

- Sánchez Aragón, R., & Díaz-Loving, R. (1997). Medición e implicaciones de la cercanía en el ciclo vital de la pareja [Measurement and impact of closeness in couple's life cycle]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 13, 1-18.
- Shaver, P.R., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1987). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R.J. Sternberg, & M.L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 68-99). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 49, 1585-1608.
- White, L. (1983). Determinants of spousal interaction: Marital structure of marital happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(3), 511-519.

*Psychosocial Research Unit
National Autonomous University
of Mexico (UNAM)
Mexico, DF - Mexico*

Fecha de recepción: 26 de marzo de 2003
Fecha de aceptación: 25 de septiembre de 2003

- Lamm, H., Wiesmann, U., & Keller, K. (1998). Subjective determinants of attraction: Self-perceived causes of the rise and decline of liking, love, and being in love. *Personal Relationships*, 5(1), 91-104.
- Lee, J.A. (1973). The colors of love: *An exploration of the ways of loving*. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.
- Nina, E. (1988). Desarrollo de un Inventario de Comunicación Marital: Estudio descriptivo [Development of a Marital Communications Inventory]. In AMEPSO (Eds.), *La Psicología social en México* (Vol. 2). México: AMEPSO.
- Ojeda García, A., Díaz-Loving, R., & Rivera Aragón, S. (1997). El doble vínculo como determinante de la satisfacción marital [Double communication as a determinant of marital satisfaction]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 12, 19-40.
- Pick, S., & Andrade, P. (1988). Desarrollo y validación de la escala de satisfacción marital [Development and validation of a marital satisfaction scale]. *Psiquiátrica*, 4(1), 9-20.
- Reyes Domínguez, D., Díaz-Loving, R., & Rivera Aragón, S. (1997). El impacto de la escolaridad en la satisfacción marital [The impact of education on marital satisfaction]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 13, 103-122.
- Rivera Aragón, S., & Díaz-Loving, R. (1995). Significado y distribución del poder en la relación de pareja [Meaning and distribution of power in couple relationships]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 11(2), 159-172.
- Rivera Aragón, S., Díaz-Loving, R., & Flores Galaz, M. (1986). Percepción de las características reales e ideales de la pareja [Perception of the real and ideal characteristics in mates]. In AMEPSO (Eds.), *La psicología social en México* (Vol. 1). México: AMEPSO.
- Rubin, Z. (1973). *Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology*. NY: Reinhart & Winston.
- Sánchez Aragón, R., & Díaz-Loving, R. (1996). Amor, cercanía y satisfacción en la pareja mexicana [Love, closeness and satisfaction in Mexican couples]. *Psicología Contemporánea*, 3(1), 54-65.

- Díaz-Loving, R., & Andrade Palos, P. (1996). Desarrollo y validación del Inventario de Reacciones ante la Interacción de Pareja (IRIP) [Development and validation of the Reactions to Couple Interactions Inventory]. *Psicología Contemporánea*, 3(1), 90-96.
- Díaz-Loving, R., Canales, L., & Gamboa, M. (1988). Desenredando la semántica del amor [Unraveling the semantics of love]. En AMEPSO (Eds.), *La psicología social en México* (Vol. 2, pp. 160-166). México: AMEPSO.
- Díaz-Loving, R., Díaz-Guerrero, R., Helmreich, R., & Spence, J. (1981). Comparación transcultural y análisis psicométrico de una medida de rasgos masculinos (instrumentales) y femeninos (expresivos) [Cross-cultural comparison and psychometric analysis of masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) trait measurements]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología Social*, 1(1), 3-37.
- Díaz-Loving, R., Rivera Aragón, S., & Flores Galaz, M. (1989). Desarrollo y análisis psicométricos de una medida multidimensional de celos [Development and psychometric analysis of a multidimensional jealousy measurement]. *Revista Mexicana de Psicología*, 6(2), 111-119.
- Díaz-Loving, R., & Rivera Aragón, S. (2002). *La psicología del amor: Una visión integral de la relación de pareja* [The Psychology of love: An integral vision of couple relationships]. Ciudad de México: Editorial Miguel Angel Porrúa.
- Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. (1988). Romantic love: Individual and cultural perspectives. In R. Sternberg, & M. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 264-292). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Freud, S. (1953). *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. NY: Hogarth Press.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The art of loving*. NY: Harper Row.
- Gurung, R., Sarason, B., & Sarason, I. (1997). Personal characteristics, relationship quality, and social support perceptions and behavior in young adult romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 4(4), 319-340.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. NY: John Wiley and Sons.

References

- Aron, A., Aron, E.N., & Smollan, D. (1992) Inclusion of others in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 596-612.
- Aronson, E., & Linder, D. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, 1, 156-171.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1978). *Interpersonal attraction*. Ready M: Addison Wesley.
- Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.
- Castillo León, T., Reyes Lagunes, I., & Mezquita Hoyos, Y. (1992). Replicación de una escala de satisfacción marital [Replication of a marital satisfaction scale]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 8, 71-84.
- Cortes Martínez, S., Reyes Domínguez, D., Díaz-Loving, R., Rivera Aragón, S., & Monjaraz Carrasco, J. (1994). Elaboración y análisis psicométrico del Inventario Multifacético de Satisfacción Marital (IMSM) [Development and psychometric analysis of the Multi-dimensional Marital Satisfaction Inventory]. *La Psicología Social en México*, 5, 123-130.
- Díaz Guerrero, R. (1994). *Psicología del mexicano: Descubrimiento de la Etnopsicología* [Mexican Psychology: The discovery of Ethnopsychology]. México: Editorial Trillas.
- Díaz-Loving, R. (1996). Una teoría bio-psico-socio-cultural de la relación de pareja [A bio-psycho-socio-cultural theory of couple relationships]. *Psicología Contemporánea*, 3(1), 18-29.
- Díaz-Loving, R., Alvarado Hernández, V., Lignan Camarena, L., & Rivera Aragón, S. (1997). Distancia entre la percepción real e ideal de la pareja y la satisfacción marital [Distance between the real and ideal perception of a mate and its relationship to marital satisfaction]. *Revista de Psicología Social y Personalidad*, 13, 85-102.

Table 3
Pearson product moment correlations between
factors for males

	Love	Hostility	Affection and dependency	Frustration and fear
Hostility	-.32			
Affection and dependency	.22	-.22		
Frustration and fear	-.16	.26	.07	
Self interest	.10	.00	.17	.10

Table 4
Pearson product moment correlations among factors
for females

	Love	Hostility vs. affection	Frustration and fear
Hostility vs. affection	-.31		
Frustration and fear	-.29	.29	
Self interest	.31	-.01	.22

Table 2
 Couple relationship dimensions second order factor
 analytic structure (females)

Ideal Love	Hostility vs. Affect	Frustration and fear	Self interest
Shows understanding, love, appreciation, respect, and admiration.	Aggressive behavior towards partner.	Is frustrated by interaction.	Feels hurt when jealous.
Perceives respect, understanding, love, appreciation, and admiration.	Aggressive behavior from partner.	Interaction generates fear.	Does not allow affairs.
Enjoys interacting with partner.	Does not demonstrate passion, tenderness, understanding or physical closeness.	Acceptance of affairs.	Maintains relationship for economic security.
Satisfaction with relationships.	Perceives partner as not being, passionate, tender, understanding or physically close.	Has less sexual relationships.	Is in relationships for prestige.
Reaction of anger when jealous.	Infidelity.		
Wants to know about partner's activities.	Perceives relationships as painful.		
Is in and maintains relationship for love.	Perceives low emotional security.		
Perceives low emotional security.			

Table 1
 Couple relationship dimensions second order factor
 analytic structure (males)

Love	Hostility	Affection and dependency	Frustration and fear	Self interest
Shows understanding, love, respect, appreciation, and admiration.	Shows aggressive behavior towards partner.	Is passionate, tender, understanding, and physically close.	Is frustrated by interaction.	Acts hurt when jealous.
Receives love, respect, understanding, appreciation, and admiration.	Aggressive behavior from partner.	Perceives partner as passionate, tender, understanding, and physically close.	Interaction with partner generates fear.	Acts angry when jealous.
Satisfied with relationships.	Promiscuity is part of the relationship.	Is in relationship for emotional security.	Indifference towards partner promiscuity.	Maintains relationship for prestige.
Enjoys interacting with partner.	Perceives relationships as boring.	Is dependent.	Perceives lack of liberty.	Wants to know about partner's activities.
Has more sexual relationships.	Perceives relationships as painful.	Partner is dependent.		
Perceives a tranquil relationship.				
Is in relationship for love.				

the relationship fall short on many occasions to the imagined ideal. In fact, males consistently perceive their spouses to be more sensitive, tender and supportive, showing what is probably really happening in the relationship, whereas females perceive their mates to be less expressive, and specially compared to when they were dating (Díaz-Loving, Canales, & Gamboa, 1988). A last interesting result, is that there is a steady decline in the positive aspects of the relationship across time with the exception of dependency, which increases. We have found this same result in every study we have done in which we include length of relationship. However, although this is true, it is also true that the means never go under the mid point of the scale. In other words, the emotional high point of a relationship comes at the beginning, when there is more arousal, passion and discovery. With time, these levels are reduced to what seems to be maintenance level that allows the relationship to persist for a longer period of time. At the same time, certain commitment, intimacy, and dependency components of the relationship are highlighted in order to increase organization and functional aspects of the relationships.

cultural norms were created are no longer adequate or appropriate in the present day settings. Thus, it would be promising if changes are introduced into the socialization practices in order to change the status quo and allow both males to rip the benefits of enjoyable consensual sexual activities.

A basic and deeply disturbing differences among the sexes appeared in relation to the hostility and affection dimensions. Females perceive these two constructs as diametrically opposite. In other words, if you are affectionate you cannot be hostile. This result in females is compatible with data (Díaz-Loving, Díaz Guerrero, Helmreich, & Spence, 1981) showing that Mexican females who are high on positive expressive characteristics (e.g. tender, caring for others) are low on negative instrumental attributes (e.g. aggressive, cynical). Meanwhile, males perceive these two categories as essentially orthogonal (two different factors) and in fact, show a low negative correlation between them. This result is very alarming given that it could be a precursor of intra-family violence. That is to say, males may not perceive the incompatibility of caring for someone and being violent with them. This difference between the sexes could be pointing towards one of the basic psychodynamic problems in the conception of the Mexican male: being strong enough to be able to protect the family, but at the same time sensitive enough to take tender care of them (Díaz Guerrero, 1994). Confronting the dilemma without becoming neurotic could require a cultural norm revolution, allowing males to show their feelings without losing their capacity to protect, paving the road towards the discovery of male androgyny.

Another interesting sex difference appears in the self interest dimension, where in the case of males, the two jealousy scales are related with wanting to know more about their mate, whereas in the case of females, they want to know more in order to enjoy and love their spouse. It seems as though for males, communication is information, and information is power and control. Hence the only time they are interested in knowing what their spouse is up to, is when they feel they are losing control or when they are jealous. It seems safe to say that males are in need of communication workshops.

Finally, in general, there is a pattern of higher positive evaluations of all aspects of the relationship by males than by females. Two possible explanations for these results in a traditional culture are that expectations created about the relationship are traditionally higher in females and that males fulfill many of their personal needs outside the relationship. The relative comparison of what females think marriage would be like, makes

males ($M = 3.58$) obtained higher scores than females ($M = 3.36$), $F(1,855) = .06$.

Frustration and fear change significantly both due to sex and length of the relationship. Females ($M = 2.39$) indicate more fear and frustration than males ($M = 2.04$) in the interaction, $F(1,855) = 13.42$; $p \geq .001$. While time shows the same type of cyclical effect found for the *hostility* dimension in both sexes (*Means* = 2.14; 2.22; 2.10; 2.38), $F(3,855) = 2.95$; $p = .03$.

Discussion

The specification, construct definition, measurement and interaction of four or five basic dimensions, which allow a clearer understanding of the functioning of couples, represents an important contribution in the area of personal relationships. The fact that both sexes perceive and feel that giving and receiving love and affection go together in the construction of pleasant ideal love, opens a door to the possibility of more romantic and egalitarian relationships. In addition to the evident similarities in the configuration of the dimensions, which stress the cultural and human character of the sample being studied, there are some interesting differences by sex. While males include tranquility and more sexual relationships in the ideal love dimension, females do not see these variables as part of love. They add enjoying communicating with spouse and feelings of hurt if couple relationship was to break down or split (part of the jealousy scale) as components of their conception of an ideal love relationship. We should also note that the frequency of female sexual intercourse is not part of the love dimension but rather increases when there is lower fear and frustration. Both a biological universal position (Buss, 1989) and an idiosyncratic culture explanation (Díaz Guerrero, 1994) seem plausible for the pattern of results. From the evolutionary position, males would look to increase any probable sexual contact with healthy females, those that would seem more attractive and capable of producing feelings associated to ideal love. At the same time, females are expected to look for protection for themselves and their offspring, increasing the possibility of having sexual activity only when feeling secure, in other words when they are not frustrated or fearful. From a cultural perspective this could be explained by the traditional roles of the Mexican culture that point toward male hedonism and female abnegation. In either case, the evolutionary benefits of this particular pattern of behavior and the learning contingencies present when these traditional

72% of the variance for the female sample. The dimensions were named *ideal love*, *hostility vs. affection*, *frustration and fear*, and *personal interest*. Among the clearest differences between the sexes are the bipolar conception of hostility and affection in females and the relative independence of these factors in males, evident by the presence of two separate factors. Other differences refer to the appearance of a distinct construct in several of the factors. For example, while more sexual relations appear in the ideal love factor in males, they appear in the lack of fear and frustration factor for females. In another example, females consider the enjoyment of listening and knowing more about their spouse, as well as hurt and sadness deriving from jealousy as part of ideal love, while males put these two constructs together with the angry-jealousy and maintaining relationship because of prestige as part of the self interest factor. Yet another interesting difference is that males perceive tranquility to be part of an ideal love relationship and boredom as part of hostility while females do not relate these constructs to any other.

The relationship among the dimensions was obtained with Pearson product moment correlations for each sex. Table 3 shows the correlations for males, making it evident that ideal love and affection-dependency go together but is not the same thing. The same holds true for hostility and fear frustration. On the other hand, ideal love is farther from hostility than from fear and frustration while affect-dependency is moderately far from hostility but almost independent from fear and frustration. For females, Table 4 indicates a consistent positive relationship between ideal love and affect and a distance from hostility, fear and frustration.

To analyze the differences by sex and length of the relationship (0 to 5 years; 6 to 9 years; 10 to 14 years; 15 or more) for each factor, the constructs that were the same in the two sexes were maintained, and in the case of *hostility-affection*, this dimension was converted into two factors for males. Analysis of variance showed two significant main effects for *ideal love*. Males ($M = 3.87$) show higher scores than females ($M = 3.39$), $F(1,855) = 7.21$; $p = .007$, and length of the relationship consistently reduces ideal love in both sexes ($M = 3.93$; 3.75; 3.65; 3.34), $F(3, 855) = 11.07$; $p \geq .001$.

The *hostility* dimension shows only one significant effect. With time, hostility fluctuates having its highest values between 6 and 9 years and after 15 years of relationship ($Means = 1.22$; 1.58; 1.36; 1.69), $F(3,855) = 5.57$; $p \geq .001$. On the other hand, *affection-dependency* monotonically decreases with time ($Means = 3.69$; 3.61; 3.41; 3.01), $F(3,855) = 14.2$; $p \geq .001$; while sex indicates a marginal effect in which

norm, (f) feelings of sadness produced by mates' real or imagined transgression of the exclusivity norm, (n) marital satisfaction with the form and frequency of interaction with partner.

The remaining and loose items were introduced in an orthogonal rotation factor analysis in order to obtain the rest of the major categories that describe the couple's life. The dimensions yielded by this factor analysis are: (a) demonstrates love toward spouse (wants, respects, admires, appreciates, and is in love with partner), (b) perceives partner's love (feels spouse wants, respects, admires, appreciates, and is in love with him / her), (c) is aggressive towards partner (verbally offensive and abusive, uses a violent communication style: shouts, etc.), (d) perceives partner to be aggressive (partner is verbally offensive and abusive, uses a violent communication style: shouts, etc.), (e) is affectionate with spouse (is passionate, tender, understanding, and hugs partner), (f) perceives partner to be affectionate (spouse is passionate, tender, understanding, and hugging with subject), (g) believes love to be part of the relationship (perceives love, passion, and understanding in the relationship).

In all cases, internal consistency scores were then specified with Cronbach Alphas that in all cases were superior to .76. Some items did not conform to the general factors but were kept because they insure interesting information. These independent items were: (a) tranquility in the relationship, (b) dependency on spouse, (c) spouse's dependency, (d) maintains relationship for love, (e) maintains relationship for emotional security, (f) maintains relationship for prestige, (g) maintains relationship for economic reasons, (h) frequency of sexual relations with partner, (i) sexual infidelity, (j) perceives liberty in relationship, and (k) boredom with the relationship and indifference towards partner's promiscuity.

Results

In order to obtain the structural relation among the measured constructs separately for males and females, all the factors and loose items were entered in an oblique rotation second order factor analysis. Table 1 shows the five factors with Eigen-values greater than one and which explain 67% of the instrument's variance for the male sample. For each factor, constructs with factor loading over .40 are presented. According to their content, the dimensions were called ideal love, hostility, affection and dependency, frustration and fear, and self-interest. Table 2 shows the four factors with Eigen-values over two that explain

Method

Subjects

A probabilistic representative household sample from four general areas of Mexico City was obtained (two areas of lower-middle socioeconomic status where inhabitants had high school or professional training and lived in houses with a full set of services and ample living space, and two of low socioeconomic status where the participants had junior high school or elementary school and lived in houses with limited services and were normally quite crowded for space). Socio-economic status was insured through a Socio-economic Map of the city developed by the Bank of Mexico. The sample consisted of 459 married females, and 402 married males. Once a couple was identified for the sample, interviewers would go back to the house up to six times to meet the participant, 57 males were never available. Twenty-four percent the sample was under 25 years, 29% was between 26 and 30, 21% between 31 and 35, and 27% were 36 or older. In terms of education, 20% had finished elementary school, 30% junior high school, 25% high school, and 25% had a college degree.

Instrument

The first part of the instrument was designed with the four to five items with the highest factor loadings for each sub-scale from the Multi-dimensional Jealousy Inventory (Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón, & Flores Galaz, 1989), the Marital Satisfaction Measure (Pick, & Andrade Palos, 1988) and the Couple Interaction Reactions Scale (Díaz-Loving, & Andrade Palos, 1996). In order to insure the psychometric quality of the shorter measurement form, orthogonal rotation factor analysis was run for each inventory, and internal consistency scores (Cronbach Alphas) were obtained for every scale. Factor loadings above .40 in the expected dimensions and internal consistency scores above .72 in all cases, assured construct validity and reliability for the new versions. The following dimensions were confirmed from these analyses: (a) enjoyment from interaction with mate, (b) enjoyment derived from communicating and knowing more about partner, (c) frustration derived from interacting with mate, (d) fear caused by interacting with spouse, (e) feelings of anger produced by spouses' real or imagined transgression of the exclusivity

(1973) refers to styles, while Sternberg (1986) talks about factorial dimensions);

b) the different operationalizations used in different studies for the same conceptual variable evoke distinct response sets. For example, marital satisfaction has been measured by some authors with attitude scales (Cortes Martínez, Reyes Domínguez, Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón, & Monjaraz Carrasco, 1994), while others use subjective well-being scales (Pick, & Andrade Palos, 1988);

c) samples belong to different bio-psycho-socio-cultural ecosystems where the phenomena behave differently (education may not be equally important in all cultures), and

d) variables are studied in isolation, not allowing for the integration of couples daily life or for the control of extraneous variables.

A way to respond to some of these shortcomings is to conduct theoretically based multi-method and multidimensional studies in different socio-cultural contexts. This, will help create culturally sensitive structural models that will logically integrate all those variables and processes, which take place in couple encounters. In order to explore such a conceptual framework within the Mexico City socio-cultural ecosystem, a research project was undertaken which included variables extracted from the bio-psycho-socio-cultural model of couple relationships (Díaz-Loving, 1996), and added questions on how people feel, think and act in their relationships, as well as how they perceive their spouse feels and acts. Given that the larger percentage of inhabitants of Mexico City are between middle and low socio-economic status, a representative sample of spouses from these groups was interviewed. Each spouse answered an extensive self-report questionnaire that included a select set of measures previously validated for this population.

The variables included in the study were perception and demonstration of love, affection, tenderness and dependency, violent behaviors, frequency, and evaluation of sexual life, positive and negative emotions produced by the interaction, reasons to end or maintain the relationship, jealousy, marital satisfaction and frequency and evaluation of couple interactions. In addition, in order to better understand the subject's ecosystem, socio-demographic variables such as number of children, length of relationship and other personal and social attributes were added to the study.

Introduction

Psycho-social theory and research regarding the perceptions, expectations, behaviors, reactions, emotions and general functioning of couples flourished during the latter part of the Twentieth Century (e.g. Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992; Aronson, & Linder, 1965; Berscheid, & Walster, 1978; Díaz-Loving, 1996; Dion, & Dion, 1988; Freud, 1953; Fromm, 1956; Gurung, Sarason, & Sarason, 1997; Heider, 1958; Lamm, Weismann, & Keller, 1998; Rubin, 1973; Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1987; Sternberg, 1986). In Mexico, the last decades have seen a rapid growth of interest in these topics. Among other aspects, there has been psycho-social research with regards to the perception of the ideal and real attributes of couples (Rivera Aragón, Díaz-Loving, & Flores Galaz, 1986), reactions to interpersonal interaction (Díaz-Loving, & Andrade Palos, 1996), the symbolic conceptualization of love (Díaz-Loving, Canales, & Gamboa, 1988); the measurement of intimacy, passion and commitment (Sánchez Aragón, & Díaz-Loving, 1996), jealousy (Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón, & Flores Galaz, 1989), communication (Nina, 1988; Ojeda García, Díaz-Loving, & Rivera Aragón, 1997), marital satisfaction (Díaz-Loving, Alvarado Hernández, Lignan Camarena, & Rivera Aragón, 1997) closeness (Sánchez Aragón, & Díaz-Loving, 1997), power (Rivera Aragón, & Díaz-Loving, 1995), and couple relationships in general (Díaz-Loving, & Sánchez-Aragón, 2002).

An overview of the results reported in both the English international and Mexican ethno-psychological literature focusing on the different components of couple relationships, presents a generally coherent and consistent pattern. However, the use of small and non representative samples and the inclusion of few variables in each study, sometimes have led to results that do not replicate from one study to another or from one sample to another. An example of these problems is evident when different patterns of results are reported for the same variables, as is the case in which some studies indicate marital satisfaction is either positively (e.g. Reyes Domínguez, Díaz-Loving, & Rivera Aragón, 1997; White, 1983), negatively (e.g. Castillo León, Reyes Lagunes, & Mezquita Hoyos, 1992), or not related to an individual's level of education. Several reasons have been advanced as an attempt to explain these differential findings:

- a) the same term is used for constructs which have different meanings or have been conceptualized differently (e.g. love for Lee

was followed by items which measured the perception and demonstration of love, affection, tenderness and dependency, violent behaviors, frequency and evaluation of sexual life, emotions produced by the interaction, reasons to end and maintain the relationship. All the items from this section were submitted to an orthogonal rotation factor analysis and the resulting dimensions were then checked for internal consistency. In addition, the previously validated multi-dimensional inventories of jealousy (Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón, & Flores Galaz, 1989), Marital Satisfaction (Cortes Martínez, Reyes Domínguez, Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón, & Monjaraz Carrasco, 1994) and Couple Interactions (Díaz-Loving, & Andrade Palos, 1996) were included. Once the new factors demonstrated acceptable reliability coefficients and the multidimensional scales demonstrated their stability, all dimensions were included in an orthogonal rotation second order factor analysis in which subjects were selected by sex. The structure provided by the second order factor analysis yields five factors with Eigen-values greater than one and conceptual clarity in the case of males. The dimensions in this case describe *ideal love*, *hostility*, *affection and dependency*, *frustration and fear* and *self interests*. A similar solution was found in females, with the exception that for them hostility and affection are not separate constructs but rather a bipolar dimension with affection as the opposite of hostility. Separate correlations between the dimensions in males and females show a consistent pattern in which ideal love and affection relate positively in both sexes. In the same way, hostility and fear-frustration go together and are negatively related to love and affection. The basic difference between the sexes is that personal interest is basically independent from all other factors in the case of males, while in the case of females it is positively correlated to both affection-love and fear-frustration. With regards to the differences in means, males significantly show more ideal love and females more fear-frustration scores.

Key words: Couple relationships and interaction - love - jealousy - behavior - marital satisfaction.

muestran un patrón consistente y coherente con el marco teórico y las características socioculturales de la muestra estudiada, en las cuales destaca la relación entre amor ideal y afecto y hostilidad con temor y frustración.

Palabras clave: Relación e interacción de pareja - amor - celos - conductas - satisfacción marital.

Abstract

Interest in the perceptions, expectations, behaviors, reactions, emotions and general functioning of couples has stimulated a great deal of psycho-social research in the past two decades in the West (e.g. Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992; Aronson, & Linder, 1965; Berscheid, & Walster, 1978; Díaz-Loving, 1996; Dion, & Dion, 1988; Freud, 1953; Fromm, 1956; Gurung, Sarason, & Sarason, 1997; Heider, 1958; Lamm, Weismann, & Keller, 1998; Rubin, 1973; Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1987; Sternberg, 1986). However, research has either been empirically and question driven leaving little space for theoretical models or has been primarily based on intuitive and partial approaches that are not adequate to integrate findings and guide future research. In an attempt to describe the interrelationships of these phenomena among Mexican couples, an empirical structural model, which integrates variables in an ordered and logical fashion, is presented. Based on Díaz-Loving and Sánchez Aragón (2002), a bio-psycho-socio-cultural model was considered to select variables and measures. The first step included the conceptualization and development of valid, reliable and culturally sensitive measures of each construct. At a second stage, the created items were enriched with Mexican inventories of jealousy, couple interaction, and marital satisfaction. The research project was undertaken with 459 Mexico City middle, and lower socio-economic class couples who filled out the extensive self-report questionnaire. The inventory included a section of socio-demographic questions such as sex, age, education, length of the relationship, etc. and

CONFIGURATION AND INTEGRATION OF PSYCHOSOCIAL COMPONENTS IN MEXICAN COUPLE RELATIONS

Rolando **Díaz-Loving** *

Resumen

El interés en la percepción y en las expectativas, conductas, reacciones, emociones y en el funcionamiento en general de pareja, ha estimulado una gran cantidad de investigaciones psicosociales en Occidente. A fin de describir dicha interacción en parejas mexicanas, se desarrolló y probó empíricamente un modelo estructural que integra en forma lógica, las variables insertas en el fenómeno. En este estudio participaron 459 parejas residentes de la Ciudad de México, quienes respondieron a un extenso cuestionario de auto-reporte construido para la presente investigación. El inventario incluía preguntas sobre demostración y percepción de amor, afecto, cariño, dependencia, conductas violentas, frecuencia y evaluación de vida sexual, emociones generadas por la interacción y razones para mantener la relación. Adicionalmente, se incluyeron los inventarios multidimensionales de celos (Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón & Flores Galaz, 1989), satisfacción marital (Cortes Martínez, Reyes Domínguez, Díaz-Loving, Rivera Aragón & Monjaraz Carrasco, 1994) y formas de interacción con la pareja (Díaz-Loving & Andrade Palos, 1996). La estructura empírica fue extraída de un análisis factorial de segundo orden del que resultaron cinco factores que describen al *amor ideal*, *hostilidad*, *afecto y dependencia*, *frustración y temor* y finalmente, *interés personal* en el caso de los hombres y cuatro factores de *amor ideal*, *hostilidad-afecto*, *frustración-temor* e *interés personal* en el caso de las mujeres. Las diferencias y las correlaciones entre las escalas por sexo

* PhD. Professor of the Faculty of Psychology and Head of the Psychosocial Research Unit at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). E-Mail: loving@servidor.unam.mx