

ROMANTIC PARTNERSHIP AND PERCEIVED RISK OF SEPARATION DURING COVID-19 LOCKDOWN IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Unión Romántica y riesgo de separación durante el confinamiento COVID-19 en la República Dominicana

Gloriannys Baez

Universidad Iberoamericana (UNIBE). República Dominicana.
Gloriannys@gmail.com, g.baez@prof.unibe.edu.do
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7492-7122>

Laura Pacheco del Castillo

Escuela Psicología Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra (PUCMM). República Dominicana.
la.pacheco@ce.pucmm.edu.do
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0289-5023>

Juan Amílcar Pérez Guzmán

Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC), República Dominicana.
amilcar4000@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0991-045X>

Recibido: 14/7/2023 • Aprobado: 30/10/2023

Cómo citar: Baez, G., Pacheco del Castillo, L., & Pérez Guzmán, J. A. (2023). Romantic partnership and perceived risk of separation during COVID-19 lockdown in the Dominican Republic. *Ciencia y Sociedad*, 48(4), 57–89. <https://doi.org/10.22206/cys.2023.v48i4.2806>

Abstract

This paper aims to identify the variables that best predict the perceived risk of romantic breakup or separation during COVID-19. We hypothesize that greater psychological distress and lower perceived equity, partner support, and satisfaction increase the perceived risk of separation from a partner. Participants ($n = 409$ Dominicans; 79.71% female) answered six questionnaires corresponding to the variables of the study. The original model could correctly classify 88.8% of the cases, $\chi^2(4) = 231.926$, $p < 0.001$, but only marital satisfaction was a statistically significant predictor of the perceived risk of separation, $W^2 = 46.897$, $p < 0.001$. The data was trained with 80% of the final sample and was cross validated with the rest of the sample to ascertain its value outside the current sample. The resulting model combines marital satisfaction, perceived risk of separation before COVID-19, quality time spent together before COVID-19, and marital status as the best predictors of perceived relationship dissolution, correctly classifying 95.3% of the cases, $\chi^2(5) = 314.873$, $p < 0.001$. We discussed the role of gender in the results and the value of each predictor for the model.

Resumen

Este trabajo tuvo como objetivo identificar las variables que mejor predicen el riesgo percibido de ruptura o separación sentimental. Nuestra hipótesis es que una mayor angustia psicológica y una menor equidad percibida, el apoyo de la pareja y la satisfacción aumentan el riesgo percibido de separación de una pareja. Los participantes ($n = 409$ dominicanos; 79.71% mujeres) respondieron seis cuestionarios relacionados con las variables del estudio. El modelo propuesto pudo clasificar correctamente el 88,8% de los casos, $\chi^2(4) = 231,926$, $p < 0,001$; pero solo la satisfacción conyugal predijo significativamente el riesgo percibido de separación, $W^2 = 46,897$, $p < 0,001$. Los datos se entrenaron con el 80% de la muestra final y se validaron de forma cruzada con el resto de la muestra para determinar su valor fuera de la muestra actual. El modelo resultante combina la satisfacción conyugal, el riesgo percibido de separación antes de la pandemia, la cantidad de tiempo de calidad que pasaban juntos antes de la pandemia y el tipo de convivencia como los mejores predictores de pensar en la disolución de la relación. Este modelo clasifica correctamente el 95,3% de los casos, $\chi^2(5) = 314,873$, $p < 0,001$. Se discute el papel del género



Keywords: marriage, family disorganization, perceived risk of separation, psychological effects.

Predictors of Perceived Risk of Separation in Dominican Relationships

This article delves into the study of the effects of prolonged forced cohabitation, an area of investigation with salient onset during the COVID-19 pandemic. By examining the consequences of spending more time together than couples were accustomed to before the implementation of government regulations aimed at preventing virus transmission, we shed light on the impact of extended cohabitation on interpersonal dynamics. This research aims to provide valuable insights into the complexities of human relationships as they played out during and beyond the context of COVID-19 prevention related measures.

The COVID-19 pandemic awakened psychological discomfort in the general population. Its preventive measures of social distancing went hand in hand with confinement or quarantine policies (Mesa Vieira et al., 2020). In their review of 24 articles, Brooks et al. (2020) confirmed the psychological consequences of quarantine periods established throughout the 21st century for other diseases such as Ebola, SARS, H1N1 influenza, MERS, and equine influenza. For COVID-19, stressors could occur before, during, and after quarantine periods. The main stressors detected by Brooks et al., (2020) related to the duration of the quarantine period, fear of contagion, struggles to restock household items, ignorance, or inadequate information about the disease, and even boredom from being isolated during quarantine.

Stress situations in and out of every home, whether due to a substantial crisis or recurrent trivial

en los resultados, ya que la mayoría de la muestra eran mujeres y el valor de cada predictor para el modelo.

Palabras clave: desintegración de la familia, riesgo percibido de separación, matrimonio, efectos psicológicos.

incidents, can psychologically affect individuals and their close relationships (Lincoln & Chae, 2010; Randall & Bodenmann, 2009; 2017; Ridner, 2004). A couple's relationship is vulnerable to emotionally demanding situations through what is known as the stress overflow phenomenon (Neff & Broady, 2011; Neff et al., 2022; Randall & Bodenmann, 2009). This relates to the onset of maladaptive behaviors in romantic relationships, given the wear and tear in each member's capacity to self-regulate, which in turn leads to a decreased sense of satisfaction in the relationship (Buck & Neff, 2012).

The success or failure of romantic relationships has been previously studied in terms of how couples manage stressful experiences, including those of medical nature (Aydogan & Ozbay, 2015; Bodenmann & Cina, 2005; Nina Estrella, 2016). Variables such as perceived support from the partner, communication, and perceived equity in roles have been addressed in the literature in this regard, including the consequences for the individual and the dyad. A partner's perceived support and satisfaction with communication within the relationship have shown to be predictors of satisfaction with the partnership (Aydogan & Kizildag, 2018; Jones et al., 2018; Yedirir & Hamarta, 2015). Similarly, the perception of inequities and unhealthy communication patterns are among the predictors of low marital satisfaction or divorce (Clarke & Berrington, 1999; Cook & Hegtvædt, 1983; Dew et al., 2012; Schrodt et al., 2014).

The COVID-19 emergency was a non-normative life event, expected to have enduring societal, individual, and romantic partnership repercussions.

Previous research underscored the association between relationship-related variables and individual coping strategies with relationship quality, satisfaction, and divorce. Nonetheless, these variables also underwent scrutiny in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Most of the research indicated that the pandemic-induced stress, anxiety, and uncertainty generally adversely affected relationship quality (Balzarini, et al., 2023; Pietromonaco, & Overall, 2021; Relvas et al., 2023), dyadic adjustment, and adaptive coping mechanisms (Donato et al., 2021; Romeo, et al., 2022). It is worth noting that these studies predominantly offered cross-sectional insights, while a singular longitudinal study revealed there were no changes in couple satisfaction over a one-year follow-up period (Galdiolo, et al., 2022). Notably, some reports surfaced regarding enhancements in relationship quality during lockdown measures, particularly in areas of commitment, trust, passion, love, and sexual intimacy (Mutang, et al., 2022), specifically for newlyweds (Williamson et al., 2021). These differences in results could be due to how the couple grappled with pre-existing stressors, sociodemographic characteristics, and personal vulnerabilities (Overall et al., 2022; Pietromonaco & Overall, 2021).

This research responded to a need for knowledge at the onset of the declaration of a state of national emergency in the Dominican Republic due to COVID-19. Once this resolution was made public in March 2020, couples in the Dominican Republic found themselves in a state of forced cohabitation that differed from their typical time-share pattern. Although the literature suggests that the time couples spend face to face is essential to their marital satisfaction as well as communication patterns, and results in a good indicator of staying together (Bernardo et al., 2015; Voorpostel et al., 2010), the question remained whether couples who were the most compatible and happy

would also decide to spend more time together when their other interactions were restricted due to external factors. No empirical evidence concerning the amount of time spent emerged in the context of COVID-19 according to our literature review, underscoring the necessity for a more comprehensive understanding and thorough exploration of these variables.

Social distancing, better referred to as physical distancing and similar restrictions worldwide, led couples to spend more time together, but not necessarily by choice. Forced cohabitation had its consequences in the epicenter of this pandemic, the city of Wuhan in China, where divorce requests in some areas exceeded pre-existing records per day after the lifting of the restrictions (Jiang, 2020). In the Dominican Republic, the ONE (2023) database showed that the total of marriages and divorces decreased in 2020, which can be expected because of the closure and corresponding restrictions. But for 2021 and 2023 the number of divorces increased on average more than in previous years. This same database shows that from 2010 to 2018 the number of divorces increased by an average of 4.08 % per year, but in comparison, during 2021 and 2022 it was at an average of 9.78 % (compared to 2019). Some authors affirmed that these rates were due precisely to the time spent confined, in addition to the economic pressures that could result from the pandemic (Fies, 2020; Tate, 2020). On the other hand, the economic crisis could oppositely affect divorce rates as people may choose to stay together because of the financial stability that a live-in relationship affords each member of the dyad (Fischer & Liefbroer, 2006; Lyngstad & Jalovaara, 2010; Schaller, 2013).

The act of asking a partner to indicate the likelihood of their romantic separation to occur has proven to be an effective predictor of the execution of said separation (Dew et al., 2012). Employing a quanti-

tative cross-sectional study, we aimed to identify the perceived risk of respondents' separation from their romantic partner during a state of national emergency due to COVID-19. Second, we sought to identify the variables that best predicted said risk. We selected as predictors variable: psychological distress, marital satisfaction, perceived partner support, and perceived equity in romantic relationships.

Studying the changes couples go through during this unprecedented pandemic could shed novel and valuable insight into the state of romantic relationships, particularly in the context of forced cohabitation. Identifying common indicators associated with healthy cohabitation for couples could help understand which aspects are crucial for the continuity of the romantic bond in times of crisis or, in turn, constitute risk factors that may result in separation or divorce.

We hypothesized that, during the state of emergency due to COVID-19, higher psychological distress, lower perceived couple equity, lower perceived partner support, and lower marital satisfaction, would result in a higher perceived risk of separation from their partner.

Method

Population, Sample, and Sampling

Participants met the following criteria: Dominicans; residents of the Dominican Republic; adults (over 18); of any sexual orientation; in common law or marriage; living in the same home with their partner. We excluded subjects whose partner was not Dominican, as well as those who were primary caregivers of their partner or whose partner was their primary caregiver. This study collected online data from May through September 2020, during the national state of emergency decreed by the Dominican government, which required the popu-

lation to maintain physical distancing through strict at-home curfews.

Calculation of sample size

We expected a minimum of 500 observations defined by the logistic regression analysis intended for this study. The analysis considered a minimum sample size of $N = 10 k / p$ observations, where k is the number of independent variables (15 variables including demographics for control), and p is the estimated proportion of couples that divorce or separate. The upper limit for a conservative range was used, with $p = 0.3$. This resulted in $n = 10 \times 15 / 0.3 = 500$ observations. We established a confidence level of 95% to estimate proportions or percentages, rates, and reasons in the sample. The final sample was 409 observations that met the inclusion criteria. A total of 912 subjects started the questionnaire and 600 completed it (65.79%).

Measures

For all the instruments described in this section, a translation (when needed), validation by experts, and piloting of the items were completed before use. For details about this process, see the procedures section. Please refer to the annex for a comprehensive list of the instruments used in Spanish.

Sociodemographic Questionnaire

We created a questionnaire to explore respondents' and their partner's age, sex, educational level, marital status, and time in the relationship. We also explored couples' financial status and the amount of shared quality time during and before COVID-19.

- **Perceived Risk of Separation:** To measure this variable, we developed a questionnaire inspired by five items extracted from the instrument employed in the NSFH (Sweet et al., 1988).

The instrument consists of three interval questions for reports of pre-COVID-19 perceived risk of separation, the severity of relationship issues during the pandemic, and one question seeking the expressed probability of separation. The last question was used as a dependent variable; participants were required to respond using an interval scale to indicate the likelihood of a breakup occurring in the near future. We assessed the Perceived Risk of Separation using a single question, making it impossible to ascertain internal consistency by Cronbach's alpha.

- **SCL-5 Symptom Checklist (Symptom Checklist-5):** Used to measure psychological distress through five items related to symptoms of anxiety and depression. Respondents rated each item on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (indicating no distress) to 5 (signifying extreme distress). The average item score was determined by dividing the total score by the number of items answered. Higher scores reflected pronounced psychological distress.

This instrument was developed in Norway by Strand et al., 2003. The scale is an adaptation from the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 (HSCL-25), which is an abbreviated form of the original 90-item scale published in 1973 by Derogatis and colleagues (Müller et al., 2010; Strand et al., 2003). The items were selected because of their high correlation with the HSCL-25 global score. It has been used for clinical and non-clinical populations of different nationalities, gender, and age; getting a Cronbach's Alpha between 0.79 and 0.88 (Beisland et al., 2021; Müller et al., 2010; Pullmer et al., 2019).

We failed to find evidence of this instrument being used in Latin America, nor other Spanish-

speaking countries, but it was applied to non-clinical European populations during COVID-19 (Beisland et al., 2021; Reme et al., 2022). In the final sample, the unidimensional reliability was good, indicated by an alpha coefficient of 0.83.

- **Perceived Equity Scale:** To measure the construct of perceived equity in the relationship, we adapted items from the National Survey of Families and Households ([NSFH] Bumpass et al., 2017). Four Likert-type items measured perceived injustice towards the respondent and their partner regarding sources and allocation of income, household chores, and taking care of the couple's children. Dew et al. (2012) suggested reversing the scoring of these items, with the highest scores indicating injustice or lack of equity. The scale measures how fair each statement is perceived for self and for their partner, the scale that originally has the answer options as 1) Very unfair to me, 2) Somewhat unfair to me, 3) Fair to both, 4) Somewhat unfair to my partner, and 5) Very unfair to my partner; are transformed to 0 to 2 scales. This results in zero points for options from 3 to 5, one point for "Somewhat unfair to me" and two points for "Very unfair to me". The original authors say that only equity to self can be measured in a self-report test. Another key point for this scale is that if the person reported not having children living at home, the item regarding childcare was automatically scored a zero.

These items were based on the theory of distributive justice, which states that money may give power and control to one person over the other in a close relationship. Based on this theory, finances are not usually managed fairly within the household regardless of who the

breadwinner may be— one or both members of the dyad (Dew et al., 2012). Similar dynamics of power and control can take place involving other aspects of the household (Dew et al., 2012; Dew & Stewart, 2012; Echeverría Flores, 2018).

There are no reports of the validity or consistency of this scale in other studies. For the final sample, the unidimensional reliability was questionable with an alpha of 0.57.

- **Spousal Support Scale:** Perceived support was measured using a Spanish adaptation of the Social Support Questionnaire-Short Form (SSQ6) created by Sarason et al. (1983; 1987). The SSQ6 was adapted by Hofsøe et al. (2018) to measure respondents' perceived support from their partners, based on a Norwegian population. Elevated levels of perceived support are associated with functional behaviors in the couple, the regulation of stressful situations, and positive implications for satisfaction in the relationship (Yedirir & Hamarta, 2015).

We adapted and translated this instrument to be applicable to perceived support from the actor's partner. Questions from the original SSQ6, such as "Who completely accepts you, including your flaws and virtues?" have been changed to "My partner completely accepts me, including my flaws and virtues" (Mi pareja me acepta totalmente, incluyendo mis defectos y virtudes). Refer to the Annex to see the resulting instrument. The response options consisted of six choices, ranging from 1 "Very dissatisfied" to 6 "Very satisfied"; higher results meant more satisfaction. For its application in this study, a process of translation, expert validation, and item piloting was conducted (see Procedure for details).

The original SSQ6 has six questions that have shown greater internal reliability than other short versions of the same questionnaire, as well as adequate correlation levels with scales for social anxiety, state/trait anxiety, and depression (Sarason et al. 1983; 1987). It aimed to measure the number of people the respondent perceives as a source of help and support in situations that can generate anxiety, tension, sadness, or anger. It held solid psychometric properties ($\alpha = 0.83$ to 0.98) in Spanish and Latin American populations, specifically in Peru (Martínez-López et al., 2014; Sánchez-Aragón & Calleja, 2021). In the final sample of this study, the unidimensional reliability displayed an excellent performance, as evidenced by an alpha coefficient of 0.96.

- **Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS):** This study used a Spanish-based adaptation (de la Rubia, 2008) of the RAS (Hendrick, 1988) to measure satisfaction in romantic relationships. It can be positive (higher scores, maximum 35) or negative (lower scores, minimum 7). This scale conceives satisfaction as a unifactorial construct, determined by self-report evaluations of romantic relationships (de la Rubia, 2008; Rivera, 2020). The scale comprises seven items on a Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 to 5.

It has a high reliability in Mexican (0.94 to 0.92 ordinal's alpha; 0.91 to 0.88 Croanbach's alpha) and Puerto Rican's samples (0.91 for Croanbach's alpha and 0.93 for split-half reliability). We did not find studies using Dominicans' samples. For our sample, we reported an alpha of 0.90, which is of excellent consistency.

The usage of this scale is not limited to marital relationships, showing reliability and predictive validity during dating (Vaughn & Matyastik

Baier, 1999). Furthermore, it demonstrates validity and a high correlation with other measures of marital satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and sexual satisfaction (Beyazit y Sahin, 2018; Rosen-Grando et al., 2004; Scorsolini-Comin y dos Santos, 2012).

Procedure

The first step was the review of the literature and adaptation of the instruments. We made sure that the informed consent and psychometric instruments did not include complex words or technical jargon. Moreover, we made back-translation for the ones originally unavailable in Spanish. This is translating the instrument to Spanish and then another person/program translating it back to its original language. We sent the resulting instruments to five Dominican psychologists for expert validation using a simple content validity index, and they agreed that they had content validity.

As soon as the application number CEI2020-13 was approved by UNIBE's ethics committee, pilot testing was conducted to determine whether the instruments had internal consistency for the study's sample. Likewise, we analyzed the data and feedback given by the pilot's participants, paying attention to the indicated educational level, to determine the need for additional adjustments in the instruments that would ensure the understanding of all participants.

Most instruments had a good internal consistency in the pilot (between 0.83 and 0.97) except for Perceived Equity Scale, which had an alpha of 0.78. The Perceived Risk of Separation was measured by a single question, so internal consistency could not be determined by Cronbach's alpha.

Online data collection took place from May 1st through September 21st, 2020. This timeframe was important as it covered the period in which

Dominicans adhered to strict curfews for at-home confinement as part of a state of national emergency due to COVID-19. Compliance with social distancing and curfews decreed by the Dominican government was required by law and led to forced and increased cohabitation for Dominican couples.

Participants were recruited through Facebook and Instagram advertisements. By clicking the ads, subjects were redirected to the data collection platform, QuestionPro, where they found a brief description of the study and informed consent. If they indicated acceptance to participate in the study, they were able to view the research items. If they chose not to participate, the data collection platform redirected them to the end of the survey.

To protect the confidentiality and anonymity of personal information and responses, the following measures were taken:

- 1) We did not request participants' personal data in the survey.
- 2) For the analysis and presentation of results, an alphanumeric code was automatically assigned by QuestionPro to each participant.
- 3) Informed consent documents, administered instruments, and any materials from the participants were handled solely by the researchers and did not contain personal data.
- 4) We stored the database in encrypted PDF, Microsoft Word, and Excel database files with access keys.

Data Analysis

We designed simple frequency distributions and cross-tabulations through conventional database processing, and generated point estimates or intervals

of indicators such as totals, means, percentages or proportions, ratios, and rates. For the logistic regression analysis, sample data were weighted using the factors of expansion or elevation of the sample regarding the population. We calculated the sample within each stratum to control the design effect on the statistical data processing programs (SPSS 17, Excel and JASP) and to calculate variance in the sample using clusters as primary sampling units. Finally, we used Cronbach’s Alpha for internal reliability and Spearman’s Rho for correlations.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The final sample was of 409 adults, aged between 18 and 95 (\bar{x} = 38. 29; SD = 10.85), female (f = 326, 79.70 %), married (f = 275, 67.23 %), with post-graduate education (f = 206; 50.36 %). At the time of completing the survey, they were employed and working mostly from home (f = 192; 46.944%). Most of the sample resided in the capital of the Dominican Republic (f = 216; 52.812%), followed by responses from the east side of the island (f = 102; 24.939%), north provinces (f = 65; 15.982%) and south (f = 26; 6.357%). Table 1 reflects the 10 provinces with the highest number of responses.

Partner relationship duration ranged from a minimum of one and a maximum of 55 years (\bar{x} = 13,444; SD = 10,031). The average age of the respondent when initiating the relationship was 24.71 (SD = 7.06). The couples were heterosexual (97.76 %), married by civil or religious marriage (66.83 %), and with an average of 1.45 children (SD = 1.15) living with the couple. There was no significant relationship between age, age at the start of the relationship, number of children living at home, and the perceived probability of union dissolution ($p > 0.05$).

Table 1

Top 10 places of origin of the sample

<i>Place of origin</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Distrito Nacional	216	52.812
Santo Domingo Province	70	17.115
Santiago	27	6.601
San Pedro de Macorís	14	3.423
San Cristóbal	10	2.445
La Altagracia	8	1.956
La Vega	8	1.956
Azua	5	1.222
Barahona	5	1.222
Españillat	5	1.222

To analyze financial data, we integrated the couple’s financial status by considering the employment status of members combined (see Table 2) for couples whose number of dependents were above the average 2.89 (SD = 2.06). We also analyzed the percentage of income destined to clear debts, as well as income destined for savings (see Table 2). The latter was measured according to the number of months that the couple could survive without income, which was, on average, 5.39 (SD = 9.2). Reporting income level was not plausible because financial security is based more on budgetary capacity than net income. Under this classification, participants were categorized as financially at risk (f = 343; 83.86 %) or not.

As for the question about quality time spent as a couple during COVID-19, subjects may have found this question confusing, as many responded 24 hours. This question is interpreted with caution, as it highlights that some couples spent all hours in a day together, which does not necessarily mean the elapsed time was of quality. On average, 6.87 hours of quality time was reported by the sample during COVID-19 (SD = 3.69). Reports of couples’

Table 2*Employment and financial status of respondents and their partners*

Current employment status		<i>f</i>	%
Respondent	Employed / self-employed and working mostly from home	192	46.944
	Employed / self-employed and working mostly away from home	140	34.23
	Temporarily laid-off or with business paused by COVID-19	38	9.291
	Unemployed	34	8.313
Respondent's partner	Employed / self-employed and working mostly from home	180	44.01
	Employed / self-employed and working mostly away from home	127	31.051
	Temporarily laid-off or with business paused by COVID-19	47	11.491
	Unemployed	44	10.758
Current employment status		<i>f</i>	%
Dyad	Both working	266	65.037
	Only one working	107	26.161
	Both unemployed or temporarily laid-off	36	8.802
Couple income earmarked for debts		<i>f</i>	%
Dyad	> = 50%	201	49.144
	< 50%	208	50.856

quality time before COVID-19 were 2.56 points lower, with 5.36 hours a day on average ($SD = 3.05$).

In the descriptive analysis of our sample, we observed that Perceived Partner Support, as measured by the SSQ6, yielded an average score of 26.13 ($SD = 7.68$). The mean score for perceived equity stood at 1.19 ($SD = 1.56$). In terms of Marital Satisfaction, as assessed by the RAS scale, the mean score was 24.52 ($SD = 3.71$). Additionally, for Psychological Distress, our analysis revealed a mean score of 9.82 ($SD = 2.89$). The dependent variable, perceived risk of separation, was dichotomized by merging the answers of 50% or less to no risk category and the rest to risk. Most of the sample were in the “no at risk of separation category” ($f=307, 75.06\%$).

In Table 3 a descriptive comparison of the independent variables for the group of yes or no at risk of separation. As showed in Table the groups at risk separation had lower Marital satisfaction, less Perceived Partner Support, more Psychological Distress and higher Perceive Inequity as we hypothesized. We used the Mann-Whitney U test to assess the difference between this group in each variable, finding significant differences in all measurements. The nonparametric test was selected because of the unequal group size and the deviation from normality for the “Not at Perceived Risk of Separation” group, both can affect the results of a t test (Şimşek, 2023).

There was a repetitive difference between gender and several of the study's variables. On average, males reported lower psychological distress ($M = 8.66, SD = 2.72, Median = 8$ versus $M = 10.11,$

Table 3

Group differences for Perceive Risk of Separation in the independent variables for the original model

	Group	N	Mean	SD	Median	W	p
Marital Satisfaction	No	363	27.755	4.014	27	15360	< .001
	Yes	46	19.13	4.42	15.5		
Perceived Partner Support	No	363	27.386	6.817	9	14588.5	< .001
	Yes	46	16.174	6.813	11		
Psychological Distress	No	363	9.639	2.77	0	6034	0.002
	Yes	46	11.239	3.433	3		
Perceive Equity	No	363	0.953	1.303	29	3275	< .001
	Yes	46	3.043	2.118	19		

Note. SD: Standard Deviation, W: Mann-Whitney U

SD = 2.87, Median = 10), indicating a potential gender disparity in emotional well-being. Regarding perceptions of equity in the relationship, males (M = 0.88, SD = 1.53, Median = 0) reported slightly lower levels than females (M = 1.27, SD = 1.56, Median = 1), in this scale higher scores means less equity. In contrast, females (M = 25.72, SD = 7.79, Median = 26) expressed slightly lower levels of perceived partner support compared to males (M = 27.74, SD = 7.05, Median = 29). Finally, when assessing marital satisfaction, both males (M = 25.51, SD = 3.42, Median = 27) and females (M = 24.26, SD = 3.74, Median = 29) appeared to be relatively content. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test suggested that, while there are significant differences in psychological distress (W = 9382.5, p < 0.001) and perceive equity (W = 10770.5, p = 0.002) between the genders, there was not for the rest of the variables (p > 0.01).

We calculated a Spearman’s Rho to check the correlation between the model’s variables. This statistic was used because the data did not match the assumptions for a parametric analysis. Despite all the variables being significantly correlated, none of the correlations were strong (see Table 4).

Multiple Logistic Regression

We performed a binomial logistic regression to determine the order and weight of the variables psychological distress, perceived equity, perceived partner support, and relationship satisfaction in predicting the perceived risk of separation. To begin testing the research hypotheses, we explored the data to rule out outliers. We found six cases with standardized residual values greater than 2.5 standard deviations, which we eliminated from the analysis. This means that all analysis done for the multiple logistic regression was done for a total sample of 403 subjects.

The linearity of the logit of the continuous independent variables was also verified using the Box-Tidell transformation (Box & Tidwell, 1962). In the analysis of the iterations between each continuous variable, its logit, and logit of the dependent variable, indicators of non-linearity were found for the variable “Risk of separation before COVID-19”; however, when estimating the lambda value ($\lambda = 1 + (b/\text{gamma}) = 1 + (1.266/3.622) = 1.349$), it was found that there was no need to perform a

Table 4*Correlations between variables in the original model*

Variable	Analysis	Marital Satisfaction	Perceive Risk of Separation	Psychological Distress	Perceive Equity	Perceive Partner Support
<i>Marital Satisfaction</i>	Spearman's rho	—				
	p-value	—				
<i>Perceive Risk of Separation</i>	Spearman's rho	0.548	—			
	p-value	< .001	—			
<i>Psychological Distress</i>	Spearman's rho	-0.130	-0.207	—		
	p-value	0.009	< .001	—		
<i>Perceive Equity</i>	Spearman's rho	-0.477	-0.426	0.204	—	
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	—	
<i>Perceived Partner Support</i>	Spearman's rho	0.651	0.545	-0.215	-0.512	—
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001	—

transformation since λ was approximately equal to one (Abreu et al., 2000; Jorge, 2013).

We expected that the greater the psychological distress, the lower the perceived equity, and the lower the partner support. Additionally, we expected that the lower the relationship satisfaction, the higher the perceived risk of separation from the partner. The original logistic regression model included these four independent variables. Its results were statistically significant, $X^2(4) = 231.926, p < 0.001$; explaining 72.4% (Nagelkerke R²) of the variance of the perceived risk of separation and also correctly classifying 88.8% of the cases compared to the constant. However, despite this model's high percentage of explanation and classification, only marital satisfaction was statistically significant, $W^2 = 46.897, p < 0.001$.

We conducted follow-up exploration by selecting demographic variables of interest. We performed the model data training with 80% of the final sample, resulting in the variables presented in

Table 5, being those that, overall, best predict the perceived risk of separation from the couple. This separation of the sample allowed the possibility of conducting cross-validation between samples and generalizing the conclusions beyond the intrinsic characteristics of the sample. The cross-validation results were verified using a correlation between the model's predicted values for 80% versus the whole sample. The model correlation was $r = 0.773, p < 0.01$ for the training data, and $r = 0.769, p < 0.01$ for the 20%. For the full sample, the set of variables explains 81.2% (Nagelkerke R²) of the variance of the independent variable with good sensitivity (78%) and high specificity (98.3%), correctly classifying 96.28% of the cases, $\chi^2(4) = 200.24, p < 0.001$. In conclusion, the results indicated that the logistic regression model effectively captures the relationship between the variables and explains a significant portion of the outcome's variance.

The odds ratios (OR) were calculated. The odds of perceiving a risk of separation (Yes) increased significantly with lowers Marital Satisfaction

Table 5

Logistic regression to predict the perceived risk of separation

Coeficient	Wald Test					
	Estimar	Error Típico	z	Wald	gl	p
(Intercept)	8.102	1.621	4.998	24.985	1	< .001
<i>Marital Satisfaction</i>	-0.240	0.059	-4.083	16.669	1	< .001
Severity of current problems	-1.386	0.300	-4.616	21.307	1	< .001
Common Law	-1.504	0.530	-2.841	8.072	1	0.004
Perceive risk of separation before lockdown	2.110	0.650	3.246	10.539	1	0.001

(*OR* = 0.708, 95% *CI* [0.491, 0.833], *p* < .001) and were notably higher for individuals reporting a higher level of severity in their current relationship problems (*OR* = 0.114, 95% *CI* [0.042, 0.294], *p* < .001). On the other hand, those individuals who were in Common Law (*OR* = 11.393, 95% *CI* [2.569, 17.307], *p* = 0.001) or had a “Risk before (Yes)” (*OR* = 18.197, 95% *CI* [3.331, 15.264], *p* < .001) were more likely to perceive a risk of separation. These results indicate that relationship severity, marital status, and past thoughts about breaking up significantly impact the odds of perceiving the risk of separation.

Discussion

This study explored the model that best predicts the subjective risk of break-up or separation in Dominican couples during COVID-19 lockdown. Quantitative analyses identified four variables that significantly affect the dependent variable for a sample. Compared to research evaluating a partnership’s risk of separation during times besides a pandemic, the intended original model included a set of variables that by themselves were related to a romantic couple’s risk of dissolution. Nevertheless, when presented as part of a model, not all variables were significant predictors

of this risk (despite being significantly associated with each other and the dependent variable), so we opted for a smaller set of predictors that better explained the dependent variable.

The first and the most robust predictor of separation during COVID-19 was the perceived risk of separation before the pandemic (Table 4), which refers to relationship difficulties before forced cohabitation was set in place during national lockdown orders. This was measured by a single question: “Before COVID-19, what was the likelihood that you and your partner would separate?”. Individuals who had a “Risk before (Yes)” were found to be 18.20 times more likely to be in the category of “perceived risk of separation (Yes)” compared to those without a history of risk. Despite not being among the original hypothesis, we studied this factor due to its strong power in predicting divorce (Broman, 2002; Dew et al., 2012), particularly when associated with marital satisfaction. Moreover, it can give an idea regarding the status of the relationship before the lockdown.

Researchers (Overall et al., 2022; Pietromonaco, & Overall, 2021) have suggested that the outcomes revealing a decline in relationship quality or satis-

faction can reflect preexisting situations within the couple that remained unaddressed before the lockdown, and potentially exacerbated during it. An explanation for the heightened risk among couples already contemplating separation prior to COVID-19 lies in the stress overflow phenomenon that we described before, which made the relationship more susceptible. Empirical evidence robustly indicates that couples experiencing frequent coronavirus-related conflict or those unable or unwilling to engage in mutual coping were more likely to report lower satisfaction, decreased in sexual and intimate encounters and conflicts (Donato et al., 2021; From et al., 2023; Luetke et al., 2020; Relvas et al., 2023).

Marital Satisfaction was the only variable from the original hypothesis that we kept in the final model. In this regard, while thinking about divorcing or separating from one's partner has proven to be a strong predictor of long-term separation, not everyone who thinks about getting divorced ends up pursuing it. Some factors mediate this association; for example, Broman (2002) indicates a statistically significant correlation between lower marital satisfaction and contemplation of divorce, particularly among individuals who seriously considered divorce compared to those who did not. Furthermore, there's robust evidence that lower marital satisfaction is a predictor, but not the only determinant, of relationship dissolution (Fan, & Lui, 2004; Hirschberger et al., 2009).

The Investment Model serves as a valuable framework for understanding how marital satisfaction is related to thoughts about divorce and the actual dissolution of the relationship. It suggests that individuals with lower commitment are more inclined to perceive that they are investing more than the benefits of staying in the marriage are giving them. This is supported in a meta-analysis by Tran et al., (2019) across 202 distinct samples, which revealed that commitment exhibited a strong positive

correlation with both satisfaction and investment. Simultaneously, there was a moderately negative correlation between commitment and the perception of attractive alternatives, such as separation or other potential partners. Consequently, those with less commitment are more likely to think about divorce to overcome the cost-benefit equation, indicating that their dissatisfaction exceeds the perceived benefits of remaining together.

Common Law status was the second-strongest predictor of the perceived risk of separation, the group was 11.39 times more likely to perceive a risk of separation (Yes) compared to marriage. This finding is not new, as the literature has established that individuals in cohabiting relationships faced a greater risk of dissolution than those who were legally married. This is true for all stages of adulthood, regardless of socioeconomic status (Carver & Teachman 1993; Wu & Penning, 2018). Furthermore, a study found that romantic relationships are three times more likely to dissolve if the partnership started under Common Law, even if they were later married (Carver & Teachman, 1993). Nevertheless, this study may be outdated, and results may differ across countries and cultures (Asanjarani et al., 2021; Liefbroer & Dourleijn, 2006; Rosenfeld & Roesler, 2018).

Despite gender not being a significant predictor of the perceived risk of romantic dissolution, there was a repetitive difference between gender in several of the study's variables. Historically, gender has made a difference in separation rates: males tend to be happier in the relationship, while females tend to think or decide to divorce first, although not statistically significant (Broman, 2002). But this tends to change when parenthood enters the relationship dynamic (Hirschberger et al., 2009).

Being a woman also has more significant repercussions in post-divorce social, economic, and

psychological aspects (Asanjarani et al., 2021). Even before romantic dissolution takes place, females worry more profoundly about these aspects than males (Akhavan Tafti, 2003; Arab et al., 2018; Asanjarani et al., 2021). A qualitative study with a sample of females from the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico found that there is still an abundant negative perception, cultural beliefs, and social stigma around this topic (Arditti & Lopez, 2005). These authors found that Dominican women were inclined toward targeting divorce women as examples of failure and social outcasts. Upcoming research should aim to get a fair sample of genders, ensuring a better comparison between females, males, and others; considering male union dissolution may have different predictors than females (Hirschberger et al., 2009; Røsand et al., 2014).

For gender we found that women felt a higher unfairness toward them in the relationship, as shown by the results of the perceptions of equity in the relationship. Literature review clearly show that the double burden of women during the pandemic was more evident. As both males and female were working from home the chores and unpaid work within the household was not evenly distributed. And this impacted their mental health, therefore creating distress, and work conditions, especially when there were children in the household (Chauhan, 2021; Leonard et al., 2022; Power, 2020; Yildirim & Eslen-Ziya, 2021). Despite other authors reporting that children in the household was a protection factor for well-being and coping during the Coronavirus lockdown (Mari et al., 2020; Sels et al., 2022)

In the Dominican Republic this was evidenced in a report about use of time during Covid-19 by Morales Pacheco & Tatem Brache (2020). They found that women saw an increment in their reproductive and unpaid work where they had to take care of children's education, plus the caregiving, healthcare, and emotional support of the family.

The variable of quality time warrants discussion for two key reasons: firstly, due to the methodological limitations it posed within this study, and secondly, because of its potential strength in predicting the dependent variable. As presented before, face-to-face time spent as a couple is a predictor of marital satisfaction. Satisfaction with quality time spent with the partner in the past week was used as a predictor of in perceived changes in relationship satisfaction since the pandemic began; it was associated with high and stable relationship satisfaction over time (Ascigil et al., 2023).

The measure of quality time in this study was "quality hours spent together," both for before as during lockdown. Despite the robust effect shown by quality time before COVID-19 while exploring the prediction model, this variable was ultimately excluded because many respondents responded "24" hours of quality time during or before the lockdown. Milek, (2015) warns that a single question of shared time cannot adequately address the need to simultaneously consider: (a) the quantity of time spent together as a couple, (b) the objective nature that characterizes the time spent together, and (c) the perceived satisfaction with the time spent together. This author explains that while these dimensions are interconnected, each captures a unique aspect of shared time. With one single question, we tried to measure two of these dimensions, which resulted in a potentially conflicted interpretation of time "quantity" and "quality" as the same concept by the sample.

Future researchers should take steps to avoid this error, as it notably affected the validity of the results pertaining to this variable. The way that we redacted the questions regarding quality time may imply an error in the response process, specifically in the comprehension of what the respondent needed to answer to and retrieval of the information (Smith, & Miller, 1983 Quality is a multifaceted

concept, and the ambiguity surrounding the timeframe of this “quality time”—ranging from immediately before to years prior, depending on respondents’ interpretation—further complicated the matter. To prevent this, a more in-depth review of these questions for potential ambiguity is necessary, ensuring that the intended meaning is clear. Adding a definition of what “quality time” means in the research could have helped avoid this issue.

Other methodological limitations of this study are the gender-ratio, the use of non validated instruments for the Dominican population, and the lack of power of the original model. We can explain the male-to-female ratio by the social media recruitment and online data collection used for this research. Social media advertisement has proof to be the most effective means of recruiting because we can reach more of the world population using it (Guillory et al., 2018; King et al., 2014; Whitaker et al., 2017). But some researchers have found a sampling bias towards females in the studies that use social media recruitment (Acun, 2020; Merolli et al., 2014; Yuan et al., 2018; Whitaker et al., 2017), including for population that are believed to be majoritarian male as those living with the autism spectrum (Rødgaard et al., 2022). We can explain this bias with the gender-ratio in social media use in which women tend to use more social media websites and expend more hours on it than males (Goswami, & Dutta, 2015; Krasnova et al., 2017; Tifferet, 2020). In the Dominican Republic, the 50 % of active social media accounts belong to females, but there was not any study found regarding use of these accounts.

All the instruments used for gathering data were either translated by the authors or taken from studies of others population. This means that they lack empirical data regarding their validity and consistency for the Dominican population, which cross-cultural adaptation issues can affect

both measures. We were conscious of this limitation, therefore, we try to ensure content validity by ensuring a standard back-translation process, by literature review, and by experts’ evaluation with content validity index which are the most used methods for content validity and cross-cultural adaptation (Arafat et al., 2016; Epstein et al., 2015). But we recommend the use of instruments that had undergone a more systematized validation process, as the “equivalence” in the cross-cultural uses of psychological tests is a topic with low consensus (Epstein et al., 2015; Herdman et al., 1998). We recommend that future study follow a stricter adaptation protocol than the one proposed by the International Test Commission (Hernández et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022).

The Perceived Equity Scale had deficient performance both in the final sample and the pilot. For the pilot, we assumed that the low alpha was related to the sample size of just 12 participants, and that led to the decision to keep the scale. For example, if we use Bonett (2002), assuming a desired Cronbach’s alpha of 0.90 with just four items test and with a desired margin of error of 0.05 and a 95% confidence level ($Z = 1.96$). We would need a sample size of approximately 138 participants, which is a large sample for a pilot study. To put this into perspective, the final sample size was 409, and 139 participants represent 33.98% of it.

We selected the original model after a literature review of factors that, in separate research, correlated with either divorce or marital satisfaction. We did find that there was a weak to moderate association between psychological distress, perceived couple equity, partner support, marital satisfaction, and perceived separation risk during the COVID-19 emergency. These results, as the one found in the literature review, do not account for other potential confounding factors that may explain the results of the original logistic regression

model. In our specific case, only Marital Satisfaction was statistically significant based on the Wald statistic; it suggests that this variable has a stronger and more significant effect on the Perceive Risk of Separation compared to the others (Basu et al., 2017). Nevertheless, this result does not necessarily mean that the other variables were unimportant or irrelevant; they still contributed to the model's overall performance, even if their individual effects were not statistically significant (Bewick et al., 2005).

In the context of statistical analysis, the Wald test has been a subject of scrutiny, as observed by Bewick et al., (2005), due to its susceptibility to yielding results with reduced reliability. The Wald test tends to inflate standard errors and may lead to erroneous conclusions regarding the significance of explanatory variables within a given model. As a recommendation to future researchers, we advise considering the likelihood ratio tests. Because, it is perceived as a more robust and dependable approach for evaluating the significance of model parameters (Bewick et al., 2005; Boateng, & Abaye, 2019). However, in our specific case, the application of likelihood ratio tests was not a viable option, as the statistical package used did not offer it.

Despite the lack of definitive robust evidence to support our hypothesis regarding the prediction power between psychological distress, perceived couple equity, partner support and marital satisfaction, for perceived separation risk during the COVID-19 emergency, the results still hold significant value. When making an inferential comparison the group at risk of separation had lower marital satisfaction, were more distressed, reported less equity and less partner support.

Our findings highlight that the most robust predictor of separation during this period was the perceived risk of separation before the pandemic,

indicating that pre-existing relationship difficulties played a substantial role. Additionally, the second-strongest predictor of the perceived risk of separation was Common Law, a well-established factor in the literature indicating that individuals in cohabiting relationships face a higher risk of dissolution compared to those who are married. This holds true across all stages of adulthood, regardless of socioeconomic status.

References

- Abreu, P., Adam, W., Adye, T., Adzic, P., Ajinenko, I., Albrecht, Z., Alderweireld, T., Alekseev, G.D., Alemany, R., Allmendinger, T., Allport, P.P., Almed, S., Amaldi, U., Amapane, N., Amato, S., Anassontzis, E.G., Andersson, P., Andreatza, A., Andringa, S., ... Zumerle, G. (2000). Ab polarization in Z0 decays at LEP. *Physics Letters B*, 474(1-2), 205-222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(99\)01431-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(99)01431-8)
- Acun, I. (2020). The Relationship among University Students' Trust, Self-Esteem, Satisfaction with Life and Social Media Use. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 35-52. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1313a>
- Akhavan Tafti, O. (2003). Divorce Stages and Aftermaths. *Women's Studies Sociological and Psychological*, 1(3), 125-151. <https://doi.org/10.22051/jwsp.2003.1323>
- Arab Khorasani, S., & Ghiasvand, A. (2018). Women's Decision to Divorce in Light of Failure in Marital Status and Dignity. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 59(6), 486-500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2017.1403822>
- Arafat, S. Y., Chowdhury, H. R., Qusar, M. M. A. S., & Hafez, M. A. (2016). Cross cultural adaptation and psychometric validation of research instruments: A methodological review. *Journal of Behavioral Health*,

- 5(3), 129-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5455/jbh.20160615121755>
- Arditti, J., & Lopez, N. (2005). Puerto Rican and Dominican Women's Perceptions of Divorced Women. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 17*(3-4), 143-173. https://doi.org/10.1300/j086v17n03_08
- Asanjarani, F., Guzmán-González, M., & Etemadi, O. (2021). Adjustment to divorce among Iranian and Chilean women: an exploratory study. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 24*(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1856057>
- Ascigil, E., Luerssen, A., Gonzalez, R., & Gordon, A. M. (2023). Predictors of relationship satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 17*(12), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12881>
- Aydogan, D., & Kizildag, S. (2018). Examination of relational resilience with couple burnout and spousal support in families with a disabled child. *The Family Journal, 25*(4), 407-413. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480717731215>
- Aydogan, D., & Ozbay, Y. (2015). Relational resilience and relational professional help on couples: Dyadic analysis. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 5*(44), 179-191. <https://turkpsdrergisi.com/index.php/pdr/article/view/37/34>
- Balzarini, R. N., Muise, A., Zoppolat, G., Di Bartolomeo, A., Rodrigues, D. L., Alonso-Ferres, M., ... & Slatcher, R. B. (2023). Love in the time of COVID: Perceived partner responsiveness buffers people from lower relationship quality associated with COVID-related stressors. *Social psychological and personality science, 14*(3), 342-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506221094437>
- Basu, A., Ghosh, A., Mandal, A., Martín, N., & Pardo, L. (2017). A Wald-type test statistic for testing linear hypothesis in logistic regression models based on minimum density power divergence estimator. *Electronic Journal of Statistics, 11*(2), 2741-2772. <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-EJS1295>
- Beisland, E. G., Gjeilo, K. H., Andersen, J. R., Bratås, O., Bø, B., Haraldstad, K., ... & Flølo, T. N. (2021). Quality of life and fear of COVID-19 in 2600 baccalaureate nursing students at five universities: a cross-sectional study. *Health and quality of life outcomes, 19*(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-021-01837-2>
- Bernardo, C., Paleti, R., Hoklas, M., & Bhat, C. (2015). An empirical investigation into the time-use and activity patterns of dual-earner couples with and without young children. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 76*, 71-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.12.006>
- Bewick, V., Cheek, L., & Ball, J. (2005). Statistics review 14: Logistic regression. *Critical care, 9*(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc3045>
- Beyazit, F., & Sahin, B. (2018). Determining the factors influencing the intimate relationship between sexual satisfaction and dyadic adjustment in postmenopausal women. *Menopause Review/Przegląd Menopauzalny, 17*(2), 57-62. <https://doi.org/10.5114/pm.2018.77302>
- Boateng, E. Y., & Abaye, D. A. (2019). A review of the logistic regression model with emphasis on medical research. *Journal of data analysis and information processing, 7*(4), 190-207. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jdaip.2019.74012>
- Bodenmann, G., & Cina, A. (2005). Stress and coping among stable-satisfied, stable-distressed and separated/divorced Swiss couples. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 44*(1), 71-89. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v44n01_04
- Bonett, D. G. (2002). Sample size requirements for testing and estimating coefficient alpha. *Journal of educational and behav-*

- ioral statistics*, 27(4), 335-340. <https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986027004335>
- Box, G.E.P. & Tidwell, P.W. (1962) Transformation of Independent Variables. *Technometrics*, 4, 531-550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1962.10490038>
- Broman, C. L. (2002). Thinking of divorce, but staying married: The interplay of race and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 37(1-2), 151-161. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v37n01_09
- Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227), 912-920. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)
- Buck, A. A., & Neff, L. A. (2012). Stress spillover in early marriage: The role of self-regulatory depletion. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(5), 698-708. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029260>
- Bumpass, L. L., Sweet, J. A., & Call, V. R. A (2017). *National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Wave 1: 1987-1988* [United States]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2017-08-31. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06041.v2>
- Carver, K. P., & Teachman, J. D. (1993). Female employment and first union dissolution in Puerto Rico. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 686-698. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353349>
- Chauhan, P. (2021). Gendering COVID-19: Impact of the pandemic on women's burden of unpaid work in India. *Gender issues*, 38, 395-419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-020-09269-w>
- Clarke, L., & Berrington, A. (1999). Socio-demographic predictors of divorce. In, Simons, J. (ed.) *High Divorce Rates: The State of the Evidence on Reasons and Remedies: Reviews of the Evidence on the Causes of Marital Breakdown and the Effectiveness of Policies and Services Intended to Reduce its Incidence*. (Lord Chancellor's Department Research Series, 2/99, 1) London, UK. Lord Chancellor's Department.
- Cook, K. S., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (1983). Distributive justice, equity, and equality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 217-241. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.001245>
- de la Rubia, J. M. (2008). Validación del Modelo Unidimensional de la Escala de Valoración de la Relación en Personas Casadas y en Unión Libre de Monterrey, México. *Revista Internacional de Psicología*, 14(02), 1-71. <https://doi.org/10.33670/18181023.v14i02.134>
- Dew, J. P., & Stewart, R. (2012). A Financial Issue, a Relationship Issue, or Both? Examining the Predictors of Marital Financial Conflict. *Journal of Financial Therapy* 3(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.4148/jft.v3i1.1605>
- Dew, J., Britt, S., & Huston, S. (2012). Examining the relationship between financial issues and divorce. *Family Relations*, 61(4), 615-628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00715.x>
- Donato, S., Parise, M., Pagani, A. F., Lanz, M., Regalia, C., Rosnati, R., & Iafrate, R. (2021). Together against COVID-19 concerns: The role of the dyadic coping process for partners' psychological well-being during the pandemic. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.578395>.
- Echeverría Flores, M. P. M. (2018). El compromiso en las relaciones de pareja: Temáticas conflictivas y su resolución en parejas chilenas. [Masters thesis, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile], <https://repositorio.uc.cl/xmlui/handle/11534/22254>
- Epstein, J., Santo, R. M., & Guillemin, F. (2015). A review of guidelines for cross-cultural adap-

- tation of questionnaires could not bring out a consensus. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 68(4), 435-441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.11.021>
- Fan, C. S., & Lui, H. K. (2004). Extramarital affairs, marital satisfaction, and divorce: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 22(4), 442-452. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cep/byh033>
- Fies, A. (2020, April 17). *Surge in divorces anticipated in wake of COVID-19 quarantine*. ABC News. <https://abcnews.go.com/US/surge-divorces-anticipated-wake-covid-19-quarantine/story?id=70170902>
- Fischer, T., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2006). For richer, for poorer: The impact of macroeconomic conditions on union dissolution rates in the Netherlands 1972–1996. *European Sociological Review*, 22(5), 519-532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcl013>
- From, A., Luerssen, A., & Gordon, A. M. (2023). Both overwhelmed or in it together? Similarity in COVID-19-related stress and romantic relationship quality. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12789>
- Galdiolo, S., Culot, S., Delannoy, P., Mauroy, A., & Gaugue, J. (2022). Couple satisfaction during 1 year of the COVID-19 pandemic: Dyadic coping as a protective factor. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 11(3), 232–243. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cfp0000230>
- Goswami, A., & Dutta, S. (2015). Gender differences in technology usage—A literature review. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 4(1), 51-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2016.41006>
- Guillory, J., Wiant, K. F., Farrelly, M., Fiacco, L., Alam, I., Hoffman, L., et al. (2018). Recruiting hard-to-reach populations for survey research: Using Facebook and Instagram advertisements and in-person intercept in LGBT bars and nightclubs to recruit LGBT young adults. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 20(6), <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9461>
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 93-98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352430>
- Herdman, M., Fox-Rushby, J., & Badia, X. (1998). A model of equivalence in the cultural adaptation of HRQoL instruments: the universalist approach. *Quality of life Research*, 7, 323-335. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024985930536>
- Hernández, A., Hidalgo, M. D., Hambleton, R. K., & Gómez Benito, J. (2020). International test commission guidelines for test adaptation: A criterion checklist. *Psicothema*, 2020, vol. 32, num. 3, p. 390-398. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2019.306>
- Hirschberger, G., Srivastava, S., Marsh, P., Cowan, C. P., & Cowan, P. A. (2009). Attachment, marital satisfaction, and divorce during the first fifteen years of parenthood. *Personal Relationships*, 16(3), 401–420. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2009.01230.x>
- Hofsøe, S. M., Lehane, C. M., Wittich, W., Hilpert, P., & Dammeyer, J. (2018). Interpersonal communication and psychological well-being among couples coping with sensory loss: The mediating roles of perceived spouse support. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(8), 2323-2344. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265407518787933>
- Jiang, E. (2020, March 13). *Divorce rate spikes across China after 'couples spend too much time together during coronavirus home quarantine', officials claim*. Mail Online. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8108385/Divorce-cases-spike-China-couples-spend-time-coronavirus-quarantine.html>

- Jones, A., Lucero Jones, R., & Morris, N. (2018). Development and validation of the Couple Communication Satisfaction Scale. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 46(5), 505-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2019.1566874>
- Jorge, J. (2013). Characterizing complete weak efficiency in multiple objective linear programming. *Investigación Operacional*, 25(2), 131-136. <http://www.invoperacional.uh.cu/index.php/InvOp/article/view/169>
- King, D. B., O'Rourke, N., & DeLongis, A. (2014). Social media recruitment and online data collection: A beginner's guide and best practices for accessing low-prevalence and hard-to-reach populations. *Canadian Psychology / Psychologie canadienne*, 55(4), 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038087>
- Krasnova, H., Veltri, N. F., Eling, N., & Buxmann, P. (2017). Why men and women continue to use social networking sites: The role of gender differences. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 26(4), 261-284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2017.01.004>
- Leonard, M. T., Giraud, C., & Abraham, C. (2022). Coupling with COVID: The Role of Dyadic Coping in Relationship Satisfaction and Psychological Distress during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Family Issues*, 43(8), 2234-2252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X211030028>
- Liefbroer, A.C., & Dourleijn, E. (2006). Unmarried cohabitation and union stability: Testing the role of diffusion using data from 16 European countries. *Demography*, 43, 203-221. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2006.0018>
- Lincoln, K. D., & Chae, D. H. (2010). Stress, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress among African Americans. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X10365826>
- Luetke, M., Hensel, D., Herbenick, D., & Rosenberg, M. (2020). Romantic relationship conflict due to the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in intimate and sexual behaviors in a nationally representative sample of American adults. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 46(8), 747-762. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2020.1810185>Return to ref 2020 in article
- Lyngstad, T. H., & Jalovaara, M. (2010). A review of the antecedents of union dissolution. *Demographic research*, 23, 257-292. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26349595>
- Mari, E., Frascchetti, A., Lausi, G., Pizzo, A., Baldi, M., Paoli, E., Giannini, A. M., & Avallone, F. (2020). Forced Cohabitation during Coronavirus Lockdown in Italy: A Study on Coping, Stress and Emotions among Different Family Patterns. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 9(12), 3906. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9123906>
- Martínez-López, Z., Fernández, M. F. P., Couñago, M. A. G., Vacas, C. T., da Silva Almeida, L., & González, M. S. R. (2014). Social support in Spanish first year university students: Psychometric properties of the Social Support Questionnaire-Short Form and the Social Provisions Scale. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 46(2), 102-110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0120-0534\(14\)70013-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0120-0534(14)70013-5)
- Merolli, M., Sanchez, F. J. M., & Gray, K. (2014). Social media and online survey: Tools for knowledge management in health research. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Australasian Workshop on Health Informatics and Knowledge Management-Volume 153* (pp. 21-29).
- Mesa Vieira, C., Franco, O. H., Gómez Restrepo, C., & Abel, T. (2020). COVID-19: The forgotten priorities of the pandemic. *Maturnitas*, 136, 38-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2020.04.004>
- Milek (2015). Spending Time with One's Partner: The Interplay Between Dimensions of Shared Time, External Stress, and Couples'

- Relationship Functioning (Doctor's thesis). University of Zurich
- Morales Pacheco, G., & Tatem Brache, Y. (2020) el uso del tiempo durante el covid-19 en república dominicana. Perspectiva. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung – República Dominicana
- Müller, J. M., Postert, C., Beyer, T., Furniss, T., & Achtergarde, S. (2010). Comparison of eleven short versions of the Symptom Checklist 90-Revised (SCL-90-R) for use in the assessment of general psychopathology. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 32, 246-254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-009-9141-5>
- Mutang, J. A., Chua, B. S., Hon, K. Y., Siau, C. S., Wider, W., & Ismail, R. (2022). Stressors, psychological states, and relationship quality among east Malaysian adults with partners amid the COVID-19 lockdown. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(18), <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811258>
- Neff, L. A., & Broady, E. F. (2011). Stress resilience in early marriage: Can practice make perfect? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(5), 1050-1067. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023809>
- Neff, L. A., Gleason, M. E. J., Crockett, E. E., & Ciftci, O. (2022). Blame the Pandemic: Buffering the Association Between Stress and Relationship Quality During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(2), 522-532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211022813>
- Nina Estrella, R. V. (2016). Estrés y el afrontamiento diádico en la relación marital. *Revista Griot*, 9(1), 48-56. <https://revistas.upr.edu/index.php/griot/article/view/2426>
- Overall, N. C., Chang, V. T., Pietromonaco, P. R., Low, R. S. T., & Henderson, A. M. E. (2022). Partners' Attachment Insecurity and Stress Predict Poorer Relationship Functioning During COVID-19 Quarantines. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(1), 285-298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550621992973>
- Pietromonaco, P. R., & Overall, N. C. (2021). Applying relationship science to evaluate how the COVID-19 pandemic may impact couples' relationships. *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 438-450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000714>
- Power, K. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic has increased the care burden of women and families. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 16(1), 67-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561>
- Pullmer, R., Coelho, J. S., & Zaitsoff, S. L. (2019). *Kindness begins with yourself: The role of self-compassion in adolescent body satisfaction and eating pathology*. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23081>
- Randall, A. K., & Bodenmann, G. (2009). The role of stress on close relationships and marital satisfaction. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29(2), 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.10.004>
- Randall, A. K., & Bodenmann, G. (2017). Stress and its association with relationship satisfaction. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 13, 96-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.05.010>
- Relvas, A. P., Lacomba-Trejo, L., Portugal, A., Chiarolanza, C., Major, S., Rosa, C., ... & Randall, A. K. (2023). YES, WE COPE: Dyadic Coping as a Mediator Between Perceived Relationship Quality and Emotional Representation of COVID-19. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-023-10379-4>
- Reme, B. A., Wörn, J., & Skirbekk, V. (2022). Longitudinal evidence on the development of socioeconomic inequalities in mental

- health due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Norway. *Scientific reports*, 12(1), 3837.
- Ridner, S. H. (2004). Psychological distress: Concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 45(5), 536-545. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02938.x>
- Rivera, J. A. G. (2020). Reliability and validity of the Relationship Assessment Scale in Puerto Rican women. *Informes Psicológicos*, 20(1), 11-18.
- Romeo, A., Castelli, L., Benfante, A., & Di Tella, M. (2022). Love in the time of COVID-19: The negative effects of the pandemic on psychological well-being and dyadic adjustment. *Journal of affective disorders*, 299, 525. <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jad.2021.12.078>
- Rødgaard, E. M., Jensen, K., Miskowiak, K. W., & Mottron, L. (2022). Representativeness of autistic samples in studies recruiting through social media. *Autism Research*, 15(8), 1447-1456. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.2777>
- Røsand, G. M. B., Slinning, K., Røysamb, E., & Tambs, K. (2014). Relationship dissatisfaction and other risk factors for future relationship dissolution: a population-based study of 18,523 couples. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 49(1), 109-119. <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs00127-013-0681-3>
- Rosenfeld, M. J., & Roesler, K. (2018). Cohabitation experience and cohabitation's association with marital dissolution. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(1), 42-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12530>
- Rosen-Grandon, J. R., Myers, J. E., & Hattie, J. A. (2004). The relationship between marital characteristics, marital interaction processes, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of counseling & Development*, 82(1), 58-68.
- Sánchez-Aragón, R., & Calleja, N. (2021). Adaptación y validación de la Escala de Satisfacción con el Apoyo Recibido de la Pareja y diseño y validación de la Escala de Disposición a Recibir Apoyo Social. *Revista Costarricense de Psicología*, 40(1), 37-59. <https://doi.org/10.22544/rcps.v40i01.03>
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing Social Support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.127>
- Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., Shearin, E. N., & Pierce, G. R. (1987). A brief measure of social support: Practical and theoretical implications. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4(4), 497-510. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265407587044007>
- Schaller, J. (2013). For richer, if not for poorer? Marriage and divorce over the business cycle. *Journal of Population Economics*, 26(3), 1007-1033. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43738182>
- Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Shimkowski, J. R. (2014). A meta-analytical review of the demand/withdraw pattern of interaction and its associations with individual, relational, and communicative outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, 81(1), 28-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2013.813632>
- Scorsolini-Comin, F., & dos Santos, M. A. (2012). Correlations between Subjective Well-being, Dyadic Adjustment and Marital Satisfaction in Brazilian Married People. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 166-176. http://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37304
- Sels, L., Galdiolo, S., Gague, J., Geonet, M., Verhelst, P., Chiarolanza, C., et al. (2022). Intimate relationships in times of COVID-19: A descriptive study of Belgian partners and their perceived well-being. *Psychologica Belgica*, 62(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5334%2Fpb.1088>
- Şimşek, A. S. (2023). The power and type I error of Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney, Welch's t, and

- student's t tests for likert-type data. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 10(1), 114-128. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1183622>
- Smith, E. R., & Miller, F. D. (1983). Mediation among attributional inferences and comprehension processes: Initial findings and a general method. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 492-505. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.3.492>
- Smith, M. R., Adams, N., & Munnik, E. (2022). The development of the Quality of Translation and Linguistic Equivalence Checklist. *African Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 4, 15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ajopa.v4i0.132>
- Strand, B. H., Dalgard, O. F., Tambs, K., & Rognerud, M. (2003). Measuring the mental health status of the Norwegian population: A comparison of the instruments SCL-25, SCL-10, SCL-5, and MHI-5 (SF-36). *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 57(2), 113-118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08039480310000932>
- Sweet, J., Bumpass, L., & Call, V. (1988). *National survey of families and households, 1988*. In *The American Family* (pp. 28-i). Routledge.
- Tate, C. (2020, April 16). *Divorce rates predicted to increase following COVID-19 pandemic*. KFDA. <https://www.newschannel10.com/2020/04/16/divorce-rates-predicted-increase-following-covid-pandemic/>
- Tifferet, S. (2020). Gender differences in social support on social network sites: A meta-analysis. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking*, 23(4), 199-209. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2019.0516>
- Tran, P., Judge, M., & Kashima, Y. (2019). Commitment in relationships: An updated meta-analysis of the Investment Model. *Personal Relationships*, 26(1), 158-180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/per.12268>
- Vaughn, M. J., & Matyastik Baier, M. E. (1999). Reliability and validity of the relationship assessment scale. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 27(2), 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/019261899262023>
- Voorpostel, M., Van Der Lippe, T., & Gershuny, J. (2010). Spending time together—Changes over four decades in leisure time spent with a spouse. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(2), 243-265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2010.11950204>
- Whitaker, C., Stevelink, S., & Fear, N. (2017). The use of Facebook in recruiting participants for health research purposes: a systematic review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 19(8), <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.7071>
- Williamson, H. C., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2021). Experiencing a natural disaster temporarily boosts relationship satisfaction in newlywed couples. *Psychological Science, Advanced Online Publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976211015677>
- Wu, Z., & Penning, M. J. (2018). Marital and Cohabiting Union Dissolution in Middle and Later Life. *Research on Aging*, 40(4), 340-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027517698024>
- Yedirir, S., & Hamarta, E. (2015). Emotional expression and spousal support as predictors of marital satisfaction: The case of Turkey. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(6), 1549-1558. <http://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2015.6.2822>
- Yildirim, T. M., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2021). The differential impact of COVID-19 on the work conditions of women and men academics during the lockdown. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28, 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12529>
- Yuan, Y., Wei, G., & Lu, Y. (2018). Evaluating gender representativeness of location-based social media: A case study of Weibo. *Annals of GIS*, 24(3), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475683.2018.1471518>

ANEXOS

I. Consentimiento Informado

DOCUMENTO DE CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Investigación: Amor en Tiempos de COVID-19

Mayo 2020

INVESTIGADORES RESPONSABLES:

Gloriannys Báez, M.Sc. Correo: g.baez@prof.unibe.edu.do

Laura Pacheco, Ph.D. Correo: la.pacheco@ce.pucmm.edu.do

Juan Amílcar Pérez, M.Sc. Correo: amilcar4000@gmail.com

OBJETIVO DE ESTE ESTUDIO: Esta investigación pretende evaluar factores en la relación y convivencia de parejas durante el periodo de COVID-19, con miras a describir su funcionamiento y predecir posibles riesgos.

A. PARTICIPACIÓN Y VOLUNTARIEDAD: La participación en este estudio es voluntaria, anónima y confidencial. Su participación consiste en llenar un cuestionario demográfico y escalas que miden estrés, convivencia, apoyo, comunicación, satisfacción y riesgos en su relación de pareja. Participar requiere aproximadamente 10 minutos de su tiempo. Ud. puede abandonar el estudio en cualquier momento sin consecuencia alguna.

B. REQUISITOS PARA PARTICIPAR: a) Ser mayor de 18 años; b) Ser de nacionalidad dominicana y residir actualmente en la República Dominicana; c) Estar en una relación de pareja; d) Vivir actualmente en el mismo hogar que su pareja.

C. POSIBLES RIESGOS: Los investigadores han tomado medidas para minimizar los riesgos al participar en esta investigación. Aun así, existen riesgos potenciales asociados al uso del internet, contrarrestados a través del uso de una plataforma digital con protecciones de privacidad adecuadas. Otro riesgo puede ser

una sensación de incomodidad al reflexionar sobre su vida de pareja durante el periodo de COVID-19. Al finalizar su participación, verá un listado de contactos profesionales a consultar en caso de requerir apoyo.

D. POSIBLES BENEFICIOS: Beneficios de participar en este estudio pueden ser la reflexión de su vida en pareja y colaborar en una investigación científica en el país. No se identifican otros beneficios.

E. CONFIDENCIALIDAD: Para proteger su anonimato y mantener confidenciales sus respuestas, se tomarán las siguientes medidas: a) Sus datos de identificación no serán solicitados; b) las respuestas serán recolectadas en QuestionPro, una plataforma cibernética con protocolos de seguridad establecidos, certificada internacionalmente; c) Los datos del estudio se almacenarán de forma encriptada, con clave de acceso disponible única y exclusivamente para los investigadores.

F. DERECHOS DEL PARTICIPANTE: Si desea consultar cualquier información concerniente a este estudio, puede contactar a los investigadores al correo electrónico.

Yo, dominicano mayor de edad, declaro de plena voluntad que entiendo los requisitos del estudio así como posibles riesgos y beneficios y expreso mi decisión sobre participar al seleccionar la siguiente opción:

_____ SI, doy mi consentimiento para participar en esta investigación.

_____ NO, no doy mi consentimiento para participar en esta investigación.

II. Instrumento A: Variables Sociodemográficas

ASPECTOS SOCIODEMOGRÁFICOS

1. Edad:

_____ años

2. Sexo:

A. Hombre

B. Mujer

Otro

3. Provincia donde reside:

4. Último nivel educativo completado:

A. Educación primaria

B. Educación secundaria

C. Técnico postsecundaria

D. Grado universitario

E. Postgrado universitario

5. Estado laboral actual:

A. Desempleado

B. Suspendido por COVID-19

C. Empleado y trabajando mayormente fuera de casa

D. Empleado y trabajando mayormente desde casa

E. Autoempleado y trabajando mayormente fuera de casa

F. Autoempleado y trabajando mayormente desde casa

G. Auto-empleado pero en pausa por COVID-19

H. Retirado

I. No labora por discapacidad

6. ¿Cuántas veces se ha casado/a?

_____ veces

7. **Estado civil actual:**
- A. En unión libre (convivencia sin matrimonio)
 - B. Casado (convivencia con matrimonio)
 - C. Divorciado
 - D. Viudo
 - E. Soltero
8. **Orientación sexual de la relación:**
- A. Heterosexual
 - B. Homosexual
9. **Tiempo de relación con su pareja:**
_____ meses / años
10. **¿Número de dependientes de la pareja?**
_____ dependientes
11. **¿Número de hijos conviviendo con Ud. y su pareja en casa?**
_____ hijos
12. **Tiempo promedio compartido con la pareja antes de COVID-19:**
- A. Menos de 5 horas al día
 - B. Más de 5 horas al día
13. **Tiempo promedio compartido con la pareja durante COVID-19:**
- A. Menos de 5 horas al día
 - B. Más de 5 horas al día
14. **Estado laboral actual de su pareja:**
- A. Desempleado
 - B. Suspendido por COVID-19
 - C. Empleado y trabajando mayormente fuera de casa
 - D. Empleado y trabajando mayormente desde casa
 - E. Auto-empleado y trabajando mayormente fuera de casa
 - F. Auto-empleado y trabajando mayormente desde casa
 - G. Auto-empleado pero en pausa por COVID-19
 - H. Retirado
 - I. No labora por discapacidad

15. **¿Cuál es el nivel promedio de ingresos mensuales combinados de la pareja?**
A. Menos de 10,000 pesos
B. Entre 10,001 y 25,000 pesos
C. Entre 25,001 y 50,000 pesos
D. Entre 50,001 y 75,000 pesos
E. Entre 75,001 y 100,000 pesos
F. Entre 100,001 y 199,999 pesos
G. Más de 200,000 pesos
16. **¿Número de personas que dependen de los ingresos de la pareja?**
_____ personas
17. **¿Cuál es el porcentaje de ingresos combinados de la pareja destinado a pagar préstamos o deudas?**
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
18. **¿Por cuántos meses podrían vivir de los ahorros compartidos Ud., su pareja y sus dependientes si no tuviesen otros ingresos?**
_____ meses
19. **¿Es su pareja de nacionalidad dominicana y mayor de 18 años?**
Sí
No
20. **¿Cuántas veces se ha casado [por ceremonia civil y/o religiosa]?**

21. **Orientación sexual de la relación:**
Heterosexual
Homosexual
Otra
22. **Tiempo de relación con su pareja, incluyendo el noviazgo: [años]**
_____ años
23. **¿Número de hijos conviviendo con Ud. y su pareja en casa?**
_____ hijos

24. **Tiempo promedio de calidad compartido con la pareja ANTES del estado de emergencia por COVID-19:** [cantidad de horas al día].

_____ horas

25. **Tiempo promedio de calidad compartido con la pareja DURANTE el estado de emergencia por COVID-19:**[cantidad de horas al día]

_____ horas

III. Instrumento B: Distrés Psicológico

Escala SCL-5

Por favor, indique la opción que mejor describa hasta qué punto se ha sentido afectado por los siguientes problemas durante los **últimos 14 días**, incluyendo el día de hoy:

	Para nada	Un poco	Bastante	En extremo
1. Sentirse asustado	1	2	3	4
2. Nerviosismo, agitación interna o temblores	1	2	3	4
3. Sentirse desesperanzado por el futuro	1	2	3	4
4. Sentirse entristecido	1	2	3	4
5. Preocuparse demasiado por las cosas	1	2	3	4

IV. Instrumento C: Equidad Percibida

Escala EP

¿Cómo se siente acerca de la equidad en su relación en cada una de las siguientes áreas?

1. Tareas domésticas:

- A. Muy injusto para mí
- B. Algo injusto para mí
- C. Justo para ambos
- D. Algo injusto para mi pareja
- E. Muy injusto para mi pareja

2. Trabajo para proveer dinero:

- A. Muy injusto para mí
- B. Algo injusto para mí
- C. Justo para ambos
- D. Algo injusto para mi pareja
- E. Muy injusto para mi pareja

3. Gasto de dinero:

- F. Muy injusto para mí
- G. Algo injusto para mí
- H. Justo para ambos
- I. Algo injusto para mi pareja
- J. Muy injusto para mi pareja

4. Cuido de los niños (*sólo si la pareja tiene niños):

- A. Muy injusto para mí
- B. Algo injusto para mí
- C. Justo para ambos
- D. Algo injusto para mi pareja
- E. Muy injusto para mi pareja

V. Instrumento D: Apoyo Percibido de la Pareja**Escala SSQ**

Favor indicar qué tan satisfecho/a se siente con el apoyo brindado por su pareja en cada caso presentado a continuación:

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Puedo realmente contar con mi pareja para que me distraiga de mis preocupaciones. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | Muy
insatisfecho | Más que
insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que
satisfecho | Muy
satisfecho |
| 2 | Puedo realmente contar con mi pareja para que me ayude a sentirme más relajado cuando estoy tenso. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | Muy
insatisfecho | Más que
insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que
satisfecho | Muy
satisfecho |
| 3 | Mi pareja me acepta totalmente, incluyendo mis defectos y virtudes. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | Muy
insatisfecho | Más que
insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que
satisfecho | Muy
satisfecho |

- 4 Puedo realmente contar con mi pareja para que me cuide, sin importar lo que me pueda estar pasando.
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Muy insatisfecho | Más que insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que satisfecho | Muy satisfecho |
- 5 Puedo realmente contar con mi pareja para que me ayude a sentirme mejor cuando me siento triste.
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Muy insatisfecho | Más que insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que satisfecho | Muy satisfecho |
- 6 Puedo realmente contar con mi pareja para que me calme cuando estoy muy alterado.
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Muy insatisfecho | Más que insatisfecho | Insatisfecho | Satisfecho | Más que satisfecho | Muy satisfecho |

VI. Instrumento E: Satisfacción en la Relación

Escala RAS

Por favor, indique el número/grado que responde mejor como opción de respuesta a cada pregunta sobre su relación. Conteste lo más sinceramente posible.

1. ¿De qué manera considera usted que su pareja satisface sus necesidades?
- | | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Pobremente | | Término medio | | Extremadamente bien |
2. ¿En general, hasta qué punto está satisfecho/a con su relación de pareja?
- | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------|---|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Insatisfecho | | Término medio | | Muy satisfecho |
3. ¿En comparación con la mayoría de las parejas, cómo calificaría a su pareja?
- | | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Pobremente | | Término medio | | Extremadamente bien |
4. ¿Con qué frecuencia desea NO haber establecido una relación con su pareja actual?
- | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------------|---|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Nunca | | Con frecuencia | | Muy frecuentemente |

5. ¿Hasta qué punto su relación de pareja satisface sus expectativas iniciales?
- | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|---|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| En lo absoluto | | Término medio | | Totalmente |
6. ¿Cuánto ama a su pareja?
- | | | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|---|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Muy poco | | Término medio | | Mucho |
7. ¿Cuántos problemas hay en su relación de pareja?
- | | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Muy pocos | | Lo normal | | Muchos |

VII. Instrumento F: Riesgo Percibido de Separación

Escala RPS

Por favor seleccione su respuesta según aplique a su relación:

1. Previo al COVID-19, ¿cuál era la probabilidad de que Ud. y su pareja se separaran?
- | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Muy probable | Probable | Mitad probable,
mitad improbable | Improbable | Muy improbable |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|
2. Del 0 al 100%, ¿cuál es el nivel de severidad de los problemas presentes en su relación de pareja?
- | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Muy severo | Severo | Moderado | Poco severo | Nada severo |
|------------|--------|----------|-------------|-------------|
3. En el futuro cercano, ¿cuál es la probabilidad de que Ud. y su pareja se separen?
- | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Muy probable | Probable | Mitad probable,
mitad improbable | Improbable | Muy improbable |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|