

Annexure 9.1 : Detailed findings from variance analysis and hypothesis testing with regard to the direct (non-dyadic) association between sex-role identity and relationship satisfaction by sub-group
(See Section 9.4)

The findings do not confirm Hypothesis 4, expecting higher relationship satisfaction among androgynous respondents, compared to feminine ones.

Femininity, slightly more so than androgyny, is associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,566$), and even slightly more strongly so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners $[0,283]^1$ ($n=82$). Isolated exceptions (marked with “*” hereafter) show an inverse trend. No differences were significant with regard to the between-group variances among gay ($p=0,298$)* [$p=0,906$] ($n=15$), lesbian ($p=0,860$) [$p=0,642$] ($n=11$), heterosexual male ($p=0,113$) [$p=0,494$] ($n=25$), heterosexual female ($p=0,873$)* [$p=0,501$] ($n=31$), male ($p=0,292$) [$p=0,495$] ($n=40$), female ($p=0,957$) [$p=0,420$] ($n=42$), homosexual ($p=0,743$)* [$p=0,619$] ($n=26$), and heterosexual ($p=0,443$) [$p=0,396$] ($n=56$) respondents, each analysed separately. These findings almost completely concur with the patterns observed in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.47, where the highest adaptive sex-role identity type present in either partner was studied and reported at the dyadic level. In addition, the slightly greater association of femininity (above androgyny) with relationship satisfaction is somewhat stronger in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and partners’ relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, with only the male (combined) and heterosexual male sub-groups forming exceptions.

The findings confirm Hypothesis 5, expecting higher relationship satisfaction among androgynous respondents, compared to masculine ones.

Androgyny, relative to masculinity, is significantly associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,010$), although slightly less so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners $[0,142]$ ($n=81$). Some of the differences (underscored hereafter), even in view of the reduced sub-sample sizes, were also significant (at the 5%-level) with regard to the between-group variances among gay ($p=0,215$) [$p=0,803$] ($n=11$), lesbian ($p=0,326$) [$p=0,615$] ($n=17$), heterosexual male ($p=0,292$) [$p=0,129$] ($n=29$), heterosexual female ($p=0,036$) [$p=0,227$] ($n=24$), male ($p=0,122$) [$p=0,122$] ($n=40$), female ($p=0,040$) [$p=0,427$] ($n=41$), homosexual ($p=0,102$) [$p=0,504$] ($n=28$), and heterosexual ($p=0,025$) [$p=0,109$] ($n=53$) respondents, each analysed separately. These findings also concur very strongly with those reported in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.48, where the highest adaptive sex-role identity type present in either partner was studied. In addition, the greater association of androgyny (above masculinity) with relationship satisfaction is almost consistently stronger in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and partners’ relationship satisfaction, with the only exception the heterosexual male sub-group.

The findings widely confirm Hypothesis 6, expecting higher relationship satisfaction among androgynous respondents, compared to undifferentiated ones.

Androgyny, relative to an undifferentiated sex-role identity type, was very significantly associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,004$), although slightly less so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners $[0,040]$ ($n=81$), still significant at the 5%-level. Some of the differences were also significant (either at the 5%- or 1%-levels) with regard to the between-group variances among gay

¹ For greater clarity, the p-values associated with partners’ relationship satisfaction are cited in square brackets “[]”

($p=0,069$) [$p=0,910$] ($n=8$), lesbian ($p=0,081$) [$p=0,105$] ($n=24$), heterosexual male ($p=0,162$) [$p=0,080$] ($n=23$), heterosexual female ($p=0,476$) [$p=0,504$]* ($n=26$), male ($p=0,046$) [$p=0,062$] ($n=31$), female ($p=0,033$) [$p=0,392$] ($n=50$), homosexual ($p=0,004$) [$p=0,027$] ($n=32$), and heterosexual ($p=0,114$) [$p=0,408$] ($n=49$) respondents, each analysed separately. These findings concur quite strongly, especially with regard to female and homosexual respondents, with those reported in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.49. In addition, the greater association of androgyny (above an undifferentiated sex-role identity type) with relationship satisfaction is almost consistently stronger in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and partners' relationship satisfaction, with the only exception the heterosexual male sub-group.

The findings confirm Hypothesis 7, expecting higher (dyadic) relationship satisfaction among feminine respondents, compared to masculine ones.

Femininity, relative to masculinity, was significantly associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,002$), although slightly less so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners [$0,026$] ($n=79$), still significant at the 5%-level. Some of the differences (underscored hereafter), even in view of the reduced sub-sample sizes, were significant (at the 1%- and 5%-levels) with regard to the between-group variances among gay ($p=0,601$) [$p=0,680$] ($n=14$), lesbian ($p=0,265$) [$p=0,341$] ($n=16$), heterosexual male ($p=0,004$) [$p=0,059$] ($n=26$), heterosexual female ($p=0,095$) [$p=0,191$] ($n=23$), male ($p=0,003$) [$p=0,034$] ($n=40$), female ($p=0,073$) [$p=0,185$] ($n=39$), homosexual ($p=0,130$) [$p=0,206$] ($n=30$), and heterosexual ($p=0,007$) [$p=0,055$] ($n=49$) respondents, each analysed separately. These findings concur very strongly with those reported in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.50. In addition, the greater association of femininity (above masculinity) with relationship satisfaction is consistently stronger in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and partners' relationship satisfaction.

The findings confirm Hypothesis 8, expecting higher (dyadic) relationship satisfaction among feminine respondents, compared to undifferentiated ones.

Femininity, relative to an undifferentiated sex-role identity type, was significantly associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,001$), although slightly less so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners [$0,006$] ($n=79$), still significant at the 1%-level. Some of the differences (underscored hereafter) were significant (at the 1%- or 5%-levels) with regard to the between-group variances among gay ($p=0,164$) [$p=0,830$] ($n=11$), lesbian ($p=0,059$) [$p=0,022$] ($n=23$), heterosexual male ($p=0,025$) [$p=0,068$] ($n=20$), heterosexual female ($p=0,666$) [$p=0,795$]* ($n=25$), male ($p=0,005$) [$p=0,030$] ($n=31$), female ($p=0,066$) [$p=0,114$] ($n=48$), homosexual ($p=0,004$) [$p=0,002$] ($n=34$), and heterosexual ($p=0,046$) [$p=0,219$] ($n=45$) respondents, each analysed separately. These findings generally concur well with those reported in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.51, especially regarding the outcomes among homosexual and female respondents. In addition, the greater association of femininity (above an undifferentiated sex-role identity type) with relationship satisfaction is stronger in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and partners' relationship satisfaction, with the only exceptions the homosexual female and homosexual sub-groups.

The findings do not confirm Hypothesis 9, expecting higher (dyadic) relationship satisfaction among masculine respondents, compared to undifferentiated ones.

Masculinity, relative to an undifferentiated sex-role identity type, was not significantly associated with greater personal relationship satisfaction for respondents themselves ($p=0,670$), although slightly more so with the relationship satisfaction of their partners [$0,564$] ($n=78$). With the exception of the sub-groups indicated below with “*”, the trends were in the expected direction, or almost identical (“***”), though. None of the differences regarding the between-group variances were significant among gay ($p=0,419$) [$p=0,928$]** ($n=7$), lesbian ($p=0,548$) [$p=0,232$] ($n=29$), heterosexual male ($p=0,379$) [$p=0,357$] ($n=24$), heterosexual female ($p=0,141$)* [$p=0,069$]* ($n=18$), male ($p=0,245$) [$p=0,318$] ($n=31$), female ($p=0,632$)* [$p=0,846$]* ($n=47$), homosexual ($p=0,271$) [$p=0,120$] ($n=36$), and heterosexual ($p=0,797$)* [$p=0,692$]* ($n=42$) respondents either. For heterosexual (combined) and homosexual (combined) respondents, these trends correspond to the findings reported in Section 9.2.3.3 and Table 9.52. In addition, the greater association of masculinity (above an undifferentiated sex-role identity type) with relationship satisfaction is generally weaker in the case of the relationship between personal sex-role identity and personal relationship satisfaction, compared to personal sex-role identity and partners' relationship satisfaction, with the only exceptions the gay and male sub-groups.