CHAPTER 6

AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY / RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The main thrust of the present study comprises two distinct, though closely interwoven, elements, namely a theoretical and an empirical component.

The theoretical foundation, described in its embryonic form in Section 2.3, comprises two related theories, or theoretical frameworks, which are:

- the relationship satisfaction congruence theory; and
- the dyadic relationship outcome theory.

These two frameworks have been applied and elucidated further in Chapters 3 and 4 to support the classification and evaluation of findings from the literature review. They are further tested with a view to confirmation through the empirical part of the present research, as dealt with in Chapter 9. To enable and concretise this process, it is necessary to specify the aims and objectives of the research more clearly. This is accomplished in the present chapter. As a result, empirical tasks have been laid down to produce the data required for testing the robustness and applicability of the theoretical frameworks during analysis.

The operational specifications set to facilitate the proper execution of the empirical part of the study, are presented in Chapter 7. In some of the sections of the present chapter, the broader parameters into which the data had to fit to enable testing the boundaries of the proposed theoretical position, are set out. However, an element of data gathering purely for the sake of information and exploration has been retained (i.e., the generation of knowledge for its own sake). Data that cannot be dealt with in terms of the proposed or existing theoretical frameworks, are indicated and interpreted in Chapter 9, either by being noted as falling outside them, or by being used to motivate amendments or additions to the proposed theoretical parameters, whichever is required by new (unexpected) findings.

The foregoing two main goals translate into the structure selected for the presentation in this chapter. In addition, it has to be noted that one cannot in advance foresee every statistical technique to be used or even every hypothesis to be tested. As a result, only those techniques and hypotheses formulated before commencing with the fieldwork are presented here, to avoid unnecessary repetition and duplication in Chapter 9. As a result, the more generic techniques are presented now, while an additional record of what transpired during the exploratory data analyses, is covered later. Accordingly, the actual data analysis and hypothesis testing are covered more fully in Chapter 9. The structure and content of the present chapter is as follows:

- Section 6.1, stating and exploring the primary aim of testing the boundaries of a new theoretical framework for studying the contribution of sex-role identity (type and traits) to relationship satisfaction, irrespective of the sexes of the partners in the relationship;

- Section 6.2, stating and elaborating on the specific empirical research objectives, namely to establish the degree to which the similarity and/or dissimilarity of the sex-role identity types of
partners, comprising both masculinity and femininity sex-role identity traits, contribute to relationship satisfaction, and to interpret the findings in terms of the experience of the relationship as one of accord (acceptance) or discord (non-acceptance);

- Section 6.3, stating the main research hypotheses in their general forms;

- Section 6.4, stating the way in which any remaining relationships between variables and the theoretical models are checked, and to list most of those variables; and

- Section 6.5, setting out how the objectives in terms of testing the influence of intra-personal and extra-personal factors are pursued.

6.1 Primary aim (testing a new theoretical framework)

The review of previous research in the field (Chapters 2 to 4) revealed two main shortcomings that have affected studies of relationship satisfaction. The first limitation is the lack of a theoretical base to support or direct research. Such a framework would determine the specific areas most in need of immediate research, and also the scope of such studies. It could also direct the conceptualisation of constructs in such a way that sufficient common ground would exist between researchers about terminology and definitions.

The second shortcoming, which may be a partial outcome of the first, is the disconnected and often biased way in which variables have been selected and studied. This has led to an abundance of studies in some areas, and a lack in others. Also, it caused peripheral issues to be studied independently, without being placed within the context of more central phenomena and outcomes. It is not argued that such issues should not be researched. What is argued, though, is that such research should be related to and integrated into the bigger picture. This would only be possible if we had a credible description or map of the bigger picture.

The main aim of this study, therefore, is to test the boundaries of the proposed new theoretical framework for relationship satisfaction studies. It has been argued throughout so far, that the structure and functioning of core personality elements, such as the sex-role identity type of respondents, may largely determine relationship outcomes. Therefore, the central concern is to find a way to describe and understand the contribution of sex-role identity to relationship satisfaction, and to generate empirical information that will render it possible to test the claims of such a theoretical position.

This undertaking should be applied as broadly as possible. Two main reasons require this, namely the fact that intimate dyadic relations are a fundamental part of people’s daily existence, and the great changes occurring in this domain at present. Theoretical foundations have to be sufficiently extensive, for instance, to provide for investigation into relationship satisfaction irrespective of the sexes of the partners in the relationship, such as in intimate same-sex (gay and lesbian) relationships.
The theoretical points of departure should also make provision for the integration between sex-role identity and relationship satisfaction, and as many as possible of the intra-personal and extra-personal psychological variables closely related to the main connection, as described in Figures 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

Provided that the envisaged empirical work would follow accepted methodological standards, and generate useful data of good quality, the present study has accepted as its first task to propose new theoretical foundations for relationship satisfaction research, and to evaluate their applicability and usefulness in the light of empirical evidence.

6.2 Specific empirical research objectives

Generally speaking, all the objectives are aimed at establishing the degree to which the similarity and/or dissimilarity of the sex-role identity traits of partners, for both masculinity and/or femininity, contribute to relationship satisfaction. Once this is known, the findings have to be interpreted in terms of partners' experience of their relationship as one of accord (acceptance) or discord (non-acceptance). Sex-role identity trait and type (in)compatibility is therefore under the looking glass.

In its most general form, the underlying hypothesis being tested is that individuals with an identical sex-role identity type, or homo-gender sex-role identity relationship (Table 2.5), stand a better chance of experiencing relationship satisfaction. Conversely, individuals with non-identical sex-role identity types (and traits), or a hetero-gender sex-role identity relationship (Table 2.6), will most probably experience the least relationship satisfaction. The underlying rationale and terminology to these notations are found in the model presented in Figure 2.2, as well as the accompanying discussion in Section 2.3.2, and also in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 in Section 2.1.7. The foregoing two general hypotheses are based on the assumption that similarity of sex-role identity type (and traits) provides the common ground or overlap that guarantees relationship satisfaction. In the reverse case, the complementarity or dissimilarity of types and traits may not be sufficient enough to bridge the differences keeping partners apart. Beyond and between the previous combinations, many variables will have to be tested to establish the degree of modification required to the hypotheses by these variables' relative contributions. A special case is the mixed dyads in which the sex-role identity types of partners are also not identical, because only one of the sex-role identity traits are identical each time.

In the sub-sections to follow, the hypothesised sets of links are introduced in the order of the expected strength of the correlations, with the greater effects being anticipated first.

Furthermore, in line with the dyadic focus of the present study, interactions (congruence or incongruence between partner scores on independent and dependent variables) are listed first. This is also the sequence followed in Chapter 9 where the findings are reported. Simple or direct
relationships are listed and investigated second. The rationale behind this sequence is to understand narrow, uni-dimensional links against the broader patterns or (dyadic) configurations underlying them. The debate between researchers about appropriate statistical procedures, reported in Sections 3.1 and 3.3.2, is again relevant here.

6.2.1 Influence of identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits

How does identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits between partners influence their relationship satisfaction? The investigation centres on the simultaneous presence or lack of masculinity and femininity between partners. Here, the sex-role identity side of the relationship satisfaction congruence theory is focused on. The following sex-role identity trait patterns are relevant: M-M, m-m, F-F, and f-f. They translate into the four potential sex-role identity type configurations explained in Table 2.5. These are: Mf-Mf, mF-mF, mf-Mf, and MF-MF. These notations respectively represent the incidences where both partners in a dyadic relationship are masculine, or feminine, or undifferentiated, or androgynous (in terms of sex-role identity type). Respondents’ performance on relationship satisfaction is first compared as a cluster to that of other clusters (sex-role identity type configurations). Thereafter, the role of individual sex-role identity type combinations within the cluster is also investigated further in relation to each other.

[It is anticipated that androgyny, femininity and masculinity, in this order, would be shown to contribute most to relationship satisfaction. This sequence is tested throughout as subsidiary hypothesis.]

6.2.2 Influence of identical feminine and non-identical masculine sex-role identity traits

How does identical feminine and non-identical masculine sex-role identity traits between partners influence their relationship satisfaction? The investigation moves to the simultaneous presence or lack of femininity, but opposite presence or lack of masculinity between partners. The following four potential configurations are relevant (as explained in Table 2.8): MF-mF, mF-Mf, mF-MF, and MF-Mf. These notations represent couples where an androgynous and a feminine partner, or an undifferentiated and a masculine partner live together. (To facilitate the evaluation of all the relevant configurations among heterosexual couples, and also to simplify the requirements of data-coding, inverse configurations are listed as such, e.g., MF-mF and mF-MF, or androgynous husband with feminine wife, and feminine husband with androgynous wife. Obviously, there would seem to be a repetition of patterns in the case of same-sex dyads.) Again, respondents’ performance on relationship satisfaction will be compared to the performance of respondents in other clusters, and of the individual sex-role identity type combinations within the same cluster.

6.2.3 Influence of identical masculine and non-identical feminine sex-role identity traits

How does identical masculine and non-identical feminine sex-role identity traits in partners influence their relationship satisfaction? The investigation this time tests the simultaneous presence or lack of

---

1 And by definition, also identical sex-role identity traits
masculinity, but opposite presence or lack of femininity between partners. The following four potential configurations are relevant (as explained in Table 2.7): MF-Mf, mf-mF, Mf-MF, and mF-mf. These notations represent couples where an androgynous and a masculine partner, or an undifferentiated and a feminine partner live together. (The same procedures as under 6.2.2 apply to facilitate the analysis of all the relevant configurations among heterosexual couples, and to simplify the requirements of data-coding, albeit just inversely. Again, respondents’ performance on relationship satisfaction will be compared to the performance of respondents in other clusters, and of the individual sex-role identity type combinations within the same cluster.)

6.2.4 Influence of non-identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits

How does non-identical masculine and feminine sex-role identity traits between partners influence their relationship satisfaction? The investigation now focuses on the simultaneous opposite presence or lack of masculinity and femininity between partners. The influence of incongruence of sex-role identity type and traits is explored. The following sex-role identity trait patterns are relevant: M-m, m-M, F-f and f-F. They translate into the four potential sex-role identity type configurations explained in Table 2.6. These are: mF-Mf, Mf-mF, MF-mf, and mf-MF. These notation sets represent the consistent incidence of opposite sex-role identity types and traits between the partners in a dyadic relationship: the one masculine and the other feminine; or the one undifferentiated and the other androgynous. Respondents’ performance on relationship satisfaction is first compared as a cluster to that of other clusters (of sex-role identity type configurations). Then, the role of individual sex-role identity type combinations within the cluster is also investigated further in relation to each other.

6.2.5 Variance across sex

Do the above configurations show variance across sex? Differences in the frequencies, scale (variable) scores and correlations are explored for as many of the measures as possible. Examples of central questions addressed in Chapter 9, where the findings are reported, are the following:

- Do males and females show a preference for any given sex-role identity type?
- Do the numbers of males and females differ in terms of the sex-role identity type relationship configuration they have entered into?
- Do the relationship satisfaction scores of males and females differ in similar situations?

Important leads discovered during the exploratory analyses have been followed up.

6.2.6 Variance across type of relationship

Do the sex-role identity type and relationship satisfaction scores and configurations show variance across the kind of relationship that couples prefer or experience? Reference is made here to the influence that traditional, egalitarian, and comradeship models of dyadic relationship may have on their relationship satisfaction, as well as the fact that they are in a same-sex or heterosexual relationship.
It is hypothesised that modern preferences, such as for egalitarian or comradeship relations, may correlate with the identical (i.e. congruent) presence of androgyny among partners, and result in greater relationship satisfaction. The extent to which (assumed to be to a lesser degree) modern preferences may also apply in the case of either identical femininity or masculinity, is also investigated.

The possibility that androgyny, or strong femininity or masculinity among either partner, may have a similar, assumedly even lesser effect, has also been investigated.

Relationships along more traditional lines may benefit from each partner having a sex-typed sex-role identity type (incongruence, therefore, as masculine male and feminine female). This scenario has been tested as well.

Same-sex couples are hypothesised to be more satisfied than heterosexual couples for similar sex-role identity type configurations. Partners in same-sex couples may also be freer to follow non-sex-typed sex-role identity type combinations.

It has to be noted that statistical software packages provide valuable tools to explore potentially strong connections between many variables at an early stage. An example is multiple chi-square techniques such as CHAID. These have been available during the analyses, and could be used, provided that sufficient numbers of respondents have fallen within the various cells as determined by each set of comparisons.

6.3 Hypotheses on the connection between sex-role identity and relationship satisfaction

The more general exposition of the empirical research problem, presented in Section 6.2, paves the way for the formulation of specific research hypotheses. As hypothesis-testing research, the analyses are aimed at substantiating the relationships derived from the theoretical foundations proposed for the present study. Statistical tests have to inform the conclusions.

6.3.1 Main hypotheses

Three main (clusters of) hypotheses are tested. These concern the:

- relative superiority of sex-role identity (type) congruence\(^2\), over incongruence, and androgyny in particular, over other sex-role identity types, to predict relationship satisfaction;
- relative superiority of mixed sex-role identity configurations over incongruent sex-role identity types to predict relationship satisfaction; and
- relative superiority of femininity over masculinity within the mixed sex-role identity configurations to predict relationship satisfaction.

\(^2\)\("(Non)-identical" is preferred hence above "(in)congruent" for simplicity when referring to sex -role identity types / traits
6.3.1.1 Sex-role identity congruence and androgyny

Where the partners have an identical sex-role identity type, they will experience greater relationship satisfaction compared to partners from any other configuration. When this statement is translated into formal null and alternative hypotheses, the research objectives become the following:

**Hypothesis 1:**

$H_0$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ = $rs$ for partners with $id$ $F$ mixed $sri$

$H_1$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ > $rs$ for partners with $id$ $F$ mixed $sri$

(Preference satisfaction for partners with an identical (congruent) sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners having an identical (congruent) femininity trait, but non-identical (incongruent) masculinity trait)

**Hypothesis 2:**

$H_0$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ = $rs$ for partners with $id$ $M$ mixed $sri$

$H_1$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ > $rs$ for partners with $id$ $M$ mixed $sri$

(Preference satisfaction for partners with an identical sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners having an identical masculinity trait, but non-identical femininity trait)

**Hypothesis 3:**

$H_0$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ = $rs$ for partners with non-$id$ $sri$

$H_1$: $rs$ for partners with $id$ $sri$ > $rs$ for partners with non-$id$ $sri$

(Preference satisfaction for partners with an identical sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with non-identical sex-role identity types)

There are sufficient indications from literature that at some point, sex-role identity type congruence gives way to the important contribution that androgyny, or even femininity and masculinity on its own, could make. These points are simultaneously explored while testing the first three hypotheses. It has to be kept in mind that some of the additional ways of testing for the role of androgyny and the other sex-role identity types or traits may overlap with hypotheses already formally stated elsewhere. This would depend on whether they actually overlap with identical or non-identical sex-role identity type configurations. The format of the additional hypotheses is:

**Hypothesis 4:**

$H_0$: $rs$ for partners with $MF$ $sri$ = $rs$ for partners with $F$ $sri$

$H_1$: $rs$ for partners with $MF$ $sri$ > $rs$ for partners with $F$ $sri$

(Preference satisfaction for partners with an androgynous sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with a feminine sex-role identity type)

**Hypothesis 5:**

$H_0$: $rs$ for partners with $MF$ $sri$ = $rs$ for partners with $M$ $sri$
| Hypothesis 6: | $H_0$: rs for partners with MF sri $\equiv$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri  
$H_1$: rs for partners with MF sri $>$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relationship satisfaction for partners with an androgynous sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with an undifferentiated sex-role identity type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothesis 7: | $H_0$: rs for partners with F sri $\equiv$ rs for partners with M sri  
$H_1$: rs for partners with F sri $>$ rs for partners with M sri |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relationship satisfaction for partners with a feminine sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with a masculine sex-role identity type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothesis 8: | $H_0$: rs for partners with F sri $\equiv$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri  
$H_1$: rs for partners with F sri $>$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relationship satisfaction for partners with a feminine sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with an undifferentiated sex-role identity type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothesis 9: | $H_0$: rs for partners with M sri $\equiv$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri  
$H_1$: rs for partners with M sri $>$ rs for partners with undifferentiated sri |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relationship satisfaction for partners with a masculine sex-role identity type will be greater than that of partners with an undifferentiated sex-role identity type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the cases of Hypotheses 5 to 7, various sub-hypotheses are incorporated. They will provide for those cases in which the specific sex-role identity type is found only in one of the partners in a couple.

In addition, various other configurations in terms of the connection of individual sex-role identity type and individual relationship satisfaction outcomes, irrespective of whether they are intra- or inter-partner, are being investigated.

6.3.1.2 Mixed sex-role identity configurations within the broader patterns

Couples in which partners only have one of the sex-role identity traits (masculinity or femininity) in common, may experience greater relationship satisfaction compared to partners with non-identical sex-role identity types altogether. The following two sets of formal null and alternative hypotheses are derived from this formulation.

| Hypothesis 10: | $H_0$: rs for partners with id F mixed sri $\equiv$ rs for partners with non-id sri  
$H_1$: rs for partners with id F mixed sri $>$ rs for partners with non-id sri |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relationship satisfaction for partners with identical femininity, but non-identical masculinity, will be greater than that of partners with non-identical sex-role identity types)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 11:  
\[ H_0 : \text{rs for partners with id M mixed sri} = \text{rs for partners with non-id sri} \]
\[ H_1 : \text{rs for partners with id M mixed sri} > \text{rs for partners with non-id sri} \]
(Relationship satisfaction for partners with identical masculinity, but non-identical femininity, will be greater than that of partners with non-identical sex-role identity types)

6.3.1.3 Mixed sex-role identity configurations among themselves

The literature is ambiguous about the predominance of either identical masculinity or femininity in mixed sex-role identity type configurations. The relationship satisfaction scores of couples in which partners display an identical sex-role identity trait of masculinity and non-identical sex-role identity trait regarding femininity, and the converse situation (identical masculinity and non-identical femininity), are also examined. Because there is insufficient evidence for either being more likely, no direction is set for the difference scores. Consequently, the following null and alternative hypotheses are tested:

Hypothesis 12:  
\[ H_0 : \text{rs for partners with id F mixed sri} = \text{rs for partners with id M mixed sri} \]
\[ H_1 : \text{rs for partners with id F mixed sri} \neq \text{rs for partners with id M mixed sri} \]
(Relationship satisfaction for partners with identical femininity, but non-identical masculinity, will not be equal to (greater or smaller than) that of partners with identical masculinity, but non-identical femininity)

Where relationship satisfaction (rs) is referred to in the foregoing hypotheses, a whole set of hypotheses is implied in each case. The reason for this is that the global or total DAS relationship satisfaction score, and the scores on each of its (four) subscales may be tested each time, or at least when sensible (see the discussion of measuring instruments under 7.2). Each hypothesis may therefore imply a number of iterations. These possible options have throughout been investigated and informative outcomes are pointed out where relevant in the reporting of findings in Chapter 9. The same principle is followed in the case of alternative measures for sex-role identity and/or relationship satisfaction, as appropriate.

Basow (1992) pointed out that the common presence of nurturance and expressiveness, often found in females, greatly contributes to relationship satisfaction in same-sex female partnerships (friendships). This applied even when cultural barriers were prominent. This has been kept in mind when exploring the dataset, with a view to the appropriate modification of the relevant hypotheses in the first two sets (see 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2). The outcomes of same-sex male friendships may be more difficult to predict in this regard, while the most difficult ones will be male-female friendships. The latter applies because of the divergence in gender roles, traits and behaviours (see also the implications of the abovementioned position for the link between the hypotheses under 6.3.1.2 and 6.3.1.3).

In all cases mentioned thus far in Sections 6.2 and 6.3, the objective has always been to first test the influence of sex-role identity type patterns on dyadic relationship satisfaction. Only after that,
iterations start to test the (assumed) effect of personal sex-role identity type on partners’ relationship satisfaction. Finally, the connection between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction is explored in further iterations of analysis.

6.3.2 For dyads

Some additional explorative analyses have been done to explore other possible significant effects. Without having set hypotheses in advance, the findings covering the topics introduced below, are reported in Chapter 9.

Mainly by way of chi-square tests, potential multivariate connections have been explored for significance. For example, a 4x3x3 design would be used to test for any interaction between sex-role identity type (or trait) configuration (4), dyadic outcome (3), and sexual orientation (3), where:

- sex-role identity type / trait configurations would be: identical types, identical masculinity trait only, identical femininity trait only, and non-identical types;
- dyadic outcome comprises: both, only one, or neither partner satisfied with the relationship; and
- sexual orientation comprises: both partners homosexual (male), both lesbian (female), and both heterosexual (male and female).

Cross-tabulations, including classification by sub-sample, have also been very important at this point. Reference is made to the relative relationship satisfaction scores achieved within the following purposively sampled sub-groups: the homosexual respondents, the respondents from heterosexual populations that should experience high satisfaction, and the heterosexuals from populations experiencing discord.

Another important objective is to establish whether (non-)identical sex-role identity types between partners are consistently associated with (dis)satisfaction. Table 2.2 (Section 2.1) clarifies the arguments and terminology used. The main issue is that opposites could also attract, instead of assuming that such a situation implies a lack of common values and interests. Also, familiarity could breed contempt, instead of assuming that great minds think alike and complement each other. Therefore, the degree of relationship satisfaction experienced from the perspectives of corresponding (or common), competing, complementing and conflicting sex-role identity types, is analysed. It is hypothesised that relationship satisfaction scores will decrease from high to low in the sequence of combinations listed hereafter:

- identical sex-role identity type, with the relationship experienced as satisfactory (accord);
- non-identical sex-role identity types, with the relationship experienced as satisfactory (acceptance);
- identical sex-role identity type, with the relationship experienced as dissatisfactory (discord); and
- non-identical sex-role identity types, with the relationship experienced as dissatisfactory (non-acceptance).

The resulting patterns are explained in Chapter 9 in terms of the assumed dynamics underlying commonality, complementarity, competition and incompatibility (or conflict).
6.3.3 Between individual partners

Without detailing any additional hypotheses with a view to filling any remaining gaps, the kind of analyses done in further exploring connections at the individual level between sex-role identity type and relationship satisfaction, is very briefly commented on. By way of chi-square tests, for example a 4x2x2 design, the influence of sex-role identity type (4), biological sex (2), and sexual orientation (2) on relationship satisfaction would be investigated, where:

- sex-role identity type comprises androgynous, masculine sex-typed, feminine sex-typed and undifferentiated individuals;
- biological sex comprises males and females; and
- sexual orientation comprises homosexual and heterosexual individuals.

6.3.4 Self-rated vis-à-vis ascribed sex-role identity

It is one of the objectives of the research to correlate self-rated and ascribed sex-role identity scores. This implies that during the analysis, many statistical tests have been done on the data twice. The reason for this is to establish whether or not the sex-role identity scores derived from individuals' personal ratings are better predictors of relationship satisfaction than the sex-role identity ratings given them by their partners. The latter can also be termed perceived sex-role identity.

6.4 Exploration of less immediate theoretical connections

Additional relationships between the research variables, derived from theoretical positions more peripherally cited in Chapters 2 and 4, have also been explored briefly. These potentially significant relationships have not only been raised in previous research, but also cover the assumed influence of intra- and extra-personal factors on sex-role identity, relationship satisfaction, and the link between them. Chi-square techniques again have proven to be helpful in this regard. In addition, other exploratory or confirmatory techniques suggested by the data at the appropriate points have been employed.

6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the central aims and objectives of the present study have been made explicit. These have been dealt with in terms of the two main aspirations of the present study.

In the first instance, arguments and objectives have been proposed for testing the usefulness of an expanded theoretical framework linking relationship satisfaction and the related variables in close dyadic relationships between heterosexual and same-sex couples.
In the second instance, empirical objectives have been derived from the first goal. They have specified the aspects on which data had to be gathered to enable reaching conclusions about the various hypothesised relationships that had to be explored to confirm (or disconfirm) the validity of the expanded theoretical framework, or even just to add to our knowledge about the phenomena. More specifically, the empirical data enable analyses of the main connection between (non-)identical sex-role identity types and relationship satisfaction in couples. Thereafter, the more detailed research hypotheses and anticipated explorations cover the finer nuances pertaining to the various connections between the relevant variables. Not only do the hypotheses involve the influence of various sex-role identity types on relationship satisfaction, but also the role of many intra-personal and extra-personal factors. In addition, these interactions have been tested in terms of many potential dyadic and individual outcomes, as well as in terms of alternative measures for the same variables.

Having mapped the objectives of the research investigation, the tools required and developed for gathering the data, are described next in Chapter 7.