

African Research Review: An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia

International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia
AFRREV Vol. 13 (4), Serial No 56, September, 2019: 107-122
ISSN 1994-9057 (Print) ISSN 2070-0083 (Online)
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v13i4.10>

Nexus between Gender differences and Sexual Satisfaction in selected Married couples in Ilishan, Ogun State, Nigeria

Ariguzo, V. A., Nnorom, G. K., Tijani, O. O.

Department of Business Admin and Marketing
School of Management Sciences,
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo,
Ogun state, Nigeria
E-mail: ada.ariguzo@gmail.com
Phone no.: +2348051675162

Amanze, O. P.

Department of Religious Studies
School of Education and Humanities
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo,
Ogun state, Nigeria

Abstract

Scholarly discourse has intensified the debate on differences regarding sexual drive, sexual initiation, and intimacy between male and female partners and sexual satisfaction in marriage. A pre-tested questionnaire was administered to 124 married students of Babcock University and results were analysed using various regression analysis. Findings revealed that sexual initiation has no influence on sexual satisfaction. It depicted that sexual drive provokes sexual satisfaction more in males than in females while intimacy tends to engender sexual satisfaction more in females than in their male counterparts where the joint effect of the three variables on sexual satisfaction was tested. Furthermore, length of time in marriage significantly moderates the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction. The study confirms intimacy as a key driver in the sexual satisfaction of married couples and recommends its embrace in obedience to the Holy book, as it motivates sexual initiation and increases sexual drive in each partner.

Key Words: Intimacy, Marriage, Sexual drive, Sexual initiation, Sexual satisfaction

Introduction

Academic debate, statements and claims on gender differences has gained a lot of attention since Bernard's (1982) assertion of the existence of two marriages in every marital union. Pertinently, the Holy Bible is clear as declared in Genesis (2:24), that man need to cleave to his wife and become one flesh, though various empirical findings (Hyde, 2005; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Kurdek, 2005; Sprecher & Cate, 2004) remained mixed on this subject matter. Despite God's desire that man and woman must ensure that no spouse keeps the body away from the other without agreed prior notice (1Cor.7:2-5), the practice observed these days, is the continuous exclusion from each other, with reasons such as work stress, undue attention to the children, excessive tiredness, fasting without permission from either spouse, unresolved and undeclared health issues and even deliberate act to punish either partner due to misunderstanding in the home. This continuous deprivation of one partner's body from the other, has been seen to give room for the devil to come in (1Cor.7: 4-5), and many times resulting into depression, lusting for another, terrible sexual thoughts, adultery and many times, may lead to divorce.

Generally, usual ratings of sexual satisfaction (Hyde, 2005; Jackson, Miller, Oka, & Henry, 2014) are not different between the genders; as several findings (Nigatu, Seme, Fituma, & Segni, 2018; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992) suggest that gender differences exist in the meaning, perceptions and importance attached to sexual drive, sexual initiation, and sexual intimacy. Female and male sexual orientations are divergent. They are also viewed as supporting evolutionary, biological, or genetic accounts of mating. However, upon further empirical scrutiny (Muisse, Giang, & Impett, 2014; Seal, Smith, Coley, Perry, & Gamez, 2008), these gender differences are either not what they seem, completely eliminated, or narrowed considerably. From the foregoing, the paper sought to evaluate gender differences from the view point of sexual initiation, sexual drive and sexual intimacy by determining (i) their individual relationship and (ii) the joint relationship with sexual satisfaction, (iii) and moderating effect of length of time of the marriage on the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction. The work is structured as such; introduction, literature review, methodology, presentation of results and discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Literature Review - Sexual Initiation

Sexual initiation is perceived as the ability to influence and commence sexual activity with one's partner resulting in sexual intercourse (Nigatu, Seme, Fituma, & Segni, 2018). Various scholars (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; McCormick, 1979; Vannier & O'Sullivan, 2011) have dimensioned sexual initiation into two – the verbal and non-verbal initiations. They have described sexual initiations as the ability of an individual to communicate directly (straightforward and unambiguous words or actions) or indirectly (implicit and ambiguous words and actions) his or her sexual interests to the partner. Indirect or non-verbal initiations (which include flirting, romantic-sexual repertoire, such as kissing, necking and hugging a partner) have been found to be more desired than direct verbal initiations (Greer & Buss, 1994; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Mitchell & Wellings, 1998). The ambiguity of indirect and nonverbal strategies enables a rejected partner save face if his or her attempt to initiate sexual activity is snubbed, but becomes a less attractive approach as the relationship progresses.

Continuous adoption of verbal approach as a preferred initiation strategy may reflect greater comfort, openness, and a norm to be clear about one's sexual intentions as relationships become more established (Humphreys & Newby, 2007).

Sexual initiation patterns, according to sexual script theory (Simon & Gagnon, 2003; 1984), stereotypically follow expected gender roles of women as sexual activity restrictors and men, the sexually active initiators (Morgan & Zurbriggen, 2007). Proponents of the theory have argued that people have internalized messages that inform gender roles as rooted in everyday lifestyle. For example, in Africa there is the belief that the male partner should pursue and initiate sexual activity while the female partner remains the target of their male partner's sexual advances, who enjoys the chase. A preference for indirect and nonverbal sexual communication could reflect a view that sexual activity should occur "naturally" (Gilbert, Walker, McKinney, & Snell, 1999), that is, without the need for verbal strategies to reveal a desire for sexual activity.

Although the majority of researches (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992) have found that men initiate sexual activity more frequently than their female partners, some studies suggested that there are no gender differences in receptiveness to a sexual initiation. That is, women were no more likely than their male partners to restrict, or turn down, a partner's attempt to initiate sexual activity (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992). Additionally, there may be less reliance on traditional scripts as a relationship progresses. Seal, Smith, Coley, Perry, and Gamez (2008) found that first sexual encounters with a new partner were more likely to be initiated by the male partner, and limited or restricted by the female partner, as compared to later sexual encounters with the same individual. Seal et al (2008) suggested that this change reflected a shift to a more open initiation pattern as a relationship progressed and become more established. Based on the foregoing, sexual initiation could be said to vary according to the type and duration of an intimate sexual relationship.

Sexual Drive

The term, sexual drive does not necessarily refer to a biologically innate tendency but to the sexual motivations, usually focussed towards desiring for sexual activity and pleasure (Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs, 2016). Desire is probably the most detailed rendition of the term "sexual drive". A person with higher sex drive would be one with more intense or more frequent desires, or both, for sex. Hill (1997) observed that people show interest in sexual activities for various reasons such as desire for relief from stress, desire to procreate, desire to feel loved, or desire to enhance feelings of power. Sexual drive for procreation or companionship constitutes intrinsic motivation while other desires for sex can be classified as extrinsically motivated reasons (Lepper & Greene, 1978). Still, any findings of gender differences in sex drive (motivation) should not automatically be interpreted as reflecting innate differences and especially not immutable differences.

The question of gender differences in sex drive thus refers to whether one gender desires sex more than the other (Baumeister et al., 2016). A partner that would probably think about sex more often is the one with a greater sex drive, as such the one with a lesser sex drive, has lower motivational interest in thoughts of sex. Various studies (Eysenck, 1971; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994) have revealed that the male partner have more frequent thoughts about sex and frequent desires for sex. Ard (1977) in his study of 20year old marriages also

found that men are more easily stimulated and prefer sexual intercourse more frequently than their wives. This corroborates findings of Julien, Bouchard, Gagnon, and Pomerleau (1992) as husbands and wives investigated agreed that men are more sexually active and frolicsome. Laumann et al (1994) further revealed that only one-fifth of women under study frequently think about sex. They explained that due to the inconspicuous nature of female arousal, women may not even know that they are sexually aroused! Some of the females confessed to experiencing spontaneous sexual arousal. Their study helped cast the audacious conclusion that men actually have a higher sex drive than women because it may actually be as a result of women's inability to connect to their sexual drive due its inherent invisibility when compared to the male counterparts.

Intimacy

Intimacy is a multidimensional concept composed of knowledge, caring, interdependence, mutuality, trust, and commitment (Ben-Ari & Lavee, 2007). Murray, Milhausen, Graham and Kuczynski (2016) and Weingarten (1991) suggested that intimacy is the resultant effect of coordinated actions of people with shared meaning to reflect their mutual minds. Intimate partners possess knowledge (personal, confidential and private), intense caring disposition (intertwined and interdependent lives that affect each other in different ways), exhibit mutuality (thinking of themselves as "us"), remain committed (invest time, effort and resources at their disposal) towards each other (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 2004; Fitzsimons & Kay, 2004; Reis, Clark, & Holmes, 2004). Intimate partners inherently are able to establish trust relationship which makes it easy for each partner to know that it is safe to open up and that their partner will be there to support and respond to their needs. Intimacy is a close relational reciprocal phenomenon - either both partners are intimate or neither is (Kouneski & Olson, 2004).

Weingarten's (1991) theory of relational intimacy offers deeper insight into the role of intimacy in sexual relationships. It focussed on individualistic view of partners' one-mindedness on issues pertaining to sexual relations based on their level of intimacy (Murray et al., 2016). Establishing and sustaining close, intimate relationships with a particular partner has been recognized as a fundamental human motivation (McCarthy, Ginsberg, & Clinton, 2008). In that context, marriage is perceived as the most intimate adult bonding, serving as a primary source of affection, love, and support (Strong, DeValut, & Cohen, 2011). Researchers (Cohen, Gottlieb, & Underworld, 2001; McCarthy, Ginsberg, & Clinton, 2008; Strong et al., 2011) have continually shown that long-term, committed intimate relationships are critical to physical and emotional well-being. Study by Flora and Segrin (2000) revealed that couples in intimate relationships suffer from fewer stress-related symptoms and recover faster from ill health. It emphasized a lesser possibility of relapses related to stress for such couples when compared to less intimate ones. Montesi, Fauber, Gordon, and Heimberg (2010) also concluded that couples that engage in intimate sexual communication (being open about sexual desires and fantasies; communicating about sexual likes and dislikes) are generally more sexually satisfied than less intimate partners.

Sexual Satisfaction

Sexual satisfaction has been described as the frequency, pleasantness and pleasure derived from sexual activity (Arrindell, Boelens, & Lambert, 1983; Conradi, Noordhof, Dingemans, Barelde, & Kamphuis, 2017). The ability to keep relationships ever fresh and lively helps

couples maintain and achieve sexual satisfaction over a long period of time (Christopher & Sprecher, 2000; Fredrick, Lever, Gillespie, & Garcia, 2016). Sexual activity implies a physical proximity that may enhance emotional closeness and desire for a spouse. Scholarly discourse has established various contributors to sexual satisfaction. Laumann et al., (1994) explained that couples who engage in more frequent virginal intercourse have greater sexual satisfaction. This is the opposite situation for couples involved in less frequent sexual intercourse (Call, Sprecher, & Schwartz, 1995).

In differentiating between sexual drive and intimacy on satisfaction, experts (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993) suggest that the satisfaction begins to decline due to the reduction in sexual drive. This is attributed to fading away of the initial euphoria of early marriage days, when love is fresh (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993). This assumptions stem from Sternberg's (1986) triangular theory of love, in which he asserted that the desire for sex (sexual drive) develops rapidly and passionately in the early stages of marriage and but tends to subside as quickly as it started, leaving couples who do not experience growth in both intimacy and commitment with vulnerable sexual relationships. According to Muise, Giang, and Impett (2014), the depth of foreplay and duration of sexual activities matter for sexual satisfaction. For instance, women prefer to have more romantic-sexual repertoire such as kissing, cuddling and necking (Jankowiak, Volsche, & Garcia, 2015), because it helps in the sexual initiation process, increases her sexual drive and based on the sustained feeling of intimacy before, during and after sexual act, increases the likelihood of an orgasm (Singh, Meyer, Zambarano, & Hurlbert, 1998), and completes sexual satisfaction.

Based on the literature reviewed, the study proposed the following hypotheses as follows:

Ho₁: There is no significant gender difference between sexual initiation and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

Ho₂: There is no significant gender difference between sexual drive and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

Ho₃: There is no significant gender difference between intimacy and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between the combined effect of sexual initiation, sexual drive and intimacy on sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

Ho₅: Length of time in marriage does not significantly moderate the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

Methodology

This study adopted a survey-based research design and utilized descriptive and inferential statistics, to investigate the nexus between gender differences and sexual satisfaction of marriages. The benefits of the aforementioned approaches rest on the statistical robustness in determining the influence of one predictive variable on another variable, as utilized in the study of Javed, Gul, & Siddiqa (2016) that surveyed 200 married people in Pakistani in order to determine marital sexual satisfaction.

the power of sexual initiation was examined against sexual satisfaction. The results are as stated in Table III:

Table III Female View: Sexual Initiation and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
SS = 25.953+ 0.198SI		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	25.953	4.791		5.417	.000
	SI	.198	.232	.134	.853	.399
R = 0.134, R ² = 0.018, p=0.399 > 0.05						
a. Sexual Intimacy				b. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction		
Male View: Sexual Initiation and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
SS = 30.148- 0.072SI		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	30.148	2.157		13.980	.000
	SI_Total	-.072	.106	-.098	-.680	.500
R = 0.098, R ² = 0.010, p=0.500 > 0.05						
a. Sexual Intimacy				b. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction		

Source: Field study, 2017

From the statistical results in Table III, it is evident that a unit change in sexual initiation, leads to a 0.198 unit increase in female sexual satisfaction and 0.072 unit decrease in male sexual satisfaction. To predict sexual satisfaction from sexual initiation, the results revealed no statistically significant relationship with $R^2 = 0.018$, $p = 0.399 > 0.05$ for females and no statistically significant relationship with $R^2 = 0.010$, $p = 0.500 > 0.05$. Therefore, it implies that sexual initiation is not operationally important in the sexual satisfaction of either males or females of the surveyed married postgraduate students of Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria. While existing literature (Byers & Heinlein, 1989; Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992) have established that sexual initiation has a positive relationship among males in engendering sexual satisfaction, this observation remains less important among the married respondents as investigated and further validates the findings of Byers & Heinlein (1989) and O'Sullivan & Byers (1992).

Hypothesis two, Ho₂: There is no significant gender difference between sexual drive and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

The results as indicated in Table IV emerged from the tested effect of sexual drive on sexual satisfaction amongst postgraduate students in Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State.

Table IV Female View: Sexual Drive and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
SS = 24.332+ 0.183SD		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.332	4.473		5.440	0.000
	SD	0.183	0.143	0.199	1.285	0.206
R = 0.199, R ² = 0.040, p=0.206 > 0.05						
a. Sexual Drive			b. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction			
Male View: Sexual Drive and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
SS = 19.104+ 0.331SD		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.104	2.378		8.032	0.000
	SD	0.331	0.081	0.506	4.067	0.000
R = 0.506, R ² = 0.256, p=0.000 < 0.05						
a. Sexual Drive			b. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction			

Source: Filed study, 2017

From the statistical results, $R^2 = 0.040$, $p > 0.05$ for females and $R^2 = 0.256$, $p < 0.05$ for males. It indicates that a unit change in sexual drive leads to a 0.183 increase in female sexual satisfaction and 0.331 increase in male sexual satisfaction. The relationship was statistically significant for males but showed no significant relationship with females. By implication, the results reveal that male sexual drive is twice the sexual drive of females in stimulating sexual satisfaction, and it is supported by studies of Ard (1977), Eysenck (1971) and Laumann et al (1994).

Hypothesis three, Ho₃: There is no significant gender difference between intimacy and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

The results as indicated in Table V emerged from the tested effect of intimacy on sexual satisfaction amongst postgraduate students in Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State.

Table V Female View: Intimacy and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
SS = 16.936+ 0.396IN		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.936	4.620		3.666	0.001
	Intimacy	0.396	0.138	0.413	2.865	0.007
R = 0.413, R ² = 0.170, p=0.007 < 0.05						
a. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction						
Male View: Intimacy and Sexual Satisfaction						
Model:		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
SS = 21.500+ 0.250IN		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	21.500	6.185		3.476	0.001
	Intimacy	0.250	0.214	0.166	1.166	0.249
a. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction						

Source: Filed study, 2017

From the statistical results in Table V, it is evident that a unit change in intimacy, leads to a 0.396 unit increase in female sexual satisfaction and 0.250 unit decrease in male sexual satisfaction. To predict sexual satisfaction from intimacy, the results revealed no statistically significant relationship with $R^2 = 0.028$, $p = 0.249 > 0.05$ for males and a statistically positive significant relationship with $R^2 = 0.170$, $p = 0.007 < 0.05$. Therefore, it implies that intimacy is not very important in the sexual satisfaction for males; on the other hand, females prefer to enjoy intimacy because it would propel sexual satisfaction. This result negates the Biblical teachings which emphasized “two working together except they agree” (Amos 3:3). It implies that only the females require intimacy to get sexually satisfaction because it helps build up the body works before the actual sex. This deviates from the views of scholars: Cohen, Gottlieb, & Underworld (2001); McCarthy, Ginsberg, & Clinton (2008); and Strong, DeValut& Cohen (2011). In their works, intimacy was relevant to sexual satisfaction, irrespective of the gender of the spouse.

Hypothesis four, Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between the combined effect of sexual initiation, sexual drive and intimacy on sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University.

A stepwise regression analysis was done in order to evaluate which of the independent variables tells a good story of predicting sexual satisfaction among the respondents. This analysis was done using the stepwise technique which excludes variables that are insignificant. So, from the analysis, the results are as stated in Table VI.

Table VI Joint effect of sexual initiation, sexual drive, and intimacy on sexual satisfaction.			
Model	(Sig. value)	Included V	Excluded V
$SS = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 SI + \beta_2 SD + \beta_3 IN + \mu$	(SI: 0.737), (SD: 0.475), (IN: 0.012).	Intimacy	Sexual Initiation and Sexual Drive

Source: Field study, 2017

Table VI shows that sexual initiation and sexual drive were excluded from the stepwise analysis because the two variables were not able to significantly predict the change in sexual satisfaction. The only variable included in that analysis is intimacy which significantly predicts change in sexual satisfaction. These findings agree to the postulations of some authors that intimate partners possess knowledge, intense caring disposition, exhibit mutuality, remain committed towards each other (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 2004; Fitzsimons & Kay, 2004; Reis, Clark, & Holmes, 2004). They further align to the supposition that intimate partners inherently are able to establish trust relationship which makes it easy for each partner to know that it is safe to open up and that their partner will be there to support and respond to their needs. Intimacy is a close relational reciprocal phenomenon - either both partners are intimate or neither is (Kouneski & Olson, 2004).

Hypothesis Five, Ho₅: Length of time in marriage does not significantly moderate the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction of married postgraduate students of Babcock University. The moderation analysis was done to see how length of time in marriage can help to moderate the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction, and the result is as stated on Table VII.

Table VII Moderating Length of Time on Intimacy and Sexual Satisfaction

N	Model	β	Sig.		r	R^2	R^2 change	F statistics
102	Constant	21.1493		0.0255	0.2564	0.0658	0.0401	0.0088 (1, 100)
	Intimacy	0.2628	0.4658					
	LOTM	0.2026	0.9615					
	IN*LOTM	0.0116	0.0255					

a. Dependent Variable: Sexual Satisfaction

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Length of Time in Marriage

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Intimacy*Length of Time in Marriage

Source: Field study, 2017

From the results as presented in Table VII, the co-efficient of determination, R^2 indicates 6.58% variance in sexual satisfaction jointly explained by the intimacy, length of time in marriage, while other factors not investigated in this study contribute the rest of the 93.42%. However, with the introduction of the interaction term (intimacy*length of time in marriage), the product terms of the R^2 change, that is the change of 0.0401 implies that the moderating effect of length of time in marriage on the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction is given as 4.01%. The probability value of the interaction term (IN*LOTM) is given as 0.0255 which is less than 0.05 showing that the moderation of length of time on the relationship between intimacy and sexual satisfaction is statistically significant at $F(1, 100) = 0.0088, p < 0.05$. Based on the results as stated in Table 6, the model is:

$$SS = 21.1493 + 0.2628IN + 0.2026LOTM + 0.0116LOTM*IN$$

Discussion

From the results of the analysis in hypothesis 1, 2, and 3, it was discovered that intimacy played a better role in predicting sexual satisfaction while sexual initiation and sexual drive did not. This implied that as married couples, intimacy plays a good role of bonding which even when the initiation and drive is poor. When initiation and drive is poor, intimacy will spark the bonding and keep them together according to the findings of this study. This is further confirmed when the stepwise regression analysis was done where sexual initiation and sexual drive were excluded and only intimacy was included as a proper predictor of sexual satisfaction. The moderation shows that length of time in marriage is a good influencer of the relationship intimacy and sexual satisfaction. This is true from the descriptive representation of the respondents' length of time spent in marriage. Clearly, that majority of our respondents had spent 10 years and above in their marriages and is suggested as the reason for their prolonged union.

To confirm the findings further, study by Flora and Segrin (2000) revealed that couples in intimate relationships suffer from fewer stress-related symptoms and recover faster from ill health. It emphasized a lower chance of stress relapse for such couples when compared to less intimate ones. Montesi, Fauber, Gordon, and Heimberg (2010) also concluded that couples that engage in intimate sexual communication (being open about sexual desires and fantasies; communicating about sexual likes and dislikes) are generally more sexually satisfied than less intimate partners. The underlining wisdom of the Bible's Matt (6:33) – "seek ye first the

kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you”, helps to partners understand the need for intimacy with God. It further gives an exemplary view of the level of intimacy required (1 Peter 3:7-12) based on understanding, humility and grace.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Holy Book has stated the need for man and woman cleaving to one another after departing from his parents (Gen 2:24). However, in today’s world various attitudes of males and females in marital relations have affected the wholesome cleaving of partners to one another. Many times, newly wedded couples enjoy the tingling moments of closeness, ensuring that they dot the “i’s” and cross the “t’s” in making each partner happy. However, with the passage of time, the various attitudes of either partner begin to rear its ugly head, sometimes causing cracks in the marital union. The study investigated the nexus between gender differences and sexual satisfaction with proxies of sexual initiation, sexual drive and intimacy. The findings revealed that sexual satisfaction is not influenced by sexual initiation of either the male or female partner. It however showed male sexual drive enhances sexual satisfaction, while intimacy for the male has no bearing on their satisfaction in sexual relations in marriage. The reverse situation for women is that intimacy greatly enhances sexual satisfaction while sexual drive has no effect on sexual satisfaction. Despite, the findings of this study, its general applicability is globally restrictive.

The study recommends that patience and understanding which is expected to have existed during the courtship period be rekindled with special efforts by partners to increase their intimacy level, despite the gender differences that exist. Also, sexual initiation should be creative to set straight the “apparent” holding back attitude of the female partner, in order to reduce the notion of men always initiating sex. This will help to create excitement in the male partner’s mind of the spouse’s desire. Sexual drive should be continually enhanced through direct friendly discussions between spouses. When a partner observes a drop in sexual drive, efforts to discuss the problem with a view to understanding, with conscious effort towards resolution would do a lot of good to the union, to revive the once burning desires existent during the courtship years. However, where the drop in sexual drive may have been caused by other factors, such communication with medical doctor and a trusted spiritual leader could help when the need arises for counselling.

Intimacy is highly encouraged within the purview of this study because it is found to be the one variable that does the job of explaining sexual satisfaction positively. Therefore, the following activities are suggested to enhance intimacy:

Soul gaze: In this exercise, both partners sit facing one another and stare into each other’s eyes, imagining that the eyes are a “window into the soul”. This may not be cool at first but with time it becomes a good driver of intimacy.

Three things game: Partners can play this game by taking turns to state preferences to one another. Each partner must itemize questions and have them listed. Questions revolving around preference for dessert, dinner, items that could accompany a person on adventure to a tropical island, could be discussed intimately.

Two ears, one mouth: In this active listening exercise, one partner talks or “vents” on a topic of choice, while the other partner must practice active listening techniques, while maintain eye contact only. Couples may be amazed at how unnatural it can feel to actually just listen

without speaking. After some minutes of active listening for say, three minutes, the listening partner is then free to express feedback. Even the Holy book emphasizes this practice as stated in James 1:1-19.

Finally, as couples grow, they are advised to keep track of their number of years in marriage by celebrating anniversaries at significant times with activities that are mind renewing. This will help a whole lot in improving intimacy and thereby making them become satisfied sexually. These suggestions will create room for bonding, and help each partner be less evasive and more willing to make efforts to increase sexual drive and begin to initiate sexual relations in marriage. Further study to investigate the effect of length of time in marriage on sexual drive and sexual satisfaction among married couples is required.

Acknowledgements

The author(s) are thankful to Prof O. P. Amanze, Director of Academic Planning, Babcock University, Nigeria for providing the necessary mentorship which birthed this paper, after teaching the course, *Personal and Family Wholeness (GEDS 901)* to doctoral students in the post-graduate school of Babcock University, Nigeria. Special gratitude goes to the financiers of this paper, Engr. Ugochukwu Ariguzo and Mr Olusegun Adegoke, and also, to Chief & Mrs Nwosu, Mrs Nnorom, and Mrs Ruth Amanze for all their support and prayers. Final accolades go to God Almighty, the fountain and giver of all knowledge.

References

- Ard, B. N. (1977). Sex in lasting marriages: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Sex Research, 13*, 274-285.
- Arrindell, W. A., Boelens, W., & Lambert, H. (1983). On the psychometric properties of the Maudsley marital questionnaire (MMQ): Evaluation of self-ratings in distressed and 'normal' volunteer couples based on the Dutch version. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences, 4*(3), 293-306.
- Baumeister, R. F., Kathleen R. Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2016). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*(3), 242-273.
- Ben-Ari, A., & Lavee, Y. (2007). Dyadic closeness in marriage: From the inside story to a conceptual model. *Journal of Social Personal Relation, 24*(5), 627-644.
- Bernard, J. (1982). *The future of marriage*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (2004). *Measuring Closeness: The Relationship Closeness Inventory (RCI) Revisited: Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Buss, D. M. (2003). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York: Basic books.
- Byers, E. S., & Heinlein, L. (1989). Predicting initiations and refusals of sexual activities in married and cohabitating heterosexual couples. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 210-231.
- Call, V., Sprecher, S., & Schwartz, P. (1995). The incidence and frequency of marital sex in a national sample. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 639-652.

- Cohen, S., Gottlieb, B. H., & Underwood, L. G. (2001). Social relationships and health: Challenges for measurement and intervention. *Advanced Mind Body*, 17(2), 129-141.
- Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., Ziegler, A., & Valentine, B. A. (2011). Women, men, and the bedroom: Methodological and conceptual rights that narrow, reframe, and eliminate gender differences in sexuality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 296-300.
- Conradi, H. J., Noordhof, A., Dingemans, P., Barelds, D. P. H., & Kamphuis, J. H. (2017). Actor and partner effects of attachment on relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction across the genders: An APIM approach. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 1-17.
- Christopher, F. S., & Sprecher, S. (2000). Sexuality in marriage, dating, and other conradrelationships: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 999-1017.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1971). Masculinity-femininity, personality and sexual attitudes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 7, 83-88.
- Fitzsimons, G. M., & Kay, A. C. (2004). Language and interpersonal cognition: causal effects of variations in pronoun usage on perceptions of closeness. *Person Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(5), 547-557.
- Flora, J., & Segrin, C. (2000). Relationship development in dating couples: Implications for relational satisfaction and loneliness. *Journal Social Person Relation*, 17(6), 811-825.
- Fredrick, A. D., Lever, J., Gillespie, B. J., & Garcia, J. R. (2016). What keeps passion alive? Sexual satisfaction, mood setting, sexual variety, oral sex, orgasm, and sex frequency in a national U.S. study. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 00(00), 1-16.
- Greer, A. E., & Buss, D. M. (1994). Tactics for promoting sexual encounters. *Journal of Sex Research*, 31, 185-201.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M. J., & Foote, F. H. (1983). Gender differences in sexual attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1630-1642.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1994). Attachment theory and close adult relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 38-41.
- Hickman, S. E., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1999). By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom: How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *Journal of Sex Research*, 36, 258-272.
- Hill, C. A. (1997). The distinctiveness of sexual motives in relation to sexual desire and desirable partner attributes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 139-153.
- Humphreys, T., & Newby, J. (2007). Initiating new sexual behaviours in heterosexual relationships. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 16, 77-88.
- Hunt, M. (1974). *Sexual behaviour in the 1970s*. Chicago: Playboy press.
- Hutchison, E. D. (2017). Life course theory. *Encyclopedia of Adolescence*, 1-10.
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60(6), 581-592.

- Jackson, J. B., Miller, R. B., Oka, M., & Henry, R. G. (2014). Gender differences in marital satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(1), 105-129.
- Javed, S., Gul, T., & Siddiq, U. (2016). Gender differences: Association of sex drives and marital satisfaction. *American Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(2), 31-38.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(1), 3-34.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., Martin, C., & Gebhard, P. (1953). *Sexual behaviour in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Kouneski, E. F., & Olson, D. H. (2004). *A practical look at intimacy: Enrich couple typology. Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kurdek, L. A. (2005). Gender and marital satisfaction early in marriage: A growth curve approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(1), 68-84.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lepper, M. R., & Greene, D. (1978). (Eds.). *The hidden costs of reward*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- McCarthy, B., Ginsberg, R. L., & Clinton, J. A. (2008). Primary prevention in the first two years of marriage. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 19(2), 143-156.
- McCormick, N. B. (1979). Come-ons and put-offs: Unmarried students' strategies for having and avoiding intercourse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 194-211.
- Mitchell, K., & Wellings, K. (1998). First sexual intercourse: Anticipation and communication. Interviews with young people. *Journal of Adolescence*, 21, 717-726.
- Montesi, J. L., Fauber, R. L., Gordon, E. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (2010). The specific importance of communication about sex to couple's sexual and overall relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28, 591-609.
- Morgan, E. M., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2007). Wanting sex and wanting to wait: Young adults' accounts of sexual messages from first significant dating partners. *Feminism & Psychology*, 17, 515-541.
- Muise, A., Giang, E., & Impett, E. A. (2014). Post sex affectionate exchanges promote sexual and relationship satisfaction. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43, 1391-1402.
- Murray, S. H., Milhausen, R. R., Graham, C. A. & Kuczynski, L. (2016). A qualitative exploration of factors that affect sexual desire among men aged 30 to 65 in long-term relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 00(00), 1-12.
- Nigatu, D. T., Seme, A., Fituma, S., & Segni, M. T. (2018). Sexual initiation and associated factors among young women in West Shoa, Ambo Town, Ethiopia: A community-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Women's Health*, 18(76), 1-6.

- O'Donnell, L., O'Donnell, C. R., & Stueve, A. (2001). Early sexual initiation and subsequent sex-related risks among urban minority youth: The reach for health study. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33(6), 268-275.
- Peplau, L. A. (2003). Human sexuality: How do men and women differ? *American Psychological Society*, 12(2), 37-40.
- Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., & Holmes, J. G. (2004). *Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness: Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Reis, I. L., Anderson, R., & Sponaugle, G. C. (1980). A multivariate model of the determinants of extramarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 395-411.
- Rockwood, T., & Constantine, M. (2009). Item and instrument development to assess sexual function and satisfaction in outcomes research. *International Urogynecology Journal*, 20, 57-64.
- Seal D. W., Smith, M., Coley, B., Perry, J., & Gamez, M. (2008). Urban heterosexual couples' sexual scripts for three shared sexual experiences. *Sex Roles*, 58, 626-638.
- Sprecher, S., & Cate, R. (2004). Sexual satisfaction and sexual expression as predictors of relationship satisfaction and stability. In J. H. Harvey, A. Wenzel & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *The handbook of sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 235-256). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Strong, B., DeValut, C., & Cohen, T. F. (2011). *The marriage and family experience: Intimate relationships in a changing society*, (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Stulhofer, A., Busko, V., & Brouillard, P. (2009). Development and bi-cultural validation of the new sexual satisfaction scale. *Journal of Sex Research*, 1-41.
- The Holy Bible. New King James Version & New Testament Version. Year accessed 2017.
- Vannier, S. A., & O'Sullivan, L. F. (2011). Communicating interest in sex: Verbal and nonverbal initiation of sexual activity in young adults' romantic dating relationships. *Arch Sex Behav*, 40, 961-969.
- Weingarten, K. (1991). The discourses of intimacy: Adding a social constructionist and feminist view. *Family Process*, 30, 285-305.