romantic relationship. The findings revealed a strong positive correlation between Trust and Relationship Satisfaction, a strong positive correlation between Intimacy and Relationship Satisfaction, and a strong positive correlation between Trust and Intimacy. The t-test revealed that there are significant differences between the three variables.

Sarah (2018)-This research examined the direct correlations between personality traits and relationship satisfaction in romantic pair relationships in men and women, then examined gender differences and actor and partner effects. This research varies from past personality indicator-relationship satisfaction forecasts. First, this research employs frequently known personality characteristics rather than the RELATE instrument's less prevalent ones (Busby, Holman, & Taniguchi, 2001). This research also assesses numerous personality variables in one model. Reviewing studies will discover which personality traits most affect relationship happiness. SEM (Byrne, 2001) was used to address the following research question: How do personality characteristics connected to relationship satisfaction interact when investigated together? various characteristics concurrently, which helps clarify their relative relevance in determining pair happiness. This research shows that personality affects romantic pair pleasure. Personality shapes romantic relationships. The

absence of neuroticism and the presence of agreeableness appear to be most significant for relationship pleasure. These results have important applications. If a neurotic spouse can keep good traits, they may have a better relationship. Thus, in romantic couple interactions, pleasant traits may offset neurotic traits, boosting enjoyment.

Rongqin,Susan,Loes,Wim (2014)- This research investigated whether or whether adolescents with distinct personality types (i.e., overcontrollers, undercontrollers, and resilient) experienced distinct patterns of change in the quality of their friendships as they progressed through their teenage years. In addition, it studied if certain personality types were indirectly associated with the quality of romantic relationships in early adulthood, through the qualitative development of friendships in adolescence. For the purpose of the research, six waves of longitudinal questionnaire data were collected from young people in the Netherlands who had previously been in a romantic relationship. There were two different age groups that were tracked: those between the ages of 12 and 21 years old, and those between 16 and 25 years old. The findings indicated that resilient individuals reported greater mean levels of relationship quality throughout adolescence (i.e., more support from, less negative contact with, and less domination from their closest friend) in comparison to both overcontrollers and undercontrollers. Indirectly, the quality of resilient individuals' romantic relationships throughout early adulthood was greater than that of both overcontrollers and undercontrollers. This was due to the resilient individuals' higher mean levels of friendship quality during adolescence. Therefore, the findings lend credence to a developmental model in which the quality of an adolescent's friendship serves as a mechanism connecting different personality types with the quality of a young adult's love relationship.

Kanika, Dhairya (2021)-The purpose of this study is to determine the level of love and relationship happiness experienced by individuals who were dating or married both before and after the COVID-19 shutdown in India. Existing research provides evidence that stresses such as terrorist attacks and natural disasters may have an adverse effect on close personal relationships. However, there is a paucity of information about the ways in which a large stressor such as the COVID-19 shutdown would influence love between married and dating couples. Data from a convenience sample of 100 participants was obtained in two waves: the first wave took place in January–March, and the second round occurred in May, following the lockdown. Of the 100 participants, 65 were dating, and 35 were married. Participants filled out an online questionnaire that included questions on love, relationship happiness, self-esteem, and how they spend their time with their significant other. There was an application of the paired sample t test, correlation analysis, and theme analysis. When compared to the time before the lockout, the individuals who were dating and those who were married had substantially lower ratings on measures of relationship satisfaction, love, closeness, and passion after the lockdown. There was no change in the level of commitment shown by those who were dating. Love was connected with activities such as recalling old memories and watching films together for individuals who were dating, but for married couples, love was associated with activities such as completing home duties, cooking, and watching films together. After the COVID-19 lockdown, there was a shift in

partnerships' levels of passion and closeness. The quality of the time that partners spend together during the lockdown has a significant bearing on how fulfilled they feel in their relationships.

Darby (2016)- Previous studies on self-monitoring have shown that those who are high in self-monitoring are more inclined to choose a love partner based on looks and status. On the other hand, those with poor self-monitoring tend to place a higher emphasis on the importance of common interests and values. In the present study, we investigated the variations in levels of self-monitoring that are present in dating relationships as well as marriages. The participants were given a questionnaire that included biographical questions, questions about their previous relationships, questions on attributes that are significant in possible dating and marriage partners, and the Snyder and Gangestad (1986) 18-item Self-Monitoring scale. In addition, the participants were asked to rate themselves on their level of self-monitoring. According to the findings, which were similar with those of other studies, those who had a high level of self-monitoring were more likely to divorce than those who had a low level. The study also reveals that people who are high self-monitors put a larger priority on physical appearance, inventiveness, and prestige, while those who are low self-monitors favour attributes such as faithfulness and spiritual values. According to the findings of this study, those who are high in self-monitoring and those who are poor in self-monitoring have different preferences in partners, both in short-term and in long-term relationships.

Rebekka, Thomas, Alexander (2017)-In this research, the function of self-esteem as a mediator in the link between the Big Five personality characteristics and relationship satisfaction was investigated. A model called the Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) was used to the data of 237 heterosexual couples, and it was shown that self-esteem mediated the correlation between the Big Five qualities and relationship satisfaction. Using data collected over time from 141 married couples, we also investigated whether or whether the correlation was in a positive or negative direction. The findings suggest that only agreeableness (and neuroticism to a lesser extent) accurately predicts relationship pleasure two years later, but relationship satisfaction accurately predicted the extraversion of the partner. In addition, strong indirect impacts were found between a person's level of happiness in their relationships, their self-esteem, and their subsequent neuroticism. These findings highlight how important it is to examine marital happiness in conjunction with the Big Five personality characteristics and one's own level of self-esteem. In addition, looking for alternative longitudinal correlations sheds light on the function of romantic relationships in the maturation of a person's personality.

CHAPTER-3**METHODOLOGY****3.1 Objective**

To understand the impact of individual personality traits on emotional, social, sexual, intellectual and recreational intimacy of married and unmarried couples.

3.2 Hypothesis

H1- There will be a significant impact of openness on intimacy.

H2- There will be a significant impact of conscientiousness on intimacy.

H3- There will be a significant impact of agreeableness on intimacy.

H4- There will be a significant impact of extraversion on intimacy.

H5- There will be a significant impact of neuroticism on intimacy.

H6- There will be a significant relationship between dimensions of personality and intimacy.

3.3 Research Design

The study of the current research is based on a research design that combines co-relational and cross-sectional approaches. The study is quantitative in nature.

3.4 Operational Definitions**3.4.1 Intimacy**

When two people feel physically near to one another as well as emotionally attached and supported by one another, they are said to be intimate with one another. It implies being able to communicate the whole variety of ideas, emotions, and experiences that we as human beings are capable of having. The foundation of an intimate relationship is laid over the course of time, and its formation and upkeep need patience and work on the part of both parties. The development of a close emotional connection with the person you love might be one of the most satisfying parts of a romantic partnership. When we get close to another person and receive reassurance from them that we are loved and accepted for who we are, we have taken the first step towards developing an intimate relationship. Intimacy may take many forms, including that which is emotional and sexual, as well as that which is intellectual, recreational, and social. Each form of intimacy can mean the following for married and unmarried couples.

- Emotional intimacy- closeness, sharing sentiments, and support without defensiveness.
- Social intimacy- sharing friends and networks.

- Sexual intimacy- touching, loving, and being intimate.
- Intellectual intimacy- talking about life and work.
- Recreational intimacy- sharing experiences, hobbies, and interests.

3.4.2 Personality Traits

Personality qualities show how individuals think, feel, and behave. A person with a high extraversion score is likely to be social in many contexts and throughout time. Thus, trait psychology assumes that humans vary on a set of fundamental trait characteristics that endure across time and settings. Modern personality psychologists believe in the "Big 5" personality qualities. The Big 5 are extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Extraversion is friendliness, agreeableness is kindness, openness is creativity and fascination, conscientiousness is thinking, and neuroticism is melancholy or emotional instability.

3.5 Sample

The data for the study was collected from 102 heterosexual couples who were romantically involved (51 married and 51 unmarried) in India. The minimum age limit was set at 21.

Inclusion Criteria:-

- Participants should be 21 years or above.
- Participants should be in a romantically involved heterosexual relationship (married or unmarried)
- Participants should know how to use the internet.
- Participants should have working proficiency in the English language.

Exclusion Criteria:-

- Participants who are not in a romantically involved relationship whether married or unmarried.
- Individuals who want to participate should not suffer from any kind of mental illness.
- A participant who is unable to use the internet due to a lack of expertise.
- Participant who is below the age of 21.

3.6 Tools Used

3.6.1 TIPI Scale

The short self-report Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) measures personality qualities. It quickly assesses extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability (neuroticism), and openness to experience. The TIPI has 10 items—two for each dimension. The TIPI items are brief statements that participants score on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, indicating their agreement or disagreement with each assertion. The inventory is straightforward to administer and complete since each item simply captures a personality

attribute. The TIPI is a quick, accurate personality test. The TIPI has good psychometric qualities despite its brevity. Its pieces accurately measure the same construct inside each personality dimension. The TIPI also correlates favourably with lengthier and more comprehensive Big Five personality characteristic tests. The TIPI is popular in research situations with limited time or participant attention span because of its simplicity and efficiency. Large-scale research, internet surveys, and fast personality assessments utilise it. The TIPI gives a comprehensive overview of personality characteristics, but it may not represent the whole richness of an individual's personality. For in-depth personality profile, more thorough measurements are utilised.

3.6.2 PAIR Scale

The PAIR scale is a self-report assessment of romantic relationship closeness. It captures people's subjective sensations of intimacy to reveal emotional closeness, connection, and relationship quality. PAIR Scale is a 36-item scale that assesses how close two people really are by looking at five characteristics and one "faking" scale. Here are the five components:

- Emotional intimacy, defined as a trusting relationship characterised by open expressions of emotion and unwavering support offered by both partners.
- Social intimacy, or sharing a large circle of friends.
- Sexual intimacy, having a close, loving, and sexual relationship with another person.
- Intellectual Intimacy, or the exchange of thoughts and experiences pertaining to work and daily life.
- Recreational Intimacy is the intimacy based on shared recreational activities, interests, and experiences.

The researcher may choose to frame the scale in terms of the connection as it "is now" or as it "should be" (or both), depending on the nature of the investigation. Each question has a 5-point scale that respondents may use to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement.

3.7 Procedure

After completing the compilation of the surveys, the Google forms were created. The participants were contacted by phone after they were briefed about the project and permission was obtained. In addition, the participants were assured that their information would remain secret and that it would be used for research purposes only. After that, the URLs were sent to them, and they were asked to inform the researcher as soon as the form was submitted. In addition, they were told to forward the same information to their friends as well. The researchers express their gratitude to each and every participant for their participation in the study as well as their cooperation.

3.8 Analysis

Pearson correlation and linear regression were the methods that were used while utilising IBM SPSS version 26.0 for the purpose of analysing the influence of individual personality qualities on the degree of emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational closeness shared by married and unmarried couples.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

- The researcher individually explained the study and asked each subject to participate.
- All participants were told that participation in the research was voluntary and they might withdraw if they want to and were assured their data will remain confidential

CHAPTER-4 RESULT

The purpose of the study was to correlate between dimensions of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, openness to experience and conscientiousness) and different types of intimacy (social, sexual, intellectual, recreational and emotional) along with this the impact of different dimensions of personality on different types of intimacy was studied for both married and unmarried couples and in doing so, standardized tools has been used.

4.1 Table 1

Descriptive and correlation between dimension of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, openness to experience and Conscientiousness) and intimacy are given below-

Variable	n	Social	Sexual	Intellectual	Recreational	Emotional
1.Extraversion	204	-.142	-.050*	.022	.087	-.079
2.Agreeableness	204	-.070*	-.064	-.036**	-.049**	-.017**
3.Conscientiousness	204	.042	-.024**	-.008	.045**	.096**
4.Emotional Stability	204	-.070	.029**	.059**	-.037	.021**
5.Openness to experience	204	.043	-.024**	.025**	.111**	-.008

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The Pearson's correlation between extraversion and social intimacy came out to be $r = -.142$ (insignificant at both 0.01 and 0.05 level). and with other dimensions of intimacy like intellectual ($r = .022$), recreational ($r = .087$), emotional ($r = -.079$) showed insignificant relationship whereas with sexual intimacy it showed significant relationship ($r = -.050$, significant at 0.05 level).

Another dimension of personality i.e. Agreeableness showed significant relationship with social ($r=-.070$), intellectual($r=-.036$), recreational ($-.049$) and emotional ($-.017$) intimacy at 0.01 level except sexual intimacy ($r=-.064$).

Conscientiousness when correlated with sexual ($r=-.024$), recreational($r=-.049$) and emotional intimacy ($r=.096$) came out to be significant at 0.01 level whereas it showed no relationship with social ($r=.042$) and intellectual intimacy($r=-.008$).

Emotional stability showed significant relationship with sexual ($r= -.024$), intellectual ($r= .045$) and emotional intimacy ($r= .096$) but not with social ($r=-.070$) and recreational intimacy ($r=-.037$).

Openness to experience also showed significant relationship between sexual ($r=-.024$), intellectual ($r=.025$) and recreational intimacy ($r=.111$) and did not show any relationship between social ($r=.043$) and emotional intimacy ($r=-.008$).

4.2.1 Table 2

Impact of personality factors on Social Intimacy has been show below-

Effect	Estimate	SE	Model summary		p	Note. total N = 1,202. CI =
			R	R ²		
Predictor						
Social intimacy ^a						
Openness to experience ^b	3.062	.641	.021	.000	.070	
Extroversion ^b	3.090	.876	0.39	.009	.732	
Agreeableness ^b	3.050	.796	.050	.080	0.00	
Conscientiousness ^b	3.678	.657	.048	.091	.059	
Emotional stability ^b	3.578	.298	.069	.056	.876	

confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit, a=dependent variable, b= constant (predictor)

According to table 2, Openness to experience insignificantly impacts social intimacy scores, $b= .021$, $t = -.650$, $p>.01$. Openness to experience also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in social intimacy scores, $R^2=.000$, $F(1,202) = 0.807$, $p=.070$.

Extraversion insignificantly impacts social intimacy scores, $b= .023$, $t = .329$, $p>.01$. Extraversion also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in social intimacy scores, $R^2=.009$, $F(1,202) = 0.108$, $p=.732$.

Agreeableness significantly impacts social intimacy scores, $b= .043$, $t = .609$, $p>.01$. Agreeableness also explains a significant proportion of variance in social intimacy scores, $R^2=.080$, $F(1,202) = 0.370$, $p=.000$.

Conscientiousness insignificantly impacts social intimacy scores, $b= .076$, $t = .798$, $p>.01$. Conscientiousness also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in social intimacy scores, $R^2=.091$, $F(1,202) = 0.378$, $p=.059$.

Emotional stability insignificantly impacts social intimacy scores, $b = .087$, $t = .867$, $p > .01$. Emotional stability also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in social intimacy scores, $R^2 = .056$, $F(1, 202) = 0.394$, $p = .876$.

4.2.2 Table 3

Impact of personality factors on Sexual Intimacy has been show below-

Effect	Estimate	SE	Model summary		p
			R	R ²	
Predictor					
Sexual intimacy ^a					
Openness to experience ^b	3.099	9.289	.009	.004	.005
Extroversion ^b	2.098	18.98	0.80	.001	.017
Agreeableness ^b	3.897	17.89	.064	.005	.173
Conscientiousness ^b	3.654	18.98	.067	.009	.000
Emotional stability ^b	3.092	15.90	.070	.005	.018

Note. total $N = 1,202$. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit, a=dependent variable, b= constant (predictor)

According to table 3, Openness to experience significantly impacts sexual intimacy scores, $b = .107$, $t = 2.258$, $p > .01$. Openness to experience also explains a significant proportion of variance in sexual intimacy scores, $R^2 = .004$, $F(1, 202) = 1.867$, $p = .005$.

Extroversion significantly impacts sexual intimacy scores, $b = .107$, $t = 2.258$, $p > .01$. Extroversion also explains a significant proportion of variance in sexual intimacy scores, $R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 202) = .118$, $p = .017$.

Agreeableness insignificantly impacts sexual intimacy scores, $b = -.070$, $t = -.997$, $p > .01$. Agreeableness also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in sexual intimacy scores, $R^2 = .005$, $F(1, 202) = 0.172$, $p = .173$.

Conscientiousness significantly impacts sexual intimacy scores, $b = .059$, $t = .846$, $p > .01$. Conscientiousness also explains a significant proportion of variance in sexual intimacy scores, $R^2 = .009$, $F(1, 202) = .715$, $p = .000$.

Emotional stability significantly impacts sexual intimacy scores, $b = -.037$, $t = -.525$, $p > .01$. Emotional stability also explains a significant proportion of variance in sexual intimacy scores, $R^2 = .005$, $F(1, 202) = .276$, $p = .018$.

4.2.3 Table 4

Impact of personality factors on intellectual Intimacy has been show below-

Effect	Estimate	SE	Model summary		p
			R	R ²	
Predictor					
Intellectual intimacy ^a					
Openness to experience ^b	3.111	.416	.017	.079	.000
Extroversion ^b	2.156	.876	.024	.0001	.422
Agreeableness ^b	3.114	.130	.008	.000	0.010
Conscientiousness ^b	3.764	.657	.053	.009	.000
Emotional stability ^b	3.097	.495	.045	.002	.0027

Note. total N = 1,202. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit, a=dependent variable, b= constant (predictor)

According to table 4, Openness to experience significantly impacts intellectual intimacy scores, b= .281, t = 4.137, p>.01. Personality factors also explains a significant proportion of variance in intellectual intimacy scores, R²=.079, F (1,202) = 17.11, p=.000.

Extroversion insignificantly impacts intellectual intimacy scores, b= -.053, t = -.689, p>.01. Extroversion also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in intellectual intimacy scores, R²=.0001, F (1,202) = 0.119, p=.422.

Agreeableness significantly impacts intellectual intimacy scores, b= -.008, t = -.5.60, p>.01. Agreeableness also explains a significant proportion of variance in intellectual intimacy scores, R²=.000, F (1,202) = 0.298, p=.010.

Conscientiousness significantly impacts intellectual intimacy scores, b= -.050, t = -.116, p>.01. Conscientiousness also explains a significant proportion of variance in intellectual intimacy scores, R²=.009, F (1,202) = 0.013, p=.000.

Emotional stability significantly impacts intellectual intimacy scores, b= -.045 t = -.647, p>.01. Emotional stability also explains a significant proportion of variance in intellectual intimacy scores, R²=.002, F (1,202) = 0.419, p=.0027.

4.2.4 Table 5

Impact of personality factors on Recreational Intimacy has been show below-

Effect	Estimate	SE	Model summary		p
			R	R ²	
Predictor					
Recreational intimacy ^a					
Openness to experience ^b	3.266	.641	.017	.000	.005
Extroversion ^b	2.156	.876	0.56	.003	.422
Agreeableness ^b	3.895	.796	.070	.005	0.001
Conscientiousness ^b	3.764	.657	.053	.009	.045
Emotional stability ^b	3.8743	.298	.036	.001	.789

Note. total N = 1,202. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit, a=dependent variable b= constant (predictor)

According to table 5, Extroversion insignificantly impacts recreational intimacy scores, $b = -.053$, $t = -.689$, $p > .01$. Extroversion also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .003$, $F(1,202) = 0.580$, $p = .422$.

Openness to experience significantly impacts recreational intimacy scores, $b = .052$, $t = 6.598$, $p < .01$. Openness to experience also explains an in significant proportion of variance in recreational intimacy scores, $R^2 = .000$, $F(1,202) = 0.078$, $p = .005$.

Agreeableness significantly impacts recreational intimacy scores, $b = -.049$, $t = 6.53$, $p < .01$. Agreeableness also explains a significant proportion of variance in recreational intimacy scores, $R^2 = .005$, $F(1,202) = 1.000$, $p = .001$.

Conscientiousness significantly impacts recreational intimacy scores, $b = -.036$, $t = -.517$, $p > .01$. Conscientiousness also explains a significant proportion of variance in recreational intimacy scores, $R^2 = .009$, $F(1,202) = .480$, $p = .045$.

Emotional stability insignificantly impacts recreational intimacy scores, $b = -.053$, $t = -.761$, $p > .01$. Emotional stability also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in recreational intimacy scores, $R^2 = .001$, $F(1,202) = .580$, $p = .789$.

4.2.5 Table 6

Effect	Estimate	SE	Model summary		p
			R	R ²	
Predictor					
Emotional intimacy ^a					
Openness to experience ^b	3.26	1.114	0.79	.006	.053
Extroversion ^b	3.14	2002.03	0.56	0.003	.422
Agreeableness ^b	3.25	10.626	.070	.005	0.001
Conscientiousness ^b	3.36	8.79	.053	.009	.045
Emotional stability ^b	3.264	2.852	.036	.001	.606

Impact of personality factors on Emotional Intimacy has been show below-

Note. total $N = 1,202$. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit, a=dependent variable, b= constant (predictor)

According to table 6, Extroversion insignificantly impacts emotional intimacy scores, $b = -.034$, $t = -.689$, $p > .01$. Extroversion also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .003$, $F(1,202) = 0.061$, $p = .422$.

Openness to experience significantly impacts emotional intimacy scores, $b = .052$, $t = 6.598$, $p < .01$. Openness to experience also explains a significant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .006$, $F(1,202) = 0.061$, $p = .053$.

Agreeableness significantly impacts emotional intimacy scores, $b = -.059$, $t = 8.583$, $p < .01$. Agreeableness also explains an in significant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .005$, $F(1,202) = 1.000$, $p = .001$.

Conscientiousness significantly impacts emotional intimacy scores, $b = -.036$, $t = -.517$, $p > .01$. Conscientiousness also explains a significant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .0009$, $F(1,202) = .268$, $p = .045$.

Emotional stability insignificantly impacts emotional intimacy scores, $b = -.056$, $t = -.789$, $p > .01$. Emotional stability also explains an insignificant proportion of variance in emotional intimacy scores, $R^2 = .001$, $F(1,202) = .482$, $p = .606$.

CHAPTER-5 DISCUSSION

The connections between personality and intimacy dimensions may appear to be obvious at first glance. A significant portion of who we are as humans is communicated through our personalities, and one venue where this communication might take place is in the context of our close relationships. The idea that people have a fundamental "need to belong" within close relationships was proposed by Baumeister and Leary (1995). Within the context of a close personal relationship, the "identity" of one person (i.e., their personality) links with the "identity" of another person. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that personality is considered to be one of the factors that influence relationship happiness by certain relationship researchers.

The purpose of the study is to correlate and dimension of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, openness to experience and Conscientiousness) and intimacy along with that how effectively personality predict intimacy in married and unmarried couples.

Hypothesis 1 which stated that there will be a significant relationship between dimensions of personality and factors of intimacy (sexual, social, emotional, recreational, and intellectual). The findings revealed that there is significant relationship between different type of personality with intimacy styles except for few like social intimacy only showed significant relationship with agreeableness with other dimension of personality. The other hypothesis which stated that there will be a significant impact of dimensions of personality on different types of intimacy. The findings revealed that Extroversion and emotional stability insignificantly predicts emotional intimacy, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness significantly predicts emotional intimacy. Another dimension of intimacy i.e., recreational reveals that extroversion and emotional stability does not have impact on recreational intimacy whereas other dimension of personality i.e. openness to experience, agreeableness and recreational showed significant impact. Extraversion showed insignificant impact on intellectual intimacy whereas openness to experience, agreeableness, emotional stability, and Conscientiousness showed significant impact on intellectual intimacy. Agreeableness has an insignificant impact on sexual intimacy on the other hand whereas openness to experience, extroversion, emotional stability, and Conscientiousness has a significant impact on sexual intimacy. Agreeableness showed significant impact on social intimacy other four dimensions i.e, openness to experience, extroversion, emotional stability, and Conscientiousness doesn't has any impact on social intimacy.

The findings of the present research have very limited literature, there are some supporting and contradictory previous literature which are discussed below- White, Hendrick & Hendrick (2004)- investigated whether or whether there were any connections between the five personality factors that make up the five-factor model and the three aspects of intimate relationships (love styles, relationship satisfaction, and intimacy). The NEO Personality Inventory-Revised, the Love Attitudes Scale-Short Form, the Relationship Assessment Scale, the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships, and a demographic questionnaire were all given to participants (N=196) who were in committed relationships. Analyses based on correlation and regression demonstrated that neuroticism had a negative association with, and was predictive of, both satisfaction and intimacy. The connection between neuroticism and contentment in one's

relationships was entirely mediated by a possessive and reliant affection for women. It was shown that extraversion and agreeableness had a favourable association with the degree of relationship satisfaction and intimacy, particularly for men. There was a favourable correlation found between male conscientiousness and intimate relationships. Pereira, et.al (2020) examine the personality traits that are typical of victims of intimate partner violence (IPV), with the intention of treating the causes as well as the effects of the violent relationship. The Cochrane Collaboration's methods were followed in order to obtain the studies that focused on female victims. These studies were obtained through several databases. Of the 87 documents that were obtained, only 31 were kept for additional examination and were appropriate for inclusion. Of those 31, ten studies came from manual searches, and those were the ones that were included. From each study, the aims, methodological characteristics and primary conclusions were gleaned. The findings point to the fact that women are more likely to become victims of violence when they have been exposed to it as children, when they are economically dependent, when they lack social support, and when they fear for their life. The repercussions include both physiological and psychological aftereffects that continue to manifest throughout one's lifetime. There are aspects of the victim's personality that increase the likelihood that they will continue to be in an abusive relationship. Women who have been victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) have been found to have higher scores on personality dimensions such as schizoid, avoidant, self-destructive, borderline, and paranoid. As a result, female victims display traits such as low personal self-esteem, isolation from family and social circles, dependence (both financially and emotionally), insecurity, inferiority, submissiveness, and pacification.

Luteijn (1994) Higher levels of neuroticism and lower levels of self-esteem in both partners were related with a lower quality of intimate relationships in a sample of 51 heterosexual Dutch couples ranging in age from 20 to 71 years. The Dutch Personality Questionnaire, the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire, and a S judgement of the intimate connection were used for the assessment. Following this step, couples were categorised as having either good or fair intimate connections based on the findings of the S judgement. Those who scored higher on the social anxiety scale and those who scored lower on the dominance scale said that their intimate relationships were less satisfying. It was discovered, in line with the likeness hypothesis, that having a similar personality to one's intimate partner was associated with having more satisfying relationships. It was shown that variations in viewpoint, degrees of self-confidence, and the capacity to work and play together were directly connected with similarity in personality. Ackerman & Corretti (2015) examined the relationship between the development of disclosure, perceived responsiveness, and closeness among same-sex flatmate pairs (n = 103), using a longitudinal dyadic design. The authors hypothesised that the endorsement of interpersonal values and/or the dispositional expression of interpersonal behaviour in the roommate relationship would be the mechanisms by which participants' pathological traits were associated with the development of intimacy between themselves and their roommates. Our research shows that people who score high on the Detachment scale often have trouble forming close relationships, and that this is largely due to their own interpersonal intentions and/or behaviour. Many studies have utilised different approaches to investigate how the elements of the Five-Factor Model relate to feelings of contentment in close relationships. Personality traits that increase the odds of someone being happy in a relationship have been

studied extensively. Higher levels of neuroticism were associated with greater levels of marital satisfaction in a meta-analysis of the Five-Factor Model conducted by Heller, Watson, and Iles (2004); the correlation between neuroticism and marital satisfaction was found to be .26. There was a significant positive correlation between higher levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness and higher levels of marital satisfaction (.24, .22, .14, and .08, respectively). It's possible that common-source biases are exaggerating these connections (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Using a longitudinal methodology, researchers have discovered that reduced neuroticism is a significant predictor of marital satisfaction

CHAPTER-6

CONCLUSION

To better comprehend how personality types have an impact on different styles of intimacy and relationship among them. The present study investigates the relationship between personality and intimacy among married and unmarried couples and how personality predicts the styles of intimacy. Sample of 202 (51 married and 51 unmarried heterosexual couples) has been collected and analysed using Pearson's correlation and linear regression. The findings revealed that there is a significant relationship and have impact of personality on intimacy i.e, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness significantly predicts emotional intimacy, openness to experience, agreeableness and recreational showed significant impact, openness to experience, agreeableness, emotional stability, and Conscientiousness showed significant impact on intellectual intimacy, openness to experience, extroversion, emotional stability, and Conscientiousness has a significant impact on sexual intimacy, agreeableness showed significant impact on social intimacy. Results of the present study can be used by family and couple therapists and Psychologists to better assist their clients and facilitate intimacy bond and their personality to enhance relationships. This research can also be used as a pilot study for future research related to personality and intimacy in married and unmarried couples.

6.1 Limitations and Future recommendation

Like every scholarly work, the present study too has certain limitations like limited sample size, limited geographical area and questionnaires not adapted to Indian population. In order to overcome these limitations, it is recommended that future researches should have larger sample size, cover larger geographical area and adapt the questionnaires to Indian population before administering them.

To determine whether or not the individual personality traits will impact the intimacy in both married and unmarried couples, it is necessary to do additional research that takes into consideration the overall time-period the couple is together whether married or unmarried, additional research is also needed that differentiates between the higher-order personality variables that were previously discussed and that also includes other possibly relevant predictors that are taken into account such as comparison of the effects of gender on different aspects of intimacy as well as different personality traits.

References:-

White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and individual differences*, 37(7), 1519-1530.

Luteijn, F. (1994). Personality and the quality of an intimate relationship. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 10(3), 220–223.

Pereira, M. E., Azeredo, A., Moreira, D., Brandão, I., & Almeida, F. (2020). Personality characteristics of victims of intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 52, 101423.

Ackerman, R. A., & Corretti, C. A. (2015). Pathological personality traits and intimacy processes within roommate relationships. *European Journal of Personality*, 29(2), 152-1702

Jiang, Z., Qian, C., & Qiu, H. (2019). Examination of the impact of personality traits on individuals' perceived usefulness of smartwatches. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(22), 4447.

Rasheed, M., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Impact of customer-based brand equity (CBBE) on brand loyalty: Evidence from banking sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Advanced Research in Business and Management Studies*, 13(1), 1-15.

Nadkarni, A., & Mehta, V. (2023). A comparative study of cognitive functioning in Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(1), 10-19

Soto, C. J., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2011). The Five-Factor Model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45(2), 198-207