



Brief Report

The Five-Factor Model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis

John M. Malouff*, Einar B. Thorsteinsson, Nicola S. Schutte, Navjot Bhullar, Sally E. Rooke

University of New England, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Available online 8 October 2009

Keywords:
Big five
Five-Factor Model
Personality
Marital satisfaction
Relationship satisfaction meta-analysis

ABSTRACT

A meta-analysis that included 19 samples with a total of 3848 participants showed that scores on four of the Five-Factor Model personality factors correlated significantly with level of relationship satisfaction by intimate heterosexual partners. The four personality characteristics were low neuroticism, high agreeableness, high conscientiousness, and high extraversion. The associations between an individual's personality characteristics and the relationship satisfaction of the individual's intimate partner did not vary significantly from men to women or from married to unmarried individuals. The results of the meta-analysis provide support for the utility of the Five-Factor Model of personality in understanding an important realm of life, intimate relationships.

© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Five dimensions, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness, are core aspects of personality (Digman, 1990; John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1999). The Five-Factor Model dimensions are related to a variety of important life outcomes (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006). For example, high conscientiousness predicts good work performance and good health while low agreeableness and high neuroticism are associated with poor health; high agreeableness is related to helping others; high extraversion predicts leadership; high neuroticism is associated with depression; and high openness is related to creativity. The lack-of-self-control cluster of high neuroticism, low agreeableness and low conscientiousness has been found to be associated with various types of psychopathology (Malouff, Thorsteinsson, & Schutte, 2005), including alcohol involvement (Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Rooke, & Schutte, 2007) and smoking (Malouff, Thorsteinsson, & Schutte, 2006).

An important life outcome is satisfaction with an intimate (romantic) relationship. It seems likely that personality characteristics would express themselves in ways that affect intimate relationships. Greater intimate relationship satisfaction is associated with less relationship instability and lower relationship dissolution (Gottman & Levenson, 1992), more parenting satisfaction (Rogers & White, 1998) and better mental health (Beach, Katz, Kim, & Brody, 2003). Relationship satisfaction has been operationalized

through self-report (e.g., Barelds, 2005) and through behavioral indicators such as dissolution of a marriage (e.g., Kurdek, 1993).

Researchers have used various research paradigms to examine the relationship between the Five-Factor Model dimensions and intimate relationship satisfaction. One focus has been on personality characteristics that make it more likely that individuals will be satisfied with their relationships. Heller, Watson, and Iles (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of Five-Factor Model characteristics and self-rated marital satisfaction and found that all five characteristics had statistically significant correlations, with Neuroticism having the strongest relationship, with higher neuroticism being associated with self-rated marital satisfaction at $-.26$. Greater agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and openness were associated with greater marital satisfaction at $.24$, $.22$, $.14$ and $.08$, respectively. It seems likely that these correlations may be inflated to some extent by common-source biases (see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The longitudinal approach to predicting marital satisfaction has also found low neuroticism to be an important predictor. In a review of longitudinal studies (Karney and Bradbury (1995) reported that neuroticism was a substantial predictor of marital quality and stability.

Another research focus has been on congruence between individuals' Five-Factor Model characteristics and their partners' Five-Factor Model characteristics. Although congruence between partners' individual Five-Factor characteristics generally does not predict relationship satisfaction well (see Shiota & Levenson, 2007), congruence between overall Five-Factor profiles does seem to correlate with satisfaction (Gonzaga, Campos, & Bradbury, 2007). Also, there is evidence that congruence between an individual's self-rated characteristics and his or her perception of the partner's characteristics predicts satisfaction (Zentner, 2005).

* Corresponding author. Address: School of Psychology, University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia. Fax: +61 2 6773 3820.
E-mail address: jmalouff@une.edu.au (J.M. Malouff).

A third approach, which comprises a substantial amount of research on the Five-Factor Model and relationship satisfaction, has focused on the association of the satisfaction of one partner in relation to the level of the Five-Factor characteristics of the other partner. The present meta-analysis focused on these studies. Comparing findings resulting from different approaches in this area creates a nomological net facilitating the understanding of the overall relationship between personality dimensions and relationship satisfaction.

The main purpose of the present meta-analysis was to obtain an estimate of the overall association between an individual's Five-Factor personality characteristics and the relationship satisfaction of his or her partner. We included studies that examined all or almost all Five-Factor characteristics so that we could compare effect sizes of the different characteristics in samples in which all participants completed similar measures of all or almost all the characteristics. Another purpose was to examine potential moderating factors of this relationship. With meta-analysis, we expected to answer research questions with much more power than any individual study. We also expected a total sample far more diverse than any one study sample.

2. Method

2.1. Literature search, inclusion criteria and coding

We searched the PsycINFO database from its beginning through to November, 2008, for studies that assessed the relationship between an individual's Five-Factor personality characteristics and his or her intimate partner's relationship satisfaction or the outcome of the relationship. We searched for the following key terms: "marriage" or "relationship" and "Big Five," "Big 5," or "Five-Factor." We checked relevant articles for citations to other potentially relevant articles. We excluded articles that provided results for fewer than four of the five factors. We also excluded articles that did not provide essential data. In these cases, we attempted to obtain the needed information from the first author but did not always succeed, e.g., Zentner (2005).

We found a total of 10 studies that provided relevant data. All the studies focused on heterosexual relationships. One study did not report an effect size for openness (Barelds, 2005, Study 2). The studies reported separately the correlation between (a) the man's relationship satisfaction and the Five-Factor characteristics of his female partner and (b) the woman's satisfaction and the Five-Factor characteristics of her male partner. Thus each study was given two rows in the data set for each Five-Factor characteristic, except that the Barelds's Study 2 only had one row for each characteristic as it aggregated all participants, male and female, giving the correlation between participants' own marital satisfaction and their partner's Five-Factor characteristics. This coding method means that there is a dependency between effect sizes from the same study as there is more than one row per study.

However, each study, bar one, had two sets of effect sizes. Thus, there is not an issue of one study being weighted higher than another in the overall data set. Further, to test the hypotheses this coding method was the most appropriate.

To facilitate a search for moderators, we coded each study for all variables that were commonly accessible in the study articles and that might be related to effect size: (a) relationship status (dating, mix of living together and married, and married), (b) Five-Factor measure (NEO or other), (c) type of research design (longitudinal or cross-sectional), (d) study location (USA or not USA), and (e) type of research analysis (correlation or comparison of means) and (f) whether there was a risk of response bias because the couples were not separated physically by researchers when they completed a relationship satisfaction scale. In a few instances, we contacted study authors to obtain information for coding because the information was not clearly presented in the report of the study. One of the present authors coded the studies and then another author checked the coding. In some instances the coding was not in agreement. When this occurred, the two coders reached a mutual agreement on the coding.

2.2. Statistical analyzes

We used Pearson's r as the effect size with computations based on guidelines by Lipsey and Wilson (2001). We converted group differences, reported in two studies, to r . We applied inverse variance weighting to effect sizes ($w = 1/SE$). Fisher's transformation of r (z_r) was used in the analyzes, with the r and CI values back-transformed from the z_r values. We conducted homogeneity analyzes using the Q statistic. There were no effect size univariate or multivariate outliers (criterion $z = 3.29$, $p = .001$).

3. Results

Table 1 reports the overall weighted correlations for each of the Five-Factor Model factors. Across 19 samples with a total of 3848 individuals, the following four Five-Factor dimensions were significantly related to relationship satisfaction by an individual's intimate partner: Lower neuroticism, higher agreeableness, higher conscientiousness, and higher extraversion. The effect sizes and moderator levels for each study can be seen in supplementary tables available at this journal's web site.

One possible explanation for the significant effect sizes involves assortive mating, that is, a tendency for individuals to find a partner who is similar. For instance, if neurotic individuals tended to mate with other neurotic persons, the association between a partner's neuroticism and a person's relationship satisfaction might be due to the person being neurotic himself or herself. To test this possibility, we collected data on personality characteristic similarity from the studies included in the meta-analysis. Six of the studies provided relevant data, from a total of eight samples (Barelds, 2005, only four personality characteristics; Botwin, Buss, & Todd,

Table 1
Overall effect sizes, homogeneity analysis, random effect size model.

Big five factor	N_r	r	CI 95%		p	Fail safe N^a	Homogeneity analysis		
			Lower	Upper			Q	df	p
Openness	18	.03	-.03	.09	.37	0	49.86	17	<.01
Conscientiousness	19	.12	.09	.16	<.01	14	19.10	18	.39
Extraversion	19	.06	.01	.10	.02	0	35.31	18	<.01
Agreeableness	19	.15	.11	.20	<.01	22	37.47	18	<.01
Neuroticism	19	-.22	-.26	-.19	<.01	41	27.25	18	.07

Note. N_r = number of effect sizes (analyzes).

^a Reports the number of analyzes with $r = .00$ needed to reduce the mean r to the r criterion value ($\pm .07$).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/951960>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/951960>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)