

Construction and Development of Perceived Marital Self Efficacy Scale

Afusat Olanike Busari, Ph.D.

Department of Guidance and Counselling
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study conceptualized on measures assessing efficacy in performing specific relationship behaviours as important and useful in understanding functioning within relationships, marriage including habitual patterns of behaviour. The purpose of the study, therefore, attempt to develop local instrument create for understanding of perceived marital self - efficacy as many of related instruments available are foreign ones. The marital self-efficacy scale was administered to 250 volunteers' male and female married individuals of secondary school teachers. Personal identity and optimism instruments were also used to examine the predictive validity of perceived marital self-efficacy. Exploratory factor analysis determined that a three-factor solution was best fitting, explaining 45.77 percent of the variance, which was reproduced reliably in the subsamples. Through a series of factor model testing by confirmatory factor analysis, findings indicated that the two-factor structure was reliable, internally valid as demonstrated while no items were assigned to the third factor since the items did not meet criterion assigned. Subsequent, Pearson's product moment correlation analysis also showed that there were positive significant relationship between factors in predicted perceived marital self-efficacy.

Keywords: Perceived Marital self-efficacy, Exploratory factor analysis, Confirmatory factor analysis

INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce diverse effects through four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes. A strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. This efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to either lack or insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression.

In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of

difficulties. They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They fall easy victim to stress and depression

Self-efficacy is comprised of “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments”(Bandura, 1997). Scholars strongly support the role of self-efficacy beliefs in affecting motivation, effort, and persistence in performance. High self-efficacy involves expectations that outcomes can and will be achieved through action; such beliefs thus affect behavior and expectations of how well one will perform (Bandura, 1997). Self-reports concerning general self-efficacy are positively associated with feelings of personal control, ability to cope with stressful situations, interpersonal competence, and psychological health (Bandura, 1997). Efficacy beliefs are increasingly of interest in terms of processes in intimate relationships. Researchers have specifically examined individual beliefs about ability to resolve conflicts with a relationship partner (Cui, Fincham, & Pasley, 2008; Fincham, Harold, & Gano-Phillips, 2000) and ability to engage in specific, positive relationship behaviors (Lopez, Morúa, & Rice, 2007).

Although some researchers argue that beliefs about self-competence in personal relationships are enduring dispositions that influence adaptive interactions and affect relationship success (Bradbury, Cohan, & Karney, 1998), fewer studies have examined broader self-perceptions of capabilities to meet task demands within romantic relationships that are not tied to a specific relationship with a specific partner. The present study examines the predictive validity of a self-report measure of self-efficacy in romantic relationships—the Self-Efficacy in Romantic Relationships (SERR) scale (Riggio, 2011) by examining how broad self-assessments of relationship competence are linked with outcomes in current romantic relationships. Direct experiences provide the most vital information for individual development of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), which is based on a large sampling of life events and is composed of information from a variety of related experiences (Woodruff & Cashman, 1993). Experiences in romantic relationships should inform judgments of task demands within relationships and one’s abilities to respond effectively to such demands (Bandura, 1997; Rusbult, Verette, Whitney Slovik, & Lipkus, 1991).

It is a known fact that for every individual, work life and family life are two crucial fields. In spite of the fact that they are seemingly two separate areas in the humans’ life, the cause and effect dynamisms of families and work have been emphasized by scholars many years ago (Mousaei, Mousavi, & Mehr-Ara, 2011). Every person’s satisfaction with either field significantly affects different aspects of life. Regarding family factors, marital satisfaction is one of the most important factors, which lead to a healthy family performance; playing a crucial role in the endurance of marriage lives. Also, it can have a big impact on other aspects of life such as jobs (Tumin, Han, & Qian, 2015). Marital satisfaction is an index of healthy marital relationships, including the individuals’ emotional, cognitive, and intellectual perceptions of their marriage life. Andreassen, Hetland, and Stale (2013) believe that marital satisfaction is the adjustability of the status quo and the expected status. Based on this definition, marital satisfaction happens when the status quo matches what couples expect in their marital relationships. Also, in literature related to marital satisfaction, the presented definition was ignored by Ellis. Tumin, Han, and Qian (2015) define marital satisfaction as something which includes feelings of joy and being pleased with all relationships. In other words, marital satisfaction is the couples’ general assessment of marital relationships. This general assessment could be a reflection of the individuals’ happiness with the marital life or a combination of their satisfaction with the aspects related to marital relationships (Reiter, Hjørleifsson, Bredablik, & Meland, 2013). Therefore, by emphasizing different positive aspects,

marital satisfaction could significantly affect the individuals' lives; hence, it requires attention and examinations.

In addition to the marital satisfaction, another variable which is imperative in the individuals' professional and even personal lives, and which should be examined more carefully, is the feeling of being self-efficient, especially in nurses. Self-efficacy is an assuredness that an individual has successfully performed a particular behavior and waits for the expected results. In fact, it is a person's belief in achieving a particular goal (Bollen, Verbeke, and Euwema, 2014). As a factor which significantly influences resources to achieve goals (Vancouver, More and Yoder, 2008), self-efficacy is one of the valuable items that receives a lot of attention from positive psychology (Hatemi, McDermott, and Eaves, 2015). It was conceptualized as a belief in the organization and doing necessary activities for achieving a set goal. In addition, using a social-cognitive approach to jobs, self-efficacy helps form positions and motivations directly and indirectly (by affecting the expected results) (Rosnati, Barni, & Uglia, 2014). High self-efficacy regulates the level of stress; high self-esteem increases welfare and physical health, and it helps recover quickly from chronicle diseases (Rosnati, Barni, & Uglia, 2014). Also, a low self-efficacy leads to anxiety, depression, and low intellectual welfare (Shakerian, Nazari, Masoomi, Ebrahimi, and Danai, 2014). Therefore, the examining factors that enhance self-efficacy are crucial for clinical researchers

Despite the fact that efficacy expectations (as self-attributions) have been investigated within the context of relationship attributions, and researchers have argued that efficacy as a construct should be more fully incorporated into cognitive models of intimate relationships (Fincham, 2000), few measures have been used or developed, and most are dependent on specific experiences with particular relationship partners. Bandura (1997) asserts that self-efficacy is based on perceived capabilities within the same activity domain across conditions sharing common features and is not just reflective of "specific behaviors within specific situations" (Bandura, 1997). Judgments of self-efficacy also vary depending on contextual features and targets of behavior (Bandura, 1997). Although individuals are likely to have beliefs about their abilities to resolve conflicts within a particular relationship, and to engage in positive relationship behaviors with a specific relationship partner (Fincham & Bradbury, 1993; Lopez et al., 2007), a broader assessment of self-efficacy in romantic relationships involves capturing

Self-perceptions of relationship capabilities as they have occurred and developed across relationships, and assessing such self-perceptions independent of particular partners or relationships. A broader assessment of individual beliefs about abilities to form and maintain satisfying romantic relationships in general, across relationships and partners, may be particularly useful in examining individual behaviors that occur repeatedly within different relationships, and relationship-oriented behaviors that occur outside of particular relationships, including feelings of anxiety about relationships and beliefs about the likelihood of various relationship outcomes, including a happy, long-lasting relationship.

Several studies indicate relations between positive reports of self-efficacy within a particular relationship and positive relationship outcomes. Using an unpublished measure assessing beliefs in one's ability to resolve conflicts with a particular relationship partner (Bradbury, 1989), Fincham and colleagues (2000) found that greater efficacy expectations are related to more positive attributions about partner behaviors in relationships and greater satisfaction among married couples over time. Using the same self-report measure, Cui and colleagues (2008) found that efficacy beliefs about resolving conflicts are related to less romantic relationship conflict, which in turn is related to relationship quality (feelings of satisfaction,

reward, warmth, and happiness), while Fincham and Bradbury (1987) found that efficacy beliefs about resolving conflicts are related to persistence in solving problems in relationships. Using a “relationship-specific” (p. 81) measure of self-efficacy, assessing individual confidence in ability to engage in “specific relationship maintenance behaviors” (p. 83), Lopez and colleagues (2007) found that self-efficacy judgments predict relationship satisfaction among college students over time. Although these findings support that judgments of efficacy concerning specific relationship behaviors in interaction with a specific partner are linked to relationship outcomes, there is little research evidence on how broad beliefs about one’s abilities as a romantic partner that are not dependent on a specific relationship or a specific partner relate to outcomes in relationships and other relationship beliefs.

Additional research has investigated relational competence, individuals’ perceptions that communications with a partner are appropriate and effective (Spitzberg & Hecht, 1984). Although each partner develops their own sense of relational competence, the impression is dyadic as it is dependent on actions and reactions of both partners. Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) identify components of relational competence: skills (abilities to engage in effective communication behaviors), knowledge (of partner and context), outcomes (satisfaction with communications), and motivation (dependent on partner and context). Recent conceptualizations of marital competence also distinguish between skills and motivation (Carroll, Badger, & Yang, 2006). Self-efficacy can be distinguished from relational competence in that it is not based on intentions to behave (Bandura, 1997); although self-efficacy is predictive of behavioral intentions, the constructs are distinct (Wulfert & Wan, 1995). Self-efficacy is similarly not based on skill enumeration but on one’s beliefs about abilities to deal effectively with task demands inherent in particular situations (Bandura, 1997). If self-efficacy in romantic relationships is based on an overall assessment of typical difficulty involved in relationships for oneself, it is less dependent on behaviors of specific others, because it is based on experiences across relationships and central to self-referent processes across similar situations (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy beliefs are “can do” beliefs, beliefs that one has sufficient power and skill to produce desired effects by one’s actions (Bandura, 1997). Regardless of actual skill and knowledge a person may possess, without a firm belief that one “can do” behaviors necessary for success, one is easily overwhelmed by setbacks, limitations, negative feedback from others, and other challenges. Self-beliefs that outcomes can be achieved through actions affect goal selection, expectations of goal achievement, and persistence in response to difficulties. These types of beliefs may be particularly important in functioning in personal relationships, in which accommodations are quite common and necessary (Etcheverry & Le, 2005; Rusbult, 1991) and in which conflict may also be common. Individuals who believe that their behaviors will effectively maintain relationship satisfaction and positivity have efficacy in relationships. They are willing to persist in their relationship in the face of difficulties. They intend to engage in behaviors that establish their commitment to and investment in relationships, and they see relationship satisfaction as an achievable goal (Bandura, 1997; Riggio, 2012).

In line with research documenting links between greater self-efficacy and success expectations (Conklin, Dahling, & Garcia, 2013; Tudoran, Scholderer, & Brunst, 2012) and lower anxiety (Ghaderi & Rangaiah, 2011; Lavasani, Khezriazar, Amani, & Malahmadi, 2011), individuals with greater beliefs in their competence in relationships should expect to be successful in relationships, and they should report a greater degree of comfort and ease in relationships compared to those with fewer beliefs in their abilities to achieve positive relationship outcomes. A valid measure of such beliefs should be predictive of such relationship attitudes and outcomes. It is difficult to put effort into maintaining a successful romantic relationship.

SERR items require “can do” judgments (Bandura, 1997), assessments of one’s abilities to deal with task demands in relationships (“I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that may come up in romantic relationships”). SERR items reflect perceptions of one’s tendency to persist in response to relationship problems (“Failure in my romantic relationships only makes me want to try harder”). Although results suggest some distinction between perceptions of romantic relationships as difficult for oneself and beliefs about abilities to deal with task demands and persist within relationships, one underlying dimension of self-efficacy involving one’s characteristic ability to effectively fulfill broad task demands within romantic relationships is supported. As such, SERR scores are reflective of beliefs about one’s competence and mastery within relationships, one’s ability to deal effectively with the challenges of being a relationship partner.

These results support a rather solid link between self-efficacy in romantic relationships and other relationship attitudes, even when controlling for reports of general social competence. Self-efficacy in romantic relationships is related to feelings of anxiety in relationships, with individuals reporting stronger beliefs about their capabilities to deal effectively with task demands in relationships experiencing fewer feelings of tension and discomfort in relationships. Individuals with high relationship self-efficacy believe they can competently cope with intimacy; they feel comfortable in intimate situations while individuals with low self-efficacy feel uneasy and awkward. Clearly, such beliefs are intertwined, with experienced awkwardness in close relationships leading to feelings of lower efficacy and beliefs of low capabilities leading to anxiety.

Self-efficacy is kind of assurance a person feels about certain activities (Rosenstock, Strecher, and Becker, 1988). According to Bandura, self-efficacy forms up due to the effects of several resources in an individual which are mostly associated with family and its relationship patterns (Hamidian & Mousavi, 2015). Individuals with high levels of self-efficacy can remove obstacles by improving their skills, resist in the face of difficulties, and have more control over surrounding affair, hence understanding self-efficacy can lead to maintaining health-promoting behaviors (Bandura, 1977). As stated by Bandura, a person's self-confidence provides the necessary assurance for successful performance because a person with lower levels of self-efficacy is less committed to accomplish goals, while someone with higher degrees of self-efficacy in a given situation does more challenging things, tries to overcome difficult situations, and remains committed to their goals (Bandura, 1977). In this respect, the results obtained by Mousavi revealed that couples benefiting from high self-confidence believe in their own abilities to deal with problems and they are endowed with higher levels of marital satisfaction and also experience a happier and better life (Hamidian & Mousavi, 2015). Likewise, stress from marital conflicts leads to the emergence of irresponsible behaviors, and one of the marital conflicts in this respect is emotional divorce (Lagarde, 2004).

Perceptions of efficacy in romantic relationships are also related to expectations of experiencing happy, lifelong relationships, with individuals reporting low ability to respond effectively to task demands in relationships reporting lower expectations for lifelong relationship success. Such expectations are influential for behaviors and interactions within intimate relationships, including marriages (Etcheverry & Le, 2005). Beliefs about one’s competence as a romantic relationship partner are important for development of expectations about how likely one is to be a successful relationship partner in the future. Research indicates that such expectations are influential for behaviors and interactions within intimate relationships, including marriages (Etcheverry & Le, 2005). As such, beliefs about one’s competence as a romantic relationship partner are important for development of expectations

about how likely one is to be a successful partner in the future, which are then predictive of relationship quality and longevity.

These results also support the independence of self-efficacy within romantic relationships from broad feelings of self-competence and persistence in response to problems. People who view themselves as generally effective and competent do not necessarily view themselves as able to competently respond to task demands of being an intimate partner. Further, while “can do” judgments in romantic relationships are linked to expectations of lifetime relationship success here, views of the self as generally or socially competent are not. Feelings of competence as a relationship partner are also linked to experiences of anxiety and tension in intimate relationships, while general competence self-views are not. These results support the uniqueness and utility of a self-report measure of perceptions of self-efficacy within romantic relationships, beyond perceptions of general or social competence, independent of a particular relationship or partner.

Although measures assessing efficacy in performing specific relationship behaviors are important and useful in understanding functioning within relationships, including habitual patterns of behavior (Bradbury & Fincham, 1988), broader perspectives of self-efficacy as evolving over time and based on multiple experiences within a particular domain are useful and important (Wood-ruff & Cashman, 1993). Such an approach is central to understanding how personal dispositions influence behavior in romantic relationships, including enduring beliefs about relationships, commitment, and the self as a partner (Bradbury, 1998).

Questions about how efficacy beliefs as a relationship partner change over time, and how they are related to different relationship experiences and partners, memories of relationships, attributions of relationship success and failure, and behaviors that occur outside of relationships, including relationship seeking, can only be addressed by examining broad beliefs about abilities as a romantic partner, not efficacy for performing certain behaviors with a specific partner. Research may examine how broad relationship self-efficacy beliefs are related to outcomes in current romantic relationships, including satisfaction and conflict, as well as interpretations of relationship events, including partner behaviors. Many of the foreign instruments available are those that deal with marital satisfaction, enrich marital satisfaction scale, relationship efficacy measure, marital instability scale etc. but scale to measure marital self- efficacy was scarce. The purpose of this study therefore is to attempt to develop local instrument create for understanding of marital self - efficacy as many of related such related instruments available are foreign ones.

METHODOLOGY

The marital self- efficacy scale a psychometric test to explain the extent of relationship between the five dimensions of marital relationship was constructed by:

1. Developing items from the literature that indicates the extent of agreement and disagreement on relationship efficacy measure such as (conflict, closeness, financial, relationship happiness and romantic).
2. Administering and factor analyzing these items on three separate samples.

Factor I

In the first instance 300 items were developed from the various dimensions of marital self - efficacy discussed in the literature. The 300 items were statements about dimensions of marital self- efficacy with five response choices reflecting the degree to which the dimension is present for the participants and would select one of five alternative responses most descriptive of him/ her. The participants constituting the first sample were 250 volunteer male and

female married individuals who are secondary schools teachers and civil servants in Ibadan metropolis of Oyo State. These participants were given the 300-item scale once at the beginning and again at the end of a 3-week period.

After this scale was given the second time, the participants were asked to indicate on the scale the dimension that best described their experience with marital self- efficacy. The purpose of the two administrations for the first sample was to yield test-retest reliability of the items which was 0.79 after subjecting it to Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. Factor analysis was performed on the results of the second administration.

Factor II

The five dimensions of marital self -efficacy emerged from and was defined by the factor analysis of the data from administration of the scale to the first sample. This scale was then revised by eliminating those items which were not correlated with the factors, and by rewriting items for increased clarity. The resulting, revised scale had 105 items). One hundred and five (105) items were statements about marital dimensions with five response choices reflecting the degree to which the dimension is present for the participants completing the scale.

Twenty three (23) of these 105 items were characteristics conflict dimension of marital relationship, Twenty seven (27) were closeness dimension, Nineteen (19) of the and One hundred and five 105 were characteristics of financial dimension of marital relationship Twenty (20) were relationship happiness while Sixteen items formed the romantic aspect of marital relationship . This revised inventory was administered to a second sample to examine whether or not the items would continue to be reliable, and would continue to generate the same factors item scale. The participants in the second sample were 120 male and female married individual who are teachers and civil servants from Egbeda Local Government Area of Oyo State, and who had not participated in the previous administrations of the 300-item scale. These participants were given the 105-item scale once at the beginning and again at the end of a 3-week period.

This 105-item scale was scored so that each participant was given a score of 1-5 for each item. The score of 5 was assigned when participants responded to 'All the Time' experiencing a characteristic of dimensions of marital relationship. A score of 1 was assigned if participants responded to 'Never' experiencing this dimension of marital relationship. Conversely, a score of 1 was assigned if participants responded to 'All the time' experiencing a characteristic of dimension of marital relationship; and a score of 5 was assigned if another participant responded to 'Never' experiencing this dimension of marital relationship. In this phase a correlation coefficient of 0.81 was obtained after processing the data collected with (PPMC).

Factor III

From the responses obtained at the second step of the development of (PMSES), the researcher further subjects the items to qualitative and quantitative analysis using Item Discrimination (ID) Technique. Thus, the 105 items in step II were reduced to 75 divided into five dimensions of marital relationship. These items were also given to test experts and psychologist for validation. They were further reduced to 60 items that finally made up the PMSES. These were eventually tested on 70 married individual teachers and civil servants in Iseyin Local Government Area of Oyo state. The internal consistency correlation co-efficient of the scale was established using responses obtained from step III. The response was subjected to Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Reliability which yielded .873 and coefficient Alpha of .89. The highest possible score was 300 and the lowest possible score was 60.

RESULT

The Scale

Table 1:- Internal Consistency Values of Perceived Marital Self - Efficacy Scale (PMSES)

Items	Inter- Item R.I (T-I)	Items	Inter- Item R.I (T-I)
1.	.7525	56.	.5961
2.	.5966	57.	.5918
3.	.6349	58.	.6898
4.	.7235	59.	.7723
5.	.7357	60.	.6981
6.	.7968		.5959
7.	.7714		
8.	.8331		
9.	.8246		
10.	.7973		
11.	.6515		
12.	.7749		
13.	.6373		
14.	.8234		
15.	.7363		
16.	.8247		
17.	.6739		
18.	.6239		
19.	.6453		
20.	.7417		
21.	.6151		
22.	.7532		
23.	.7827		
24.	.7623		
25.	.6681		
26.	.5992		
27.	.6750		
28.	.6389		
29.	.7757		
30.	.5363		
31.	.6711		
32.	.5643		
33.	.6717		
34.	.4932		
35.	.5519		
36.	.6482		
37.	.4973		
38.	.5777		
39.	.6813		
40.	.7523		
41.	.7216		
42.	.6563		
43.	.5712		
44.	.5967		
45.	.4861		

46.	.8211		
47.	.7199		
48.	.6313		
49.	.7675		
50.	.5774		
51.	.4998		
52.	.7539		
53.	.6878		
54.	.5766		
55.	.6904		

Equal Length Spearman - Brown = .7461

Unequal Length Spearman - Brown = .7731

Guttman Split Half = .7897

Coefficient Alpha = .7996

Table 2: Factor Pattern of the Three Unrotated PMSES Factor

Item number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	H2
1.	-0.342	0.687	-0.297	0.679
2.	0.596	0.419	0.463	0.593
3.	0.178	0.535	-0.299	0.482
4.	0.503	0.378	0.374	0.449
5.	0.417	0.524	0.366	0.497
6.	0.587	-0.357	-0.267	0.495
7.	0.642	-0.253	0.325	0.575
8.	0.436	-0.295	-0.336	0.364
9.	-0.283	0.585	0.314	0.497
10.	0.509	-0.324	-0.272	0.383
11.	0.274	0.516	0.407	0.539
12.	0.618	0.471	0.347	0.648
13.	0.309	0.584	0.420	0.526
14.	0.609	0.331	0.406	0.610
15.	0.477	-0.298	0.512	0.486
16.	-0.311	0.611	-0.039	0.495
17.	0.265	0.496	-0.336	0.341
18.	0.630	-0.297	0.421	0.654
19.	0.364	0.534	0.364	0.489
20.	0.420	0.618	0.380	0.583
21.	0.527	0.346	0.371	0.517
22.	0.279	0.493	-0.349	0.451
23.	0.273	0.512	0.340	0.372
24.	0.528	-0.294	-0.373	0.462
25.	0.596	-0.592	0.397	0.815
26.	0.637	0.509	-0.237	0.677
27.	0.553	0.359	0.501	0.603
28.	0.449	-0.296	0.313	0.408
29.	0.571	-0.311	0.406	0.446
30.	0.481	0.496	0.361	0.512
31.	0.605	0.417	0.395	0.483
32.	0.593	0.329	0.301	0.581
33.	-0.294	0.583	0.258	0.392
34.	0.511	0.307	0.359	0.483
35.	0.402	0.697	0.359	0.406
36.	0.291	0.442	0.409	0.531
37.	0.563	-0.329	0.472	0.558
38.	0.649	0.583	0.049	0.492
39.	0.607	0.403	-0.276	0.563
40.	0.319	0.273	0.477	0.486
41.	-0.427	0.497	0.363	0.389
42.	0.619	0.535	0.371	0.395
43.	0.377	0.383	-0.293	0.661
44.	0.437	0.551	0.428	0.439
45.	0.373	0.597	0.383	0.566
46.	0.647	0.566	0.356	0.447
47.	0.639	0.456	-0.273	0.381
48.	0.549	0.383	0.397	0.357

49.	0.491	-0.257	0.406	0.417
50.	0.469	0.391	0.412	0.659
51.	-0.249	0.431	0.373	0.439
52.	0.646	0.392	0.314	0.563
53.	0.583	0.359	0.309	0.467
54.	-0.263	0.677	-0.257	0.483
55.	0.309	0.397	0.336	0.372
56.	0.483	0.543	0.483	0.485
57.	0.347	0.411	0.697	0.463
58.	0.607	0.567	0.635	0.485
59.	0.643	0.397	0.483	0.556
60.	0.467	-0.271	0.607	0.373
Total Variance accounted for	45.871	29.635	15.651	75.839
Eigen values	7.619	4.517	1.101	

Table 3: List of Ranked Scores Obtained from Second Pilot Administration of PMSES

Items	Ranked Scores	Items	Ranked Scores
1.	515	41.	400
2.	518	42.	397
3.	520	43.	393
4.	516	44.	389
5.	536	45.	386
6.	513	46.	383
7.	523	47.	377
8.	513	48.	375
9.	531	49.	369
10.	497	50.	367
11.	499	51.	363
12.	493	52.	354
13.	493	53.	352
14.	493	54.	346
15.	495	55.	349
16.	487	56.	342
17.	483	57.	335
18.	483	58.	333
19.	477	59.	330
20.	473	60.	325
21.	467		
22.	455		
23.	458		
24.	452		
25.	446		
26.	446		
27.	446		
28.	438		
29.	438		
30.	429		
31.	429		
32.	430		
33.	430		
34.	430		
35.	422		
36.	415		
37.	417		
38.	412		
39.	405		
40.	402		

The Five Subscales of MPSES and the Number of Items in Each of the Subscales

S/N	Subscales	Number of Items
1.	Conflict	14
2.	Closeness	15
3.	Financial	10
4.	Relationship Happiness	11
5.	Romantic	10

Table 7: Summary of Reliability Analysis for the Subscales and the Scale as a Whole

S/N	Summary of the Subscales	Reliability Coefficients For Each Subscales
1.	Conflict	.8111
2.	Closeness	.7937
3.	Financial	.8939
4.	Relationship Happiness	.8771
5.	Romantic	.8635
	Perceived Marital Self –Efficacy Scale (PMSES)	.8424

Table 8: Inter Factor Correlation of the Subscales

Factor	1	2	3	4	5
1.	1.00				
2.	.4623	1.00			
3.	.5441	.2812	1.00		
4.	.2853	.41251	.3712	1.00	
5.	.3919	.4361	.4543	.6307	1.00

P < 0.05, inter – correlation

In this section of the paper, results of analysis of research hypotheses are presented. The 60-item scale first underwent a correlational analysis to examine the reliability of the items over the 3-week period of time. All items yielded reliability coefficients equal to or greater than 0.700 and the average coefficient based on Z-score transformation were 0.79. Following this correlational analysis, a principle components factor analysis (Cooley and Lohnes, 1975) was performed on the second administration of the scale. This was to examine whether or not participants were responding differently to those items.

The requirement that a factor possess an Eigen value greater than 1 was the criterion for the number of factors (of a limit of ten) was considered. Using this criterion, the first three factors were extracted from the correlations among items. These three factors accounted for 45.77 percent of the data’s variance, while the other factors accounted for an additional 12.63 percent of the total variance. Those items with factor loading greater than ± 0.400 were assigned to one of the three factors. For those items meeting this criterion, the highest loading determined the factor to which the item was assigned. Using this procedure, no items were assigned to the third factor and 195 items which did not meet criterion were eliminated.

DISCUSSION

Resulting from the operations above, the final items that make up the Perceived Marital Self Efficacy Scale is 60. Five dimensions emerged at the end of the investigation of the items. These five dimensions include conflict, closeness, financial, relationship happiness and romantic. The first dimension was called “Conflict”. Under this dimension, items about efficacious manner of dealing with intensity and the amount of the verbal conflicts, the level of the problem- solving communication patterns between spouses, whether the spouses accept each other ,the general disagreement and the problem solving skills. The second subscale was “Closeness.” Items included in this dimension are; how efficacious the couples are handling mutual love in the relationship, care, sympathy with spouse, the pleasure of spending time together with spouse and admiration for the spouse. It also included the issue related to whether a friendly communication can be promoted in the relationship and whether there is a common interest in the marriage which is revealed through the items.

The third dimension of this scale is “Financial” Items of this dimension include efficacious dealing with disagree on money matter with my spouse, financial position and the couples financial decisions, satisfied with financial situation. “Relationship happiness” is the fourth dimension of PMSES. This has to do with the happiness between spouses. The feeling of efficacy with marriages covers concepts like general feelings about marriage, their getting along well with each other, the amount of love, sexual intercourse. The fifth subscale is “Romantic”, items in this dimension include but not limited to “my spouse take pleasure as much as I do in our sexual intercourses, When my spouse refuse to kiss and hug me, I initiate it, I always touch my spouse willingly and lovingly, I can easily talk to my spouse about anything related to our sexual life.

The development of this scale is a response to the client’s demand for a marital scale that could prevent conflict and enhance happiness in marriages. Prevention of intimate spouses’ conflict involve programme designed to change attitudes hence a scale that measure such attitudes is essential. Thus, the author extensively reviewed current and recent literature on marital self-efficacy and generated and validated items to read the current 60 items. After the data collection phase of the study, the scale was scored. All the data were codified in the computer and the statistical analysis was done by means of SPSS 13.0, a statistical package programme. For the reliability of the scale, Varimax Rotation Vertical Technique and exploratory factor analysis were applied. The extraction of the two factors, the reliability of the items and distribution of the scores into two groups all suggest that the PMSES has a psychometric capable of differentiating the five subscales.

The relationship between the items of the scale and the scale as a whole was investigated by applying the Pearson Product –Moment Correlation Coefficient. On the other hand, the validity of the scale was explored by applying the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The maximum internal consistency of the scale scores was found through Cronbach α . Finally, the Pearson Product –Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to reveal the test- retest reliability of the scale by focusing on the relationship between two applications of the scale.

References

- Abdul, A. E. 2013. *Employed Women and Marital Satisfaction: A Study among Female Nurses*. A Central University, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, India
- Aghajani, M. J., Tizdast, T., Ghorbani, M., and Bajvar, M. 2014. Relationship of psychological tenacity with occupational fatigue in nurses. *Holistic Nursing and Midwifery*, 23(70), 1–7.
- Aghajanian, A., and Thompson, V. 2013. Recent divorce trend in Iran. *J Divorce Remarriage* 54, 112-25.
- Akbarzadeh, M., Abdi-Zarrin, S., Baghban, I., and Abedi, M. R. 2013. Normalization and determination of short-form reliability and validity of self-efficacy of the personal-circular list when evaluating self-efficacy in students of Isfahan’s University, who seek to find jobs. *Researchers of behavioral-cognitive sciences*, 1(2), 77–94.
- Amiri-Majd, M. and Zari-Moghadam, F. 2011. Relationship of happiness and marital satisfaction in working women and housewives in Arak. *Behavioral Sciences Quarterly*, 2(4), 9–21.
- Andreassen, C. S., Hetland, J., and Stale-Pallesen, S. 2013. Work holism, and work–family spillover in a cross-occupational sample. *Euro J Work and Organ Psych*, 22(1), 78–87.
- Asghari, F., Saadat-Atefi, K. S., and Janalizadeh, K. S. 2015. The relationship between educational self-efficacy and psychological welfare, family coherence, and spiritual health in students of Kharazmi University. *Iranian Magazine of Medical Training*, 14(7), 593–851.
- Bandura A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Regalia, C., and Scabini, E. 2011. Impact of family efficacy beliefs on quality of family functioning and satisfaction with family life. *Appl Psychol*, 60, 421-48.
- Bandura, A. 1977. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychol Rev*, 84, 191-215
- Bollen, K. N., Verbeke, A. L., Euwema, M. C. 2014. Computers work for women: Gender differences in e-supported divorce mediation. *Comput Human Behav*, 30, 230-7.

- Bracke, P. F., Colman, E., Symoens, S. A., and Van Praag, L. 2010. Divorce, divorce rates, and professional care seeking for mental health problems in Europe: A cross-sectional population-based study. *BMC Public Health*, 10:224
- Brockwood, K. J. 2007. Marital Satisfaction and the Work-Family Interface: An Overview, *Sloan Work and Family Research Network*, 14, 1-14.
- Caprara, G. V., Pastorelli, C., Regalia, C., Scabini, E., and Bandura, A. 2005. Impact of adolescents' filial self-efficacy on quality of family functioning and satisfaction. *J Res Adolescence*, 15:71-97.
- Charania, M. R., and Ickes, W. 2007. Predicting marital satisfaction: Social absorption and individuation versus attachment anxiety and avoidance. *Pers Relationsh*, 14, 187-208.
- Dargahi, H., Gharib, M., and Goudarzi, M. 2007. The quality of work life in nursing employees of Tehran University of Medical Sciences hospitals. *Hayat*, 13.
- Delavar A. Research Methods in Psychology and Educational Sciences. Tehran: Edited Press; 2007.
- Esmaelifar, N., Shafiabadi, A., and Ghodsi, A. 2014. The share of self-efficacy in predicting happiness. *Thought Behav Clin Psychol*, 5, 27-34
- Fallahian, R., Aghaie, A., Atashpoor, A., and Kazemi, A. 2014. The Effect of Subjective Well-being Group Training on the Mental Health of Students of Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan (Isfahan). *Knowledge & Research in Applied Psychology*, 15(2), 14-24.
- Hamidian, S., and Mousavi, F. S. 2015. Emotional Intelligence and the Mediated Role of Self-Effectiveness Described by Marriage Satisfaction Model.
- Hatemi, P. K., McDermott, R., and Eaves, L. 2015. Genetic and environmental contributions to relationships and divorce attitudes. *Pers Individ Diff*, 72, 135-40.
- Jannati-Jahromi, M., Moein, L., and Yazdani, L. 2011. Examining and comparing the relationship between personality traits and marital satisfaction in working women of Kazerun. *Woman-and-Society Quarterly*, 2(1), 143-162.
- Kent, P. and Lavery, J. F. 2007. Burnout in nursing. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 24(3), 43-48.
- Lagarde, E., Chastang, J. F., Gueguen, A., Coeuret-Pellicer, M., Chiron, M., and Lafont, S. 2004. Emotional stress and traffic accidents: The impact of separation and divorce. *Epidemiology*, 15, 762-6.
- Lent, R. W. 2005. *A Social Cognitive View of Career Development and Counselling*. In Brown SD, Lent RW (Eds.). Career development and counseling. Putting.
- Mami, S., and Asgari, M. 2014. Their Differentiation and the Role of Attachment Styles in Predicting Emotional Divorce. Pathology Conference Phenomenon Divorce; Islamic Azad University, Saghez.
- Mohammadyari, G. 2012. Comparative study of relationship between general perceived self-efficacy and test anxiety with academic achievement of male and female students. *Proc Soc Behav Sci*, 69, 2119-23.
- Mohsen, G. and Maryam, J. 2014. Protective role of psychological assets against the effect of conflicts and overburdens of work and family on mental welfare in nurses. *Midwifery and Nursing Magazine of Hamadan's College*, 21(4), 22-34.
- Monden, C. W., Metsä-Simola, N., Saarioja, S., and Martikainen, P. 2015. Divorce and subsequent increase in uptake of antidepressant medication: A Finnish registry-based study on couple versus individual effects. *BMC Public Health*, 15, 158.
- Mousaei, M., Mousavi, G., and Mehr-Ara, M. 2011. The relationship between divorce and economic-social variables in Iran. *Br J Arts Soc Sci* 1, 1.
- Najafpoor, E., Bardide, M., Kazemi, Z. 2015. Compare Emotional Divorce and Part-Time Secretary Natural Features among Women Working Full-Time and Housewives Shiraz City. Second National Conference on Modern Research in the Humanities.
- Parvin, N., Fatemi, A., Aminian, F., and Rafiee, L. 2015. Effect of life skill training sessions on the marital status of female personnel working in Hajar Hospital. *Midwifery-Nursing Clinical Magazine*, 3(1), 37-46.
- Peymani, N. and Ezzati-Rastegar, K. H. 2013. Effect of training based on self-efficacy theories on tension management in nurses. *Birjand's Medical Sciences University*, 9(1), 1-9.

- Pourghaffari, S., Pasha, G. H. R., and Attari, Y. A. 2010. Examining the effect of teaching lifestyle components based on personal psychology approaches on marital satisfaction in nurses of Dr. Ganjavian in Dezfoul. *Novel Findings in Psychology*, 4(12), 27-48.
- Rajabi, G., Sarvestani, Y., Aslani, K., and khojastemehr, R. 2013. Prediction of marital satisfaction in married female nurses. Center for Nursing Care Research, Iran University of Medical Sciences. *Iran J Nurs*, 86, 23-33.
- Ramezani, S., and abolghasemi, S. 2014. The Effectiveness of Group Therapy on Marital Satisfaction and General Self-Efficacy Couples with Marital Conflict Counseling Centers in Lahijan. First National Congress of Psychology, Marvdasht, Iran.
- Raymo, J. M., Fukuda, S., and Iwasawa, M. 2013. Educational differences in divorce in Japan. *Demogr Res* 28, 177-206.
- Reiter, S. F., Hjörleifsson, S., Bredablik, H. J., and Meland, E. 2013. Impact of divorce and loss of parental contact on health complaints among adolescents. *J Public Health (Oxf)*, 35, 278-85.
- Rosenstock, I. M., Strecher, V. J., and Becker, M. H. 1988. Social learning theory and the health belief model. *Health Educ Behav*, 15, 175-83
- Rosnati, R., Barni, D., and Uglia, D. 2014. Adolescents and parental separation or divorce: The protective role of values against transgressive behavior. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci*, 140, 186-91.
- Rubio, C., Osca, A., Recio, P., Urien, B., Peiró, J. M. 2015. Work-family conflict, self-efficacy, and emotional exhaustion: A test of longitudinal effects. *Rev Psicol Trab Organizaciones*, 31, 147-54.
- Saeedifard, T., Hajrezaei, B., and Jahanbazi, B. 2015. Correlation between Marital Satisfaction and Mental Health in Nurses of Tehran Hospitals.
- Seyyedrasooli, A., Parvan, K., Valizadeh, L., Rahmani, A., Zare, M., and Izadi, T. 2015. Self-efficacy in foot-care and effect of training: A single-blinded randomized controlled clinical trial. *Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery*, 3, 141-9.
- Shabani, S., Delavar, A., Boluki, A., and Sharifi, I. 2013. Examining the relationships of self-efficacy, social support, and optimism with the predictability of intellectual welfare to design a structural model for students. *Clinical Psychology Studies Quarterly*, 8(2), 93-117.
- Shakarami, M., Davarnia, R., Zaharakar, K., and Gohari, S. 2015. Effect of sexual training on sexual intimacy in married women. *Psychiatric Nursing*, 2(1), 24-42.
- Shakerian, A., Nazari, A. M., Masoomi, M., Ebrahimi, P., and Danai, S. 2014. Inspecting the relationship between sexual satisfaction and marital problems of divorce-asking women in sanandaj city family courts. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci*, 114:327-33.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., Rogers, R. W. 1982. The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychol Rep*, 51, 663-71.
- Soltani-Majd, A. H., Taghizadeh, M. E., and Zareh, A. 2015. Effect of psychological welfare group training on self-esteem and motives for advancement in male first-grade high school students. *Behavioral and psychological sciences magazine*, 4(2), 31-44.
- Tumin, D., Han, S., and Qian, Z. 2015. Estimates and meanings of marital separation. *J Marriage Fam* 77, 312-22.
- Vancouver, J. B., More, K. M., and Yoder, R. J. 2012. Self-efficacy and resource allocation: Support for a nonmonotonic, discontinuous model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 35-47.
- Varasteh-Moghadam, Y., Sadeghfar, M., Mohammadi, S. H., and Ahanjan, P. 2014. Stressful factors and methods of adjustment for nurses of psychological sections. *Psychiatric Nursing*, 1(3), 54-61.
- Vasile, C., Marhan, A. M., Singer, F. M., and Stoicescu, D. 2011. Academic self-efficacy and cognitive load in students. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 12(1), 478-482.
- Vazquez, C., Hervas, G., Rahona, J. J., and Gomez, D. 2009. Psychological well-being and health. Contributions of positive psychology. *Ann Clin Health Psychol*, 5, 15-27.
- Weiser, D. A. and Weigel, D. J. 2016. Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: Direct and indirect effects on relationship maintenance and satisfaction. *Pers Individ Diff*, 89, 152-6.