Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561, P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume : 02 Issue : 10 October-2026

Beyond the Couple Dyad: A GAP-MCT Conceptualisation of Extended-Family Influence, Cultural Meaning, And Marital Conflict in African Contexts

Dr. Christian Matthew Adetunji
Africa College of Theology, Kigali, Rwanda

Published Date: October 01, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E10/2026-01**

ABSTRACT :

Purpose: This conceptual article extends GAP Marriage Counselling Theory (GAP-MCT) to explain how extended-family and wider contextual systems may support marriage, generate relational discrepancies, or intensify conflict in African contexts.

Approach: We integrate scholarship on African marital relationships, kinship, cultural psychology, and systemic family therapy with the core constructs of GAP-MCT.

Analysis: Extended-family influence becomes clinically significant when spouses assign different meanings to obligation, authority, privacy, loyalty, care, and belonging. These discrepancies may be appraised as threats to identity, attachment, status, fairness, or family membership, prompting protective responses and recursive escalation within the couple and across the wider family network. The article introduces the contextual relational field, distinguishes supportive involvement from intrusive or coercive involvement, and advances six propositions for research and practice.

Implications: GAP-MCT provides a culturally responsive way to retain the couple as an important relational unit without isolating it from its social systems. The framework also guards against romanticising communalism or using culture to excuse gender inequality, coercive control, or violence.

KEYWORDS: contextual relational field, kinship systems, networked escalation, relational gaps, threat appraisal

INTRODUCTION

Marital conflict is often examined through communication, attachment, cognition, emotion, and behaviour among couples. These perspectives have generated valuable knowledge and effective interventions. Nevertheless, a predominantly dyadic focus can obscure how marriage is constituted through relationships that extend beyond two partners. Kin, elders, religious communities, customary expectations, material exchanges, and transnational obligations may influence who is authorised to make decisions, what spouses owe each other, how privacy is understood, and which responses to conflict are considered legitimate.

This concern is particularly important in African contexts, although neither “Africa” nor “African marriage” denotes a single cultural form. The continent contains substantial variation across nations, ethnicities, religions, classes, legal regimes, urban and rural locations, and marital forms. African families are also changing through education, migration, urbanisation, economic insecurity, digital communication, religious change, and shifting gender expectations. Accordingly, the purpose of a culturally grounded account is not to replace an individualistic stereotype with a collectivistic one. It is to examine how particular marriages are embedded in specific networks of meaning and power.

In family therapy research conducted in Africa, culturally appropriate intervention has also received emphasis and must not be guided by imported concepts but by justice only (Asiimwe et al., 2021, 2026). From this perspective, extended-family participation does not cause marital problems in itself. Conflict becomes more likely when partners differ over the meaning, boundaries, distribution, or legitimacy of that involvement and when these differences threaten valued identities or relationships. The article therefore asks: How can GAP-MCT conceptualise marital conflict when the relevant relational system extends beyond the couple's dyad?

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH AND SCOPE

This is a theory-building article rather than an empirical test, systematic review, or claim that GAP-MCT has already demonstrated effectiveness. It uses integrative conceptual analysis: scholarship on African marital relationships, kinship and cultural psychology is placed in dialogue with systemic family therapy and the constructs of GAP-MCT. The goal is to specify mechanisms, define boundary conditions, generate propositions, and identify implications that can subsequently be examined empirically.

The term 'extended family' refers here to kin and kin-like individuals whose roles, expectations, resources, authority, or judgements bear materially on a marriage. Depending on context, the extended family may include parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, clan or lineage

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

members, elders, in-laws, co-wives, sponsors, and trusted religious or community figures. Their influence may be direct, as in requests for money or intervention in a dispute, or indirect, as when a spouse anticipates familial judgement and regulates their behaviour accordingly.

The phrase "African contexts" is deliberately plural. The analysis identifies recurrent possibilities documented across parts of the continent; it does not present them as universal attributes of African people. Country- and community-specific inquiry remains necessary. The article also distinguishes cultural responsiveness from cultural deference. A culturally intelligible practice is not necessarily ethical, equitable, or safe. Power, gender, age, disability, sexuality, class, legal status, and economic dependence must remain visible in any systemic formulation.

Marriage as a Culturally Embedded Relational System

Anthropological and psychological scholarship has long challenged the assumption that the autonomous individual or self-contained nuclear household is the natural baseline for understanding human relationships. Most Africans have emphasised relational embeddedness, social responsibility, and development by virtue of their involvement in the context of families and communities (Gyekye, 1997; Nsamenang, 2006).

Moreover, the studies from cultural psychology have found out that obligation, trust, links, and perceptions of social risk influence personal relations (Adams, 2005; Adams & Plaut, 2003). These perspectives do not strip away individuality but rather affect agency and affiliation processes. Marriage may therefore be experienced not only as a bond between spouses but also as an alliance between families, a location of lineage continuity, a moral and religious vocation, an economic arrangement, and a source of social identity. Classic and contemporary scholarship demonstrates that African marriages have never been static. Colonial law, missionary Christianity, Islam, labour migration, wage economies, education, and urban life have interacted with indigenous institutions in uneven ways (Bledsoe & Pison, 1994; Cole & Thomas, 2009; Therborn, 2004). The result is not a simple transition from “traditional” to “modern” marriage but the coexistence of multiple scripts.

This coexistence can strengthen marriage by multiplying sources of support. Relatives may provide childcare, housing, financial assistance, emotional care, ritual recognition, conflict mediation, and continuity during illness, migration, unemployment, or bereavement. Extended networks can therefore be relational assets. Research with Black married couples outside Africa also illustrates this dual potential: extended-family relationships provided practical and emotional support but could also become sites of interfamilial conflict (St. Vil et al., 2018). Although those findings cannot simply be transferred to African settings, they reinforce the systemic principle that wider networks may function as both resources and stressors.

Contestation may also arise within these networks. Disagreement can arise over remittances, residence, fertility, naming, inheritance, caregiving, funeral obligations, religious practice, household labour, childrearing, marital privacy, or the authority of elders. Not only do they constitute the subjects of disagreement, but also are frequently linked to issues of respect, faithfulness, maturity, gender, reciprocity, and belongingness. On the authority of Gyan and Ossom (2026), the gender dynamics of Ghana have been seen to persist and develop as a consequence of family pressure, religious pressure, dependence on the economy, education, and modernity.

Discontent in marriages and divorces are examples of difficulties such as poverty, infidelity, poor communication, and intervention by the family members. These studies focus on specific populations, yet they highlight the necessity of analysing cultural meanings and structural conditions together.

The GAP-MCT Framework

GAP-MCT conceptualises conflict as a recursive process rather than a linear consequence of difference. A relational gap is a perceived discrepancy between a partner’s internal relational framework and what that partner experiences in the relationship. Gaps may concern expectations, roles, values, communication, affection, sexuality, spirituality, finances, behaviour, or cultural identity. Difference itself is normal and does not inevitably produce distress. Its significance depends on meaning.

Threat appraisal is the interpretative process through which a discrepancy is experienced as endangering something valued. The perceived threat may concern attachment, identity, dignity, justice, authority, security, morality, status, or family inclusion. Protective behaviours are attempts to manage that threat. They include withdrawal, shutdown, compliance, aggression, competition, concealment, coalition-building, and help-seeking. A response that protects one person may threaten another and thereby create a feedback loop. The basic sequence is relational gap, threat appraisal, protective behaviour, response from a partner or social network, and escalation. Given that this is a recursive method, the gap can be widened by the process of escalation (Author, 2025).

The framework does not assume that both spouses contribute equally to every conflict. Circular description must not erase asymmetries of power or responsibility. Where there is coercive control or violence, a victim’s concealment, appeasement, or withdrawal may be an immediate survival response rather than a mutually produced communication problem. Systemic analysis remains accountable to safety, law, ethics, and individual agency.

Extending GAP-MCT: The Contextual Relational Field

To move beyond the isolated dyad, this article introduces the contextual relational field: the active network of people, institutions, material conditions, histories, and cultural narratives through which spouses interpret and organise their marriages. The field is not a background variable. It supplies meanings, resources, audiences, sanctions, and possible responses. It may enter the marital interaction even when no relative is physically present.

The contextual relational field has five analytically distinct but interacting dimensions. First, the kinship dimension concerns obligations, authority, inheritance, caregiving, lineage, and belonging. Second, the normative dimension concerns shared expectations about gender, respect, privacy, fidelity, parenthood, and marital endurance. Third, the material dimension concerns income, housing, remittances, bridewealth-related expectations, employment, and access to family resources. Fourth, the spiritual-institutional dimension concerns religious teaching, pastoral authority, ritual, customary leadership, and legal pluralism. Fifth, the historical-transitional dimension concerns migration, urbanisation, education, interethnic marriage, diaspora life, generational change, and earlier family injuries.

These dimensions help clinicians and researchers avoid using “culture” as a vague explanation. They invite specific questions: Who expects what from whom? What resource, relationship, status, or identity is at stake? Which expectation is consensual, which is contested, and which is

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

coercively enforced? How have economic or generational changes altered the spouses' capacity to fulfil it? What meaning does each spouse attach to compliance or refusal?

Extended-Family Influence as Support, Strain, and Relational Gap

Extended-family influence is best conceptualised along two axes: its function and its governance. Function ranges from supportive to harmful. Governance ranges from jointly negotiated to unilaterally imposed. Support that spouses jointly welcome—such as agreed childcare or mediation—may increase resilience.Assistance can also be a source of stress despite being beneficial since it can lead to indebtedness, inequality, and conflict. Conversely, one spouse may perceive advice that a relative considers supportive as surveillance or displacement.

GAP-MCT locates the clinically relevant issue in the discrepancy between relational positions. A husband may understand regular financial transfers to his parents as gratitude and filial duty, whereas his wife may experience unannounced transfers as a violation of partnership and household security. A wife may understand consultation with her mother as emotional support, whereas her husband may experience it as exposure and coalition-building. Parents may understand advice about fertility as care for lineage continuity, while one or both spouses experience it as intrusion, shame, or denial of bodily autonomy. None of these meanings can be inferred from the behaviour alone.

Several gap domains are especially pertinent. Boundary gaps concern who may know, decide, enter, advise, or intervene. Loyalty gaps concern the relative priority of spouse, natal family, marital family, children, faith community, and lineage. Resource gaps concern money, labour, residence, property, remittances, and caregiving. Authority gaps concern elders, gendered leadership, decision rules, and conflict mediation. Identity gaps concern what it means to be a virtuous spouse, adult child, parent, believer, or member of a kin group. Temporal gaps concern the collision of inherited expectations with current economic, urban, professional, or transnational realities.

These gap domains frequently overlap. A dispute over money may also be a dispute over filial identity, marital authority, gendered provision, and public respect. Treating it only as budgeting misses the meaning that gives the dispute its emotional force. Conversely, treating every disagreement as cultural can conceal ordinary deception, poor planning, incompatible priorities, or abuse. A useful formulation must hold meaning, behaviour, material conditions, and power together.

From Cultural Meaning to Threat Appraisal

The distinctive contribution of GAP-MCT is its account of the interpretative bridge between contextual influence and conflict. A family request does not automatically create escalation. The request becomes consequential through appraisal. The spouse who is asked to refuse a relative may appraise refusal as betrayal, ingratitude, spiritual failure, or loss of belonging. The other spouse may appraise compliance as abandonment, financial danger, humiliation, or evidence that the marriage is secondary. Thus, the same event activates different threat systems.

At least five forms of threat are common in the contextual relational field. Attachment threat involves fear of losing closeness or priority with the spouse. Identity threat involves fear of failing culturally meaningful roles. Status threats are shame, lack of respect, or loss of status in front of family members or the community. Material threat refers to losing one's home, money, inheritance, labour, or support. A moral-spiritual threat involves perceived violation of faith, ancestral responsibility, or communal obligation. These categories are heuristic and may co-occur.

Threat appraisal is shaped by family history and social position. The spouse that has been ostracised by the in-laws before might view the ambivalent statements as another form of ostracism. A financially dependent spouse may experience a relative's intervention differently from a spouse with independent resources. A migrant may comply with remittance requests because refusal threatens transnational belonging. Cultural scripts therefore interact with attachment histories, economic constraints, gendered power, and institutional authority.

Protective Behaviour and Networked Escalation

Once a threat is activated, spouses and relatives may adopt protective behaviours. Withdrawal may protect against disrespect; concealment may protect resources or avoid confrontation; placating may preserve peace or access to support; attack may defend status; and coalition-building may create validation or leverage. These behaviours can be intelligible without being constructive. The analytic task is to understand function while retaining accountability for impact.

Escalation may occur in at least three linked loops. In the dyadic loop, one spouse's protective behaviour becomes the other spouse's evidence of danger. In the triadic loop, a spouse recruits or is recruited by a third person, stabilising one alliance while intensifying another conflict. In the network loop, messages, judgements, resources, or sanctions circulate across households, congregations, or digital groups. The conflict may then persist even after the original couple disagreement subsides.

Take the example of two people fighting about a hidden monetary transaction. One of them, having done that transaction, is afraid of being considered unfaithful to his or her family and does not reveal more information. The other person is seeking some approval from his/her relatives, who perceive the fight as disrespectful. Their involvement then confirms the first spouse's fear that an external alliance is displacing the marriage. What began as a resource gap becomes an identity, boundary, and loyalty crisis. Meanings and responses distributed across the relational field sustain the cycle.

Six Propositions for Research

Proposition 1: Extended-family involvement will not predict marital distress uniformly; its association with distress will depend on whether spouses perceive its form and boundaries as legitimate, reciprocal, and jointly negotiated.

Proposition 2: The relationship between contextual demands and escalation will be mediated by threat appraisal. Demands interpreted as threats to attachment, identity, status, material security, or moral belonging will be more likely to elicit protective behaviour.

Proposition 3: Discrepancy in spouses' interpretations of the same family involvement will predict conflict more strongly than the frequency of involvement alone.

Proposition 4: Multiple interacting gaps—particularly boundary, loyalty, resource, authority, and identity gaps—will be associated with more persistent escalation than a single isolated disagreement.

Proposition 5: Economic insecurity, gendered dependence, migration, and unequal access to kin resources will moderate the relationship between relational gaps and threat appraisal.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Proposition 6: Those interventions that help make meaning clear, empower supportive network members, create agreed-upon boundaries, and resolve power imbalances will be more successful at preventing escalation than those that depend merely on dyadic communication. Such propositions need testing in other countries, societies, types of marriages, economic environments, and religions. Suitable designs include dyadic qualitative interviews, social-network mapping, longitudinal couple studies, actor-partner interdependence models, and observational analyses of conflict discussions. Measures should be developed with local participants and tested for conceptual, linguistic, and measurement equivalence rather than merely translated.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COUPLE ASSESSMENT AND PRACTICE

A culturally responsive GAP-MCT assessment should map both the couple cycle and the contextual relational field. The therapist should ask each partner about their views on marriage, family, loyalty, privacy, respect, gender, money, spirituality, and help-seeking, as well as enquire about each partner's understanding of these concepts within their communities and personal histories. Questions should be curious rather than prescriptive. Membership in an ethnic or religious category does not disclose a person's meanings.

Assessment can proceed through six tasks. First, identify the concrete event or recurrent demand. Second, elicit each spouse's meaning without prematurely deciding whose account is culturally authentic. Third, identify what each person fears losing. Fourth, map protective responses and their effects across the couple and network. Fifth, examine power, resources, safety, and the realistic consequences of changing a boundary. Sixth, identify supportive people and practices that can assist change.

Intervention should not aim automatically to exclude relatives or restore traditional authority. Instead, it should seek workable relational governance. Meaning clarification helps spouses distinguish intent from impact and name competing loyalties. Threat reframing can reduce the equation of a boundary with rejection or family support with marital disloyalty. Boundary negotiation specifies what information, money, access, and decision authority are shared, with whom, and under what conditions. Resource planning translates moral commitments into sustainable agreements. Network-sensitive repair might take the form of carefully choosing an elder, a mediator, or a faith leader where both parties agree to confidentiality and where safety issues are addressed.

Interpretive humility is important for therapists. For example, Western-educated therapists may overemphasise autonomy and privacy, whereas local practitioners may overemphasise harmony, endurance, age hierarchy, and gender norms. Both positions may have power implications.

Therefore, cultural responsiveness in family therapy would require reflection, social justice, and a critical analysis of how certain discourses in the professional environment can be used to perpetuate power relations (Asiimwe et al., 2026; Bakker & Snyders, 1999). In any case, one needs to strive to achieve cultural awareness and ethics and not culturalism and relativism.

Power, Gender, and Safety

The risk of invoking kinship and religious legitimacy to legitimise abuse is inherent in the topic of communal marriage. Therefore, cultural responsiveness in family therapy involves self-reflection, social justice, and critical examination of how the discourses in the professional environment can be employed to perpetuate power imbalances (Asiimwe et al., 2026; Bakker & Snyders, 1999). Issues such as respect, subordination, family pride, bride price, restoring, and sexual fidelity could prevent a person from voicing out his or her fear or continuing violence. Empirical studies carried out in Ghana and elsewhere have established possible connections between the relationships involving gender, religion, family, and domestic violence (Gyan & Ossom, 2026; Sedziafa et al., 2019; Stiles-Ocran, 2021). Cultural meaning must therefore be examined alongside power and safety.

GAP-MCT should not present coercive control or violence as merely another reciprocal cycle in couple therapy. Meaning-focused couple work may be unethical when disclosure could place a person in danger, when one partner cannot communicate freely, or when mediation is used to pressure a victim into reconciliation. Protective behaviour by a threatened spouse should not be pathologised, and responsibility for abuse must remain with the person who uses it.

The same principle applies to extended-family participation. Inclusion is appropriate only when it is voluntary, clinically justified, and consistent with confidentiality and safety. The social importance of an elder or religious leader does not guarantee neutrality or competence. Network resources should be mobilised selectively and reviewed for their effects on both partners.

DISCUSSION

Moving beyond the couple dyad changes the explanation of marital conflict. Extended-family influence is neither a cultural curiosity nor a uniform risk factor. It is a relational process whose effects depend on function, governance, meaning, power, and material conditions. The proposed contextual relational field makes those processes visible while preserving GAP-MCT's parsimonious sequence of gap, appraisal, protection, and escalation.

The extension also contributes to systemic therapy. Systemic models already attend to circularity, boundaries, subsystems, and intergenerational processes. GAP-MCT adds a structured account of perceived discrepancy and the meaning through which contextual events become threatening. Its focus is not simply that the wider system matters, but how a particular influence is translated into a specific experience of danger and a particular protective response.

The framework may also correct two opposing clinical errors. Dyadic reductionism treats couple autonomy as the obvious goal and relatives as interference. Cultural essentialism assumes that communal obligation is uniformly valued and should be preserved. A contextual GAP-MCT formulation instead asks how the spouses themselves locate commitment, belonging, responsibility, and agency—and whether the arrangements are negotiated, sustainable, equitable, and safe.

Important limitations remain. The framework is conceptual and must not be presented as evidence of treatment effectiveness. Much published research is concentrated in a limited number of African countries, and findings cannot represent the continent as a whole (Januário et al., 2018, 2021). The categories proposed here may require revision in matrilineal, patrilineal, bilateral, polygynous, customary, civil, religious, same-sex,

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

diasporic, and transnational relationships. Finally, clinical language, such as "boundary" or "threat", may not translate directly into local concepts. Participatory research is necessary to determine whether the framework reflects couples' own categories of experience.

CONCLUSION

Marriage can be intimate and collective at the same time. In many African contexts, spouses negotiate their relationship within active networks of kinship, material obligation, religious authority, cultural expectation, and social change. These networks can sustain couples, strain them, or do both simultaneously. Counting relatives or assuming that involvement is either supportive or intrusive does not help us understand their effects. GAP-MCT offers a mechanism-based account. Wider-system demands create conflict when spouses experience consequential discrepancies in expectations, meaning, resources, authority, or loyalty; appraise those discrepancies as threats; and respond protectively in ways that evoke further threats across the dyad and its relational field. By specifying this pathway, the extended framework keeps the couple analytically important without isolating it. It also provides a research agenda and a culturally responsive practice stance grounded in specificity, interpretative humility, power awareness, and safety.

Author Declarations

Beyond the Couple Dyad: A GAP-MCT Conceptualisation of Extended-Family Influence, Cultural Meaning, and Marital Conflict in African Contexts

Originality and exclusive submission

The author confirms that this manuscript is original, has not been published previously, and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Authorship and approval

Christian Matthew Adetunji is the sole author and accepts responsibility for the conception, literature synthesis, theoretical development, writing, accuracy, and final approval of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding

The author received no specific grant or other external funding for this work.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable. This is a conceptual article based on published literature and did not involve human participants, animals, or the collection of primary data.

Consent for publication

Not applicable. The manuscript contains no identifiable personal information or participant material.

Data availability

Not applicable. No new dataset was generated or analysed for this conceptual article.

Acknowledgements

None.

REFERENCES

1) Adams, G. (2005). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Enemyship in North American and West African worlds. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88(6), 948–968. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.948
2) Adams, G., & Plaut, V. C. (2003). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Friendship in North American and West African worlds. Personal Relationships, 10(3), 333–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00053
3) Asiimwe, R., Lesch, E., Karume, M., & Blow, A. J. (2021). Expanding our international reach: Trends in the development of systemic family therapy training and implementation in Africa. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 47(4), 815–830. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12514
4) Asiimwe, R., McIntosh, D. L., Nyambura, R. G., & Kasujja, R. (2026). Cultural threads: An Afrocentric paradigm for integrating social justice principles in the practice of family therapy in Africa. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 52(1), e70091. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.70091
5) Bakker, T. M., & Snyders, F. J. A. (1999). The (hi)stories we live by: Power/knowledge and family therapy in Africa. Contemporary Family Therapy, 21(2), 133–154. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021639324279
6) Bledsoe, C. H., & Pison, G. (Eds.). (1994). Nuptiality in sub-Saharan Africa: Contemporary anthropological and demographic perspectives. Clarendon Press.
7) Cole, J., & Thomas, L. M. (Eds.). (2009). Love in Africa. University of Chicago Press.
8) Gyan, C., & Ossom, B. L. (2026). Enduring traditions and emerging shifts: Exploring gender roles in Ghanaian marriages amidst modernization. Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society, jxaf069. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxaf069
9) Gyekye, K. (1997). Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience. Oxford University Press.
10) Januário, D., Narciso, I., Vieira-Santos, S., Fonseca, G., & Relvas, A. P. (2018). First journey by a descriptive review of empirical research on African marital relationships—Scientific dissemination, thematic focus, and methodology. Marriage & Family Review, 54(3), 259–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2017.1403996
11) Januário, D., Narciso, I., Vieira-Santos, S., & Relvas, A. P. (2021). Second journey through a descriptive review of research on African marital relationships—Empirical findings. Marriage & Family Review, 57(8), 700–720. https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2021.1887988

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

12) Malm, E. K., Oti-Boadi, M., Adom-Boakye, N. A., & Andah, A. (2023). Marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction among Ghanaians. Journal of Family Issues, 44(11), 3117–3141. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X221126752
13) Nsamenang, A. B. (2006). Human ontogenesis: An indigenous African view on development and intelligence. International Journal of Psychology, 41(4), 293–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590544000077
14) Oppong Asante, K., Osafo, J., & Nyamekye, G. (2014). An exploratory study of factors contributing to divorce among married couples in Accra, Ghana: A qualitative approach. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 55(1), 16–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2013.837715
15) Osafo, J., Oppong Asante, K., Ampomah, C. A., & Osei-Tutu, A. (2021). Factors contributing to divorce in Ghana: An exploratory analysis of evidence from court suits. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 62(4), 312–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2021.1871839
16) Sedziafa, A. P., Tenkorang, E. Y., & Owusu, A. Y. (2019). Can marriage (re)produce and legitimize sexual violence? A phenomenological study of a Ghanaian patrilineal society. Women's Studies International Forum, 77, 102296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102296
17) St. Vil, N. M., McDonald, K. B., & Cross-Barnet, C. (2018). A qualitative study of Black married couples' relationships with their extended family networks. Families in Society, 99(1), 56–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/1044389418756847
18) Stiles-Ocran, E. (2021). Women's stolen voices in marriage in Ghana: The role of the church in addressing intimate partner violence. Diaconia, 12(2), 179–198. https://doi.org/10.13109/diac.2021.12.2.179
19) Therborn, G. (2004). Between sex and power: Family in the world, 1900–2000. Routledge.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Dr. Christian Matthew Adetunji