



**EXAMINING THE EFFECT OF ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP ON THE LOCUS OF
CONTROL AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS AMONG INDIAN
ADULTS**

¹Muskan Sukheja, Master's in Arts, Clinical Psychology, Amity Institute of Psychology and
Allied Sciences, Noida, India
Muskansukheja2001@gmail.com

²Dr. Pankaj Singh, Assistant Professor-III, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences,
Noida, India
Psingh32@amity.edu

ABSTRACT

Romantic connections, which foster feelings of closeness, mutual attraction, and commitment, are fundamental to the human experience. The study focused on the impact of romantic relationships on locus of control and communication skills. The results found that married individuals feel more in control of their lives compared to singles, especially in chance and influential people dimensions. Committed individuals also displayed a stronger attachment style, indicating greater comfort and security in relationships. Furthermore, single individuals showed higher levels of fear of rejection or abandonment in relationships, as evidenced by their

scores in the relationship styles dimension. Secure attachment types were associated with higher levels of internal locus of control and communication competence. These findings suggests that relationship styles may reflect both locus of control and communication competence. With a sample size of 300 individuals (150 single, 150 committed), the study used a quantitative methodology. The information was gathered using the Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ), the Communication Competence Scale, and the Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale.

Keywords: *Romantic Relationships, Locus of Control, Interpersonal skills, Communication skills.*

INTRODUCTION

Romantic relationships are intricate and profoundly affect people's psychological growth and social interactions. Awareness, one the dynamics of romantic engagement requires an awareness of the relationship between important ideas like locus of control and interpersonal abilities and intimate partnerships. The term "locus of control," was first used in 1954 by psychologist Rotter and defined as “to how much people feel they have control over the direction of their life. ”Understanding people's sense of control over their life and how they relate to their partners is essential to understanding how people navigate the complexities of romantic relationships.

Successful relationships depend on effective communication. It fosters empathy, understanding, and respect for one another by enabling people to communicate their ideas, feelings, and desires to one another. Effective communication is essential for laying the groundwork for trust and respect between people as well as for mediating conflicts. While, it

is true that romantic relationships shape the way individuals communicate and locus of control, also seems plausible that the initiation and maintenance of romantic relationships are influenced by pre-existing tendencies in these domains. Consequently, it's critical to acknowledge the potential reciprocal impact romantic relationships can have on psychological ideas.

Research by (Munro and Adams, 2010) aimed to investigate the relationship between locus of control and attitudes towards love, found that individuals with an internal locus of control tend to have lower levels of idealism towards love compared to those with an external locus of control. Another study, (Lad and Kakulte, 2022) investigated the association between locus of control, dyadic coping, and relationship satisfaction among married couples in India, found that individuals with a higher internal locus of control reported better dyadic coping and higher relationship satisfaction.

Romantic connections can enhance people's sense of power and communication abilities, which can lead to personal development. Individuals may feel more confident in their ability to make positive changes in their lives and in their internal locus of control if they are in a supportive and caring relationship, for example. As partners navigate the pleasures and challenges of sharing their daily lives, intimate partnerships need and encourage the development of sophisticated communication skills. On the other hand, romantic relationships can have some detrimental impacts on locus of control and communication. Relationships that are tense, misinterpreted, or unbalanced might reinforce an external locus of control or limit the development of good communication skills.

Personality traits and attachment styles are examples of individual traits that exacerbate the context of these processes. Personality traits such as extraversion, openness to new events,

and attachment styles are indicative of how individuals approach romantic undertakings and how suitable they are with potential partners. Patterns of emotional engagement and connection from childhood that persist into adult relationships are known as attachment styles. Individuals can select from one of three primary attachment types, according to attachment theory: avoidant, anxious, or secure. Securely attached individuals might depend upon and trust their connections and feel comfortable in close quarters. While, avoidantly attached people may find it difficult to be intimate and may value their autonomy and independence, anxiously linked people may seem needy or clingy and concern about being overlooked or abandoned. The type of attachment a person chooses can have an impact on communication styles, partner preferences, and relationship dynamics. This can provide light on how an individual's early attachment experiences shape their romantic relationships.

The longevity of romantic relationships and overall well-being are significantly influenced by relationship pleasure. It comprises an evaluation of the relationship's subjective quality based on factors including compatibility, emotional chemistry, and shared values. More than just basic contentment, relationship fulfilment involves an additional level of joy, meaning, and purpose that arises from the union. Research has demonstrated that effective communication, mutual respect, and emotional intimacy are major factors in a partner's well-being. When partners share comparable experiences, ambitions, and personalities, they also feel happy and fulfilled. Examining the levels of happiness and fulfilment in romantic relationships can help one understand the principles that support long-lasting and high-quality partnerships.

People's lives are profoundly changed by romantic relationships, which are intricate webs of feelings, emotions, as well as interpersonal dynamics. These dynamics are shaped by

a variety of factors, including relationship quality, attachment styles, interaction, resolution of disputes, personal growth, and cultural environment. Comprehending the psychological aspects of romantic partnerships, encompassing the interaction between communication abilities, attachment styles, and locus of control, is imperative in fostering reciprocal understanding, efficient communication, and proportionate personal autonomy inside relationships. Developments in our understanding of the intricate relationships between these psychological ideas can direct therapies that help individuals and couples build wholesome relationships characterised by clear communication, understanding, and a healthy sense of control.

METHOD

Aim

The study aimed to understand how being in a romantic relationship impacts one's locus of control and interpersonal abilities, especially communication.

Research Objectives

- To investigate the impact of being in a romantic relationship on locus of control and interpersonal abilities.
- To understand the relationship between relationship patterns, attachment types, locus of control, and communication competence.
- To compare the feelings of control over life events between married and single individuals.
- To explore the differences in attachment styles between committed and single individuals.

Hypothesis

- There will be no significant difference in the internal and external locus of control between single and committed participants.
- There will be no significant difference in secure, dismissive, preoccupied and fearful attachment between single and committed participants.
- The value of the attachment style will not be predicted by the value of communication competence and locus of control.

Variables

Independent Variables: Romantic Relationship

Dependent Variables: Interpersonal Skills (Communication) and Locus of Control

Sample

The study used a quantitative approach to research containing a questionnaire to gather data about an intake of 300 participants who were distributed equally between single and committed people.

Tools

The following tools were used to fulfil the objective of the study; Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ) by Griffin and Bartholomew, Communication Competence Scale by Wiemann, Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale by Levenson were used in this study.

Statistical Techniques

The research study, involving 300 individuals split equally between single and committed relationships, used regression analysis and t-tests to analyse how romantic partnerships influence locus of control and interpersonal communication skills.

RESULTS

Table 1

T test between committed (1) and single (2) across study variables.

	Mean	SD	T	Sig. (2 tailed)	Result
Communication competence					
Committed	137.55	17.95	1.63	.10	NS
Single	140.90	17.53			
Internal locus of control					
Committed	33.89	5.55	1.47	.14	NS
Single	32.98	5.14			
Powerful others_LC					
Committed	26.05	7.17	2.93	.00	S
Single	23.78	6.18			
Chance_LC					
Committed	29.07	6.90	3.57	.01	S
Single	26.33	6.36			
Secure_R					
Committed	35.23	6.76	2.53	.01	S
Single	37.21	6.74			
Dismissive_R					
Committed	40.69	4.89	.63	.52	NS
Single	40.34	4.68			
Preoccupied_R					
Committed	37.82	6.44	2.40	.01	S
Single	39.59	6.30			
Fearful_R					
Committed	36.59	4.98	1.21	.22	NS
Single	37.26	4.54			

NS-Not significant, S-Significant

Table 1 represents the t statistics between committed (1) and singles (2) on

Communication competence, locus of control (Internal locus of control, Powerful others, Chance), Relationships (Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, Fearful). There is a significant difference in the Powerful others and Chance dimension of locus of control between the two sample groups. The mean of committed was higher in both psychological aspects compared to singles. There is a significant difference in the secure and preoccupied dimension of relationship between the two sample groups. The mean of singles was higher in both psychological aspects compared to committed.

Linear Regression Analysis

Table 2

Linear regression table with relationship as predictor of communication competence

Predictor	Criterion: communication competence								
	B	S. E.	β	t	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	α	F
Secure_R	-.18	.30	-.06	.59	.12	.01	.00	153.54	1.13
Dismissive_R	-.20	.50	-.05	.39					
Preoccupied_R	-.27	.35	-.09	.76					
Fearful_R	.29	.47	.07	.61					

**significant at 0.01 level (p<0.01) *significant at 0.05 level (p<0.05)

Table 2 represents the linear regression with relationship as predictor of communication competence. The model did not present a significant fit and there was no variance explained by relationship (Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, Fearful) on dependent variable/criterion of the participants.

Table 3

Linear regression table with relationship as predictor of internal locus of control

Predictor	Criterion: internal locus of control								
	B	S. E.	β	t	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	α	F
Secure_R	.03	.09	.04	.35	.13	.01	.00	57.77	1.32
Dismissive_R	-.33	.15	-.30	2.20					
Preoccupied_R	-.10	.10	-.12	1.01					
Fearful_R	-.20	.14	-.18	1.43					

**significant at 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$) *significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$)

Table 3 represents the linear regression with relationship as predictor of internal locus of control. The model did not present a significant fit and there was no variance explained by relationship (Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, Fearful) on dependent variable/criterion of the participants.

Table 4

Linear regression table with relationship as predictor of powerful others

Predictor	Criterion: powerful others								
	B	S. E.	β	t	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	α	F
Secure_R	-.05	.11	-.05	-.50	.12	.01	.00	37.47	1.24
Dismissive_R	-.17	.19	-.12	-.87					
Preoccupied_R	.17	.13	.16	1.30					
Fearful_R	-.28	.18	-.19	-1.55					

**significant at 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$) *significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$)

Table 4 represents the linear regression with relationship as predictor of powerful others. The model did not present a significant fit and there was no variance explained by relationship (Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, Fearful) on dependent variable/criterion of the participants.

Table 5*Linear regression table with relationship as predictor of chance*

Predictor	Criterion: chance								
	B	S. E.	β	t	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	α	F
Secure_R	-.07	.11	-.07	.66	.11	.01	.00	48.98	1.04
Dismissive_R	-.27	.19	-.19	1.40					
Preoccupied_R	.11	.13	.10	.85					
Fearful_R	-.32	.18	-.22	1.77					

**significant at 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$) *significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$)

Table 5 represents the linear regression with relationship as predictor of chance. The model did not present a significant fit and there was no variance explained by relationship (Secure, Dismissive, Preoccupied, Fearful) on dependent variable/criterion of the participants.

DISCUSSION

The study aimed to investigate differences in communication styles, locus of control, and relationship patterns between individuals in committed relationships and those who were single. Employing a comparative approach using T-tests, the research revealed significant disparities across several dimensions.

To measure these variables, the study utilized the Communicative Competence Scale (CCS), Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ), and Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale. The sample comprised 300 participants, evenly divided between single and committed individuals. Results indicated significant differences between the two groups, particularly in the Chance and Powerful Others dimensions of locus of control.

Compared to single individuals, those in committed relationships exhibited a stronger sense of control over their lives, particularly in the realms of chance and powerful others within

their locus of control. This finding contradicts Hypothesis 1, which stated that there would be no significant difference in internal and external locus of control between single and committed participants.

Furthermore, analysis revealed pronounced disparities in relationship patterns, with committed individuals demonstrating a higher prevalence of secure attachment styles, while single individuals exhibited greater apprehension regarding rejection or abandonment. This finding contradicts Hypothesis 2, which stated that there would be no significant difference in secure, dismissive, preoccupied, and fearful attachment between single and committed participants.

However, regression analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between relationship styles and communication competence or locus of control, supporting Hypothesis 3, which stated that the value of the attachment style will not be predicted by the value of communication competence and locus of control.

These findings highlight the importance of considering the impact of committed relationships on individuals' sense of control and attachment styles and suggest that relationship status may be related to differences in locus of control and attachment style.

The study's implications are supported by previous research, including Fitzpatrick (2011) emphasizing the significance of interpersonal skills for relationship stability and satisfaction, and Egeci and Gencoz (2006) linking relationship satisfaction to a secure attachment style and strong self-confidence in problem-solving. Additionally, Sabatelli (2006) highlighted a positive correlation between internality and marital satisfaction, while Harasymchuk and Morry (2005) found socioemotional intimacy to significantly impact relationship satisfaction. These studies collectively underscore the importance of

understanding and fostering positive relationship dynamics, locus of control, and communication skills for promoting relationship happiness.

However, the limitations of this study, such as the use of self-report measures and the relatively small sample size, suggest that future research should replicate these findings using larger and more diverse samples.

CONCLUSION

The study investigated how communication styles, locus of control, and relationship patterns differ between individuals in committed relationships and those who are single. Through T-tests and regression analysis, significant differences emerged, highlighting that committed individuals feel more in control of their lives and exhibit more stable attachment patterns, while single individuals often fear rejection. These findings emphasize the importance of considering these factors in therapy interventions aimed at enhancing relationship satisfaction and promoting long-term well-being. They underscore the positive impact of committed relationships on individuals' sense of control and attachment styles. Building upon previous research, the study contributes to our understanding of the complex dynamics within romantic partnerships and informs future interventions to foster healthier relationship dynamics and greater happiness.

REFERENCES

- Burns, D. (1989). Relationship Satisfaction Scale (RSAT). *Feeling Good Together: The Secret to Making Troubled Relationships Work*, pp. 4. Retrieved from: https://tantorsiteassets.s3.amazonaws.com/bonuscontent/0820_FeelingGood/0820_FeelingGood_BonusPDF.pdf
- Clawson, J., & Yemen, G. (2008). 'The Locus of Control.' SSRN Electronic Journal. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.911111>
- Dimitrovsky, L., Schapira-Beck, E., & Itskowitz, R. (1994). Locus of Control of Israeli
- Doherty W. J. (1981) Locus of control differences and marital dissatisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 369–377.
- Doherty W. J. (1983) Locus of control and marital interaction. In Lefcourt H. M. (Ed.), *Research with the locus of control construct. Vol. 2. Methods and applications*. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 245–277.
- Doherty W. J., Ryder R. G. (1979) Locus of control, interpersonal trust, and assertive behavior among newlyweds. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 2212– 2220.
- Falconier, M. K., & Epstein, N. B. (2010). 'Relationship Satisfaction in Argentinean Couples under Economic Strain: Gender Differences in a Dyadic Stress Model.' *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27(6), 781-799. Retrieved from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/026540751037>
- Lefcourt H. M. (1976) *Locus of control*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lefcourt H. M., Martin R. A., Fick C. M., Saleh W. E. (1985) Locus of control for affiliation and behavior in social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 755–759.

Nahar, L., & Mohajan, L. (2017). 'Effect of Family Type and Gender on Locus of Control and Marital Adjustment of Urban People.' *Journal of Life Earth Sciences*, Vol. 14. 99104.

Personal Relationships, 23(1), 84-97. Retrieved from:

Psychology, 38(3), 462-476. Retrieved from:

Rotter J. B. (1966) Generalized expectancies for internal versus external locus of control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, No. 1 (Whole No. 609).

Sabatelli R. M., Dreyer A., Buck R. (1983) Cognitive style and relationship quality in married dyads. *Journal of Personality*, 51, 192–201.

Shubina, I. (2017). 'Locus of Control, Feeling of Happiness and Self-Esteem:

Vajda, D., & Sz Makó, H. (2014). 'The Importance of Relationship Satisfaction and The Questionnaire Techniques of Its Measurement.' *Psychiatria Hungarica: A Magyar Pszichiatriai Tarsasag tudomanyos folyoirata*, 29(3), 328–342. Retrieved from:

Vedes, A., Hilpert, P., Nussbeck, F. W., Randall, A. K., Bodenmann, G., & Lind, W. R. (2016). 'Love Styles, Coping, and Relationship Satisfaction: A Dyadic Approach.'

Women during the Transition to Marriage.' *The Journal of psychology*, 128(5), 537-545. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1994.9914911>

Wunderer, E., & Schneewind, K. A. (2008). The Relationship between Marital Standards, Dyadic Coping and Marital Satisfaction.