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Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to examine validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the Maried Life Satisfaction Scale. Data was collected from 327 married individuals. For structure validity, explanatory and confirmatory factor analyze were used. Cronbach’s Alpha formula was used for determining the reliability of the scale. Furthermore, t-test and corrected item-total correlation were used for item analysis. The results of exploratory factor analysis demonstrated that five items loaded on single-factors, and also the factor structure was harmonized with the factor structure of the original structure of the scale. The result of the confirmatory factor analysis showed that chi-square (χ² = 7.08 DF = 5, p = 0.21) was significantly, and also indices of fit RMSEA = .03, AGFI = .97, NFI = .99, NNFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, IFI = 1.00, RFI = .99, GFI = .99, and SRMR = .01 was acceptable. The results of the CFA was consistent with the original form. The scale’s internal consistency was .85. The result of the item analysis showed that corrected item-test correlations were ranged from a low of 0.30 to a high of 0.82; and t-test values were ranged from a low of 10.80 (p<.001) to a high of 23.98 (p<.001). Corrected item-total correlations and t-test values were statistically significant at the p<.01 level. These findings showed that the Turkish version of the Married Life Satisfaction Scale was a valid and reliable instrument. Key Words: Married life satisfaction, validity, reliability, factor analysis.

INRODUCTION

The concept of marriage satisfaction is one of the most studied terms about marriage. The married couples who have high marriage satisfaction have both low stress level and high happiness levels, have resistance against negative life conditions (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Kirby, 2005). Marriage satisfaction was defined as lack of stress in marriage relation (Bradbury et al., 2000; Busby et al., 1995; Kinnunen & Feldt, 2004; Spanier, 1976).
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Furthermore, Collard (2006) defined marriage satisfaction as a situation including individuals’ interaction, experience and expectation in their marriage.

Rosen-Grandon (1999) stated that mutual love, attachment and satisfactory relation are effective on couples’ marriage satisfaction. Body language, stay away from conflicts, supportive behavior, to be less critical to each other, and pleased more in their marriage influence to the marriage satisfaction (Fitzpatrick, 1988). And also successful couples are good friends with each other, share their leisure time, spend more time together, have mild approaches in their dispute, express importance of friendship and desire (Chapin, Chapin, & Sattler, 2001). Individuals who have a partner with positive aspects have higher marital satisfaction (Whisman & Delisky, 2002). Many researchers (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Chapin, Chapin, & Sattler, 2001; Fitzpatrick, 1988; Feeney, 2002; Rosen-Grandon, 1999; Storaasli, & Markman, 1990; Synder, 1997) indicated that love, emotional attachment, problem solving, communication style, conflict solving ability increased married life satisfaction. Financial issues, sexual dissatisfaction, gender roles and role expectation related to marital satisfaction.

The measure of marital satisfaction is a difficult process requiring much effort and energy. There are difficulties in defining and to measure marital satisfaction effectively. One of those difficulties stems from that there is not a complete agreement on definition and psychometric aspects about marital dissatisfaction (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Jones, Adams, Monroe, & Berry, 1995; Patrick, Sells, Giordano, & Tollerud, 2007). On the other hand, there are a lot of scales about marriage relationship in literature, such as Marital Assessment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959), Quality Marriage Index (Norton, 1983), Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), and Marital Satisfaction Scale (Schumm et al., 1985). Marital Satisfaction Scale focused on only measuring marital satisfaction. However, these scales include many items, and they have difficulties in universal usage (Renshaw, McKnight, Caska, & Blais, 2011). So Johnson, Zabriskie, & Hill (2006) adopted Life Satisfaction Scale, developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, (1985), as married satisfaction scale. Then Ward, Lundberg, Zabriskie, & Berrett (2009) compared it other scales and got meaningful result. In this context, The purpose of the present study was examine validity and reliability of Turkish version of the Married Life Satisfaction Scale.

METHOD

Procedure
A communication established through e-mail with Ward, Lundberg, Zabriskie, & Berrett (2009) who studied on psychometric expects of Married Life Satisfaction Scale and necessary permission was granted. The participants were asked to complete the Turkish version of the married life satisfaction scale. They were told that their responses would be treated confidentially and anonymously. The entire procedure took about 15 minutes.

Participants
Study groups of this research consist of married individuals who living in different parts of Istanbul. Within 327 married individuals 146 of them is man, 181 of them is women. The age of the participants ranged from 23 to 62.

Instrument
Married life satisfaction scale: The scale was developed by Johnson, Zabriskie & Hill (2006). This scale is a 5-items self-report measurement and consists of one factor, which measures married life satisfaction. In the process of translation of Married Life Satisfaction Scale into Turkish, at first, 3 expert translators translated into Turkish, than into English again to examine their consistence. Necessary corrections are made by 5 expert in
psychological counseling and guidance field-by getting their opinion. After that, those forms reexamined and redacted by three experts in Turkish language and literature in meaning and grammar a Turkish form is got as a pilot. At next step, pilot Turkish form is applied on 63 married couples and they are asked determine unclear statements. In the end, those unclear statements have been expressed different.

Data Analysis
In scale adaptation studies, explanatory and confirmatory factor analyses were used for structure validity. To determine the reliability of the scale, Cronbach’s (1951) Coefficient Alpha was used. T-test and corrected item-total correlation were used for item analysis.

RESULTS

Structure Validity
Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA). EFA examined the structure validity of the Married Life Satisfaction Scale. Firstly, the correlation matrix among all items was calculated to reveal meaningful correlations existed. The Bartlett’s test should be meaningful with a KMO higher than 0.60 to determine whether data are suitable for explanatory factor analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2010). In this analysis, that is made for that purpose, KMO example suitable coefficient was .85, Barlett Sphericity test $X^2$ value was 1076.16 ($p<.001$), and answer for the scale were factorable. At first analyze in the research; there was one factor that explains 68.07% of total variance and factor eigenvalue was over 3.40. Also, factor loading of the scale ranged from .41 to .92. Item factor loading that belongs to each factor showed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 3.40 |
| Variance (%) | 68.07 |

Confirmatory Factor Analyze (CFA). CFA was applied to confirm the single-factor Structure found in original form of scale for structure of Married Life Satisfaction Scale in CFA. The result of the the confirmatory factor analysis showed that chi-square ($X^2 = 7.08 \ DF = 5, p = 0.21$) was significantly, and also indices of fit RMSEA = .03, AGFI = .97, NFI = .99, NNFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, IFI = 1.00, RFI = .99, GFI = .99, and SRMR = .01 was acceptable. Factor loadings were shown in Figure 1.
Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller (2003) stated that reasonable fit indices of models range between 0 ≤ χ²/df ≤ 3 for χ²/df, 0.01 ≤ p ≤ 1.00 for p, 0 ≤ RMSEA ≤ 0.08 for the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; 0.85 ≤ AGFI ≤ 1.00 for the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; 0.90 ≤ NFI ≤ 1.00, for the Normed Fit Index; 0.95 ≤ NNFI ≤ 1.00 for the Comparative Fit Index; and 90 ≤ GFI ≤ 1.00 for the Goodness of Fit Index; and 0 ≤ SRMR ≤ 0.10 for the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. AGFI values typically range between zero and one with larger values indicating a better fit. A rule of thumb for this index is that 0.90 is indicative of a good fit relative to the baseline model, while values greater than 0.85 may be considered as an acceptable fit. Furthermore, Hu and Bentler (1999) gave evidence that 0.90 might not be a reasonable cut-off for all fit indices under all circumstances. They suggested raising the rule of thumb minimum standard for the CFI and the NNFI from 0.90 to 0.95 to reduce the number of severely mis-specified models that are considered acceptable based on the 0.90 criterion. In this regard, the results indicated that this model has acceptable fit indices.

**Reliability**
Cronbach’s Alpha internal consistence coefficient was used to examine the reliability of the scale. Scale’s internal consistence reliability coefficient was .85. If we consider that presumed reliability is .60 (Büyüköztürk, 2010) that can be used in researches, scale’s reliability level is enough.

**Item Analysis**
Corrected item-total correlations and t-test results, which for comparison of lower 27% and upper 27% groups were formed according to total scores of the test, were used for item analysis. The findings concerning the item analysis were shown in Table 2.
In the result of the item analysis showed that corrected item-total correlations were ranged between .30 and .82, and $t$ ($DF = 88$) values were ranged between 10.80 ($p < .001$) and 23.98 ($p < .001$). We can accept that scale is reliable, according to the result of internal consistency, corrected item-total correlation and t-test results ($p < .001$).

**DISCUSSION**

The results of exploratory factor analysis demonstrated that five items loaded on single-factors, and also the factor structure was harmonized with the factor structure of the original structure of the scale. The result of the confirmatory factor analysis showed that chi-square was significantly, and also indices of fit was acceptable.

The result of the reliability analysis showed that internal consistence was high. The results of the item analysis showed that item total correlation and t-test results were meaningful. Flynn, Schroeder, & Sakakibara, (1994) stated that a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.60 and above was considered an acceptable reliability level for judging a scale. In interpretation of item total correlation .30 and higher items, it is differentiate with its items; we see that item total correlation is in enough level (Büyüköztürk, 2010). The results of the present study showed that Turkish form of Married Life Satisfaction Scale was valid and reliable instrument.

Some suggestions may be made as a result of validity and reliability studies. Applying this scale to different individuals with different characteristics can contribute to the validity and reliability of the scale. Using this scale may create possibilities for further research to improve and increase the married life satisfaction of individuals. It can also be used to collect data from individuals who may have problems with their marriages and relationships in order to help them. It can be used for psychological guidance and counselling to improve individuals’ marital lives. Finally, studies that use this scale may contribute to measurements of the scale’s effectiveness. Group guidance and psychological counselling are intended to improve individuals’ married life satisfaction, and may contribute to the field of family counseling.
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Evlilik Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeğinin Türkçe Versiyonunun Geçerlik Ve Güvenirliği

Eyüp ÇELİK¹

Geniş Özet

GİRİŞ


YÖNTEM

Ölçeğin yapı geçerliği için açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Ölçeğin güvenirilirliği belirlemek için ise Cronbach Alpha formülü kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca madde analizi için düzeltilmiş madde-toplam korelasyonu ve ilişkisiz t-testi kullanılmıştır.

BULGULAR

Faktör analizinde toplam varyansın %68.07’sini açıklayan, ölçüin orijinaline uygun tek faktörlü yapı elde edilmiştir. Doğrulayıcı faktör analizinde Ki-karenin (X² = 7,08 SD = 5, p = 0.21) anlamlı, uyum indekslerinin ise RMSEA = .03, AGFI = .97, NFI = .99, NNFI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, IFI = 1.00, RFI = .99, GFI = .99 ve SRMR = .01 olduğu görülmektedir. Ölçeğin iç tutarlılık katsayısı .85; testin toplam puanlarına göre oluşturulan alt %27 ve üst %27’lik grupların karşılaştırılmasına ilişkin t-testi sonuçlarının anlamlı olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca ölçeğin düzeltilmiş madde-toplam korelasyonlarının .30 ile .82 arasında sıralandığı
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bulunmuştur. Bulgular Evlilik Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği’nin geçerli ve güvenilir bir ölçme aracı olduğunu göstermektedir.
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