Fight it out and Live with the conflict have also been found negatively associated with marital satisfaction. These conflict resolution strategies do not able to offer lasting solutions of conflicting issues. The issues are temporarily solved but partners are not permanently solved and do not lead to full marital satisfaction.

Moderating effect of family income on the link between neuroticism and marital satisfaction was not found to be significant whereas in case of link between extraversion and marital satisfaction it was found significant. The reason may be attributed to the nature of personality dimension. In case of neuroticism the financial condition could not make any difference in the level of satisfaction. Neuroticism itself remained a powerful predictor in determining marital satisfaction. However, family income enhanced the marital satisfaction of extravert because high family income generated favorable conditions for extraverts.

Family type has also been found an important variable modulating the relationship between the personality dimension and marital satisfaction. Table 8 and Table 9.

Family type, joint or nuclear both has their one reasons to moderate the relationship between the personality dimension (either neuroticism or extraversion) and marital satisfaction. Joint family provides emotional and economic support to the couples whereas nuclear family allows greater autonomy and opportunities to grow independently.

Chapter-5

Summary
Introduction

Marital satisfaction is linked to the happiness of the partners which is shared with, resolution of conflict and emotional support. Further, one can say that, it is one of the most important features which lead to the overall satisfaction in marital life of the person (Fowers & Olson, 1993, Argyle & Furnham, 1983). It reflects the suitable advantages and outlay of benefits in marriage to a particular person. Similarly, if one perceives greater benefits of marriage, one can achieve greater and more satisfying with in marital life and with the partner (Stone & Shackelford, 2007). The marital relationship is one of the most significant and unique relation among all human relationships. It is not only a mere convention, but also an implicit condition in all human society. The relationship between husband and wife is a very specific context and involves a complex process of adjustment. Thus, one can say that satisfaction with one’s marriage is an important component of well-being (Byadgi, 2011).

Definition of marital satisfaction

Bhar and Leigh (1978) defined, “marital satisfaction as subjective evaluation of the overall quality of marriage. It is a degree to which the needs, desires and expectations are met in marriage”. Roach et al. (1981) defined marital satisfaction as one’s subjective evaluation of favorability towards his or her spouse and the marital relationship.

Hick and Platt (1970) have prompted two alternatives for conceptualization of marital satisfaction. The first is to view marital satisfaction as global subjective evaluation of one’s marriage or spouse, second is to understand satisfaction as being related to the particular wants of the married life. Hence, satisfaction in with wedding relationship could be a basic
ingredient. The couples decide the success or failure of wedding by the quantity of satisfaction they receive from it.

Rice (1979) defined marital satisfaction as each person’s evaluation of the extent to which his/her individual needs are met or fulfilled through husband-wife interaction or the extent to which the marital partner, the feelings, attitudes, services and goods needed.

Roach, Frazier, and Bowden (1981) have outlined marital satisfaction as one’s subjective analysis of favorability towards his or her relation with spouse and their relationship in marriage.

Bradbury, Fincham, and Beach (2000) have defined, “marital satisfaction is not just a relationship which is characterized by the absence of dissatisfaction as implied by the routine use of the term non-distressed to describe a couple who is maritally satisfied”.

Through this discussion, it is obvious that a marital satisfaction is beneficial in effective parenting practices and develops good problem-solving skills. It also satisfies family relations through a constant and proper functioning of family. Whereas in an unsatisfied marriage, person may generate stress and frustration that weakens the attachment, closeness, ability to adapt in adverse situation effectively.

The overall quality of marriage reflects in positive and negative dimensions of marriage. According to Fincham et al. (1997) marital satisfaction is a one-dimensional approach for assessing couples whether they are distressed or not distressed. This approach is failed to incarcerate the difficulties in the marital relationship. It is tailed in distinguishing the couple as distressed or not distressed.

Conflict resolution strategies
While explaining conflict resolution it is appropriate to outline first conflict then resolution. It is seen that conflict happens at several stages, levels, from social conflict to clashes between countries. In the present study, the researcher is concern about the social level/stages. Oxford Dictionary (1976) has traditionally defined the term conflict as fight, struggle or clash of principles. Coser (1967) and Moore (1996) have defined, “conflict as a clash or fight between two or more parties in respect to values, competition for status, power or resources”. Wertheim, Love, Peck and Littlefield (1998) have described conflict as occurring when there are real or perceived differences in interests that cannot be simultaneously satisfied. Hocker and Wilmot (1995) described the term conflict as a problem between two co-dependent person (husband and wife) who recognize mismatched aims, insufficient resources and interference from others in achieving goals”. In general conflict is an interactive process which is manifested in incongruity, disagreements or difference of opinion within or between social entities”. Conflict management is defined as “the opportunity to improve conflict situations and strengthen relationship. The conceptualization of conflict management has evolved from two-dimensional managerial grid viz., assertiveness and cooperativeness. Marital dissatisfaction is a major area in which researcher is focusing their concern. When conflict arises among couples, it threatens the very heart of relationship. The way the couples handle the disputes usually considered to be strategies or style through which they resolve the conflict which are interpersonal behaviors used in the context of a relationship to resolve disagreements (Marchand, 2004). The most successful styles benefit the couple, i.e., oneself and the other partner which enhances their relationship in a peaceful manner. The ineffective style of a partner is that when he tries to avoid the issues which are concerned in their relationship.
Leonard *et al.* (1989) examined the role of gender differences in conflict resolution styles of managers at home and at work. The sample consist of 201 managers in which 99 were males and 102 were females. The results indicated that both males and females tended to deal with conflict by using accommodative style at home. They used competitive style at work. Women who scored low level managers were more collaborative at home than at work and were using avoidant style more at work than at home. It is further seen that men managers were less likely to negotiation at home than at work.

Barry (1998) assessed the management of conflict with the spouse and coworkers in a sample consist of 55 dual career couple. The result showed the difference in males and females style for conflict resolution. Females used the integrating approach more than the males. In workplace there was no differences found between males and females in using the conflict resolution style. It was also found that males were more likely to be considerate with their partner and more dominating with their partner and dominating style less with coworker. The reverse was the case for the males with their partners.

Liu and Chen (2000) in his study, “assessing Chinese conflict management styles in joint venture”, assessed the conflict management styles of the staff and managers who experience interpersonal communication conflict with foreigners. The sample comprised 82 (48 males and 34 females) managers from four large joint venture companies. The organizational communication conflict instrument was used to assess the conflict management styles. The results indicated that managers and employees tended to use more frequently the strategy of collaboration. Further, it was found that they used the control strategy more frequently than non confrontational strategy. There was a significant gender differences were also found in
conflict management styles. The females used non-confrontation strategy more frequently than males, while males used collaboration more frequently than females.

In a similar study, done by Rebecca and Mary (2004) on the conflict resolution styles among the Christians and Muslims who were living in Australia. The sample was comprised 35 practicing and 36 non-practicing Christians and 30 practicing and 30 non-practicing Muslims. Christians and Katz and Lawyer’s conflict style inventory was used to measure the styles of conflict resolution. The results shown that there was a significant difference was found between the two religious communities. The Australians who were practicing Christians preferred the collaborative style, while practicing Muslims preferred the compromise style. There was no significant difference found between the non-practicing Christians and Muslims both preferred the collaborative style.

**Following conflict resolution strategies recommended by Parik, (1997)-**

*Avoid the conflict*- In avoidance style, person used to run away from the situation of conflict. If there is some dispute, without arguing the partner used to move on.

*Make a compromise*- This style is necessary to deal with the situation where a person fails to attain the success in a particular situation. It can be defined as a solution by method of compromising and accepting the thing in which couple disagree with each other on certain viewpoint.

*Live with the conflict*- In this style, the person accepts that his/her partner used to dispute with. He/she became habitual to have quarrel with her. He/she knows it well that it’s the habit of the partner so the conflict is not going to bother him. He/she had a vivid clarity about the situation which may result in conflict.
**Negotiate a solution**- In this style, the couple used to find out the various ways to deal with the conflict. Some time partners try to resolve the conflict when the partner is angry. They used to give advice to each other on the ground, they could fight. They used to adjust and adapt the condition which they enforce on each other.

**Fight it out**- In this strategy, the pertness reached to any solution or agreement after having quarrel and expressions of their aggression. This is a cease fire like situations and avenues for further discussion and other mode of solutions are open. Sometime this type of strategy becomes necessary.

**Personality**

Eysenck proposes that the personality has two interlocking aspects. The first aspect is descriptive and it focuses on establishing the units to be used in summarizing the ways in which individual differ. The second is concerned with casual elements that say role played by environmental forces.

Eysenck has given a model on personality. The model includes three basic typological dimension:- extraversion versus introversion Neuroticism versus stability Psychoticism versus impulse control.

**Extraversion**

The people who are extravert are characterized by following characteristics. They are sociable, lively, active, assertive, carefree, easy going, dominant, surgent, sensation seeking. They are generally impulsive individual. They prefer to keep themselves dynamic, i.e., moving and doing things. They tend to be aggressive and lose his/her temper easily. They are
very opening minded and it’s difficult to resist their feelings in a tight control.

**Neuroticism**

They are being an anxious, worrying individual, moody and usually depressed person by their environment. They find it difficult to adapt and eventually adjust with the situation. This is all the result of their strong reaction which interfere with the adjustment. Due to which they use to react in an irrational way. They having a low self-esteem, irrational, quite moody, shy and emotional.

**Psychoticism**

The person which this characteristics want to live alone. He/ she may not having a caring nature. The person may create trouble to themselves or others which is not fitted anywhere. They are inhuman, insensitive, cruel and not empathetic in nature. He/she used to be very aggressive and hostile to near ones. They usually like unusual things.

**Rationale of the present work**

In the light of review of literature it is clear that personality variables do influence the marital satisfaction but no paradigmatic study has yet been conducted involving personality dimensions. A careful examination of the research literature shows that in spite of being a potential variation in the field of marital satisfaction, no systematic study has yet been conducted to identify and establish conflict resolution style as a significant predictor of marital satisfaction particulates under Indian context. So it was decided to examine the role of conflict resolution style as a predictor of marital satisfaction.
**Objectives**

The following objectives have included in this present research work:

4. To examine the role of personality dimensions viz. extraversion and neuroticism in predicting marital satisfaction.

5. To examine the role of conflict resolution style in predicting marital satisfaction.

6. To examine the role of certain demographic variables like family income and family type as moderating the relationship between personality dimensions and marital satisfaction.

**Statement of Problem**

The following problem have included in this present research work:

9. Whether the personality dimension, viz., neuroticism is a predictor of marital satisfaction or not?

10. Whether the personality dimension, viz., extraversion is a predictor of marital satisfaction or not?

11. Whether the conflict resolution strategies is a predictor of marital satisfaction or not?

12. Whether the variable, family income can moderate the relationship between neuroticism and marital satisfaction or not?

13. Whether the variable, family types (nuclear or joint family) can moderate the relationship between neuroticism and marital satisfaction or not?

14. Whether the variable, family type can moderate the relationship between neuroticism and marital satisfaction or not?
15. Whether the variable, family income can moderate the relationship between extraversion and marital satisfaction or not?

16. Whether the variable, family type can moderate the relationship between extraversion and marital satisfaction or not?

**Research hypotheses**

On the basis of the reviewed research studies following research hypotheses were included in the present study:

8. The personality dimension, viz., neuroticism would emerge as significant predictors of marital satisfaction.

9. The personality dimension, viz., extraversion would emerge as a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

10. The conflict resolution strategies would emerge as a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

11. The variables, socio-economic status would moderate the relationship between neuroticism and marital satisfaction.

12. The variables, family type would moderate the relationship between neuroticism and marital satisfaction.

13. The variables, socio-economic status would moderate the relationship between extraversion and marital satisfaction.

14. The variables family type would moderate the relationship between extraversion and marital satisfaction.
Participants
Following the stratified random sampling technique 600 participants within the age range of 40 to 46 years were drawn from Durg and Raipur city to serve as participants in the present research work. Stratification was done on the basis of socio-economic status and family type.

Design
In present research work correlational research design was employed. Here, marital satisfaction is the outcome variable, personality dimensions (neuroticism & extraversion) and conflict resolution styles are suspected predictor variable. Family type and family income are moderators on relationship between relationship between personality dimensions (neuroticism & extraversion) and marital satisfaction.

Measures

Criterion measures

Marital satisfaction:- Marital satisfaction scale (Bhagat & Hasan, 2013) since, under Indian cultural set up not a single test of marital satisfaction is available; a test of marital satisfaction was constructed and standardized. In all, the scale has 40 items. The following dimensions of marital satisfaction were included. 1. Interaction patterns. 2. Social support. 3. Violence. 4. Spousal mate guarding. 5. Spousal mate value. 6. Children. 7. Attribution towards spouse. 8. Physiological well-being of the couple. The Test-Retest Reliability of the scale has been found to be 0.822 and the concurrent validity coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.618.
Assessing predictors

Personality Dimensions: Hindi Version of E.P.Q. (Jitendra Mohan 1985) personality dimensions are measured by Hindi Version of E.P.Q. It is the Indian adaptation constructed by Jitendra Mohan (1985). It has 100 items in all of which 25 items are for tapping extraversion, 25 for neuroticism, 25 for psychoticism and 25 for measuring the tendency to tell a lie. In short it has four sub scales E, N, P and L. It is based on the original EPQ by Eysenck (1978). Its test-retest reliability for scale E is 0.93, for scale N is 0.96, for scale P is 0.85 and for scale L is 0.96. Split-half reliability for scale E is 0.69, for scale N is 0.86, for scale P it is 0.96, and for scale L it is 0.78. The full scale was administered on the subjects and scores of psychoticism and lie score were eliminated.

Conflict resolution strategies

Conflict resolution strategies scale (Bhagat & Hasan 2013) since, under Indian cultural set up not a single test of Conflict resolution strategies is available; a test of Conflict resolution strategies scale was constructed and standardized. In all, the scale has 21 items. The following dimensions of marital satisfaction were included. 1. Live with the conflict. 2. Avoid the conflict. 3. Fight it out. 4. Make a compromise. 5. Negotiate a solution. The split half reliability of the scale has been found to be 0.754 and the concurrent validity co-efficient of the scale was found to be 0.782.
Major findings

1. Predicting effect of personality dimensions on marital satisfaction

Hierarchal regression models suggested that in the first model control factors (sociodemographic factors) explained 25.00% of total variance ($r^2=.250; f (3, 596) = 110.12; p<0.01$).

In model-2, neuroticism explained an additional 10.2% ($\Delta f (1,595) =13.580, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had lower levels of neuroticism ($-.352, p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In full model-3, extraversion explained an additional 12.4% ($\Delta f (1,594) =20.253, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had high degree of extraversion (.410, $p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

2. Predicting effect of conflict resolutions strategies on marital satisfaction

Hierarchal regression models demonstrated that in the first model control factors (socio-demographic factors) explained 25.00% of total variance ($r^2=.250; f (3, 596) = 110.12; p<0.01$).

In model-2, live with the conflict (coping strategy) explained an additional 5.3% ($\Delta f (1,595) =26.128, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had lower levels of live with the conflict ($-.109, p<0.05$) likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-3, avoid the conflict (coping strategy) explained an additional 1.2% ($\Delta f (1,594) = 5.861, p<0.05$) of the variance. Those who had higher degree of avoid the conflict (.105, $p>0.05$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.
In model-4, fight it out explained an additional 10.5% ($\Delta f (1, 593) = 42.280, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had higher degree of fight it out (-.321, $p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-5 make a compromise explained an additional 15.2% ($\Delta f (1, 592) = 65.210, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had higher degree of make a compromise (.453, $p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-6 negotiate a solution explained an additional 1.5% ($\Delta f (1, 591) = 5.961, p<0.05$) of the variance. Those who had higher degree of negotiate a solution (.119, $p<0.05$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

3. **Moderating effect of family income on link between neuroticism and marital satisfaction**

In the first model control factors (socio-demographic factors) explaining 17.30% of total variance ($r^2=.173; f (1, 596) = 98.30; p<0.01$).

In model-2, neuroticism explained an additional 10.2% ($\Delta f (1, 595) = 13.580, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had lower levels of neuroticism (-.352, $p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-3 family income explained an additional 5.3% ($\Delta f (1, 594) = 7.238, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had higher family income (.351, $p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-4, neuroticism x family income explained an additional .09% ($\Delta f (1, 593) = 3.210, p>0.05$) of the variance. The interaction of neuroticism and family income were positively associated (.075, $p>0.05$) with marital satisfaction.

4. **Moderating effect of family income on link between extraversion and marital satisfaction**
In the first model control factors (socio-demographic factors) explaining 17.30% of total variance ($r^2 = .173; f (1, 596) = 98.30; p<0.01$).

In full model-2, extraversion explained an additional 12.4% ($\Delta f (1, 595) = 20.253, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had high degree of extraversion ($0.410, p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-3 family income explained an additional 5.3% ($\Delta f (1, 594) = 7.238, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had higher family income ($0.351, p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-4, extraversion x family income explained an additional 5.9% ($\Delta f (1, 593) = 7.721, p>0.01$) of the variance. The interaction of extraversion and family income were positively associated ($0.253, p<0.01$) with marital satisfaction.

5. Moderating effect of family type on link between neuroticism and marital satisfaction-

In the first model control factors (socio-demographic factors) explaining 17.30% of total variance ($r^2 = .173; f (1, 596) = 98.30; p<0.01$).

In model-2, neuroticism explained an additional 10.2% ($\Delta f (1, 595) = 13.580, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had lower levels of neuroticism ($-0.352, p<0.01$) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

In model-3 family type (1= nuclear, 2= joint) explained an additional 3.1% ($\Delta f (1, 594) = 8.321, p<0.01$) of the variance. Having nuclear family ($0.152, p<0.01$) was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.
In model-4, neuroticism x family type explained an additional 2.9% ($\Delta f (1,593) = 6.210$, p<0.05) of the variance. The interaction of neuroticism and family type were positively associated (.215, p<0.05) with marital satisfaction.

6. Moderating effect of family type on link between extraversion and marital satisfaction-

In the first model control factors (socio-demographic factors) explaining 17.30% of total variance ($r^2=.173; f (1, 596) = 98.30; p<0.01$).

In full model-2, extraversion explained an additional 12.4% ($\Delta f (1, 595) =20.253, p<0.01$) of the variance. Those who had high degree of extraversion (.410, p<0.01) were more likely to report marital satisfaction.

**Conclusion**

It is concluded that there is sufficient empirical and statistical evidence of the prediction effect of extraversion, neuroticism and conflict resolution strategies on marital satisfaction. Further moderation effect of family type and family income on marital satisfaction. Present research generates understanding of the role of extraversion, neuroticism, conflict resolution strategies, family type and family income on marital satisfaction.