

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	xii
List of Annexures	xiii
<b>1. INTRODUCTION: ON PREDICTING SATISFACTORY CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The problem of relationship satisfaction	2
1.2 Rationale or need for research in this field	3
1.3 Potential value of the study	4
1.4 General theoretical underpinnings and conceptual frameworks	4
1.5 Outline of chapters	5
<b>2. CONCEPTUALISATION OF VARIABLES AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Definition of terms	8
2.1.1 Sex	8
2.1.2 Gender	9
2.1.3 Sex role	10
2.1.4 Sex-role identity	12
2.1.5 Role	14
2.1.6 Relationship satisfaction	14
2.1.7 Other issues of terminology	19
2.2 Macro-theoretical assumptions	21
2.2.1 Role and contribution of feminist research	22
2.2.2 Bem's theory of gender schematicity	32
2.2.3 Contribution of other theoretical frameworks	33
2.3 Refining the immediate theoretical frameworks	38
2.3.1 Research on relationship satisfaction outside formal marriage	39
2.3.2 Expansion of existing theoretical frameworks	43
2.4 Some indications of the nature and extent of the research problem	47
<b>3. LITERATURE REVIEW: METHODOLOGICAL INDICATIONS FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1 Introductory orientation	49
3.2 Sampling issues	54
3.2.1 Findings of studies involving conventional dyads (i.e., marital relationships)	55
3.2.2 Findings of studies involving only one partner of the dyad	61
3.2.2.1 Only wives / females in sample	63
3.2.2.2 Only husbands / males in sample	65
3.2.3 Findings based on geographically and otherwise restricted samples	65
3.2.4 Findings based on the responses given by student samples	69
3.3 Other methodological issues	72
3.3.1 Findings based on non-empirical simulations assessing anticipated behaviours	72
3.3.2 Findings based on studies with a restricted conceptualisation of constructs and variables	74
3.3.3 Studies and findings underpinned by inadequate theoretical assumptions	77
3.3.4 Findings based on studies dating far back	78
3.4 Conclusion	80

<b>4.</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH</b>	<b>81</b>
4.1	Main findings on sex-role identity and relationship satisfaction	81
4.1.1	Influence of husbands' sex-role identity on personal and spousal relationship satisfaction	83
4.1.2	Influence of wives' sex-role identity on personal and spousal relationship satisfaction	85
4.1.3	Influence of (in)congruence between husbands' and wives' sex-role identity and personal and spousal relationship satisfaction	87
4.1.4	Some findings regarding ascribed sex-role identity	89
4.1.5	The influence of non-heterosexual partners' sex-role identity	90
4.2	Intra-personal factors	91
4.2.1	Cognitive functioning	93
4.2.1.1	Cognitive complexity (qualitative patterns)	94
4.2.1.2	Intelligence (quantitative strength)	95
4.2.2	Emotional / affective functioning	96
4.2.3	Attitudes and volition	99
4.2.4	Personality and temperament	105
4.2.5	Communication styles and patterns	112
4.2.6	Perceptions and stereotypes	122
4.2.7	Conclusion	126
4.3	Extra-personal (biographic) factors	126
4.3.1	Biological sex	128
4.3.2	Age or developmental stage	130
4.3.3	Health status	132
4.3.4	Other factors such as ethnicity and educational level	132
4.3.5	Socio-economic status and other socio-cultural factors	133
4.3.6	Family stage (duration of relationship)	134
4.3.7	Career and job factors	141
4.3.8	Conclusion	147
4.4	Summary and conclusion	148
<b>5.</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM</b>	<b>151</b>
5.1	Shortcomings of theory	151
5.1.1	Theory vacuum	152
5.1.2	Male bias	153
5.1.3	Focus restricted to conventional marital and heterosexual relationships	153
5.1.4	Neglect of a life-development perspective	154
5.1.5	Lack of integration between theory and constructs	154
5.2	Methodological limitations	155
5.2.1	Insufficient attention to research designs	156
5.2.2	Neglect of dyadic focus in favour of evaluating individual behaviour	156
5.2.3	Simulation studies	157
5.2.4	Inappropriate statistical techniques and poor data analysis	157
5.2.5	Restricted sampling	157
5.2.6	Ambiguities in defining constructs and conceptualising variables	159
5.2.7	Flawed operationalisation of variables and selection of instruments	159

5.3	Problems regarding the content and consistency of findings	160
5.3.1	Inconclusive / unrepresentative findings	160
5.3.2	Incomparability	161
5.3.3	Contradictory findings	161
5.3.4	Gaps in research coverage / knowledge	163
5.4	Conclusion	164
<b>6.</b>	<b>AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY / RESEARCH HYPOTHESES</b>	<b>165</b>
6.1	Primary aim (testing a new theoretical framework)	166
6.2	Specific empirical research objectives	167
6.2.1	Influence of identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits	168
6.2.2	Influence of identical feminine and non-identical masculine sex-role identity traits	168
6.2.3	Influence of identical masculine and non-identical feminine sex-role identity traits	168
6.2.4	Influence of non-identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits	169
6.2.5	Variance across sex	169
6.2.6	Variance across type of relationship	169
6.3	Hypotheses on the connection between sex-role identity and relationship satisfaction	170
6.3.1	Main hypotheses	170
6.3.1.1	Sex-role identity congruence and androgyny	171
6.3.1.2	Mixed sex-role identity configurations within the broader patterns	172
6.3.1.3	Mixed sex-role identity configurations among themselves	173
6.3.2	For dyads	173
6.3.3	Between individual partners	174
6.3.4	Self-rated <i>vis-à-vis</i> ascribed sex-role identity	175
6.4	Exploration of less immediate theoretical connections	175
6.5	Conclusion	175
<b>7.</b>	<b>OPERATIONALISATION OF VARIABLES (MEASUREMENT PROCEDURES)</b>	<b>176</b>
7.1	General conceptualisation	176
7.1.1	Dependent variable: relationship satisfaction	177
7.1.1.1	Dyadic consensus	179
7.1.1.2	Dyadic satisfaction	179
7.1.1.3	Dyadic cohesion	179
7.1.1.4	Affectional expression	179
7.1.2	Independent variable: sex-role identity	179
7.1.3	Contributing or nuisance variables	181
7.2	Measurement instruments	182
7.2.1	Relationship satisfaction	182
7.2.1.1	Spanier's <i>Dyadic Adjustment Scale</i>	183
7.2.1.2	Olivier's <i>Sexual Adaptation and Functioning Test</i>	186
7.2.1.3	Direct questions	186
7.2.1.4	Other relationship satisfaction instruments	187
7.2.2	Sex-role identity	190
7.2.2.1	<i>Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)</i>	190

7.2.2.2	<i>Adjective Checklist (ACL)</i> procedure adapted by Prinsloo	196
7.2.2.3	Other sex-role identity instruments	197
7.2.3	Contributing or nuisance variables	198
7.2.4	Background information and covering letter	200
7.3	Conclusion	200
<b>8.</b>	<b>RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES</b>	<b>201</b>
8.1	Research design	201
8.2	Sample	202
8.2.1	Respondents with higher levels of relationship satisfaction	203
8.2.2	Respondents with lower levels of relationship satisfaction	203
8.2.3	Respondents in non-traditional relationships	204
8.2.4	Description of realised sample	204
8.3	Procedures	208
8.3.1	Data collection	209
8.3.2	Data capture	210
8.3.3	Data analysis	210
<b>9.</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>	<b>211</b>
9.1	Descriptive statistics / general findings	211
9.1.1	Relationship satisfaction	212
9.1.1.1	The <i>Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)</i>	212
9.1.1.2	Self-constructed three-item relationship satisfaction scale	213
9.1.1.3	Correlation between the <i>DAS</i> and three-item relationship satisfaction scale	214
9.1.2	Sex-role identity	216
9.1.2.1	The <i>Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)</i>	216
9.1.2.2	Self-constructed <i>Adjective Checklist</i> measure of sex-role identity ( <i>ACL-SRI</i> )	219
9.1.2.3	Correlation between the <i>BSRI</i> and <i>ACL-SRI</i> scale	221
9.1.3	Contextual variables	223
9.2	Identical and non-identical sex-role identity types and traits and relationship satisfaction congruence from a dyadic perspective (hypothesis testing)	228
9.2.1	Coding of dyadic variables	228
9.2.2	Frequency distributions of codes for dyadic variables	229
9.2.3	Analyses and testing of hypotheses	232
9.2.3.1	Frequency distributions relating sex-role identity to relationship satisfaction	232
9.2.3.2	Relationship satisfaction and sex-role identity congruence between couples	234
9.2.3.3	Relationship satisfaction and highest adaptive sex-role identity type	241
9.2.3.4	Relationship satisfaction and identical sex-role identity type comparisons	244
9.2.3.5	Relative effect of identical and congruent sex-role identity types and traits	248
9.2.4	Summary and conclusion	250

9.3	Hypothesis testing from a partly dyadic perspective	252
9.3.1	Personal sex-role identity and dyadic relationship satisfaction	252
9.3.2	Dyadic sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction	255
9.3.2.1	Relationship satisfaction and sex-role identity congruence between partners in couples	256
9.3.2.2	Relationship satisfaction and highest adaptive sex-role identity type in couples	262
9.3.2.3	Relationship satisfaction and identical sex-role identity types in couples	267
9.3.2.4	Relative effect of direct correspondence and congruence of sex-role identity	272
9.3.3	Summary and conclusion	273
9.4	Hypothesis testing from a non-dyadic or direct perspective	275
9.5	Role of extra- and intra-personal (extraneous) factors	276
9.5.1	The effect of extraneous variables from a dyadic perspective	277
9.5.2	The effect of extraneous variables from a partly-dyadic perspective	280
9.5.3	The effect of extraneous variables from a direct, non-dyadic perspective	285
9.5.4	Summary and conclusion	287
9.6	Concluding summary	288
<b>10</b>	<b>INTEGRATION AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>293</b>
10.1	Outcomes of hypothesis testing in terms of theoretical foundations	293
10.1.1	Summary and evaluation of findings in terms of theory	293
10.1.2	Theory reformulation and refinement	297
10.2	Practical contribution and implications of the findings	299
10.3	Critical evaluation of the study	301
10.3.1	Methodology	302
10.3.2	Measuring instruments	302
10.3.3	Sample	303
10.3.4	Analyses and findings	304
10.4	Recommendations for follow-up research, dissemination and implementation	305
10.5	Concluding statement	306
	<b>ANNEXURES</b>	<b>307</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>335</b>