

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

Divjyot Kaur Saini^{1*}

ABSTRACT

Dating applications use in India is in its peak but still there has been little taboo associated with the use of such application. In order to assess the different personality traits and the loving attitudes of people using these applications, this exploratory research has been conducted. The objective of the present study is to assess the various dimensions of Personality traits and Loving styles of people using Dating Applications, who falls in the age range of (18 – 24) & (25-44) years were taken into consideration for the present study. Random sampling procedure was used to pick 60 participants , 30 males and 30 females within the target population and agreed to participate in the study .People were assessed on two different scales i.e. Big five inventory and loving attitude scale , further t-test , correlation analysis was used to calculate the correlation between the variables of the two scales and to gauge the significant difference between the mean scores of both the males and females and the p-value with the help of t-test. Results have been discussed along with the major limitations of the study.

Keywords: *Dating applications, Loving style & Personality trait.*

Living in a country where casual dates are still a big taboo and are often frowned upon. In a developing country like India, the process of finding love is in a revolutionary phase. In a raft by apps such as Tinder, Grinder, happen and Truly Madly, the old tradition of marriages arranged by families is giving way to a new, westernised style of dating, wherein growing numbers of people are choosing to date for fun, without the end goal of marriage especially living in the moment and not thinking in terms of future prospect

A dating application is a type of application which can be downloaded by any person above the age of 18. Here Individuals can add the profile that provides them with the opportunity to connect with other people to arrange a date and the possibility of being in a relationship with this person. Dating Applications are “websites that primarily and majorly focus on offering

¹ (Defence Institute of Psychological Research Ministry of Defence, Lucknow Road, Timarpur, Delhi-54, India)
[*Responding Author](#)

Received: June 10, 2018; Revision Received: July 3, 2018; Accepted: July 20, 2018

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

the users with the opportunities to form a new romantic relationship” (Finkel et al., 2012). Such applications help people to assess their abilities to produce likeminded romantic outcomes based on the likes and the extent to which the other person positively evaluates a specific romantic partner

Operation of dating applications

The dating applications in India have always welcomed several Indian entrepreneurs to set up applications that would help people to find people up for casual dating. There have been many dating applications that have come up in the last few years, attracting a good amount of money and an attractive user base for these dating applications

With the increase of an individualistic culture, there are hardly any profiles on these matrimonial sites such as mShaadi.com or Jeevansathi.com which are handled by parents or aunts as youngsters are getting concerned about connecting with the like-minded person. The major aim of dating apps such as Truly Madly, Tinder, Happn, etc is to help to connect two people through common interests, which may or may not result in marriage.

Online dating has drastically altered the process of finding romance. Users can connect across vast geographic regions, and employ a series of photos, texts, or video, for meeting potential partners.

Upon signing up, these dating applications ask the users about their gender, location and sexual orientation for locating nearby singles. They are also given the option to provide a 240 character bio, a mini description of oneself. The dating application then connects with the concerned person's Facebook information in order to check the reliability of the accounts of the person which then creates a digital profile that allows the users to anonymously swipe right for an interesting profile and left if for rejection

In the year 1992, less than 1% of the population met their partner through printed personal advertisements or any other sources (Laumann, 1994). Even Before online dating, using newspapers or magazines to find romance was largely stigmatized (Finke, 2012). Shortly after the appearance of online dating, negative views associated with newspaper personals still lingered (Finkel et al., 2012). Many online daters were stereotyped as being desperate or socially inept (Whitty & Carr, 2006).

In 1997 saw a large increase in the number of online daters, not coincidentally, as did Web 2.0 technologies, which allowed for more user-generated content and sharing capacities (Hogan et al., 2011).

Changing scenarios in India

Exposure to westernization in a country like India has seen the gradual breakdown of the traditional arranged marriages as they have become less formal; people from this generation

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

are choosing to live or rent spaces so that they can live with their spouses after the wedding. The Indian government has drawn an invisible line between those who want to date and those who want to marry and these two groups are unrelated and independent. These dating applications that have a reputation for being a mere hook-up platform, however, there have been cases in the past where people have found serious relationships/partners on such applications.

Finding love is very difficult in the era where it's just a matter of chase and when this chase ends everything ends. Either wait for it to happen, or an individual has to resign oneself to the idea that his/her parents will choose his/her marriage partner. There's very little individual agency.

Indian Trends in dating applications

All dating apps are often considered a win for non-serious relationships among casual hooking up culture, where a user can swipe right when she or he is interested in a profile, or swipe left to indicate rejection

In India, dating applications typically help to give singles an opportunity for casual relationships, but also sometimes for a potential spouse. However, unlike typical matrimonial platforms, these dating apps ensure a more open approach to India's prevalent arranged marriage culture.

For instance, researchers studying college students' attitudes toward online dating in the early 2000s found that many young adults had more negative than positive feelings about online dating (Donn & Sherman, 2002). Specifically, students were concerned that people on the Internet would lie, it would take longer to get to know someone, and it was generally unsafe (Donn & Sherman, 2002).

Personality and loving attitudes: Variables for the study

According to Allport (1961) "Personality is a dynamic organization within the individual which consists of those psychophysical systems that determine the characteristics of behaviour"

Both definitions given by Allport & Weinberg, emphasize the uniqueness of the individual and further the consequently to adopt an idiographic view.

The idiographic view believes that each individual has a unique psychological structure that consists of some traits and is possessed by only one person. At times it's difficult to compare one person with others so case studies are used for information gathering whereas homothetic view emphasizes comparability among individuals. This viewpoint sees people having traits that have some psychological meaning for everyone.

One such theory on which majorly this study is based upon is the BIG FIVE Factor model The Big Five personality traits, also called the five-factor model (FFM), is a model based on common descriptors of personality. This theory underlies five broad dimensions that are used

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

to describe the human personality and psyche. These five factors are called as openness to experience conscientiousness extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism often called under the acronyms *OCEAN*

1. Openness to experience: Those who score high on this factor are curious, imaginative, open to novel ideas, and interested in cultural pursuits. In contrast, those who score low are rigid.
2. Conscientiousness: Those who score high on this factor are responsible, prudent. Achievement-oriented, dependable, self-controlled and hardworking. On the opposite are people who are impulsive.
3. Extraversion: It characterizes people who are socially active, assertive, outgoing, and talkative and fun loving. On its opposite are people who are shy.
4. Agreeableness: This factor characterizes people who are, co-operative, helpful, friendly, nurturing and caring. On the opposite are people who are self-centered and hostile
5. Neuroticism: Those People who score high on this factor are worried, emotionally unstable, fearful, anxious, irritable, distressed and hypertensive. On the opposite side are the people who are well adjusted to the surroundings

This five-factor model represents an important theoretical development in the field of personality. It is really useful and helpful to understand the personality of people in different cultures. The personality of two individual can never be the same. There have been many types of research over the past years that show the difference in personality traits in people from different background.

Also, Personality variables (or traits) contribute to the love styles and intimacy (White, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2004), and the effect is prospective across time. Personality traits are also associated with the relationship satisfaction and might act as more salient predictors of people using Dating applications.

For instances, researcher has demonstrated that Neuroticism was negatively associated and was predictive of satisfaction and intimacy, and Extraversion and Agreeableness were positively associated with relationship satisfaction and intimacy, especially for males (Karney & Bradbury, 1997)

Love is one of the most initial emotions that can be found in mankind and has given meaning and pleasure (as well as pain) for over the centuries. Psychologists have attempted to explain why people fall in “love” and out of “love”. One major psychological theory that can explain differences in the course of romantic relationships is attachment theory.

Attachment theory was given by John Bowlby (1969). It uses a biological approach to the idea of falling in love and mating. According to him “During infancy, human beings establish

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

a behavioral system that regulates interactions between offspring and parents and is activated in times of stress or anxiety”

The attachment system is adaptive and it even helps to ensure the survival of offspring. Bowlby’s colleague Mary Ainsworth identified three attachment orientations

Secure orientation

A secure orientation is one in which the caregiver is pretty responsive to the child’s needs and when the child wants attention. In these cases, after the attachment system has been activated, it soon becomes deactivated by the parents’ attention. Children with secure orientations see their parents as both a safe haven in times of need from which the need to explore the environment comes

Anxious Attachment

In contrast, an anxious attachment is known by the caregiver responding inconsistently to a child’s need for affection and attention as the result of which so the individual’s attachment system is termed as being hyper-activated. Someone with an anxious attachment will lie between the need for attention, affection, and responses such as pushing the caregiver away.

Avoidant Attachment

An avoidant attachment is often known by a caregiver neglecting or ignoring the child’s need for attention and affection which leads to the de-activation of the attachment system. People with such attachment style may remain autonomic and independent from their caregivers to avoid the negative feelings that would lead to negative emotions.

Yet closely related to attachment orientation in adult romantic relationships are called the “love styles.”

Hendrick (1986) gave six “love-styles,” which describe individuals’ general beliefs and thought processes concerning love.

1. Eros (passionate love)
2. Ludus (game-playing love)
3. Storge (friendship love)
4. Pragma (practical love)
5. Mania (possessive, dependent love)
6. Agape (altruistic love).

In past research, Mania has been positively associated with anxious-attachment while Ludus has been associated with avoidant attachment (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

A Research by Simpson & Jeffry (1992) revealed in a study that people who have more secure attachment / loving styles behaved differently and bitterly in an anxiety-provoking situation than those with more avoidant styles in terms of seeking sensation behaviour.

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

Personality determines how a subject is to interpret things that happen around them (Narud & Dahl, 2002); investigations concerning personality traits, therefore, might enrich the cognitive-behavioral theory that contributes to the interpersonal perspectives of a romantic relationship (Collins & Furman, 2009).

The Purpose of the present study is to understand the Personality traits love attitudes and of people using Dating applications.

Objective:

- To assess the various dimensions of Personality and Loving styles of people using Dating Applications.

Sub-objective:

1. Understanding the different personality domains of people on dating application by using Big Five personality inventory.
2. Understanding the different Loving styles of people on dating application by using loving attitude scale.

METHOD

Participants

The target population was anyone who falls in the age range of (18 – 24) and (25-44) years using Dating applications were taken into consideration for the study. The random sampling procedure was used to pick 60 participants, 30 males, and 30 females within the target population and agreed to participate in the study (N=60).

Measures

Two self-rated questionnaires regarding the personality & love attitudes of people using Dating applications were administered on each subject.

A. **Big Five personality inventory:** This inventory is a personality questionnaire which consists of 44-item inventory that measures an individual on the Big Five Factors (dimensions) of personality (Goldberg, 1993). Each of the factors is then further divided into personality factors such as

1. Extraversion vs. Introversion
2. Agreeableness vs. Antagonism
3. Conscientiousness vs. lack of direction
4. Neuroticism vs. emotional stability
5. Openness vs. closeness to experience

Participants respond to each item using a 5-point scale with complete scale reliability of 0.72

B. **Love attitude scale:** This is a scale which measures individual attitudes toward love. It is a 42-item questionnaire given by Clyde Hendricks & Susan Hendrick (1986). The questionnaire helps to identify attitudes toward one's current/recent/hypothetical partner with

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

attitudes about love in general. The scale is divided into 6 subscales (7 items each) that each represents a different love style:

1. Eros (Passionate Love)
2. Ludus (Game-Playing Love)
3. Storage (Friendship Love)
4. Pragma (Practical Love)
5. Mania (Possessive, Dependent Love)
6. Agape (Altruistic Love).

Participants respond to each item using a 5-point scale. The values ranged from 1.04 to 4.44. There is medium-high alpha Cronbach value for five dimensions, specifically, 0.79 for Eros 0.87 for Storge 0.82 for Pragma, 0.72 for Mania, and 0.83 for Agape However, Ludus showed the lowest alpha Cronbach value which was 0.39

Data Analysis

For data analysis of the variables used in the study, SPSS Modeller was used. It is used and helps to build predictive models and conduct other analytic statistical tasks. A t-test was used for both the scales, Big factor inventory and Love attitude scale to gauge the significant differences between the mean score are *statistically* different from both the genders for N=60. It is used as the analysis for the post-test-only two-group randomized experimental design.

Correlation analysis was also done. A correlation is simply defined as a relationship between two variables. The whole purpose of using correlation analysis in research is to figure out which variables are connected and to establish a degree of relationship between the two variables

RESULTS

The founded sample of the study was also subjected to demographic analysis, to explore how the characteristics of the sample may also have affected the trend that the data of group analysis reflects.

The age range of the participants, it shows that out of 60 subjects, the majority of the subjects are 18-24 years old. As the sample shows that 77% of the subjects are 18-24 years old year old, 23% of subjects are 25 to 44year old.

The distribution of popular dating applications being used by the participants, it shows that out of 60 subjects, the majority of the subjects use tinder (64%), 34% use truly madly while 2% used some dating application.

The current level of education of the participants, it shows that out of 60 subjects, the majority of the subjects are graduated (58%). As the sample shows that 38% of the subjects are masters students while 2% each are Ph.D. and school students.

Socioeconomic status of the participants, it shows that out of 60 subjects, the majority of the subjects are the upper middle (66%). As the sample shows that 25% of the subjects are Upper/lower middle while 2% belong to lower status.

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

Table 1.1 Mean Score of male and female in Big Five Personality dimension (N = 60)

Dimensions	Mean		P value	df	t
	Males	Females			
1 Extraversion	27.3	27.5	0.84	58	-1.019
2 Agreeableness	27.1	27.9	0.42	58	-0.81
3 Conscientiousness	27.8	26.7	0.17	58	1.38
4 Neuroticism	26.9	27.8	0.3	58	-1.03
5 Openness:	28.5	27.6	0.37	58	0.9

Table 1.2 Table showing mean score of male and females on love attitude scale (N=60)

Dimensions	Mean		P value	df	T
	Males	Females			
1 EROS (passionate love)	21.5	18.1	0.05	58	1.98
2 LUDUS (game-playing love)	15.9	11.5	0.04	58	2.02
3 STORGE (friendship love)	20.2	17.3	0.13	58	1.5
4 PRAGMA (practical love)	19.3	13.8	0	58	2.9
5 MANIA (possessive, dependent love)	17.8	15.7	0	58	1.02
6 AGAPE (altruistic love).	19.8	13.4	0	58	3.14

Table 1.3 Correlation analysis between 4 variables

Variables	Pragma	P -Value
Conscientiousness	.315*	0.05
Variable	Ludus	P -Value
Neuroticism	.266*	0.05

DISCUSSION

As the objective of the present research was to assess the various dimensions of Personality and Loving styles of people using Dating Applications. For the present research, two sub-objectives were prepared beforehand that is understanding the different personality domains of people on dating application by using Big Five personality inventory and understanding the different Loving styles of people on dating application by using loving attitude scale.

When the two groups of males and females, 30 each were compared together on two different scales using the t-test the result showed no significant difference between the two groups (table 1.1)

In Big Five personality inventory, it showed no significant differences in all the five domains along with the negligible difference in the mean scores. In the extraversion dimension, the

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

mean score of males and females were (27.3 and 27.5) while the p-value was 0.84 which is nonsignificant at both the levels i.e. 0.01 and 0.05 level. In a study by Yair Amichai (2002) found that people high on introversion and neuroticism locate their “real me” on the Internet, while extroverts and non -neurotic people locate their “real me” through social interaction. Also in a study, both the genders, females, and males tend to evaluate their energetic skills (Hargittai and Shafer 2006).

In Agreeableness dimension, there was no significant difference in the mean score of both the groups (27.1 and 27.9) as well as the $P=0.42$ was not significant at both the levels i.e. 0.01 and 0.05 level.

Gender differences in personality traits are often characterized in terms of which gender has higher scores on that trait, on average. For example, it has been found out that women tend to agree more than men (Feingold, 1994; Costa et al., 2001). This means that women, on average, are more nurturing, tender-minded, and altruistic more often and to a greater extent than men. However, such a finding cannot come to a pre-conclusion but the fact that men may also experience, tender-minded, nurturing and altruistic states. Some men may score high than women in this domain too.

In Conscientiousness domain there was no significant difference in the mean score of both the groups as well as the P-value = 0.17 which is not significant at both the levels. According to Beverly 2005, the relation between Conscientiousness and Body mass index there was a significant difference in both the gender and the magnitude of the negative association was stronger in females. Also, the participants who were lower in Conscientiousness tended to show larger gains in Body Mass Index with age. Feingold (1994) found out that women scored very slightly higher than men on this trait. While in the present study the results have been totally the opposite. There are no sex differences in cognitive ability to organize things but enduring sex differences in competitiveness, life goals, the relative emphasis on agency versus connection (Hakim, 2006)

In the Neuroticism domain there was no significant difference in the mean score of both the groups as well as the $P= 0.30$ which is not significant at both the levels i.e. 0.01 and 0.05 level. In a study by Michael Kuhlman, found out the relationships between personality and risk-taking in six areas: smoking, drinking, drugs, sex, driving, and gambling and the result showed that both men and women are equally into this domain called neuroticism. A study on men and women with different age groups, consistently found smokers to be more extroverted and neurotic than non-smokers (Smith,1970). While in a survey by cherry (1976), those people who scored high on neuroticism used to take a high dosage of nicotine in the form of smoking than those who score low. Extraverts were more likely to smoke than introverts, the mean extraversion score being greatest for the male smokers with a high daily consumption of cigarettes.

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

In Openness dimension, there was no significant difference in the mean score of both the groups as well as the P-value = 0.37 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has no difference. A study by C. S. Bergeman (1990) administered NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI) on 82 pairs of identical twins and 171 pairs of fraternal twins reared apart and 132 pairs of identical twins and 167 pairs of fraternal twins reared together.

Sex differences in the stressful reactions to coping with negative daily life events also have been found (Matud, 2004), and observation data of women's written and verbal behaviour tend to find women express more negative emotions than men do (e.g., Burke et al., 1976; Levenson et al., 1994).

In love attitude scale, again t-test was conducted on the 2 groups of males and females, 30 each which makes N=60 (table 1.2)

In Eros (passionate love) dimension mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=21.5 > 18.1) while the P-value = 0.05 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has a significant difference. Psychologists may differ on whether romantic and passionate love are or are not emotions (Aron, et al., in press; Shaver, Morgan, & Wu, S., 1996). Also, Scientists interested in the chemistry of passionate love have found that a variety of petrochemicals shape passionate love and sexual desire. According to Fisher (2004) for example, romantic love is associated with the natural stimulant dopamine and perhaps norepinephrine and serotonin. Lust is associated primarily with the hormone testosterone in both men and women. (Estrogens may decrease desire.) Attachment is produced primarily by the hormones oxytocin and vasopressin (Hyde, 2005) Fisher and her colleagues (2004), for example, investigated the brain chemistry of men and women passionately in love (again using the PLS scale) and found that passionate love markedly increased sexual motivation.

In Ludus (Game-Playing Love) Dimension mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=15.9 > 11.5) while the P-value = 0.04 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has a significant difference at 0.05 level. A study by Hendrick and Clyde in 1995 showed gender differences in both sexual attitudes and love. Women less sexually permissive than men. Men and women differed on various relationship variables (e.g., men to game-playing love and women were more oriented to friendship-based love). However, correlation analyses showed many similar patterns for women and men. These findings underline the need to consider both gender differences and similarities in sex and love within intimate relationships. Chinese and other Asian respondents of both sexes were more friendship-oriented in their love relationships than were respondents of Anglo-Celtic or European ethnocultural backgrounds. Expectations of greater gender role differentiation among Asians were partly supported by finding that women from Asian ethnocultural backgrounds other than Chinese were less likely to view "love as a game" that

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

were either their female or male counterparts. (Kenneth L Dion 1993) A study examined the effects of a game-playing love style – ludus – (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1991) with sexual experience. In a sample of American college students ($N=305$) the study found that sexual experience was related to the ludus (game-playing) subscale. As the tendency to endorse items of the ludus scale increases, the individual reported an ever larger number of sexual partners. Neither the gender of the respondent nor the effect of being in a deepening interpersonal relationship mollifies the tendency to endorse the ludic items.

In Storge (Friendship Love) Dimension, mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=20.2 > 17.3) while the P-value = 0.13 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has no significant difference at both the levels. A study by Linda (1988) found out that while both sexes viewed the characteristics of an ideal friendship in similar ways, their actual experiences of friendships differed. Women's friendships with the same sex were higher for overall intimacy, quality, nurturance, and enjoyment. Men, on the other hand, rated their *cross-sex* friendships higher in these areas, with the exception of intimacy which was rated the same by men in both same- and cross-sex friendships. Both Men and Women, generally keep their friendships and sexual relationships separate though sexual feelings may exist in many cross-sex friendships across the globe. A study by Susan (1993) found out there was a good correspondence between love themes in the freeform accounts and love style scores on the Love Attitudes Scale, participants generated freeform accounts of their closest friendship relationship. Some 44 percent of the participants named their romantic partner as their closest friend. Results of the three studies confirm the importance of friendship as well as passion in young adults' romantic relationships

In Pragma (Practical Love) Dimension mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=19.3 > 13.8) while the P-value = 0.00 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has a highly significant difference at both the levels, 0.01 and 0.05 level. Ethno cultural background and gender were investigated as correlates of love styles in an ethnically diverse sample of university students in Toronto. Women viewed love as more friendship oriented, more pragmatic, but less permissive than did men, findings consistent with previous research with American college students. (Kenneth L Dion 1993) In Mania (Possessive, Dependent Love) Dimension mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=17.8 > 15.7) while the P-value = 0.31 which indicates that the relationship of both males and females on this domain has no significant difference at both the levels, 0.01 and 0.05 level. Studies have shown brain chemical dopamine is at higher levels in those in love. Many Psychologists are still trying to study the reason why some people become dangerously obsessed and risk everything for love and how it becomes a mental disorder and leads them to be delusional.

In Agape (Altruistic Love) Dimension mean of males in this domain was higher than that of females (Mean=19.8 > 13.4) while the P-value = 0.00 which indicates that the relationship

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

of both males and females on this domain has a highly significant difference at both the levels, 0.01 and 0.05 level. According to a study by Martin 2000, In men, social desirability was correlated positively with romantic, passionate love (Eros) and game-playing love (Ludus), but negatively with all-giving, selfless love (Agape). In women, social desirability was correlated negatively with Ludus but positively with Agape. Women also are significantly more likely than men to give to charities (whether to medical research, disaster relief, homeless, disabled, environment or religion). For single people, 90% of women give more than the average man (Piper & Schnepf, 2008). On the altruistic component of prosociality, the National Altruism Study (a nationally-representative sample of Americans in the 2002 General Social Survey) found sex is strongly associated with altruistic values, altruistic behaviours, and empathy, women best men's prosociality in almost every way

Perhaps not unrelated, women and girls are primarily responsible for child-rearing in most cultures (Low, 1989). In an analysis of the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (186 cultures selected to fairly represent preindustrial human cultures), Weisner et al. (1977) found mothers and their female relatives are responsible for most child-rearing, with fathers providing only about 6% of actual care giving to children (see also Katz & Konner, 1981). There may be neurological differences in the ways men and women respond to empathic concerns (Christov-Moore et al., 2014; Schulte-Rüther et al., 2008). For instance, *women appear to use more emotional brain areas, whereas men use more reflective brain areas when engaging in empathy, emotion recognition, perspective taking, and affective responsiveness* (Derntl et al., 2010)

Further, correlation analysis was done using SPSS; only 4 variables were correlated with each other (table 1.3). Significance correlation was found between conscientiousness and Pragma, which is .315* significant at $p < 0.05$ level which means people high on conscientiousness will be better than others, at goals: setting them, working toward them, and persisting amid setbacks. If a super ambitious goal can't be realized, they'll switch to a more attainable one rather than getting discouraged and giving up. As a result, they tend to achieve goals that are consistent with what others want so naturally will be higher on Practical love as they are more serious for their work rather than for a personal relationship.

The second variable that was correlated was neuroticism and ludus which is .266* which is significant at $p < 0.05$ level. People who will be high on neuroticism will be high on ludus i.e. Those People who score high on this factor are emotionally unstable, anxious, worried, fearful, distressed, irritable and hypertensive as the result of which are more into game playing kind of love because a person who is emotionally unavailable, anxious and is insecure would want to commit into a playful love where there is no commitment and where he/she will not give their 100 percent .It is all about passion and having fun with each other doing different activities, but that's where it ends. One does not desire commitment. Nowadays there are many tools – such as online dating – that help us find a partner for short-term relationships or merely fun for one or a few days.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the objective of this study was to understand the different personality domains of people on dating application by using Big Five-factor inventory and understanding the different Loving styles of people on dating application by using loving attitude scale. Majorly in the t-test, no significant difference was found in both the gender in big five-factor inventory while the t-test was done for the gender difference in love attitude scale only 4 dimensions out of 6 showed significant differences i.e. Eros, Ludus, Pragma, and agape. In correlation analysis, Significance and correlation was found between (conscientiousness & Pragma) (neuroticism & lupus) For future, this study could be expanded by increasing the sample size and focussing on demographics other than genders such as age, socioeconomic status, and type of job (state, central, or PSU). A more extensive research analysis could be undertaken by adopting other frameworks of the various scales.

REFERENCES

- Andreoni, J., & Vesterlund, L. (2001). Which is the fair sex? Gender differences in altruism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 293-312.
- Arriaga, X.B. (2001). The Ups and Downs of Dating: Fluctuations in satisfaction in newly formed romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 754-765.
- Baez, S., Flichtentrei, D., Prats, M., Mastandueno, R., García, A.M., Cetkovich, M., et al. (2017). Men, women...who cares? A population-based study on sex differences and gender roles in empathy and moral cognition.
- Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: An investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34, 163–175.
- Barrett, L. F., Lane, R. D., Sechrest, L., & Schwartz, G. E. (2000). Sex differences in emotional awareness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 1027-1035.
- Buss D. M. (2008). *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind*, 3rd Edn. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Botwin, M.D., Buss, D.M., & Shackelford, T.K. (1997). Personality and mate preferences: five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 107-136.
- Barelds, D.P.H. (2005). Self and partner personality in intimate relationships. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 501-518.
- Costa P. T., Jr., McCrae R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources
- Costa P. T., Jr., Terracciano A., McCrae R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 81, 322–33110.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322
- Cross S. E., Madson L. (1997). Models of the self: self-construals and gender. *Psychol. Bull.* 122, 5–3710.1037/0033-2909.122.1.51

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

- Carlo, G. (2006). Care-based and altruistically-based morality. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 551–579). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Gangadharn, L. (2003). *Gender Differences in Trust and Reciprocity* (No. 875). The University of Melbourne.
- Christ, C. C., Carlo, G., & Stoltenberg, S. F. (2015). Oxytocin receptor (OXTR) single nucleotide polymorphisms indirectly predict prosocial behavior through perspective taking and empathic concern. *Journal of Personality*.
- Christov-Moore, L., Simpson, E. A., Coudé, G., Grigaityte, K., Iacoboni, M., & Ferrari, P. F. (2014). Empathy: gender effects in brain and behavior. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 46, 604-627.
- Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1993). Gender and ethnocultural comparisons in styles of love. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17(4), 463-473.
- Glicksohn, J., & Golan, H. (2001). Personality, cognitive style and assortative mating. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 1199–1209.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1995). Gender differences and similarities in sex and love. *Personal relationships*, 2(1), 55-65.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 50(2), 392.
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 980.
- Hensley, W. E. (1996). The effect of a ludus love style on sexual experience. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 24(3), 205-212.
- Sapadin, L. A. (1988). Friendship and gender: Perspectives of professional men and women. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5(4), 387-403
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1993). Lovers as friends. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10(3), 459-466.
- Ke, X., Ye, X., Xu, Y., Shen, M., Gao, X., Zhang, Y., Livesley, W.J., Jang, K.L., & Wang, W. (2007). Sensation seeking scales and traits delineating personality disorders in a sample of Chinese students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 271-278.
- Leone, C., & Hawkins, L.B. (2006). Self-monitoring and close relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 739-778.
- Lesnik-Obeststein, M., & Cohen, L. (1984). Cognitive style, sensation seeking, and assortative mating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 112-117.
- Levine, T.R., Aune, K.S., & Park, H.S. (2006). Love styles and communication in relationships: Partner preferences, initiation, and intensification. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 465-486.
- Sangrador, J.L., & Yela, C. (2000). “What is beautiful is loved”: Physical attractiveness in love relationship in a representative sample. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 28, 207-218.

Personality Factor as a Determinant of Attitude towards Loving Styles of People Using Dating Applications in India

- Shaver, P.R., & Mikulincer, M. (2006). A behavioral systems approach to romantic love relationships: Attachment, caregiving, and sex. In R.J. Sternberg, K. Weis (Eds.), *The Psychology of Love* (pp. 35-64). New York: Yale University Press.
- Shiota, M.N., Keltner, D., & John, O.P. (2006). Positive emotion dispositions differentially associated with Big Five personality and attachment style. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 1*, 61-71.
- Sprecher, S., & Toro-Morn, M. (2002). A study of men and women from different sides of Earth to determine if men are from Mars and women are from Venus in their beliefs about love and romantic relationships. *Sex Roles, 46*, 131-147.

Acknowledgments

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed in ensuring this paper is in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be mentioned.

Conflict of Interest

The authors colorfully declare this paper to bear not a conflict of interests

How to cite this article: Saini D. K (2018). Personality factor as a determinant of attitude towards loving styles of people using dating applications in India. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 6*(3), 72-86. DIP: 18.01.007/20180603, DOI:10.25215/0603.007