

Following is the Press Release entitled “**Couples Who Play Together Aren’t Always Happier Together**” regarding the article published in the National Council on Family Relations May 2002 issue of *Journal of Marriage and Family*. The article is entitled “**Compatibility, Leisure, and Satisfaction in Marital Relationships**”



**NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FAMILY RELATIONS
PRESS RELEASE
May 2 , 2002**

The days are getting longer and the grass is getting greener. In just a few weeks the boys of summer will take to their diamonds, and millions of RVs will take to the road. Should we pity the sports widow and admire the happy couples off to explore the country’s scenery together? The answer may not be what you think, according to a recent study published in May’s *Journal of Marriage and Family*.

Although it is generally believed the more couples play together the happier they are, Drs. Duane Crawford (Texas Tech University), Renate Houts

(RTI International), Ted Huston (University of Texas at Austin), and Laura George (United Way of Palm Beach County), conclude that the connection between companionship and marital satisfaction is much weaker than previously thought.

Their article, Compatibility, Leisure, and Satisfaction in Marital Relationships, reports results from a longitudinal study of 73 married couples followed for more than 13 years, from the time they were newlyweds in 1981 until 1994-1995. For this study, spouses were questioned individually in 1983, and again in 1994-95 about which leisure activities they liked and disliked, the amount of time they spent in shared and unshared leisure activities, and their marital satisfaction.

Two surprising findings from this study stand out. First, although couples who liked many of the same activities did not necessarily pursue more leisure activities together, when couples engaged more in leisure activities that both enjoyed, the husbands were happier both 2 years and 13 years into the marriage. More surprising was that couples who participated together in activities that only one spouse liked were less happy both 2 years and 13 years later.

Of all leisure activities, those that husbands liked but wives disliked were most closely related to couples' marital satisfaction. Wives were less happy early in marriage and became less happy with their marriages over time when couples spent more time together in leisure activities that only husbands liked. Similarly, the more time husbands spent in leisure by themselves that only they liked, the

less happy their wives were early in marriage and the less happy with the marriage both wives and husbands became over time.

Researcher Duane Crawford states, “Although women may do activities with their husbands that their husbands like but they do not enjoy, the more time they spend in those activities, the more likely it is that they end up being less happy with their marriages. This may be because wives find themselves doing activities that they dislike, or it may be a reflection of how well the couple gets along during these activities, or both.”

In her review of the research, Dr. Shirley Hill of the Department of Sociology at the University of Kansas comments, “I was impressed by the way the study challenged some common shortcomings and assumptions of earlier research. What stands out particularly is the very ‘gendered’ nature of satisfaction for men and women. Not surprisingly, it appears that women in marriage may be more willing to ‘give’ even when it means their later dissatisfaction.”

“I think the more important point, however, is that women today have a better sense of what their own leisure interests are,” Dr. Hill continues. “They have more money and freedom, they are less likely to always think they should ‘come second’ in the family, and they have become more demanding in relationships. Whether compatibility in leisure is overrated as a factor in marital satisfaction depends a lot on marital expectations, or what people hoped and expected the marriage to provide.”

Dr. Alexis Walker, *JMF* Editor and Professor of Human Development and Family Sciences at Oregon State University, concludes, “When we think about a marriage, we think the couple is compatible, that the spouses enjoy doing the same leisure activities, and that when they have ‘down time,’ they choose to spend it with each other. Dr. Crawford and his colleagues have shown that enjoying the same leisure activities doesn’t always lead couples to actually spend time together doing them. And time together in recreational activities doesn’t always lead to spouses having positive feelings about their marriage. The researchers have demonstrated again how our ideas about marriage don’t always match the way marriage really is.”

The *Journal of Marriage and Family* is a quarterly publication of the National Council on Family Relations, 3989 Central Avenue NE, Suite 550, Minneapolis, MN 55421.

Contacts:

Duane W. Crawford, Ph.D.
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409-1162
806-742-3000, ext. 261
dcrawford@hs.ttu.edu

Renate M. Houts, Ph.D.
Statistics Research Division
RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Road
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
919-316-3345
rhouts@rti.org

Ted L. Huston, Ph.D.
Department of Human Ecology
Gearing Hall 117
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
512-471-5606
huston@mail.utexas.edu

Shirley A. Hill, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
722 Fraser Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
785-864-9405
hill@ku.edu

Alexis Walker, Ph.D.
Editor, *Journal of Marriage and Family*
Human Development and Family Sciences
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-5102
541-737-1083
walkera@orst.edu

Journal of Marriage and Family: Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 433–449
Full Text Article

Compatibility, Leisure, and Satisfaction in Marital Relationships

Duane W. Crawford

Texas Tech University

Renate M. Houts

*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

Ted L. Huston

*University of Texas at Austin***

Laura J. George

*United Way of Palm Beach County****

This study challenges the prevailing view that marital companionship promotes marital satisfaction. By following a cohort of married couples for over a decade and by incorporating

several methodological improvements—such as refining the measurement of marital satisfaction, determining how much spouses enjoy doing the leisure activities they pursue together and apart, and using diary data to portray marital leisure patterns—we found that the association between companionship and satisfaction is less robust than previously believed, and that it depends on how often spouses pursue activities that reflect their own and their partner's leisure preferences. Over time, involvement in leisure liked by husbands but disliked by wives, whether as a couple or by husbands alone, is both a cause and a consequence of wives' dissatisfaction.

Keywords: compatibility, interdependence theory, marital leisure, marital satisfaction.

A considerable body of research, dating back to [Burgess and Cottrell \(1939\)](#), has reinforced the idea that leisure companionship and marital satisfaction go hand in hand. The line of research that followed led [Blood and Wolfe \(1960\)](#) to assert more than 40 years ago that marital companionship had become the most valued feature of American married life. Because researchers have assumed that leisure companionship is inherently pleasurable (e.g., [Lee, 1977](#)), they have focused on documenting an association between how often couples pursue leisure activities together and their marital satisfaction. The consistency of the link found between companionship and satisfaction has been such that the notion that companionship is somehow “good” for marriage has acquired the status of a cultural truism.

There are reasons to believe, however, that the moderate correlations that have been reported between the amount of marital companionship and spouses' subjective evaluations of their marriages overstate the strength of the association ([George, 1999](#)). Spouses usually have been asked to provide an overall estimate of how often they do leisure activities with their mate ([Kilbourne, Howell, & England, 1990](#) ; [Leigh, Ladehoff, Howie, & Christians, 1985](#) ; [Snyder, 1979](#)) or how often they do particular activities together ([Holman & Jacquart, 1988](#) ; [Miller, 1976](#) ; [Orthner, 1975](#) ; [White, 1983](#)), with their responses aggregated to create a summary index of marital companionship. These estimates of companionship then have been correlated with spouses' assessments of marital quality (e.g., satisfaction, happiness, adjustment), with measures asking spouses how satisfied they are with their marriage, how well they get along together, and, most important for this paper, how much leisure they do together. This strategy may produce spuriously high associations between marital companionship and satisfaction because: (a) people who are happy in their marriage may overestimate how much they do together; (b) people who enjoy their leisure together may report doing more joint leisure, compared to those who enjoy their pursuits together less; and (c) the items on the marital quality index include questions regarding joint leisure behavior. The only study that corrected for these deficiencies used diary methods to gather data about leisure activities and a purely evaluative measure of marital satisfaction ([Huston, McHale, & Crouter, 1986](#)). This

study found marital satisfaction and companionship to be unrelated. The present study builds on this earlier study, seeking to resolve whether the amount of companionship in and of itself makes a difference, as previous research would suggest, or whether the connection between companionship and satisfaction depends on how compatible the spouses are in their leisure interests and whether they pursue activities together that they both enjoy rather than activities that only one of them likes.

Compatibility and Marital Leisure [Return to TOC](#)

The idea of compatibility, as it has been used over the years, begins with the qualities of individual partners and suggests that some combinations of qualities are more likely to promote marital harmony than others ([Houts, Robins, & Huston, 1996](#) ; [Levinger & Rands, 1985](#)). Most writings on compatibility begin with social similarities—such as similarity in religion, social class, ethnicity, and education—and link these similarities directly to marital satisfaction, leaving the mediating psychological and interpersonal processes open to speculation. Levinger and Rands have pointed out that social similarities are only modestly associated with how well couples get along on a day-to-day basis, and they suggest that researchers focus on combinations of attitudes and dispositions that bear directly on how inclined partners are to behave in ways that promote a mutually satisfying bond. Interdependence theory provides a useful way of conceptualizing such combinations, suggesting that the relative correspondence of partners' leisure preferences—or the extent to which they like and dislike the same activities—is one way to think about compatibility ([Kelley, 1979](#)). Couples who have compatible leisure interests should be more inclined to pursue activities together than those whose interests diverge and less likely to engage in activities apart. The fact that compatible couples tend to pursue many activities together and few apart, in turn, elicits feelings of satisfaction with the relationship, whereas incompatible couples, who have greater difficulty coordinating their companionate pursuits, are apt to feel less satisfied. Thus, the solutions to the problems posed by interdependence chiefly involve finding ways to coordinate joint activities such that the resulting interaction is pleasing to both partners.

The ways that couples coordinate their pursuit of leisure activities, in addition, are likely influenced by other factors, such as the divergent gender-role socialization of women and men, individuals' gender identities, and the extent to which leisure activities are normatively sex typed ([Swim & Surra, 1999](#)). For example, women have traditionally been socialized to manage the emotions in relationships, sacrificing their own interests in the name of caring ([Baber & Allen, 1992](#) ; [Coontz, 1992](#) ; [Rubin, 1976](#)), and therefore women may be more inclined than men to relent when a couple's interests clash. Accordingly, women may be more likely to companionately pursue activities that they do not enjoy, a pattern that likely leads to feelings of displeasure and, over time, marital disenchantment. Ultimately, the coordination of leisure companionship involves other qualities of marital partners that bear upon their compatibility, not all of which are addressed in this study.

To calculate couples' compatibility it is first necessary to develop a comprehensive inventory of the leisure activities marital partners might pursue, together or apart. Subsequently, data need to be gathered, independently from the spouses, concerning how much they like or dislike each leisure activity on the inventory. Once this information is obtained from both spouses it is possible to classify each activity in terms of combinations of spouses' preferences. When we shift the focus from partners' preferences for any specific activity to a consideration of how their preferences coincide across activities, we may characterize couples in terms of their overall leisure compatibility. Couples who are quite compatible in their leisure interests, such that partners tend to agree in their liking and disliking of the same activities, ought to be drawn to each other's company, to pursue many activities together that they both enjoy, and to have relatively little incentive to do activities apart from one another. Couples who have little in common, such that a comparatively greater number of leisure activities are those that one partner likes and the other dislikes, will be less drawn to each other, do fewer mutually enjoyable leisure activities, and be inclined to engage in leisure either alone or with others. This line of reasoning leads to the following formal hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The more compatible couples are in their leisure interests, the more couple-centered their leisure, that is, the more they will pursue leisure activities together and the less they will do apart.

Hypothesis 2: The more compatible couples are, the more they will pursue leisure together that they both like, and the less they will pursue mutually liked leisure activities apart.

Hypothesis 3: The more compatible couples are, the less they will pursue leisure activities together that one partner likes and that the other does not like, and the less they will pursue such activities apart.

Marital Leisure and Marital Satisfaction [Return to TOC](#)

Prior research linking leisure companionship with marital satisfaction has assumed that couples ordinarily pursue activities that both partners enjoy (e.g., [Kingston & Nock, 1987](#)). The preceding discussion draws attention to the idea that it is easier for some couples to find common leisure interests than for others, and consequently, couples differ in the extent to which their leisure companionship is apt to be enjoyable to both partners ([Houts et al., 1996](#)). Couples with little leisure compatibility may often find themselves pursuing leisure activities together that one partner likes and the other does not, a pattern that likely leads to disenchantment with marriage (although, of course, happier couples may be less likely to pursue activities together that only one of the partners likes, as we consider shortly). Further, both spouses may be dissatisfied when they pursue leisure activities together that one of them likes and the other dislikes, in that the enjoyment of spouses who get to do what they want is likely to be attenuated by the knowledge that their partner is in the unenviable position of pursuing leisure they dislike. Such reasoning

is consistent with [Kelley's \(1979\)](#) idea that individuals involved in intimate relationships are aware of the consequences of their conduct for their partner, often being as concerned about their partner's happiness as they are their own. Accordingly, partners should be disinclined to pursue activities together that only one of them likes, and the more often couples pursue such activities, the less satisfied they should be. This deduction leads us to our fourth hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: The more couples pursue activities together that both partners like, the greater their marital satisfaction, and the more they pursue activities together that one partner likes and the other dislikes, the less their satisfaction.

Next we consider whether the extent to which partners pursue leisure apart from one another is associated with marital satisfaction. Because interdependence theory would lead us to assume that couples select each other as mates partly on the basis of having common leisure interests (see [Houts et al., 1996](#); [Surra, 1985](#)), spouses are generally unlikely to pursue very many leisure activities apart; thus, the frequent pursuit of such activities ought to both reflect marital unhappiness and induce it, particularly if spouses seek out these independent activities rather than pursuing activities together that both partners like ([Kelley, 1979](#)). Consequently, we anticipate that the customary pursuit of independent leisure—whether in activities that both partners like or that only one of them likes—will engender discontentment with marriage, underscoring couples' inability or aversion to find suitable activities to undertake together. It is also reasonable to assume that spouses who are happy with their marriage have little impetus to pursue activities apart, even those that they like and their partner dislikes. Thus, we advance our final formal hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: The more couples pursue activities apart, the less satisfied they are with marriage.

The final goal of this study is to disentangle the direction of causality via our use of longitudinal information concerning leisure interaction patterns and satisfaction with marriage. To date, we are aware of only two studies reporting such data ([Marini, 1976](#); [Reissman, Aron, & Bergen, 1993](#)); in the former, however, two data collection waves were conducted within a single year, whereas the latter tracked changes in marital satisfaction over 10 weeks as a result of experimentally induced changes in leisure activities. Conceptually, it is conceivable that the causal direction between leisure companionship and marital satisfaction runs either way, such that companionate leisure may, over time, create partners' feelings of satisfaction or, alternatively, that satisfaction causes spouses to pursue more activities together ([Berscheid, 1985](#)). The same may be said regarding the relationship over time between satisfaction and spouses' independent pursuit of leisure. To the extent that satisfaction and leisure patterns are related in a lagged fashion, we may conclude that varying levels of one variable actually create changes in the other. Because the extant research provides us with little basis for proposing an explicit hypothesis for the satisfaction-leisure linkage, we frame the issue as a concluding research question:

Research Question 1: Is the causal connection between marital satisfaction and marital leisure one wherein leisure patterns elicit feelings of satisfaction, or one whereby satisfaction causes particular leisure patterns?

Method [Return to TOC](#)

Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 117 married couples who were interviewed in 1983; a subsample of 73 couples provided complete data in a follow-up study conducted in 1994–1995 ([Huston, Caughlin, Houts, Smith, & George, 2001](#)). Couples were identified initially using marriage license records in four central Pennsylvania counties; they were then contacted by letter and by telephone to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study. Respondent couples were all in their first marriages and were representative of all newly married couples in the same region in terms of age, occupation, and educational attainment ([Robins, 1985](#)). At Time 1 in 1983 (2 years into couples' marriages), the average age of wives was 24 years ($SD = 3.5$, range = 18.5–40.6), whereas husbands, on average, were 26.4 years old ($SD = 4.4$, range = 19–47.1). Husbands averaged 13.3 years of education ($SD = 2$, range = 8–19), and mean educational attainment for wives was 13.1 years ($SD = 1.9$, range = 9–18). Sixty-six couples were parents of children less than 2 years old.

Time 2 interviews were carried out in the fall of 1994 and winter of 1995, after couples had been married more than 13 years. Divorce was the principal source of attrition among the study's couples, with 29 of the 35 Time 2 nonparticipants having divorced since Time 1; one spouse was widowed, no information was available on the marital status of two couples, and three couples who were still married did not participate in the follow-up. All but two of the couples included in the follow-up sample were parents.

Procedures

Time 1 data collection. At Time 1 spouses were interviewed separately, generally in their own homes, using an interview protocol that lasted approximately 3 hours. Wives and husbands were interviewed by same-sex interviewers. Data collected in these face-to-face interviews included information about spouses' preferences for specific leisure activities and their satisfaction with marriage. Spouses were interviewed at Time 1 by telephone on nine different evenings during the 2- to 3-week period following the home interview to obtain representative data concerning their day-to-day activities and interactions (see [Huston, Robins, Atkinson, & McHale, 1987](#)). These interviews lasted about 20 minutes with each spouse; they usually took place during the evening hours on five weekdays and four weekend days (two Saturdays and two Sundays), and they generally were scheduled for every other day. During each telephone interview husbands and wives separately reported their participation in each of 50 different leisure activities,

including with whom and for how long they had done so during the 24-hour period ending at 5 p.m. on the evening of the call.

Time 2 data collection. The Time 2 follow-up consisted of a long telephone interview lasting about an hour and a half, during which marital satisfaction was assessed, followed by a set of short diary telephone interviews like those carried out at Time 1. For each interview, the participants were asked to go to a part of their home where they could talk privately, and the questions were designed so that respondents could reply with yes, no, or with a number. Six telephone interviews were used to tap daily behavior during the 2- to 3-week period following the extended telephone interview in the same way they had been at Time 1, with calls scheduled to fall on three weekend and three weekday evenings.

Measures

Leisure compatibility. At Time 1, respondents reported their own leisure preferences by sorting cards identifying 50 leisure activities drawn from a time-use study ([Robinson, 1977](#)) into seven piles with *like very much* (1) and *dislike very much* (7) as the anchors, and *neither like nor dislike* (4) as the midpoint. The 50 activities evaluated by the respondents, which are broadly inclusive, can be found in [Crawford and Huston \(1993\)](#) and consist of activities such as watching television, going for a walk, and attending a club meeting. The activities were categorized for each husband-wife pair, based on the spouses' ratings, into the following groups: (a) liked by both spouses (each rated it between 1 and 3); (b) liked by the husband (rated between 1 and 3) but disliked by the wife (rated between 5 and 7); and (c) liked by the wife (rated between 1 and 3) but disliked by the husband (rated between 5 and 7). Leisure activities that were rated neutral by either or both spouses were omitted. Leisure compatibility was defined as the proportion of the activities for which spouses' preferences agreed, either by both liking or by both disliking the activity. Couples' mean compatibility was .76 ($SD = .13$, range = .31–1.00), meaning that, on average, both spouses agreed by liking or disliking three quarters of the activities.

Marital satisfaction. Respondents rated their satisfaction with marriage at each measurement occasion using a semantic differential scale adapted by [Huston et al. \(1986\)](#) from the Life Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by [Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers \(1976\)](#). The measure consists of ten 7-point bipolar adjective pairs that respondents used to rate their marriage (e.g., *rewarding/disappointing*, *useless/worthwhile*) and a single 7-point item tapping their overall satisfaction with marriage. This scale has proven its reliability and validity (e.g., [Huston et al., 1986](#); [Huston & Vangelisti, 1991](#)), and it avoids the conceptual ambiguities that plague commonly used measures of “satisfaction” or “adjustment” that combine partners' description of their marriage as a behavioral system and their assessment of their satisfaction (cf. [Norton, 1983](#)). Following Campbell et al., we first obtained the mean for the eight semantic differential items that loaded together on a factor analysis and then averaged it with the one-item global rating of marital satisfaction, resulting in a total scale range of 1 to 7. Spouses' satisfaction scores were used separately in all analyses. Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha)

for this measure was greater than .92 for husbands and wives at both data collection waves.

Leisure behavior. The leisure activities about which respondents reported during the diary telephone interviews were the same activities they had rated earlier in terms of their liking and disliking for each activity. Thus, we were able to determine the extent to which partners engaged in activities together and apart that they both liked, as well as those that one partner liked and the other disliked. Because spouses spent almost no time pursuing activities that neither spouse liked, and because we found no significant associations between such activity and other study variables, we excluded mutually disliked activities from further consideration. The average daily duration (in minutes per day) of leisure participation was used to create the following measures at each phase of data collection:

1. Total time spent in companionate leisure;
2. Total time spent by wives and by husbands in independent leisure;
3. Time spent together in leisure activities that both partners liked;
4. Time spent separately pursuing leisure activities that they both liked;
5. Time spent together in activities liked by the husband and disliked by the wife, and time spent together in activities liked by the wife but not the husband; and
6. Time husbands spent independently engaged in leisure activities they liked but their wife did not, and time wives spent independently pursuing activities only they liked.

Spouses' independent reports of the duration of their leisure companionship at each wave were correlated as a reliability check. The resulting coefficients (Time 1: $r = .76, p < .0001$; Time 2: $r = .76, p < .001$) indicated an acceptable level of agreement ([Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989](#)).

Results [Return to TOC](#)

The five hypotheses were tested using path analysis on the Time 1 data, whereas our research question necessitated the use of both Time 1 and Time 2 data. We used maximum likelihood estimation for the structural paths in the model and based our assessment of model fit on: (a) a nonsignificant χ^2 ; (b) a Comparative Fit Index ([Bentler, 1990](#)) and Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index greater than .90 ([Bentler & Bonett, 1980](#); [Hu & Bentler, 1995](#)); and (c) a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation less than .05 ([Browne & Cudek, 1993](#)). To control for the possibility that spouses' compatibility and satisfaction differed as a function of liking many versus few leisure activities, the proportion of the total leisure activities included for each spousal pair that were liked by wives and husbands were entered into all analyses. This proved important inasmuch as the proportion of activities that husbands and wives reported liking was positively related to compatibility in all models tested. Because our sample included 66 couples who were

parents at Time 1 and 51 couples who were nonparents, we investigated the possibility that parents and nonparents systematically differed in their compatibility, marital satisfaction, or leisure behavior patterns. We found no significant mean differences between the groups. [Table 1](#) shows the means and standard deviations for all variables in the study, as well as the correlations used in model testing.

Marital companionship in mutually liked leisure from Time 1 to Time 2 declined by, on average, more than an hour per day ($t = 6.97, p < .0001$). This reduction, however, was similar to those obtained using the same sample when examining leisure interaction patterns across both the first year ([Huston et al., 1986](#)) and second year ([Crawford & Huston, 1993](#)) of marriage. Thus, this decrease in companionate leisure over a much greater interval most likely reflects the continuation of a pattern of normative change over time in marriage.

Compatibility and Marital Leisure

Hypothesis 1, which predicted that the more compatible couples are in their leisure interests, the more they engage in companionate leisure and the less they pursue leisure independently, was tested using a model consisting of paths from partners' leisure preferences and compatibility to the total time spent in each type of leisure (i.e., companionate leisure, husbands' independent leisure, and wives' independent leisure) ([Figure 1](#)). (When the models were tested using the proportion of time spent in the various leisure types rather than total time, the results were essentially the same.) The model statistics presented in [Figure 1](#) indicate that the model fit the data well, and the path coefficients provide partial support for Hypothesis 1.

The results show that the more compatible couples were in their leisure interests, the less each spouse pursued independent leisure. Compatibility, however, was not positively related to the amount of time couples spent in companionate leisure. Control paths were necessary because husbands' and wives' liking for leisure and compatibility were correlated. Only one of the six control paths was significant, positively linking wives' liking for leisure and husbands' pursuit of leisure apart.

Hypotheses 2 through 5 were tested in a series of models following the same basic structure ([Figure 2](#)). In these models, wives' and husbands' leisure preferences and their compatibility were used to predict the amount of time spent in each of the seven possible leisure configurations (see [Table 2](#)). The importance of taking into account the extent to which each spouse enjoys leisure in general was clear when we examine the correlations between liking for leisure and compatibility. Had we not included the control paths, but focused only on compatibility, we no doubt would have attributed effects to compatibility that properly belonged to the control variables. The connections between the control variables and leisure participation, though sometimes statistically significant, do not bear upon the principal hypotheses of the study. They are occasionally significant, but they contribute little understanding in and of themselves to marital leisure patterns and, therefore, will not be discussed further. Each of the seven leisure activity types were used to predict wives' and husbands' marital satisfaction in separate models because our

sample size would not permit the concurrent testing of them. As was the case earlier: (a) virtually the same results were obtained when the models were tested using the proportion of time spent in the various leisure types rather than the total time spent; (b) controls for the nonindependence of husbands' and wives' data were included in the models; and (c) the models fit the data well. Path coefficients and model statistics are presented in [Table 2](#).

Hypothesis 2 focused on the role of compatibility in fostering leisure involvement by spouses together and apart in two ways. First, we predicted that couples whose leisure interests were more compatible would spend more time pursuing activities together that both spouses enjoy. The second part of Hypothesis 2 anticipated that compatibility would be negatively related to spouses' independent pursuit of leisure activities liked by them both. Neither prediction was supported. Compatibility was unrelated to spouses pursuing activities that they both like, either together or independently (Path e).

Hypothesis 3 concentrated on the connections between compatibility and the pursuit not of activities liked by both spouses, as was the case in Hypothesis 2, but rather on activities about which they disagreed. Again, we essentially made two predictions in Hypothesis 3: (a) The more compatible couples are, the less time they will spend in the pursuit of leisure activities together that one partner likes and the other dislikes; and (b) the greater the couple's compatibility, the less time spouses will spend independently pursuing activities that are not mutually enjoyed. Both parts of this hypothesis were supported. Thus, the more compatible couples were, the greater their disinclination to engage in activities together that only one spouse liked (Path e). More interesting, however, was the finding that couple compatibility was negatively related to the likelihood that the spouse who enjoyed the activity undertook it independently of the partner who did not (Path e).

Marital Leisure and Marital Satisfaction

In the models testing Hypotheses 4 and 5, wives' and husbands' reports of marital satisfaction were, as expected, correlated. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were tested with structural equation models controlling for the proportion of activities each partner liked, the correlation between husbands' and wives' marital satisfaction, and time spent in various leisure patterns. Overall, the more spouses liked leisure activities, the more satisfied they tended to be with their marriages, and all analyses controlled for the extent to which they liked leisure in general.

Companionate leisure. Hypothesis 4 focused on the connection between pursuing leisure activities together and spouses' marital satisfaction, whereas Hypothesis 5 targeted the relationship between leisure activities undertaken apart and satisfaction. The first part of Hypothesis 4, suggesting that partners who pursue a relatively large number of activities together that they both like will be more satisfied, was supported for husbands (Path j) but not for wives (Path i). The second part of the hypothesis, proposing that couples who do more leisure activities together that only one partner likes will be less satisfied, was supported for wives when we examined the association between wives'

satisfaction and extent to which wives did activities with their husbands that their husbands liked but they did not (Path i); however, husbands' pursuit of activities with their wives that only their wives enjoyed was unrelated to either wives' or their own satisfaction (Path j). This gender difference was not rooted in wives more often pursuing joint activities that they disliked, as might be assumed. Couples spent very little time together pursuing activities together that one spouse liked and the other disliked; when they did so, however, men spent more than four times as much time engaged in activities that only the wife liked than wives spent pursuing activities enjoyed by only the husband.

Independent leisure. The analyses pertaining to Hypothesis 5 produce an interesting pattern of results, in that husbands' and wives' dissatisfaction was associated with two quite different modes of husbands' leisure involvement. In support of our hypothesis, we found that the more husbands independently pursued activities that both partners liked, the lower their own marital satisfaction (Path j); husbands' involvement in mutually liked leisure apart from their wives, however, was unrelated to wives' satisfaction (Path i). It might seem, at first glance, that husbands' independent pursuit of leisure that only they like ought to be positively connected with their satisfaction; such men, after all, are getting to do what they like, and this would seem to enhance men's perception of the quality of their marriage. We successfully predicted, however, that satisfaction and the extent of independent leisure would be negatively related. Our findings may reflect that husbands' pursuit of such activities is often substituted for the pursuit of mutually liked activities together and, consequently, augment our Hypothesis 4 findings regarding husbands' satisfaction and companionship.

Wives were also less satisfied when their husbands independently pursued activities that only husbands enjoyed. Our prediction of a negative association between wives' marital satisfaction and their solitary time spent in activities that they liked but their husbands disliked, however, was not supported. Thus, in both instances, spouses' satisfaction depended upon particular patterns of husbands' involvement in leisure alone. Interestingly, however, wives' independent involvement in activities that both spouses liked, or in activities that only wives liked, was unrelated to either their own or their husbands' marital satisfaction. Reasoning that the explanation for these findings might reflect various combinations of involvement in independent and companionate leisure, we used hierarchical regression (not shown) to test the more complex prediction that one's pursuit of activities alone that one likes but one's partner dislikes is positively linked to satisfaction if couples also pursue many mutually liked activities together (i.e., an interaction effect). This analysis, however, yielded nonsignificant interactions.

Marital Leisure and Marital Satisfaction: Longitudinal Analyses

We now turn to our research question, which asked whether marital companionship causes changes in satisfaction or vice versa. The path model for these analyses is shown in [Figure 3](#). Two paths tested the causal priority of husbands' and wives' satisfaction at Time 1 vis-à-vis their leisure interaction at Time 2 (Paths d and e, respectively), whereas two other paths (f and g) tested the extent to which Time 1 leisure patterns preceded spouses' Time 2 satisfaction. As before, controls for nonindependence of couples' data

were included (Paths h through m), as were stability paths between Time 1 and Time 2 satisfaction (Paths a and b) and leisure participation (Path c).

The impact of marital satisfaction early in marriage on leisure patterns. We began the analysis by using Time 1 marital satisfaction to predict the seven Time 2 leisure patterns identified earlier for each spouse. These analyses produced several interesting results, all but one of which pertained only to wives. First, we found that when wives were marginally more satisfied (Path e), and husbands significantly less satisfied (Path d) at Time 1, wives independently pursued more leisure that only they liked at Time 2 ([Table 3](#)). Thus, wives' later involvement in leisure alone that only they enjoyed was foreshadowed by both wives' and husbands' earlier marital satisfaction. Second, the happier wives were at Time 1, the less husbands independently pursued activities that only husbands liked, and the less couples engaged in such activities together, at Time 2 (Path e). Third, wives' Time 1 satisfaction was marginally positively related to couples' companionate pursuit of activities they both liked at Time 2 (Path e). These last two findings suggest that wives' earlier satisfaction with marriage draws couples together in the pursuit of activities that both spouses enjoy while deterring the pursuit of activities that only husbands like, whether by the couple together or the husband alone. The extent to which wives are happy early in marriage, overall, seems more important than husbands' satisfaction in creating subsequent patterns of leisure interaction.

The effect of marital leisure on marital satisfaction. The next step in the analysis of our longitudinal data involved using the seven Time 1 leisure patterns to predict husbands' and wives' Time 2 satisfaction (Paths f and g, respectively). In a number of ways, the results of this analysis yielded an even more intriguing picture of the leisure-satisfaction relationship. The first set of findings highlight leisure activities that husbands enjoy but wives do not. The more couples pursued activities together that wives disliked but husbands liked at Time 1, the lower wives' satisfaction at Time 2 (Path g). In addition, the more husbands pursued activities by themselves that they alone liked at Time 1, the more unhappy both their wives (Path g) and they themselves were (Path f) at Time 2. Consequently, the pursuit of leisure liked only by husbands, whether by the husband alone or the couple together, had a corrosive effect on wives' satisfaction, in particular, more than 10 years later, a pattern reminiscent of the findings just discussed regarding the effects of Time 1 satisfaction on Time 2 leisure.

The second pair of findings resulting from this analysis involves husbands' pursuit of mutually liked leisure activities. The more husbands were involved in such activities apart from their wives at Time 1, the less satisfied both husbands (Path f) and wives (Path g) were at Time 2. In general, the effects of husbands' independent leisure, in activities that both spouses enjoyed and in activities that only husbands enjoyed, on spouses' later satisfaction produced the most interesting findings in this analysis. Wives' independent Time 1 leisure behavior, however, was unrelated to either their own (Path g) or their husbands' (Path f) subsequent satisfaction.

Considering both sets of longitudinal analyses together, two suggestive patterns of results emerged that revealed bidirectional causality (i.e., from Time 1 to Time 2, and

vice versa). First, the companionate pursuit of leisure liked by husbands but disliked by wives was both a cause and a consequence of wives' dissatisfaction; the pursuit of these activities by the couple together at Time 1 foretold declines in wives' satisfaction at Time 2 (Path g), whereas wives' unhappiness at Time 1 was linked to the pursuit of such activities at Time 2 (Path e). Second, and in the same fashion, husbands' involvement by themselves in activities that only they enjoyed at Time 1 was predictive of wives' unhappiness at Time 2, and the dissatisfaction of wives at Time 1 promoted such leisure among husbands at Time 2. We infer from these findings that women are quite reactive to the pursuit of activities that only husbands like, either as a couple or by husbands alone, and this reactivity is reflected in significant declines in marital satisfaction over time; in addition, of course, women's dissatisfaction also seems to invite the pursuit of such leisure later in marriage. Ultimately, this class of leisure activities—those that husbands enjoy but wives do not—is the most crucial for wives' contentment, serving as both the precipitator and product of unhappiness among married women.

Discussion [Return to TOC](#)

Concurrent Relationships Among Compatibility, Leisure, and Satisfaction

Compatibility and leisure behavior. One of the most interesting findings of this study involved the relationship at Time 1 between leisure compatibility and the amount of time spouses spent pursuing leisure together, particularly leisure activities that they both like. Although compatibility in activity preferences did not serve to draw partners together and encourage leisure companionship, in general, it appears to have suppressed spouses' inclination to pursue leisure activities independently, suggesting that couples who are less compatible are more inclined to pursue leisure activities separately than highly compatible couples (cf. [Berscheid, 1985](#)). Our results also revealed that couples' pursuit of activities together that both partners reported liking, though extremely common, was not associated with compatibility, nor was leisure compatibility related to the pursuit of mutually liked leisure apart.

Spouses' pursuit of leisure activities together and apart may be weakly related to compatibility for at least two reasons. One explanation is that compatibility in leisure preferences was relatively high, and our respondents reported liking most of the activities about which we asked (e.g., it may be somewhat difficult to find a person who does not enjoy going to the movies or to a restaurant). This overall compatibility may account for why we could not predict either the overall amount of companionate leisure nor the time spent in activities that both spouses like to the extent we had envisioned. The fact that our couples were quite compatible, on average, may have served to attenuate some of the relationships we predicted. Second, although compatibility may serve as a deterrent to independent leisure, companionate leisure may be most directly influenced by other qualities of the couple. For example, couples may be more likely to pursue leisure that only one spouse likes because the couple tends to get along well while engaged in such activities, thereby making the time they spend together pleasant even though both

partners do not enjoy the activity itself. Thus, two different processes may influence leisure together and apart; compatibility may deter independent leisure, but companionate leisure may be more dependent upon affective expression when couples undertake activities together, particularly activities that only one spouse enjoys. As a result, compatibility may exert a more indirect influence upon leisure companionship than we assumed in this study, essentially serving as the context for expressions of positivity and negativity during the pursuit of activities together. When they become regularized modes of interaction within relationships, such expressions, in turn, likely lead to the extent to which spouses are satisfied with their marriage.

Leisure companionship and marital satisfaction. The findings regarding the relationship between companionship and satisfaction at first glance may seem modest, but they are quite important in documenting that when report biases are reduced and statistical controls are put in place, the connections between companionship and satisfaction are weaker than commonly presumed. The satisfaction-companionship linkage lies at the confluence of a variety of biases, impressions, and assumptions, and the previously assumed robust relationship between the two turns out to be overstated when actually put to the test.

We found that the companionate pursuit of activities that both spouses liked was significantly related to satisfaction only for husbands, and we found partial support among wives for our predicted negative association between satisfaction and spouses' companionship in activities liked by only one of them, in that the more couples pursued leisure activities together that only husbands liked, the lower was wives' satisfaction with marriage. We obtained no parallel finding, however, for husbands. One interpretation of these findings is that spouses who companionately pursue activities that they like but their partner dislikes are, on balance, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with such companionship, because although they get to do what they want in the way of leisure, they know that the same cannot be said for their partner. It may be the case, regarding the joint pursuit of activities that wives like and husbands dislike, that wives are more careful to be pleasant and congenial while so engaged than husbands, thereby averting their husbands' unhappiness. Husbands, however, may be less inclined to monitor, or less adept at monitoring, their own affective expressions when jointly pursuing activities that they like and wives do not, thereby undercutting wives' satisfaction.

Returning to a point we raised a moment ago, we speculate that the socioemotional tenor of the interaction between spouses during the pursuit of companionate leisure is more important to satisfaction than the mere fact that they are sharing leisure time. Researchers generally have presumed that leisure companionship is inherently enjoyable, and hence that the more spouses pursue activities together, the more satisfied they are with their marriage. Such researchers usually overlook the possibility that leisure experiences may differ qualitatively (e.g., companionship may be sought or coerced) ([Surra & Longstreth, 1990](#)). The affective quality of couples' time together as reflected in their expressions of affection and negativity may prove to be a better predictor of marital satisfaction than the sheer amount of companionate leisure ([George, 1999](#)). Consequently, the connection between spouses' satisfaction and their companionate

pursuit of favored and disfavored activities may occur via more proximal constructs reflecting the affective qualities of their interactions. Overall, our results suggest that qualifications are needed to the axiom that leisure companionship is an unconditional benefit for marriage. Companionship may, in fact, engender feelings of marital dissatisfaction, particularly among wives if spouses pursue activities together that only husbands like, as was shown in our longitudinal analyses.

Other perspectives on the leisure companionship/marital satisfaction relationship include the self-expansion model of [Aron, Aron, Norman, McKenna, and Heyman \(2000\)](#), which predicts that it is not so much simply doing activities with one another that makes a difference in satisfaction, but rather whether those activities are found to be exciting by both partners. For instance, although both partners like going for walks and they go for a walk together, such companionship would not contribute to satisfaction, according to [Aron et al. \(2000\)](#), because of the low excitement value of walking. Relatedly, some leisure activities involve minimal communication; perhaps it is only companionship that generates the positive feeling and sense of common identity that enhances marital satisfaction. Leisure such as watching television together would probably more closely resemble [Orthner's \(1975\)](#) “parallel activity” type, which he argued would do little to promote marital satisfaction. It seems reasonable to suggest that the extent to which activities are intrinsically exciting, the degree of couple interaction, and whether that interaction proceeds enjoyably may be more strongly connected to spouses' evaluations of their relationship than whether partners pursue activities together that they both like. We also recognize that the interaction of couples with their social networks when pursuing leisure together may be important in predicting their role balance and, thus, their overall marital happiness ([Marks, Huston, MacDermid, & Johnson, in press](#)). We did not assess such network interaction in this study, although the magnitude and diversity of spouses' network involvement in leisure might be an important contributor to their marital evaluations. It is not difficult to imagine, for example, how divergent couples' reactions to joint leisure with network members might be depending upon whether both partners enjoy the company of those with whom the activity is pursued.

Independent leisure and marital satisfaction. Turning to independent leisure, we found that the pursuit of leisure apart from one another was related to satisfaction in different ways for husbands and wives. Husbands (but not wives) were less satisfied if they pursued mutually liked leisure alone, whereas wives (but not husbands) were less satisfied if their husbands engaged in activities alone that only husbands liked. Thus, no pattern of wives' involvement in activities that they liked but their husbands disliked was related to their feelings of marital happiness, whereas only marginal findings were obtained for husbands' satisfaction and the independent or companionate pursuit of leisure that only they liked. Perhaps these findings reflect differences in leisure opportunity between, for example, single- and dual-earner couples, or couples wherein husbands work significantly more hours than their wives. In such cases, wives may have more opportunity to independently pursue activities that only they like at times when there can be no disagreement about the couple's use of joint leisure time. If husbands wish to undertake an activity that only they like, however, they must either convince their wives to participate in the activity with them—the necessity of negotiation, in itself,

tending to reduce their enjoyment—or pursue the activity by themselves, which may induce wives' unhappiness if wives believe that the couple should be spending time together. In either case, it seems likely that conflict and negotiation processes become important issues in predicting the eventual leisure behavior of married couples.

Marital Leisure and Marital Satisfaction: Causal Connections

Our longitudinal findings represent an important development in our understanding of the contributions of leisure to marital satisfaction, and vice versa, for several reasons: (a) they demonstrate the relative weakness of the presumed powerful relationship between companionship and satisfaction; (b) they actually begin to empirically settle issues of causality between the two constructs, issues that had heretofore been open to speculation; and (c) they do both of these things in the process of covering a 13-year time frame, a span far greater than any other reported to date.

The most intriguing set of longitudinal findings involved the joint and independent pursuit of activities that husbands liked but wives did not, in that it was chiefly wives' dissatisfaction that was both the source and outcome of these activities. For wives, Time 1 dissatisfaction resulted in greater time spent with their husbands in leisure that only husbands liked, and a greater propensity for husbands to pursue such activities by themselves, at Time 2. Correspondingly, husbands' involvement in activities they liked but their wives disliked, companionately and independently, rendered both spouses more susceptible to dissatisfaction over a decade later. It seems clear that reciprocal causality is at work here, in that engaging in leisure activities liked only by husbands engenders wives' unhappiness, in particular; such dissatisfaction, in turn, creates yet more leisure of this type. Conversely, of course, it is also possible that husbands of happier wives see fewer reasons to independently engage in activities that only they enjoy and, therefore, do so less. Their wives, in turn, may respond more favorably, and as a result, the less time husbands spend apart in activities only they like, the happier wives are later.

Taking both the cross-sectional and longitudinal findings together, one of our more consistent findings involves the gender differences we captured in patterns of leisure participation, and in the connections of these patterns to spouses' satisfaction with marriage. As we noted earlier, reasons for this dissimilarity between women and men may involve the role of women as partners who make adjustments in marriage more than men, often sacrificing their own desires in favor of those of their husband ([Baber & Allen, 1992](#) ; [Coontz, 1992](#)). Such an explanation would be consistent with our cross-sectional and longitudinal findings regarding the connections between wives' satisfaction and the companionate pursuit of activities that husbands like but wives dislike at Time 1 and from Time 1 to Time 2 (i.e., although wives may do such activities, they do not enjoy them). Thus, our findings appear to reflect Coontz's observation that:

Since women have historically been expected to do the work of managing emotions, many have learned to read men, to interpret their nonverbal signals and ambiguous remarks, anticipating what men want or need and what will be unwelcome to them. Men have not been trained to interpret female signals with the same sensitivity, but rather to

expect that women will reinterpret, make allowances for, translate into “prettier” form, or simply absorb men's remarks and behaviors. (p. 63)

Conclusions

We suggest that a flawed empirical approach has resulted in the overgeneralization that spouses' joint pursuit of leisure activities enhances their satisfaction with marriage, a dictum that has been accorded a level of legitimacy quite disproportionate to the evidence supporting it. One of the central weaknesses in earlier research has been the often unstated assumption that when spouses undertake leisure together, they invariably pursue activities that they both like. Although our cross-sectional results revealed a positive relationship between companionship in activities that both spouses like and husbands' (but not wives') satisfaction, our principal longitudinal finding was that husbands' pursuit of activities that they liked but their wives disliked, both with and without their wives, was the most important factor in reducing their own satisfaction, as well as that of their wives. Had we not disaggregated leisure activities into groups reflecting the extent to which spouses liked them we almost certainly would have uncovered few findings of significance, the effects being washed out by our treatment of leisure activities generically, or as a single group. Greater attention to activity preferences on a dyadic level would also more closely reflect [Kelley's \(1979\)](#) emphasis upon interpersonal coordination in his treatise on interdependence theory (e.g., processes of interference vs. facilitation), particularly when examining the frequency with which couples pursue leisure activities together, the conditions under which they do so, and how they evaluate such interaction.

Another methodological improvement in this study that may have served to distinguish its results from those of prior investigations involved the measurement of both marital satisfaction and leisure behavior. Prior research has typically assessed marital companionship and satisfaction by asking respondents to provide global estimates of how often they pursue leisure activities together and how well they get along, respectively. In the present study, however, marital satisfaction was measured in a way that avoided asking respondents to characterize the behavioral properties of their relationships, and the daily diary method of gathering reports of leisure involvement obviated the limitations of respondent estimates by focusing on specific activities over a precise time frame. Accordingly, we believe that our findings of weaker associations between companionship and satisfaction are more accurate.

The longitudinal character of this study also represents an important addition to the existing body of cross-sectional investigations concerning leisure and satisfaction, one that allowed us to determine the extent of their mutual influence. Future research will advance our understanding of these complex processes to the extent that it becomes less dependent on cross-sectional methods. Such longitudinal studies, in their turn, will need to use multiple data collection waves separated by substantial time intervals in order to capture effects that might require longer to surface than is commonly assumed. Finally, researchers will need to target a broader range of personal and interpersonal phenomena that bear upon the conduct of married couples—among them partners' orientations toward

daily activities, the feelings they hold about their relationship, and the socioemotional nature of the interaction between them—if they are to chronicle the factors that mold and modify the course of relationship development.

Acknowledgment—The data that appear in this article were derived from a project sponsored by National Institute of Mental Health Grant MH-33938 and National Science Foundation Grant SBR-9311846 (Ted L. Huston, Principal Investigator). This article was completed while Renate M. Houts was supported by a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development postdoctoral fellowship (Grant T-32 HD07376) at the Center for Developmental Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

References [Return to TOC](#)

Aron, A., E. Aron, C. Norman, C. McKenna, and R. Heyman. (2000). Couples' shared participation in novel and arousing activities and experienced relationship quality: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.*, 78, 273–284. [[PubMed Citation](#)]

Baber, K., and K. Allen. (1992). *Women and families: Feminist reconstruction*: New York: Guilford Press.

Bentler, P. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models: *Psychological Bulletin.*, 107, 238–246. [[PubMed Citation](#)]

Bentler, P., and D. Bonett. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures: *Psychological Bulletin.*, 88, 588–606.

Berscheid, E. (1985). Compatibility, interdependence, and emotion: In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships* (pp. 143–161). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Blood, R., Jr., and D. Wolfe. (1960). *Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married life*: New York: Free Press.

Browne, M., and R. Cudek. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit: In K. Bollen & J. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equations models* (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Burgess, E., and L. Cottrell. (1939). *Predicting success or failure in marriage*: New York: Prentice-Hall.

Campbell, A., P. Converse, and W. Rodgers. (1976). *The quality of American life*: New York: Sage.

Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap*: New York: Basic Books.

- Crawford, D., and T. Huston. (1993). The impact of the transition to parenthood on marital leisure: *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 39–46.
- George, L. (1999). *Affective quality, leisure time, and marital satisfaction: A 13-year longitudinal study*: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Holman, T., and M. Jacquart. (1988). Leisure-activity patterns and marital satisfaction: A further test: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 69–77.
- Houts, R., E. Robins, and T. Huston. (1996). Compatibility and the development of premarital relationships: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 7–20.
- Hu, L., and P. Bentler. (1995). Evaluating model fit: In R. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 158–176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Huston, T., J. Caughlin, R. Houts, S. Smith, and L. George. (2001). The connubial crucible: Newlywed years as predictors of marital delight, distress, and divorce: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 237–252. [[PubMed Citation](#)]
- Huston, T., S. McHale, and A. Crouter. (1986). When the honeymoon's over: Changes in the marriage relationship over the first year: In R. Gilmour & S. Duck (Eds.), *The emerging field of personal relationships* (pp. 109–132). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Huston, T., E. Robins, J. Atkinson, and S. McHale. (1987). Surveying the landscape of marital behavior: A behavioral self-report approach to studying marriage: In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Family processes and problems: Social psychological aspects* (pp. 45–71). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Huston, T., and A. Vangelisti. (1991). Socioemotional behavior and satisfaction in marital relationships: A longitudinal study: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 721–733.
- Kelley, H. (1979). *Personal relationships: Their structures and processes*: Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kilbourne, B., F. Howell, and P. England. (1990). A measurement model for subjective marital solidarity: Invariance across time, gender, and life cycle stage: *Social Science Research*, 19, 62–81.
- Kingston, P., and S. Nock. (1987). Time together among dual-earner couples: *American Sociological Review*, 52, 391–400.
- Lee, G. (1977). Age at marriage and marital satisfaction: A multivariate analysis with

implications for marital stability: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 39, 493–504.

Leigh, G., G. Ladehoff, A. Howie, and D. Christians. (1985). Correlates of marital satisfaction among men and women in intact first marriage and remarriage: *Family Perspective*., 19, 139–149.

Levinger, G., and M. Rands. (1985). Compatibility in marriage and other close relationships: In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships* (pp. 309–331). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Marini, M. (1976). Dimensions of marital happiness: A research note: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 38, 443–448.

Marks, S., T. Huston, S. MacDermid, and E. Johnson. (in press). How married people balance their roles: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*..

Miller, B. (1976). A multivariate developmental model of marital satisfaction: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 38, 643–657.

Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 45, 141–151.

Orthner, D. (1975). Leisure activity patterns and marital satisfaction over the marital career: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 37, 91–102.

Reissman, C., A. Aron, and M. Bergen. (1993). Shared activities and marital satisfaction: Causal direction and self-expansion versus boredom: *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*., 10, 243–254.

Robins, E. (1985). *A theoretical and empirical investigation of compatibility testing in marital choice*: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Robinson, J. (1977). *How Americans use time*: New York: Praeger.

Rubin, L. (1976). *Worlds of pain: Life in the working-class family*: New York: Basic Books.

Snyder, D. (1979). Multidimensional assessment of marital satisfaction: *Journal of Marriage and the Family*., 41, 813–823.

Surra, C. (1985). Courtship types: Variations in interdependence between partners and social networks: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*., 49, 357–375.

Surra, C., and M. Longstreth. (1990). Similarity of outcomes, interdependence, and conflict in dating relationships: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*., 59, 501–

516. [[PubMed Citation](#)]

Swim, T., and C. Surra. (1999). Role of gender in behavioral interdependence and relationship outcomes for premarital couples: *Sex Roles.*, 41, 49–70.

Tabachnick, B., and L. Fidell. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics* (2nd ed): New York: Harper & Row.

White, L. (1983). Determinants of spousal interaction: Marital structure or marital happiness?: *Journal of Marriage and the Family.*, 45, 511–519.

Tables [Return to TOC](#)

TABLE 1. PAIRWISE CORRELATIONS AMONG STUDY MEASURES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Companionate leisure (Time 1)									
1. Both partners like	—								
2. Husband likes, wife dislikes	-.05	—							
3. Wife likes, husband dislikes	-.07	.11	—						
4. Total companionate leisure	.95	.09	.22	—					
Husband's independent (Time 1)									
5. Both partners like	-.03	-.09	-.09	-.07	—				
6. Husband likes, wife dislikes	-.18	.39	-.02	-.14	.12	—			
7. Total husband independent	-.04	.01	-.02	-.05	.95	.33	—		
Wife's independent (Time 1)									
8. Both partners like	.00	-.06	-.16	-.05	.23	-.06	.17	—	
9. Wife likes, husband dislikes	-.21	-.02	.62	-.03	.00	.01	.07	-.02	—
10. Total wife independent	-.09	.06	.07	-.06	.20	-.02	.18	.93	.31
Leisure preferences (Time 1)									
11. Husbands'	.21	.00	-.11	.17	.04	-.07	.00	.04	-.19
12. Wives'	.20	-.25	.15	.20	.18	-.38	.11	.00	.07
13. Compatibility	.18	-.32	-.24	.07	.04	-.47	-.10	-.06	-.33
Marital satisfaction (Time 1)									
14. Husbands'	.25	.01	-.09	.22	-.19	-.17	-.23	-.07	-.11
15. Wives'	.15	-.24	-.12	.09	-.04	-.36	-.10	-.03	-.06
Companionate leisure (Time 2)									
16. Both partners like	.13	-.16	.02	.13	-.01	-.21	-.02	.08	-.03
17. Husband likes, wife dislikes	-.13	.06	-.06	-.14	.01	.39	.07	.12	-.09
18. Wife likes, husband dislikes	-.22	-.06	.26	-.14	.07	.01	.05	-.05	.10
Husbands' independent (Time 2)									
19. Both partners like	-.16	.02	.09	-.13	.17	.13	.23	.03	.18
20. Husband likes, wife dislikes	-.02	.06	-.02	-.02	-.03	.35	.11	-.14	-.17
Wives' independent (Time 2)									
21. Both partners like	.19	.11	.01	.20	-.01	.20	.09	-.02	-.04
22. Wife likes, husband dislikes	-.08	-.10	.07	-.07	.28	-.01	.23	.10	.11
Marital satisfaction (Time 2)									
23. Husbands'	.16	-.06	.00	.15	-.28	-.31	-.27	-.12	.01
24. Wives'	.17	-.20	-.05	.15	-.21	-.31	-.22	.05	-.08
<i>M</i>	182.53	2.61	9.84	195.49	93.57	8.98	109.71	113.54	17.22
<i>SD</i>	86.13	9.41	24.94	88.32	77.97	20.57	87.38	90.84	33.83
<i>n</i>	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117

TABLE 1. EXTENDED

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
—															
-.02	—														
-.00	.61	—													
-.20	.33	.49	—												
-.10	.26	.12	.24	—											
-.11	.10	.20	.21	.47	—										
.06	.22	.38	.26	.13	.27	—									
.12	.06	-.11	-.16	-.12	-.39	-.09	—								
-.02	-.19	-.11	-.09	.07	.09	-.08	-.07	—							
.10	.08	.18	-.03	-.17	-.10	.01	.11	.02	—						
-.18	.19	-.04	-.06	-.16	-.35	-.08	.37	-.12	.04	—					
-.02	.38	.17	.09	-.02	-.14	.07	.25	-.21	.37	.20	—				
.12	-.16	-.10	-.23	-.21	-.03	-.09	-.14	.28	.02	-.17	-.16	—			
-.14	.15	.24	.19	.35	.31	.31	-.13	-.06	.03	-.18	-.07	-.37	—		
-.01	.00	.10	.22	.27	.45	.14	-.15	.04	-.09	-.29	-.11	-.09	.57	—	
135.54	0.83	0.80	0.76	5.90	5.82	102.77	4.37	9.13	87.39	10.39	100.16	26.56	5.56	5.68	
97.41	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.93	1.25	78.84	16.81	33.29	72.45	20.81	70.61	49.70	1.15	1.17	
117	117	117	117	117	117	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	82	82

TABLE 2. TIME 1 STANDARDIZED REGRESSION WEIGHTS, SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS, AND MODEL FIT INDICES

Path	Companionate Leisure			Husband's Independent Leisure	
	Both Like	H Likes, W Dislikes	W Likes, H Dislikes	Both Like	H Likes, W Dislikes
a: W leisure prefs ↔ compatibility	.67***	.67***	.67***	.67***	.67***
b: W leisure prefs ↔ H leisure prefs	.16*	.16*	.16*	.16*	.16*
c: H leisure prefs ↔ compatibility	.45***	.45***	.45***	.45***	.45***
d: W leisure prefs → leisure time	.10	-.20	.32***	.28**	-.27**
e: H leisure prefs → leisure time	.13	.19*	-.17*	.00	.19**
f: Compatibility → leisure time	.05	-.27**	-.38***	-.15	-.37**
g: W leisure prefs → W satisfaction	.17**	.10	.18**	.17**	.05
h: H leisure prefs → H satisfaction	.27***	.29***	.31***	.29***	.29***
i: Leisure time → W satisfaction	.12	-.20**	-.13	-.07	-.34**
j: Leisure time → H satisfaction	.20**	.00	.00	-.19**	-.16*
k: W satisfaction ↔ H satisfaction	.47***	.49***	.48***	.47***	.46***
Squared multiple correlations					
Leisure time	.05	.16	.15	.05	.30
Wives' satisfaction	.05	.07	.05	.03	.13
Husbands' satisfaction	.13	.08	.10	.12	.11
χ^2 (4, $N = 117$)	1.54	2.13	1.70	2.74	.40
p value	.82	.71	.79	.60	.98
Comparative fit index	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Bentler-Bonett normed fit index	.99	.99	.99	.98	1.00
Root mean square error of approximation	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

Note: prefs = preferences; H = husband; W = wife.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

TABLE 3. TIME 1 TO TIME 2 STANDARDIZED REGRESSION WEIGHTS, SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS, AND MODEL FIT INDICES

Path	Companionate Leisure			Husbands' Independent Leisure	
	Both Like	H Likes, W Dislikes	W Likes, H Dislikes	Both Like	H Likes W Dislikes
a: H satisfaction 1 → H satisfaction 2	.31***	.32***	.33***	.29***	.28***
b: W satisfaction 1 → W satisfaction 2	.38***	.40***	.39***	.38***	.35***
c: Leisure time 1 → leisure time 2	.11	.05	.28**	.13	.27**
d: H satisfaction 1 → leisure time 2	-.02	.14	.05	-.13	.08
e: W satisfaction 1 → leisure time 2	.24*	-.49***	.15	-.05	-.31**
f: Leisure time 1 → H satisfaction 2	.10	-.08	.04	-.23**	-.25**
g: Leisure time 1 → W satisfaction 2	.10	-.21***	-.02	-.17*	-.21**
h: H satisfaction 1 ↔ W satisfaction 1	.55***	.55***	.55***	.55***	.55***
i: H satisfaction 1 ↔ leisure time 1	.21*	.05	-.13	-.18	-.21*
j: W satisfaction 1 ↔ leisure time 1	.21*	.02	-.10	-.11	-.30**
k: H satisfaction 2 ↔ W satisfaction 2	.51***	.50***	.51***	.49***	.48***
l: H satisfaction 2 ↔ leisure time 2	.24**	.01	-.17	.16	.00
m: W satisfaction 2 ↔ leisure time 2	.01	.09	-.04	.00	-.11
Squared multiple correlations					
Leisure time 2	.07	.19	.10	.05	.19
Wives' satisfaction 2	.17	.20	.18	.19	.21
Husbands' satisfaction 2	.12	.11	.11	.16	.17
χ^2 (2, $N = 82$)	1.96	2.52	2.40	2.07	.98
p value	.38	.28	.30	.36	.61
Comparative fit index	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Bentler-Bonett normed fit index	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Root-mean square error of approximation	.00	.06	.05	.02	.00

Note: Analyses used direct maximum likelihood estimation of missing data; results using only cases with complete data ($n = 73$) a wife.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.