

Development of the Dyadic Relationship Scale*

Özlem HASKAN AVCI*

Suggested Citation:

Haskan Avci, Ö. (2014). Development of the Dyadic Relationship Scale. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 89-108 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.56.6>

Abstract

Problem Statement: The rise of premarital studies raises questions about the effectiveness of educational programs developed to prepare young couples for marriage and family life.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to describe and introduce the Dyadic Relationship Scale (DRS) for use with university students. The author developed the DRS on the basis of Turkish culture.

Methods: Validity and reliability studies for the DRS were conducted in 2013 with the participation of 1,115 students attending Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. The data obtained were analyzed by SPSS software. Construct validity of the DRS was examined with exploratory factors and analysis. The DRS is a five point Likert scale comprising five subscales and 78 items. The five subscales measure Communication, Romanticism-Sexuality, Conflict Solving, Social Support, and Acceptance of Differences.

Findings and Results: The Communication subscale has a six-factor structure and explains 64.2% of the total variance. The Romanticism-Sexuality subscale has a five-factor structure and explains 61.5% of the total variance. The Conflict Solving subscale has a five-factor structure and explains 60.1% of the total variance. The Social Support subscale has a two-factor structure and explains 63.3% of the total variance. Finally, the Acceptance of Differences subscale displays a five-factor structure and explains 60.7% of the total variance.

Criterion-related validity was analyzed between the DRS and the Pre-Marital Relationship Assessment Scale. Based on the data obtained from

* This study is a part of the doctoral dissertation of the author.

* Dr. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Anabilim Dalı, e-mail.haskan@hacettepe.edu.tr

181 Turkish university students, a positive and significant correlation at the level of .824 was found when the two scales were compared. The reliability of the DRS was analyzed in two ways. First, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for all subscales of the DRS. Alpha coefficients were calculated to be .77 for the Communication subscale, .88 for the Romanticism-Sexuality subscale, .85 for the Conflict Solving subscale, .91 for the Social Support subscale and .79 for the Acceptance of Differences subscale. Second, reliability coefficients of the DRS, which were analyzed by use of the split-half method, were found to be .61 for the Communication subscale, .64 for the Romanticism-Sexuality subscale, .73 for the Conflict Solving subscale, .69 for the Social Support subscale and .64 for the Acceptance of Differences subscale.

Conclusions and Recommendation: The evidence for validity and reliability shows that the DRS can be validly and reliably used for measuring dyadic relationship levels between university students. Premarital educators can use the DRS in evaluating the effectiveness of their practices.

Keywords: dyadic relationship, premarital relationship, premarital counseling, marriage preparation programs

Introduction

The family, perhaps the most important building stone of society, plays a significant role in raising healthy individuals and creating a stronger society. Marriage is the most important and serious step preceding establishing a family (Dinçyürek & Uygarer, 2012). When studies conducted on marriage and family, in Turkey and around the world, are examined, divorce rates are frequently addressed. According to data of the Turkish Statistics Institution (TÜİK), the number of Turkish divorces in the first half of 2012 increased by 5.8% compared to the same period of the previous year, reaching 33,474 (TÜİK, 2012) for the six-month period. Increasing year by year, the number of divorces leads to the obvious conclusion couples' expectations from marriage were not fulfilled. Experts frequently try to bring premarital relationships to the attention of the public, educators and politicians, and emphasize the importance of preventative works to lower the rate of divorce, since several research studies have shown that the rate of divorce is 30% lower among couples who attend to and complete marriage preparation programs (Stanley, Amato, Johnson & Markman, 2006).

No doubt, couples pass through an extended process before they reach the point of deciding to divorce. The high numbers of divorce suggest that certain problems become unsolvable for couples. In the context of these problems, researchers point to the connections between divorce and the premarital period. Factors influencing marriage decisions may cause both problems and benefits during marriage (Dinçyürek & Uygarer, 2012). According to Kalkan, Hamamcı and Yalçın (2012), the premarital period may be deceptive for both parties if either person or both tends to

present only positive sides of their own personalities and overlook the negative qualities of their partner. Keitner, Heru and Glick (2010) point out that reluctance to recognize each other's differences in a relationship may result in a tendency to suppress differences, which may in turn create disappointments and conflicts. Partners who do not accept each other as is generally experience more problems.

Constraints affecting young individuals in preparation for marriage and family life have also been the subject of research. According to Olson and DeFrain (1994), engaged couples may develop an idealistic point of view for their future marriage. In general, problems arise when the first romantic phase of love comes to an end. At this point, counseling is capable of helping couples to renew and review their relationships (Peake & Steep, 2005). On the other hand, studies conducted on marriage show us that therapies applied to already damaged marriages have a very low rate of success. Several findings reveal that couples consider marriage counseling to be quite costly and that many couples experiencing marriage stress either do not seek support, or seek it after a considerable span of time (Sullivan, Pasch, Cornelius & Cirigliano, 2004). According to Bringle and Byers (1997), couples unfortunately receive counseling not as a preventive measure before problems arise, but after several problems develop and reach a serious state. The success rate is low for couples who seek marriage and family counseling at a very late stage.

These outcomes reflect the importance of the preventive dimension of marriage and family counseling, as is the case for many other fields included counseling and guidance. While the rates and negative effects of divorce are frequently mentioned, research and educational programs that emphasize the importance of the premarital relationship in the prevention of divorce and the creation of a healthy family life are too limited. Early intervention and support are known to be effective means of encouraging young individuals to marry only after establishing a strong relationship. They also improve loyalty and reduce the risks for a problematic relationship. They ensure that individuals adopt realistic expectations, reach a better understanding of marital roles and problems arising during marriage, and develop marital communication and problem-solving skills (Silliman & Schumm, 2004).

In Turkish society, which attaches great importance to the wedding day, it is necessary to draw the attention of a young couple away from marriage, a very important period of life, and to premarital counseling programs. The same seems to apply to American society; Britzman and Nagelhout (2012) accordingly report that people generally allocate too little time to considering what awaits them in their future marriage. It is particularly important for individuals the answer to the question "What would it be like to be married to me?" before deciding for it.

A common aspect of the international studies conducted on premarital relationships is the emphasis on the importance of communication and conflict solving. Doherty (2003) states that premarital counseling is important in addressing major issues of married life, which are listed as: couple communication, problem-solving techniques, loyalty, sexual desire and expectations, economical structure and financial management, and parenting approach. When the literature on premarital

counseling is reviewed, the significance of romanticism and sexuality, acceptance of differences as is, and mutual support are prominent themes. Research shows us that premarital education has become widespread in the last 50 years and that couples who attend and complete a premarital program have a higher quality of marriage, lower level of conflict and 30% lower rate of divorce (Stanley, Amato, Johnson & Markman, 2006). Marriage preparation and enhancement programs, premarital counseling and other preventive measures help to build stronger marriages and reduce marital stress (Lesage-Higgins, 1999).

In Turkey, premarital education has been addressed at the ministry level in recent years. When the Ministry of Family and Social Policies issued a statement noting, "Just as a person needs to complete a course to receive a driving license, the same may apply for marriage license," the media reacted by stressing the importance of the issue. "Marriage preparation courses" were organized and realized through the evaluation that, "The way of strengthening the institution of marriage follows from premarital courses," (The Ministry of Family and Social Policies, 2013).

The rise of such practices raises questions about the effectiveness of educational programs developed to prepare young individuals for marriage and family life and how such programs should be evaluated. The need for scientific, valid and reliable measuring instruments for use in evaluating such programs has become apparent. When earlier studies carried out in Turkey were reviewed, the author found that, in terms of validity and reliability, the number of measuring instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of premarital counseling programs was limited.

Although longstanding premarital counseling programs and measuring instruments can be found in non-Turkish studies, dyadic relationships are known to differ due to individuals' cultural backgrounds, local conditions and social group structures. From this point of view, we decided to develop a new instrument for measuring various aspects of dyadic relationships under the specific conditions of our own country, instead of trying to adopt a scale developed on the basis of a different culture. Larson et al. (1995) suggest that premarital measurements must be strong enough in five particular fields: they must be designed mainly or specifically for measuring premarital relationships; must ensure that comprehensive data are obtained about the educational process; must be applicable on a large scale; must be easily understood; and lastly, must be shown to be valid and reliable. In this study, which accounted for all those these criteria, the aim was to develop a Dyadic Relationship Scale for measuring various aspects of relationships among Turkish university students and to contribute to filling a gap in the literature.

Method

Research Sample

To determine the validity and reliability of the DRS, first, a trial form consisting of 85 items was distributed to 52 students of the university: items that students found to be confusing were subsequently rearranged. Validity and reliability work by use of the final DRS form was performed with the participation of 678 randomly selected

Hacettepe University students, 376 of whom were female (55.5%) and 302 were male (44.5%). In addition, split-half reliability and criterion-related validity analyses were carried out with 204 and 181 university students, respectively. In total, 1,115 university students contributed to the development of the Dyadic Relationship Scale.

Procedure

In order for the Dyadic Relationship Scale to be developed, firstly a literature review was first performed, and five subscales and an item pool of 88 items were established by determining the feelings, thoughts and behaviors of university students regarding premarital relationships. The five subscales included under the DRS are Communication, Romanticism-Sexuality, Conflict Solving, Social Support and Acceptance of Differences. Perceived Social Support Scale (Yıldırım, 2004) was used in the establishment of the Social Support subscale. After making necessary arrangements on the items pool in line with the suggestions given by three counseling and guidance authorities, three of the items were removed and a trial form consisting of 85 items was prepared. In consequence of the implementation of the trial form, items found to be confusing were rewritten. At the next stage, validity and reliability studies were conducted on the DRS with the data collected from 678 students. As a result, the number of items in the final form of the DRS was reduced to 78. For testing the validity of the scale, criterion-related validity was analyzed, comparing the DRS and the Pre-Marital Relationship Assessment Scale. Cronbach alpha coefficients and item/total statistics of the scale were reviewed for determining reliability coefficients of the scale. The split-half reliability method was applied as well.

Research Instruments and Procedure

Pre-Marital Relationship Assessment Scale (PMRAS) (Kalkan & Nevres Kaya, 2007) was employed for reviewing the criterion-related validity of the DRS. While the two scales present similarities in terms of the qualities intended to be measured and the study groups, there are differences related to the sub-dimensions measured. PMRAS is a scale with 34 items and five grades. Five factors are included in this scale, which explains 42.9% of the total variance. The correlation coefficient between the scores of PMRAS and the Relationship Happiness Scale was found to be .48 ($p < .01$), while the internal consistency coefficient for the whole PMRAS (Cronbach alpha) was calculated to be .86. Moreover, the test-retest reliability coefficient calculated on 64 individuals' PMRAS scores was .72 ($p < .01$).

Data Analysis

The SPSS software was employed for data analysis. First, it was considered that KMO must be higher than 0.60 and the Barlett test must provide significant results in order for the data to be deemed suitable for a factor analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2004). After it was determined that the data were suitable for carrying out a factor analysis, the factor structure of the scale and factor loading of the items were examined by use of the exploratory factor analysis. Meanwhile, the principal components analysis (PCA) was selected to be applied as the factoring technique. Common factor variance

of the factors on each variable, factor loadings of items and explained variance proportions were examined within the scope of the analyses. A factor loading value of .30 or higher was taken as a criterion for determining factor structures of the items. The items were required to have a factor loading of 0.30 or higher for the first factor, and each subscale was required to be one-dimensional and provide a usable total score in the component matrix table (Büyüköztürk 2004). The varimax rotation technique was selected in order to ensure that interrelated items form factors by combining and that the factors were constructed easily. As a result of the analyses, removed from the scales were items that had factor loading values lower than 0.30 for the first factor, or had similar factor loading values for several factors and provided little distinctiveness, or presented weak correlation with other items of the scale. Validity of the DRS was also checked by use of the criterion-related validity method The Pearson correlation coefficient was analyzed between the DRS and the Pre-Marital Relationship Assessment Scale (PMRAS). Cronbach alpha coefficients and item/total correlation values of the scale were reviewed for evaluating the scale's reliability.

Results

Validity of the DRS

In this study, validity of the DRS was examined in two ways. First, a factor analysis was performed in order to reveal the structural validity of the DRS. The KMO coefficient and explained total variance were studied for all subscales of the DRS. In factor analysis, factors with an eigenvalue of 1 or higher are considered to be significant (Büyüköztürk 2004). Based on this consideration, factor structures were examined separately for each subscale, and factor analysis results belonging to the subscales are addressed in this section of the study.

Factor analysis results for the communication subscale. The "Communication" subscale of the DRS consisted of 15 items. The KMO coefficient was calculated to be .77. The result of the Barlett test was significant for this subscale.

Table 1.*Factor Analysis Results for the Communication Subscale of the DRS*

Item Num.	Common Variance	Item Num.	Factor-1 Loading	Item Number	Factor Loading After Varimax						
					Fac.-1	Fac.-2	Fac.-3	Fac.-4	Fac.-5	Fac.-6	
1	,533	14	,647	14	,810						
2	,752	4	,639	4	,763						
4	,660	18	,594	1	,544						
7	,688	8	,555	7		,775					
8	,667	1	,548	10		,706					
10	,609	7	,541	8		,670					
12	,569	10	,533	17			,762				
13	,567	16	,515	16			,700				
14	,733	17	,366	18			,598				
15	,577	15	,339	19							
16	,559	12	,477	12				,802			
17	,649	19	,407	13				,672			
18	,612	21	,382	21				,515	,783		
19	,723	2	,335	15					,678		
21	,730	13	,408	2						,826	

Explained Variance: Total: % 64,19 Factor-1: % 24,64 Factor-2: % 9,56

Factor-3: % 9,03 Factor-4: % 7,30 Factor-5: % 6,93 Factor-6: % 6,73

Common factor variance of the factors for each variable ranged from .533 to .733. The Communication subscale presented a structure of six factors with eigenvalues higher than 1. The six factors explained 64.19% of the total variance altogether. Calculated variance percentages explained by the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth factors were 24.64, 9.56, 9.03, 7.30, 6.93 and 6.73, respectively. Factor loadings of the items (component matrix) varied between .335 and .647 at the first factor.

As a result of the varimax rotation technique, the first factor was determined to consist of three items (1, 4, 14); the second to consist of three items (7, 8, 10); the third to consist of three items (16, 17, 18); the fourth to consist of three items (9, 12, 13); the fifth to consist of two items (15, 21); and the sixth factor was determined to consist of only one item (2). Factors were named based on the contents of the items. Thus, the first factor was called "verbal offence"; the second was "self regulation"; the third,

“self control”; the fourth, “manipulation”; the fifth, “sharing and coupling”; and the sixth factor was “tiring out”.

Factor analysis results for the romanticism-sexuality subscale. The “Romanticism-Sexuality” subscale of the DRS consisted of 18 items. The KMO coefficient was calculated to be .89. The result of the Barlett test was significant for this subscale.

Table 2.

Factor Analysis Results for the Romanticism-Sexuality Subscale of the DRS

Item Num.	Common Variance	Item Num.	Factor-1 Loading	Item Number	Factor Loading After Varimax				
					Fac.-1	Fac.-2	Fac.-3	Fac.-4	Fac.-5
2	,633	20	,742	19	,741				
3	,722	13	,740	21	,714				
4	,522	16	,736	17	,691				
5	,515	21	,729	20	,676				
7	,693	17	,666	18	,674				
9	,559	7	,660	16	,571				
10	,668	19	,635	2	,750				
11	,643	18	,631	4	,667				
12	,588	9	,614	5	,617				
13	,622	5	,612	9	,604				
15	,677	4	,583	13	,570				
16	,666	12	,533	11			,768		
17	,567	3	,507	12			,657		
18	,545	2	,527	3					
19	,632	10	,307	10				,758	
20	,636	22	,460	7				,646	
21	,628	15	,353	15				,630	,768
22	,547	11	,360	22					,594

Explained Variance: Total: % 61,46 Factor-1: % 35,12 Factor-2: % 8,16

Factor-3: % 6,56 Factor-4: % 6,02 Factor-5: % 5,61

As a result of the varimax rotation technique, the first factor was determined to consist of six items (16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21); the second factor was determined to consist of five items (2, 4, 5, 9, 13); the third factor was determined to consist of two items (11, 12); the fourth factor was determined to consist of three items (3, 7, 10); and the fifth factor was determined to consist of two items (15, 22). The names of factors were

derived from the contents of the items. Thus, the first factor was called "romanticism behaviors"; the second factor was called "relationship saturation"; the third factor was called "physical intimacy"; the fourth factor was called "romanticism perception"; and the fifth factor was called "romanticism expectation".

Factor analysis results for the conflict solving subscale. The "Conflict Solving" subscale of the DRS consisted of 18 items. The KMO coefficient was calculated to be .86. The result of the Barlett test was significant for this subscale.

Table 3.

Factor Analysis Results for the Conflict Solving Subscale of the DRS

Item Num.	Common Variance	Item Num.	Factor-1 Loading	Item Number	Factor Loading After Varimax				
					Fac.-1	Fac.-2	Fac.-3	Fac.-4	Fac.-5
1	,566	24	,679	21	,752				
4	,590	5	,662	13	,691				
5	,618	20	,629	24	,687				
6	,607	4	,575	20	,645				
8	,511	11	,574	18	,511				
9	,671	21	,561	22		,772			
10	,720	8	,537	15		,760			
11	,620	23	,526	17		,680			
12	,614	9	,507	23		,552			
13	,644	17	,502	4			,710		
15	,608	18	,457	5			,701		
17	,533	22	,419	11			,696		
18	,509	10	,510	8			,634		
20	,548	15	,395	9				,789	
21	,696	13	,524	10				,774	
22	,668	1	,411	1				,709	
23	,492	12	,456	12					,626
24	,603	6	,523	6					,533

Explained Variance: Total: % 60,1 Factor-1: % 28,17 Factor-2: % 13,08

Factor-3: % 6,94 Factor-4: % 6,14 Factor-5: % 5,76

Common factor variance for the factors on each variable ranged from .509 to .720. The Conflict Solving subscale presented a structure of five factors with eigenvalues higher than 1. The five factors explained 60.1% of the total variance. Calculated variance percentages explained by the first, second, third, fourth and fifth factors were 28.17, 13.08, 6.94, 6.14 and 5.76, respectively. Factor loadings of the items (component matrix) varied between .395 and .679 for the first factor.

As a result of the varimax rotation technique, the first factor was determined to consist of five items (13, 18, 20, 21, 24); the second factor was determined to consist of four items (15, 17, 22, 23); the third factor was determined to consist of four items (4, 5, 8, 11); the fourth factor was determined to consist of three items (1, 9, 10); and the fifth factor was determined to consist of 2 items (6, 12). The names of actors were derived from the contents of the items. Thus, the first factor was called "tendency for lack of conflicting"; the second factor was called "self control"; the third factor was "power struggle"; the fourth factor was "aiming at solutions"; and the fifth factor was as "implicit conflict".

Factor analysis results for the social support subscale. The "Social Support" subscale of the DRS consisted of twelve items. The KMO coefficient was calculated to be .92. The result of the Barlett test was significant for this subscale.

Table 4.

Factor Analysis Results for the Social Support Subscale of the DRS

Item Number	Common Item Factor Variance	Item Num.	Factor-1 Loading	Item Number	Factor Loading After Varimax	
					Fac.-1	Fac.-2
3	,611	9	,809	4	,807	
4	,669	13	,802	6	,784	
5	,607	3	,781	8	,749	
6	,635	8	,773	7	,743	
7	,602	5	,770	9	,734	
8	,622	4	,767	13	,728	
9	,660	15	,757	5	,726	
13	,647	7	,756	20	,691	
15	,578	6	,752	3	,684	,840
16	,665	20	,655	19	,792	
19	,747	19	,596	16	,633	
20	,554	16	,565	15		

Explained Variance: Total: % 63,32 Factor-1: % 54,16 Factor-2: % 9,16

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Common factor variance of the factors on each variable was found to range from .554 to .747. The Social Support subscale presented a structure of two factors with eigenvalues higher than 1. The two factors explained 63.32% of the total variance together. Calculated variance percentages explained by the first and second factors were 54.16 and 9.16 respectively. Factor loadings of the items (component matrix) were seen to vary between .565 and .809 at the first factor.

As a result of the Varimax rotation technique, the first factor was determined to consist of 9 items (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 20); and the second factor was determined to consist of three items (15, 16, 19). Factors were named in consideration of the contents of the items. Thus, the first factor was named as "emotional support"; and the second factor was named as "appreciating".

Factor analysis results for the acceptance of differences subscale. The "Acceptance of Differences" subscale of the DRS consisted of fifteen items. The KMO coefficient was calculated to be .81. The result of the Barlett test was significant for this subscale.

Table 5

Factor Analysis Results for the Acceptance of Differences Subscale of the DRS

Item Num.	Common Fac.	Item Num.	Factor-1 Loading	Item Number	Factor Loading After Varimax				
					Fac.-1	Fac.-2	Fac.-3	Fac.-4	Fac.-5
2	,504	12	,667	8	,856				
3	,607	11	,636	12	,796				
4	,460	9	,589	9	,609				
5	,713	7	,566	18	□□□ ,754				
7	,520	18	,536	16				,747	
8	,754	3	,511	13				,686	
9	,597	14	,509	5				,837	
10	,686	8	,505	3				,734	
11	,522	13	,491	2				,629	
12	,761	2	,461	10					,806
13	,522	5	,414	7					,652
14	,645	16	,440	11					,526
16	,596	4	,402	20					
18	,631	20	,384	14					,738
20□□□	,590□□□	10□□□	,539□□	4□		□			,706
					,495				

Formatted: Font: Bold

Explained Variance: Total: % 60,7 Factor-1: % 26,65 Factor-2: % 11,43
Factor-3: % 8,85 Factor-4: % 7,06 Factor-5: 6,73

The common factor variance of the factors on each variable ranged from .504 to .761. The Acceptance of Differences subscale presented a structure of five factors with eigenvalues higher than 1. The five factors explained 60.7% of the total variance. Calculated variance percentages explained by the first, second, third, fourth and fifth factors were 26.65, 11.43, 8.85, 7.06 and 6.73, respectively. Factor loadings of the items (component matrix) varied between .384 and .667 for the first factor.

As a result of the Varimax rotation technique, the first factor was determined to consist of three items (8, 9, 12); the second factor was determined to consist of three items (13, 16, 18); the third factor was determined to consist of three items (2, 3, 5); the fourth factor was determined to consist of three items (7, 10, 11); and the fifth factor was determined to consist of three items (4, 14, 20). Factor names were derived from the contents of the items. Thus, the first factor was named "acceptance of socioeconomic differences"; the second factor was named "acceptance of personal differences"; the third factor was named "acceptance of personal preference differences"; the fourth factor was named as "sense of belonging"; and the fifth factor was named "respect".

High loading values for the first factor of the items before the rotation, the high percentage of variance explained by the first factor, and the rapid decrease on the line chart following the first factor together suggest that the subscales also have a common factor. The literature tells us that loading values of .45 or higher for items is a positive criterion for selection; however, the limit value can be .30 for a small number of items in practice (Büyüköztürk, 2004). While the subscales of the DRS were limited in quantity, there was no item with a factor loading value lower than .30.

Criterion-Related Validity of the DRS

Validity of the DRS was analyzed using the "Criterion-related validity" method as well. The DRS and the Premarital Relationship Assessment Scale were applied with 181 Hacettepe University students. Pearson correlation coefficients for the scales are shown in Table 6.

Table 6*The Correlation between the DRS and its subscales and the PMRAS*

	COM	RS	CS	SS	AD	DRS	PMRAS
COM	1,00						
RS	,923**	1,00					
CS	,967**	,966**	1,00				
SS	,725**	,881**	,808**	1,00			
AD	,935**	,977**	,977**	,837**	1,00		
DRS	,963**	,987**	,991**	,856**	,988**	1,00	
PMRAS	,797**	,804**	,811*	,727*	,815	,824**	1,00

Formatted Table

COM= Communication, RS= Romanticism- Sexuality, CS= Conflict Solving, SS= Social Support, AD= Acceptance of Difference, DRS= Dyadic Relationship Scale, PMRAS= Premarital Relationship Assessment Scale

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

As can be seen in Table 6, there are positive and significant correlations between the DRS and its subscales and the PMRAS. These correlations can be considered evidence of the validity of the DRS and its subscales. The two methods implemented for evaluating the validity of the DRS each produced positive results.

Reliability of the DRS

Reliability of the DRS was calculated in two ways. First, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was analyzed for all subscales of the DRS. Alpha coefficients were calculated to be .77 for the Communication subscale, .88 for the Romanticism-Sexuality subscale, .85 for the Conflict Solving subscale, .91 for the Social Support subscale and .79 for the Acceptance of Differences subscale. According to the literature, reliability coefficients of .70 or higher are considered to be sufficient in terms of reliability in the interpretation of Cronbach alpha scores. Second, split-half reliability coefficients of the DRS were found to be .61 for the Communication subscale, .64 for the Romanticism-Sexuality subscale, .73 for the Conflict Solving subscale, .69 for the Social Support subscale and .64 for the Acceptance of Differences subscale. Split-half coefficients of the DRS comply with the values expected from the

literature. Evidence reached for validity and reliability show that the DRS can be validly and reliably used for measuring dyadic relationship levels in university students.

Scoring of the DRS

Items included in the scope of the DRS were grouped in subscales. The total number of DRS items is 78, 15 of which are included in the Communication subscale, 18 in the Romanticism-Sexuality subscale, 18 in the Conflict Solving subscale, 12 in the Social Support subscale and the remaining 15 in the Acceptance of Differences subscale. All subscales also have reverse items. Three grades could be chosen from the scale ("completely fits me" = 3, "does not fit me at all" = 1), and the students were requested to put a cross in the parentheses of relevant grade. Direct items were scored with their mentioned points, while reverse items were scored contrarily. Score ranges for the subscales and the scale itself are 15-45 for Communication; 18-54 for Romanticism-Sexuality; 18-57 for Conflict Solving; 12-36 for Social Support; 15-45 for Acceptance of Differences; and 78-234 for the whole DRS. Higher scores indicate a more positive dyadic relationship for the individual in relation to the relevant subscale.

Discussion and Conclusions

The evidence reached for validity and reliability show that the DRS can be validly and reliably used for measuring dyadic relationship levels among university students. However, in order for the DRS to be capable of measuring dyadic relationships of individuals from other age groups, validity and reliability works must be performed for the scale. A limitation of the study is that it was not always possible to apply the scale to both partners simultaneously. The DRS was observed to measure various factors including, but not limited to, verbal offense, self regulation, self control, manipulation, sharing and coupling, romanticism behaviors, physical intimacy, romanticism perception, tendency for non-conflict, power struggle, aiming at solutions, implicit conflict, emotional support, appreciation, acceptance of socioeconomic differences, and acceptance of personal differences. On the other hand, other instruments should be developed for measuring additional factors of a dyadic relationship for university students, which are not included in the scope of this study.

As it was mentioned in the introduction section, premarital programs gradually became widespread in Turkey and several research studies show that a healthy dyadic relationship is a prerequisite for a healthy marriage. It is not a realistic approach to think that the problems experienced during the early dyadic relationship will come to an end with the wedding ceremony. On the contrary, problems which are not solved during the early phase of the relationship tend to continue after marriage and may even lead to the break-up marriages by creating a snowball effect. Premarital counseling is rather significant because it capable of its preparing the partners for a healthier marriage and preventing the negative and costly impacts of

divorces on individuals as well as on their families and the society (Carroll & Doherty, 2003). New measuring instruments are needed to support the proliferation of premarital programs and to evaluate marriage preparation programs. In line with this need, implementers of premarital counseling and marriage preparation programs can use the DRS in evaluating the effectiveness of their practices. The DRS can be particularly useful in the implementation of marriage preparation programs targeting university students as pre-post tests. Reviews of empirical studies conducted in the field of counseling and guidance show that premarital psycho-educational programs can be effective (Duran; 2010; Yalçın, 2010; Yılmaz & Kalkan, 2010).

An additional benefit can be created by determining the students who are experiencing problems in their dyadic relationships and ensuring that they receive individual and group therapy support from counseling centers of universities. The DRS can be also used by counselors, couples and family counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists, social service specialists and researchers. Results of the scale are thought to be beneficial, particularly for therapists specializing in couples therapy.

References

- Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı ([ASPB], (2013). *Evlilik Öncesi Eğitim Programı*. [Premarital Education Program] Retrieved February 9 2013 from <http://tv.aile.gov.tr/tr/html/1934/Evlilik-Oncesi-Egitim-Programi>
- Bringle, R., Byers, D. (1997). Intentions to Seek Marriage Counseling. *Family Relations*, 46, 299-304.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. [Data Analysis and SPSS Practices for Social Science] Ankara: Pegem-A Yayınları.
- Carroll, J. S., Doherty, W. J. (2003). Evaluating Effectiveness of Premarital Prevention Programs: A Meta-Analytic Review of Outcome Research. *Family Relations*, 52(2):105-118.
- Dinçyürek, S., Uygarer, G.. (2012). The Role of Communication Skills on Perspectives of University Students about Marriage during Dating (emotional friendship). *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 49/ A, 151-166.
- Duran, Ş. (2010). *Evlilik Öncesi İlişki Geliştirme Programının Romantik İlişkiler Yaşayan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin İletişim Becerileri, Çatışma İletişim Tarzları Ve İlişki İstikrarları Üzerine Etkisinin İncelenmesi*. [The Investigation of Effects of Premarital Relationships Enhancement Program on Relationship Stability, Conflict Communication Styles and Communication Skills of University Students with Romantic Relationship]. (Unpublished master thesis). Gaziantep Üniversitesi: Gaziantep.

- Kalkan, M., Hamamcı, Z. & Yalçın, İ. (2012). *Evlilik Öncesi Psikolojik Danışma*. [Premarital Counseling]. Ankara: Anı.
- Kalkan, M., Kaya, S.N. (2007). Evlilik Öncesi İlişkileri Değerlendirme Ölçeğinin (EÖİDÖ) Geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması , [The Development of Premarital Relationship Assessment Scale: Studies of Validity and Reliability] *Aile ve Toplum*, 3, (11), 35-40
- Keitner, G., Heru, A & Glick, I. (2010). *Clinical Manual of Couples and Family Therapy*. Washington DC: Guilford.
- Larson, J.H., Holman, T.B., Klein, D.M., Busby, D.M., Stahmann, R.F., Peterson, D. (1995). A Review of Comprehensive Questionnaires Used in Premarital Education and Counseling. *Family Relations*, 44, 245-252.
- Lesage-Higgins, S. A. (1999). Family Sculpting in Premarital Counseling. *Family Therapy*, 26, 31-38.
- Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (1994). *Marriage and The Family: Diversity and Strengths*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Peake, T.H. & Steep, A.E. (2005). Therapy with Older Couples: Love Stories—The Good, The Bad, and The Movies. Michelle Harway (Eds), *Handbook of Couples Therapy*, (pp. 80-99), Canada: John Wiley & Sons.
- Silliman, B., Schumm, W.R. (2000). Marriage Preparation Programs: A Literature Review. *The family journal: Counseling And Therapy For Couples And Families*, 8 (2), 133-142.
- Stanley, S.M., Amato, P.R., Johnson, C.A., & Markman, H.J. (2006). Premarital Education, Marital Quality and Marital Stability: Findings from a Large, Random Household Survey. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20 (1), 117-126.
- Sullivan, K. T., Pasch, L. A., Cornelius, T., & Cirigliano, E. (2004). Predictors of Participation in Premarital Prevention Programs: The Health Belief Model and Social Norms. *Family Process*, 43, 175-194.
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu ([TÜİK], 2012). *Evlilik ve Boşanma İstatistikleri, 1. Dönem* [Marriage and Divorce Statistics, First Period of 2012] Retrieved: March 30 2012 from <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=10849>
- Yalçın, İ. (2010). *İlişki Geliştirme Programının Üniversite Öğrencilerinin İlişki Doyum Düzeylerine Etkisi*. [The Effectiveness of The Relationship Enhancement Program on Relationship Satisfaction of University Students]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi: Ankara.
- Yılmaz, T., Kalkan, M. (2010). *Evlilik öncesi ilişki geliştirme programının çiftlerin ilişki doyumuna etkisi*. [The effects of a Premarital Relationship Enrichment Program

on relationship satisfaction]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 10 (3), 1893-1920.

Çift İlişkileri Ölçeği'nin Geliştirilmesi

Özet

Atf:

Haskan Avcı, Ö. (2014). Development of the Dyadic Relationship Scale. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 89-108
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.56.6>

Problem durumu

Sağlıklı bir toplum sağlıklı ailelerden oluşur. Sağlıklı ailelerin varlığı temelde sağlıklı ve işlevsel çift ilişkilerine dayanmaktadır. Türkiye'de ve dünya genelinde evlilik ve aile ile ilgili araştırmalar incelendiğinde, sıklıkla dikkat çekilen konunun boşanma oranları olduğu görülmektedir. Uzmanlar, boşanmaların azaltılabilmesi için halkın, eğitimcilerin ve politikacıların dikkatini evlilik öncesi ilişkiler üzerine çekmekte ve önleyici çalışmaların önemini vurgulamaktadırlar. Yurtdışında uzun yıllardır evlilik öncesi eğitimlerin uygulandığı ve yaygınlaştığı görülmektedir. Ülkemizde de evlilik öncesi dönemin çift ilişkileri üzerindeki etkisi ve önemi anlaşılmış olup Bakanlık düzeyinde evliliğe hazırlanan çiftlere yönelik uygulamaların başlatıldığı görülmektedir. Aynı zamanda, son yıllarda farklı üniversitelerde konuyla ilgili deneysel çalışmalara dayanan bilimsel araştırmaların yapılmış olduğu gözlemlenmektedir. Uygulamaların artması, genç bireylerin evlilik ve aile yaşamına hazırlanmalarında etkili olacak eğitim programlarının nasıl değerlendirileceği konusunu düşündürmektedir. Bu programların etkililiğini değerlendirmede kullanılacak bilimsel, geçerli ve güvenilir ölçme araçlarının gerekliliği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Türkiye'de yapılan çalışmalar incelendiğinde, evlilik öncesi eğitimlerin etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesinde kullanılacak geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği test edilmiş sınırlı sayıda ölçme aracı olduğu görülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın amacı, üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik bir Çift İlişkileri Ölçeği geliştirmektir. Çift İlişkileri Ölçeği (ÇİÖ), özellikle evliliğe hazırlık programlarında kullanılabilmesi amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. Bu amaçla yapılan çalışmada, Türk kültüründe geliştirilmiş olan Çift İlişkileri Ölçeği (ÇİÖ) tanıtılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi

ÇİÖ'nün geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları Hacettepe Üniversitesi'nde öğrenim görmekte olan 1115 üniversite öğrencisi üzerinde yapılmıştır. ÇİÖ'nün geçerliğini sınamak için yapı geçerliği ve benzer ölçekler geçerliği yöntemleri; güvenilirliğini sınamak için Cronbach Alpha katsayısı ve testi yarılama yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada kullanılan tüm veriler SPSS programıyla analiz edilmiştir. Yapı geçerliği için öncelikle, verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olup olmadığını incelemek amacıyla, KMO değerinin .60'dan yüksek, Barlett testinin anlamlı çıkması gerektiği dikkate alınmıştır. Verilerin faktör analizi için uygun çıkması üzerine ölçeğin faktör yapısı ve maddelerin faktör yükleri Açıklayıcı Faktör Analizi ile incelenmiştir. Faktörleştirme tekniği olarak da temel bileşenler analizi seçilmiştir. Analizlerde faktörlerin her bir değişken üzerindeki ortak faktör varyansı, maddelerin faktör yükleri, açıklanan varyans oranları incelenmiştir. Faktör yapılarının belirlenmesinde, maddelerin .30 ve üzerinde faktör yük değerlerine sahip olması bir kriter olarak alınmıştır. Component Matrics tablosunda birinci faktörde maddelerin faktör yüklerinin .30 ve üzerinde olması ile her alt ölçeğin aynı zamanda tek boyutlu olması ve toplam puanının kullanılabilmesi esas alınmıştır. Birbiriyle ilişkili maddelerin bir araya gelerek faktör oluşturması ve faktörlerin daha kolay yorumlanabilmesi amacıyla Varimax eksen döndürme tekniği seçilmiştir. İnceleme sonunda birinci faktörde faktör yük değerleri .30'dan düşük çıkan, faktör yük değerleri farklı faktörlerde birbirine yakın olan, ayırt ediciliği düşük olan ve diğer ölçek maddeleri ile düşük korelasyon veren maddeler ölçeklerden çıkarılmıştır. Faktör analizi sonrasında, ÇİÖ'nün 5 alt ölçekli, 78 maddeden oluşan formu elde edilmiştir. ÇİÖ'de İletişim, Romantizm-Cinsellik, Çatışma Çözme, Sosyal Destek, Farklılıkları Kabul adında beş alt ölçek bulunmaktadır. Elde edilen form üzerinden ölçeğin sözü edilen diğer geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları yapılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları

Faktör analizi çalışmalarına göre, İletişim alt ölçeği 6 faktörlü bir yapı göstermekte ve toplam varyansın % 64,2'sini açıklamaktadır. Romantizm-cinsellik alt ölçeği için 5 faktörlü bir yapı göstermekte ve toplam varyansın % 61,5'ini açıklamaktadır. Çatışma Çözme alt ölçeği 5 faktörlü bir yapı göstermekte ve toplam varyansın % 60,1'ini açıklamaktadır. Sosyal Destek alt ölçeği için 2 faktörlü bir yapı göstermekte ve toplam varyansın % 63,3'ünü açıklamaktadır. Farklılıkları Kabul alt ölçeği 5 faktörlü bir yapı göstermekte ve toplam varyansın % 60,7'sini açıklamaktadır. ÇİÖ'nün Evlilik Öncesi İlişkileri Değerlendirme Ölçeği ile benzer ölçekler geçerliği sonuçları değerlendirildiğinde; 181 üniversite öğrencisinden alınan verilere göre, iki ölçek arasında pozitif yönde ve manidar düzeyde, .824'lük bir korelasyon saptanmıştır. ÇİÖ'nün güvenilirlik çalışması sonuçları değerlendirildiğinde, ÇİÖ'nün tüm alt ölçekleri için Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik katsayıları, İletişim alt ölçeği için .77; Romantizm Cinsellik alt ölçeği için .88, Çatışma Çözme alt ölçeği için .85, Sosyal Destek alt ölçeği için .91, Farklılıkları Kabul alt ölçeği için .79 olarak bulunmuştur. ÇİÖ'nün testi yarılama yöntemiyle incelenen testi yarılama katsayıları, İletişim alt ölçeği için .61; Romantizm Cinsellik alt ölçeği için .64, Çatışma Çözme alt ölçeği için

.73, Sosyal Destek alt ölçeği için .69, Farklılıkları Kabul alt ölçeği için .64 olarak bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri

ÇİÖ'nün maddeleri alt ölçek biçiminde gruplandırılmıştır. İletişim alt ölçeğinde 15 madde, Romantizm- Cinsellik 18 madde, Çatışma Çözme 18 madde, Sosyal Destek 12 madde ve Farklılıkları Kabul 15 madde olmak üzere ÇİÖ'de toplam 78 madde bulunmaktadır. Her alt ölçekte tersine çevrilmiş (reverse) maddeler bulunmaktadır. Ölçek üçlü derecelendirmeli (bana tamamen uygun =3 ile bana hiç uygun değil=1) olup bireyler maddelerin karşısındaki parantezin içine çarpı işareti koyarak tepkide bulunmaktadırlar. Düz maddeler, olduğu gibi, tersine çevrilmiş maddeler ise tersinden puanlanmaktadır. Ölçeklerin puan aralıkları şöyledir: İletişim: 15-45, Romantizm- Cinsellik: 18-54, Çatışma Çözme: 18-54, Sosyal Destek: 12-36, Farklılıkları Kabul: 15-45, ÇİÖ (toplam): 78-234. Yüksek puan, bireyin o alt ölçek boyutunda çift ilişkilerinin daha olumlu düzeyde olduğu anlamına gelmektedir.

Geçerlik ve güvenilirliğine ilişkin elde edilen kanıtlar, ÇİÖ'nün yüksek öğretim öğrencilerinin çift ilişki düzeylerini ölçmek amacıyla geçerli ve güvenilir olarak kullanılabileceğini göstermektedir. Evlilik öncesi psikolojik danışma programları ve evliliğe hazırlık programları uygulayanlar programların etkililiğini değerlendirmede ÇİÖ'yü kullanabilirler. Ayrıca çift ilişkilerinde sorunlar yaşayan öğrencilerin belirlenmesi ile, üniversite psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik merkezlerinden bireysel ve grupta psikolojik danışma yardımı almalarının sağlanması faydalı olabilir. ÇİÖ'yü başta psikolojik danışmanlar, çift ve aile danışması alanında uzmanlar, psikologlar, psikiyatristler, sosyal hizmet uzmanları ve araştırmacılar da kendi amaçları doğrultusunda kullanabilirler. Özellikle, çift terapisi alanında uzmanlığı olanlar, terapi sürecini yürütmede ölçek sonuçlarından yararlanabilirler.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Çift ilişkileri, evlilik öncesi ilişkiler, evlilik öncesi psikolojik danışma, evliliğe hazırlık programları