

# Marital Quality, Individualism/Collectivism and Divorce Attitude in Turkey

Dr. Fatma Gül CİRİNLIÖĞLU

Near East University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences,  
Psychology Department, Nicosia-Mersin10/Turkey  
Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Letters, Psychology  
Department, Sivas/Turkey

Yeliz KINDAP TEPE

Asst. Prof., Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Letters,  
Psychology Department, Sivas/Turkey

Dr. Gözde Özdikmenli-Demir

Muğla Dil ve Konuşma Bozuklukları Merkezi, Emirbeyazıt  
Mahallesi Avcılar Sokak Modern Konutlar E Blok Kat: 1  
Daire:3 Muğla-Turkey.

Dr. Zafer CİRİNLIÖĞLU

Prof., Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Letters, Sociology  
Department, Sivas/Turkey

**Abstract:- This study examined the relationships between marital quality, individualistic-collectivistic tendencies and divorce attitudes of married individuals. In total, 514 married men and women from 36 cities in Turkey participated. The results of hierarchical regression analyses showed that a higher level of collectivism in both men and women was an important positive predictor of marital quality. Among women only, higher scores on divorce attitudes significantly predicted worse marital quality. There were some gender and age-group differences regarding marital quality and individualistic tendencies. Marital quality was higher in men than in women and also higher in participants aged between 19 and 39 than in older participants. Individualistic tendencies were also higher in the younger group than in the older group. The study results suggest that women in Turkey had fewer opportunities than men, that social changes that positively affect women's perceptions of their identity had not yet occurred, and that family ties transcended class lines and socioeconomic conditions in collectivist societies.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

The present research primarily investigated the predictive roles of cultural and individual factors in adult participants' perceptions of marital relationships. A secondary aim was to determine the gender and age-group differences in participants' marital quality, individualistic-collectivistic tendencies, and divorce attitudes.

Studies in the current literature have reported conflicting results concerning the relationship between marital quality and collectivism/individualism. It is agreed that both individualistic/collectivistic values such as autonomy, relatedness and harmony are basic human characteristics that deeply affect individuals' personal relationships and hence marital quality in many aspects. One of these values might be more prominent in one culture, whereas in another, it may not be. Individuals living in a specific cultural environment may be in a relatively more advantageous position to shape her/his marital relationships. Therefore, examining married people's marital relationships

in relation to cultural factors might contribute to the understanding of less discovered aspects of marital quality.

Having higher or lower divorce rates in a given society has been shown to have a strong impact on its members' divorce decisions, especially among women. Women socialized in collectivistic countries with lower rates of divorce and greater taboos regarding divorce had less positive attitudes towards divorce (Furtado, Marcén, & Sevilla, 2013). The results of that study also showed that women demanded more closeness in their relationships, while men prescribed more importance to independence than their female partners.

Although individualistic and collectivistic backgrounds and their relationships with a number of psychological variables have been frequently studied, there is a relative lack of knowledge about the impact of individualism and collectivism on marriage satisfaction and spouses' attitudes toward divorce.

## II. MARITAL QUALITY AND INDIVIDUALISM/COLLECTIVISM

Marital quality comprises many aspects of marital relationships, including satisfactory reciprocal communication between spouses, agreement about family issues, confidence in each other, and a feeling of reciprocal love and physical attraction (Spanier, 1976). Being a part of a satisfactory marriage leads to better psychological well-being (Erhabor & Ndlovu, 2013; Proulx, Helms, & Buehler, 2007; Umberson, Williams, Powers, Liu, & Needham, 2006), better physical health (Choi & Marks, 2013; Korporaal, van Groenou, & van Tilburg, 2013), and higher job satisfaction (Rogers, & May, 2003) in each partner.

The quality of a marriage is not only affected by individual-level factors; culture has an influential impact on partners' perceptions of their marital relationship and expectations. Culture largely shapes an individual's personal meaning systems, values, and attitudes. Individualism and collectivism are the main constructs that categorize cultures. Cultures that place an emphasis on separateness, autonomy, and agency are classified as individualistic, and cultures that attach relatively more importance to relatedness,

interdependence, and social hierarchy are identified as collectivistic. Markus and Kitayama (1991) analyzed differences in these cultural values at the individual level and defined two contrasting self-construals: independent and interdependent selves. These two self-construals affect a person's cognitive, emotional, and motivational characteristics. Individuals who are socialized in individualist cultures mainly aim to assert themselves, appreciate their differences from others, and express ego-focused emotions. In contrast, individuals socialized in collectivist cultural environments aim to be in harmony with others, think interdependently, and have other-focused emotions (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This distinction between I and C orientations is also manifested in personal value systems. Schwartz (1990) defined hedonism, achievement, self-direction, social power, and stimulation values as individualistic, whereas values such as being prosocial, adhering to restrictive conformity, promoting social harmony, and placing importance on tradition were identified as collectivistic.

In their comprehensive review, Dion and Dion (1996) summarized the empirical research on individualism/collectivism and romantic love. They found that individualistic and collectivistic values, at both the societal and psychological levels, had an impact on the perceived nature of romantic love and perceived importance of marriage. The research findings that they included in their review showed that people who were raised in individualistic cultures generally placed more importance on romantic love in their opposite sex relations and marriage decisions. Celenk, van de Vijver, and Goodwin (2011) searched for differences between Turkish and British adults regarding romantic relationship satisfaction, adult attachment, autonomy/relatedness, and gender roles. They found that Turkish participants had lower levels of relationship satisfaction, autonomy, and autonomy-relatedness than British adults, whereas British participants had lower levels of avoidance and relatedness. Participants from both cultures who had a higher comfort with closeness, identified more in autonomous-related self-construal, and had less masculine values gained more satisfactory romantic relationships. After conducting mediational regression analyses, Benjamin et al. (2015) identified the mediating role of perceived parental influence between participants' collectivism and their commitment levels to their partners. Participants who exhibited more collectivistic values were affected by their parents more, leading to lower commitment and passion levels in their romantic relationships. Having higher collectivistic values also led to family allocentrism, and higher family allocentrism resulted in being more dependent on parent's decisions in mate preferences. However, some contradictory findings that support a positive relationship between interdependent self-construals and marital satisfaction have been reported (Acitelli, Rogers, & Knee, 1999; Morry & Kito, 2009). Quadir et al. (2005) revealed the important role of women's cultural belief systems about marriage in their marital relationships. In that study, a sample of Pakistani women generally tended to view marriage as a social and familial obligation, was not very satisfied with their relationships, and felt social

pressure in expressing bad experiences with their marriages. Although they experienced these feelings of unhappiness in their marital relationships, they also had negative attitudes toward divorce.

Some research findings have identified positive contributions of both individualistic and collectivistic values to couples' marriage quality. Hamara, Deniz, Dilmac and Arslan (2015) investigated the roles of personal values on a sample of married Turkish couples. They found that individualistic values such as achievement, hedonism, and stimulation, as well as collectivistic values such as tradition and conformity, had positive effects on predicting the marital satisfaction of Turkish adults. However, in their qualitative study, Celenk and van de Vijver (2013) compared Turkish, Turkish-Dutch, and Dutch couples' marital satisfaction and found some differences according to ethnicity regarding the criteria they used for marital happiness. Dutch couples placed more importance on partners' behaviors, personality characteristics, and mutual sharing of emotions in their relationships.

In important domains of marital relations, such as decision making, household division of labor, and mutuality, there are considerable cultural differences between Eastern and Western societies. For instance, Cheung (2005) collected qualitative data from Caucasian and Chinese couples in Canada and investigated their marital relationships. She found that Chinese husbands had more internalized traditional sex roles than their Caucasian counterparts. They had a more dominant role than their wives in decision-making about relational and financial issues. Chinese women also seemed to internalize this hierarchy in sex role and centralized their role of being a good mother and raising their children, somewhat losing their individual autonomy compared to Caucasian women. Having higher values of collectivism was found to be positively correlated with loyalty conflict tactics in marital relationships, and having higher collectivistic orientations positively contributed to men's marital satisfactions in particular in a sample of Singaporean couples (Quek & Fitzpatrick, 2013).

### III. DIVORCE ATTITUDES AND INDIVIDUALISM/COLLECTIVISM

Toth and Kemmelmeier (2009) analyzed participants' divorce attitudes using country-level data from an International Social Survey. The results demonstrated that people living in individualistic countries displayed more favorable attitudes towards divorce than members of collectivistic societies. However, divorce with children was less desirable even among members of higher individualistic societies. Bulanda and Brown (2007) found that Mexican Americans and Whites had higher marital satisfaction levels than Blacks. In particular, members of Mexican American culture were better at retaining their marital quality and stability despite the economic difficulties they faced. The cultural meaning of marriage plays an important role in preserving the bonds of marriage between couples. For instance, Goodwin and Cramer (2000) found that

participants with South Asian origins had predominantly collectivistic values and perceived marriage as an expression of individual fulfillment. Social support and family networks were highly important for these South Asian participants. Some other researchers examined how culture and social networks shaped divorce-related decisions and behaviors in Mexican Americans and found that power differences between the members of extended families and traditional gender roles strained women who decided to resolve unsatisfactory marriages (Afifi, Davis, Denes, & Merrill, 2013). Elder family members generally tried to change women's decisions about divorce, and they exerted social pressure on women to remain in their marriages despite their husband's infidelity or poor behavior.

The results of a large-sample ( $n = 59,169$ ) cross-cultural study demonstrated the links between participants' I-C levels and their divorce attitudes. In that study, 42 different nations were ranked regarding their I-C levels. Participants from the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Canada had the highest individualistic levels, while in China, South Korea, Nigeria, and Turkey, collectivistic values were widespread. Having higher collectivistic values predicted a lower tolerance for divorce (Diener, Gohm, Suh, & Oishi, 2000).

#### IV. MARRIAGE, GENDER AND AGE

Married couples' gender role perceptions and personal attitudes towards traditional gender roles can differ by culture and gender and have some impact on the perceived marital quality of adults. Collectivistic tendencies also affect young adults' relationship qualities, mate preferences, and passion in relationships. In their study, Bejanyan et al. (2015) found direct and positive links between collectivism, commitment and passion levels in young adults.

In terms of gender role expectations, Gazioğlu (2006) examined young adults' attitudes towards marriage and family in a Turkish college sample. She found that men scored higher than women on perceiving marriage as a religious necessity, divorce as a sin, and men as the master of the family. Moreover, women had higher scores than men on having more positive attitudes towards sharing all chores with her partner and having equal power in a relationship. Participants who were raised in conservative cultures and those who had higher levels of collectivistic tendencies perceived higher levels of parental influence and family allocentrism (Bejanyan, Marshall, & Ferenczi, 2015; Quadir, Silva, Prince, & Khan, 2005). For example, Kline et al. (2012) investigated cross-cultural differences in the marital role and marriage conceptions of young adults from six different cultures. The results showed that participants who lived in East Asian countries (China, Korea, and Japan) placed more importance on the family home focus and traditional good and bad wife roles when compared to US participants. Amato and Booth (1995) found that attitudes towards traditional gender roles distinctly affected wives' and husbands' perceptions of marital quality. Husbands in the American adult sample who had lower levels of traditional gender role attitudes perceived more happiness in

their marriages. However, wives who had lower levels of traditional gender role attitudes perceived less marital quality in their relationships.

In their comprehensive meta-analyses, Jackson, Miller, Oka, and Henry (2014) evaluated the results of more than two hundred studies that concentrated on gender differences in couples' marriage satisfaction. Their results supported the general assumption that women had lower marital satisfaction than men in most clinical samples. In many other studies in non-clinical adult samples, women reported lower levels of marital satisfaction (e.g., Bentler & Newcomb, 1978; Bulanda, 2011; Crane, Soderquist & Gardner, 1995; Dillon et al. 2015; Fowers, 1991; Kapinus, 2004; Markman & Hahlweg, 1993) and a sense of fairness in their relationships (Skinner, Bahr, Crane, & Call, 2002) than men.

Marriages can last a long time if both partners are pleased with their relationships. Investigating the changes in marital quality over time is a main research concern. Some longitudinal research results established that there was stability in the marital quality of marital relationships among both men and women (Johnson, Amoloza, & Booth, 1992). Some other research findings (e.g., Anderson, Russell, & Schumm, 1983; Olson, et al., 1983; Sternberg, & Hojjat, 1997; Noller, Feeney, & Ward, 1997) represented a curvilinear relation indicating that marriage quality was higher in both the early and late stages of marriage. It was found that middle-aged couples (40-59 years) had the lowest marital satisfaction levels. In addition to the younger group (less than 40), an older group (60 years and older) displayed relatively higher levels of satisfaction (Wilmoth, Blaney, & Smith, 2015). Prolonged years of marriage seemed to have a negative impact on the marriage quality of couples. Participants who had been married longer had lower perceived marital quality and also a lower sense of fairness in their relationships compared to newly married couples (Skinner et al., 2002).

#### V. METHOD

##### A. Sample

The sample was composed of married individuals (257 female and 257 male) living in 36 cities in Turkey. In October 2014, some of senior psychology students at Cumhuriyet University were chosen as volunteer interviewers to administer the questionnaires in the cities in which their families lived. Using snowball sampling, each student conducted nearly 20 questionnaires in total. As some participants were illiterate, the interviewers helped them complete the questionnaire forms. Some cases were removed after the data cleaning process.

The mean age of the women was 34.68 years ( $S = 10.29$ , range 19-78), and the mean age of the men was 38.26 years ( $S = 10.52$ , range 22-84). The mean age at marriage among women was 21.87 years ( $S = 3.61$ ), and for men, it was 25.49 years ( $S = 3.64$ ). Additionally, 97.9% of the sample was married once, and 2.1% of them had been married twice. Of the women, 3.5% were illiterate; 29.1%

had graduated from primary school, 13.8% from middle school, 27.2% from high school, and 25.2% from the university; and 3.9% had finished their graduate studies. Of the men, 0.4% were illiterate, 13.7% had graduated from primary school, 9.8% from middle school, 34.1% from high school, and 38% from university, and 3.9% of them had finished their graduate studies.

## B. Measures

### ➤ Individualism and Collectivism

The Individualism and Collectivism Scale (INDCOL; Singelis et al, 1995) was used to determine the individualistic and collectivistic characteristics of the sample. This scale measures the individualism and collectivism dimensions, differentiating them vertically and horizontally (egalitarian and hierarchic). The 37-item scale was adopted for Turkish populations by Wasti and Erdil (2007). The scale consists of horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism and vertical collectivism subscales. Each item is evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale (1- Totally disagree to 5- Totally agree). Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale varies from .65-.72 (Wasti and Erdil, 2007). In the present study, there was no hypothesis regarding the vertical or horizontal differentiation; therefore, only the general individualism and collectivism scores were used. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient of the current study was .82 for the individualism dimension and .80 for the collectivism dimension.

### ➤ Attitude toward Divorce:

The Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957; revised by Coleman & Ganong, 1987) was used to measure couples' attitudes towards divorce. The scale has a total of 12 items evaluated on a 5-point scale (1- I agree with this statement to 5- I disagree with this statement.) A higher score on the test indicates a positive attitude towards divorce. The adaptation of the scale was conducted within this study, and a one-factor structure of the scale was found to explain 24.28% of the variance. However, the factor loading of items 2 and 10 were lower than .32, and the item-total correlation of items 3 and 12 were lower than .30; therefore, these items were excluded from the analyses. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was .70.

### ➤ Marriage Quality

The Quality of Marriage Index (Norton, 1983) was used to measure the perceived marriage quality of the couples. The index consists of 6 items evaluated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (e.g., I have a strong relationship with my partner: 1-I totally disagree to 7-I totally agree). The index was adapted to Turkish by Sümer ve Cozzarelli (2004), and Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the index was .95. In the current study, Cronbach's alpha of the index was .96.

## C. Research Questions

- Are there any gender differences regarding participants' marital quality, individualist-collectivistic tendencies, or divorce attitudes?
- Are there any age differences regarding participants' marital quality, individualist-collectivistic tendencies, or divorce attitudes?
- Which factors (age, educational level, individualistic-collectivistic tendencies, and divorce attitude) predict male and female participants' marital quality?

To answer these questions, in the first step, gender and age differences of the main variables were assessed, and in the second, the predictor variables of marital quality in males and females were examined.

## VI. RESULTS

### A. Age and Gender

A 2 x 2 MANOVA was conducted to investigate whether the variables varied according to gender and age group (group 1 aged between 19 and 39 and group 2 aged 40 and above). The analyses indicated main effects of gender [Wilks'  $\lambda = .97$ ;  $F(4, 497) = 3.86$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .03$ ] and age group [Wilks'  $\lambda = .96$ ;  $F(8, 990) = 5.35$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .001$ ] on marital quality, individualism-collectivism, and positive attitudes towards divorce. The interaction effect between gender and age was not significant. Further analyses revealed that the marital quality [ $F(1, 500) = 5.90$ ,  $p < .01$ ] score was higher for men than women. When the main effect of age was examined, the marital quality of individuals aged between 19 and 39 was found to be higher than that of individuals older than 40 [ $F(1, 500) = 6.08$ ,  $p < .01$ ]. Furthermore, the scores on the individualism dimension of individuals aged between 19 and 39 were higher than those of individuals older than 40 [ $F(1, 500) = 6.09$ ,  $p < .01$ ].

### B. Predicting Marital Quality

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted separately for males and females to determine whether individualistic and collectivistic characteristics and divorce attitudes predicted marriage quality. The results are presented in Table 2. The regression analysis was conducted in three steps, and the variables were entered into the equation in the following order: 1) age and gender, 2) individualistic and collectivistic characteristics, and 3) divorce attitudes. The first step explained 2% of the variance in female and 3% in male participants, and the variables did not significantly predict the variance. In the second step, the individualistic and collectivistic characteristics of the participants were entered into the analysis, and the explained total variance increased to 7% for female and 17% for male participants, and these variables significantly predicted the variance. Finally, when divorce attitudes were entered into the analysis, the explained variance increased to 8% in female participants only, and the variable significantly predicted the variance in female only. At the end of the analyses, the age of individuals negatively and collectivistic characteristics

positively predicted marriage quality in both males and females; in female participants only, a positive attitude

towards divorce negatively predicted marriage quality (see Table 2).

Variables	1	2	3	4	Female M (S)	Male M (S)	19-39 years	40 years and above
1. Marriage Quality	-	.35***	.23***	-.06	5.88 (1.32)	6.12(1.14)	6.08 (1.13)	5.82 (1.41)
2. Collectivism	.24***	-	.45***	-.02	3.88 (.42)	3.87 (.49)	3.86 (.43)	3.91 (.50)
3. Individualism	.04	.30***	-	.10	3.58 (.50)	3.66 (.58)	3.66 (.51)	3.54 (.59)
4. Divorce Attitudes	-.15*	-.07	.04	-	2.91 (.62)	2.79 (.63)	2.84 (.61)	2.86 (.67)

Table 1:- Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient, Average and Standard Deviation of All Variables.

Note. The bottom half of the table is for females, and the upper half is for males

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

		Step	Predicting Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	ΔF	β	t
Marriage Quality	Female	1	Education Level	.13	.02	.01	2.33	.01	.01
			Age					-.14	-2.01
		2	Education Level	.28	.07	.06	8.63***	.01	.22
			Age					-.17	-2.50**
			Collectivism					.26	4.01***
			Individualism					-.04	-.58
		3	Education Level	.31	.08	.02	4.20*	.04	.63
			Age					-.15	-2.24*
			Collectivism					.25	3.92***
		Individualism					-.02	-.40	
		Attitude Towards Divorce					-.13	-2.05*	
	Male	1	Education Level	.16	.03	.03	3.26*	.01	.15
			Age					-.16	-2.86**
		2	Education Level	.41	.17	.14	20.53***	.02	.46
			Age					-.17	-2.86**
			Collectivism					.34	5.12***
			Individualism					.07	1.07
		3	Education Level	.41	.17	.00	.76	.03	.52
		Age					-.17	-2.77**	
		Collectivism					.33	5.04***	
	Individualism					.08	1.17		
	Attitude Towards Divorce					-.05	-.87		

Table 2:- Regression Analyses Predicting Marriage Quality in Females and Males

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**VII. DISCUSSION**

The results are discussed in order of the research questions listed above, and the limitations of the study are highlighted.

➤ *The First Finding was that the Marital Quality of Men was Higher than That of Women.*

Many studies have previously indicated that men and women had different experiences with marriage (Bentler & Newcomb, 1978; Kapinus, 2004; Markman & Hahlweg, 1993) and that women were less satisfied with their marital relationships than men. Fowers (1991) suggested that the

reason for the lower female satisfaction was because males had more to gain from marriage than women. According to Crane et al., (1995) when women marry, they experience financial gain, but they relinquish more of their privacy, control over their schedules, and time with their friends. It should be noted that the higher marital quality in men is consistent across cultures. Similar to women in many traditional cultures, Turkish females might have tended to view themselves as less valuable than their male counterparts in their marriages. In Turkish society, it is a common view that the husband’s main familial role is to earn money for his family, while the wife is supposed to assume the domestic duties, such as cleaning the house,

giving birth, and taking care of children and parents. Even in relatively modernized families in urban areas, Turkish men want women to fulfill their traditional roles. Therefore, it would not be incorrect to say that Turkish culture is a male-dominated culture rather than an egalitarian one. For this reason, it is considered socially acceptable for women to not expect the level of satisfaction that men enjoy in their marital relationship. These results can be correlated with the fact that women have fewer opportunities than men in Turkey and that social changes that positively affect women's perceptions of identity have not yet occurred.

➤ *The Marital Quality of both Men and Women Aged between 19 and 39 was Higher than that of Individuals Older than 40.*

This suggests that there is a negative correlation between marital quality and marital duration. The current literature shows that there have been some changes in the understanding of lifelong marital satisfaction (Olson et al., 1983) and reveals conflicting findings about the nature of these changes (Finkel & Hansen, 1992). Some studies have reported that there may be a reduction (Rollins & Cannon, 1974), stability (Johnson et al., 1992), or an increase (Gilford, 1986) in lifelong marital satisfaction; that there is no relationship between marital satisfaction and length of marriage (Jones, Adams, Monroe, & Berry, 1995); that marital satisfaction tends to decrease after the first years of marriage (Paris, Bethel, Elanor, & Luckey, 1966); or that there is a curvilinear relationship between marital satisfaction and duration of marriage (Anderson et al., 1983; Olson, et al., 1983; Sternberg, & Hojjat, 1997).

The higher marital quality in the younger group and the lower quality in the older adults might be explained by the fact that the birth of a child and the increased number of children over time has negative effects on marital satisfaction. The presence of children is thought to negatively affect the conversations between couples and to cause an increase in the behavioral features of avoidant attachment styles over time. It might also be asserted that the continuation of marital stability at all costs is considered much more important than having a quality marriage in conventional Turkish culture.

➤ *For both Males and Females, Collectivism Positively Predicted Marital Quality.*

Studies show that a relational identity and a relational interdependent self-construal are significant predictors of marital quality (Acitelli et al. 1999; Morry & Kito, 2009). The family is one of the most important components of most collectivist individuals' lives. The majority of collectivist individuals have a deep awareness and pride in their family membership. Their self-worth, confidence and identity are determined by their relationship to other family members, and they have a great sense of family obligation that likely takes precedence over the individual's needs. One could suggest that family ties transcend class lines and socioeconomic conditions in collectivist societies.

These same findings seem to be true in Turkey. Participants with high levels of collectivism engage in more supportive behaviors in their relationships such as intimate self-disclosure, they share strong feelings of loyalty, reciprocity, and unity and attend to their partner's disclosures, resulting in a higher quality relationship.

➤ *For Females, Positive Attitudes toward Divorce Negatively Predicted Marital Quality.*

Females with lower perceptions of marital quality may develop positive attitudes toward divorce, or positive divorce attitudes may inhibit them from striving to maintain their marriages. Based on the relevant literature, it appears that there has been a change in attitudes toward divorce in the last 50 years. While divorce used to be considered a huge moral infraction, leading to stigmatization of divorced individuals, this is no longer the case. Although divorce was once considered a socially unacceptable solution to an unhappy marriage, the arrival of the industrial revolution, the women's movement, and the availability of contraceptives led to a change in the trends of divorce attitudes (Thornton, 2001). The current trend regarding divorce is that people are willing to consider their specific personal circumstance rather than imposing an absolute rule against divorce.

## LIMITATIONS

This study had several limitations. The relations between variables were not highly strong but were relational. Accordingly, the ability to answer questions regarding causal relationships is limited. The data were also cross-sectional and based on self-reported measures. In future studies, to understand the marital quality, I-C tendencies, and divorce attitudes of participants from different socio-economic strata in more detail, multiple techniques such as observations and interviews could be used together.

➤ *Ethical Approval*

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Acitelli, L. K., Rogers, S., & Knee, C. R. (1999). The role of identity in the link between relationship thinking and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16(5), 591-618. doi: 10.1177/0265407599165003.
- [2]. Afifi, T. D., Davis, S., Denes, A., & Merrill, A. (2013). Analyzing divorce from cultural and network approaches. *Journal of Family Studies*, 19(3), 240–253. <http://doi.org/10.5172/jfs.2013.19.3.240>.
- [3]. Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (1995). Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *American Sociological Review*, 60(1), 58–66.

- <http://doi.org/10.2307/2096345>.
- [4]. Anderson, S.A., Russell, C.S., & Schumm, W.R. (1983). Perceived marital quality and family life cycle categories: A further analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 127-139.
- [5]. Bejanyan, K., Marshall, T. C., & Ferenczi, N. (2015). Associations of Collectivism with Relationship Commitment, Passion, and Mate Preferences: Opposing Roles of Parental Influence and Family Allocentrism. *PLoS ONE*, 10(2), 1–24. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117374>.
- [6]. Bentler, P. M. & Newcomb, M. D. (1978). Longitudinal study of marital success and failure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1053-1070.
- [7]. Bulanda, J. R. (2011). Gender, marital power, and marital quality in later life. *Journal of Women & Aging*, 23(1), 3–22. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08952841.2011.540481>.
- [8]. Bulanda, J. R., & Brown, S. L. (2007). Race-ethnic differences in marital quality and divorce. *Social Science Research*, 36, 945-969.
- [9]. Celenk, O., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2013). Perceived antecedents of marital satisfaction among Turkish, Turkish-Dutch, and Dutch couples. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(6), 1165–1175. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.741242>.
- [10]. Celenk, O., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Goodwin, R. (2011). Relationship satisfaction among Turkish and British adults. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 628-640.
- [11]. Cheung, M. (2005). A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Gender Factors Contributing to Long-Term Marital Satisfaction. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 4(1), 51–78. [http://doi.org/10.1300/J398v04n01\\_03](http://doi.org/10.1300/J398v04n01_03).
- [12]. Choi, H., & Marks, N. F. (2013). Marital quality, socioeconomic status, and physical health. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 903-919. DOI:10.1111/jomf.12044.
- [13]. Christensen, A., Eldridge, K., Catta-Preta, A. B., Lim, V. R., & Santagata, R. (2006). Cross-cultural consistency of the demand/withdraw interaction pattern in couples. *Journal of Marriages and Family*, 68, 1029-1044.
- [14]. Coleman, M., & Ganong, L. (1987). Psychometric properties of the Hardy divorce scale. *Psychological Reports*, 60, 531-536.
- [15]. Crane, D. R., Soderquist, J., & Gardner, M. (1995). Gender differences in cognitive and behavioral steps toward divorce. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 3, (2), 99–105.
- [16]. Diener, E., Gohm, C. L., Suh, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). Similarity of the Relations between Marital Status and Subjective Well-Being Across Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(4), 419–436. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031004001>.
- [17]. Dillon, L. M., Nowak, N., Weisfeld, G. E., Weisfeld, C. C., Shattuck, K. S., Imamoğlu, O. E., Butovskaya, M., & Shen, J. (2015). Sources of marital conflict in five cultures. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 13(1), 1–15.
- [18]. Dion, K. K., & Dion, K. L. (1996). Cultural perspectives on romantic love. *Personal Relationships*, 3(1), 5–17. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1996.tb00101.x>.
- [19]. Erhabor, S. I., & Ndlovu, N. J. (2013). How Happy are Married People? Psychological Indicators of Marital Satisfaction of Married Men and Women in Gauteng Province, South Africa. *Gender & Behaviour*, 11(2), 5486–5498.
- [20]. Finkel, J. S., & Hansen, E. J. (1992). Correlates of retrospective marital satisfaction in long-lived marriages: A social constructivist perspective. *Family Therapy*, 19, 1-16.
- [21]. Fowers, B.J. (1991). His and her marriage: A multivariate study of gender and marital satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 24(3-4), 209-221.
- [22]. Furtado, D. Marcen. M& & Sevilla, A. (2013). Does culture affect divorce? Evidence from European Immigrants in US., *Demography*, 50(3), 1013-1038. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0180-2>
- [23]. Gazioglu, A. E. I. (2006). Genç yetişkinlerin evlilik ve aile hayatına ilişkin görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi [Investigation of young adults' views about marriage and family life]. *M. U. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 23, 107-123.
- [24]. Gilford, R. (1986). Marriage in later life. *Generations*, 10, 16-20.
- [25]. Goodwin, R., & Cramer, D. (2000). Marriage and social support in a British–Asian community. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10(1), 49–62.
- [26]. Hamarta, E., Deniz, M., Dilmaç, B., & Arslan, C. (2015). Evlilik içi ilişki ile evlilikteki yaşam doyumunun evli çiftlerin değerleri açısından incelenmesi [A Study on Marital Relationship and Marital Life Satisfaction with Regard to Values of Marital Couples], *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 12(1), 55–69. <http://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v12i1.3107>.
- [27]. Hardy, K.R. (1957). Determinants of conformity and attitude change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 54, 289-294.
- [28]. Jackson, J. B., Miller, R. B., Oka, M., & Henry, R. G. (2014). Gender differences in marital satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 76(1), 105–129. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12077>.
- [29]. Johnson, D. R., Amoloza, T. O., & Booth, A. (1992). Stability and developmental change in marital quality: A three-wave panel analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 54(3), 582–594. <http://doi.org/10.2307/353244>.
- [30]. Jones, W., Adams, J., Monroe, P., & Berry, J. (1995). A psychometric exploration of marital satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 923- 932.
- [31]. Kapinus, C. A. (2004). The effects of parent's attitudes toward divorce on offspring's attitudes: Gender and parental divorce as mediating factors. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 112-135.
- [32]. Kline, S. L., Zhang, S., Manohar, U., Ryu, S., Suzuki, T., Mustafa, H. (2012). The role of communication and

- cultural concepts in expectations about marriage: Comparisons between young adults from six countries. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 319-330.
- [33]. Korporaal, M., Broese Van Groenou, M.I. & Tilburg, T.G. van (2013). Health problems and marital satisfaction among older couples. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 25 (8), 1279-1298. doi: 10.1177/0898264313501387.
- [34]. Markman, H.J., & Hahlweg, K. (1993). The prediction and prevention of marital distress: An international perspective. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 13, 29-43.
- [35]. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- [36]. Morry, M. M., & Kito, M. (2009). Relational-Interdependent self-construal as a predictor of relationship quality: The mediating roles of one's own behaviors and perceptions of the fulfillment of friendship functions. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 149, 205-222.
- [37]. Noller, P., Feeney, J. A., & Ward, C. M. (1997). Determinants of marital quality: A partial test of Lewis and Spanier's model. *Journal of Family Studies*, 3(2), 226–251. <http://doi.org/10.5172/jfs.3.2.226>.
- [38]. Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45, 141-151.
- [39]. Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H. L., Larsen, A. S., Muxen, M. J. & Wilson, M. A. (1983). *Families: What makes them work*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- [40]. Paris, Bethel L., & Eleanor B. Luckey (1966). A longitudinal study of marital satisfaction. *Sociology and Social Research*, 50 (January), 212-223.
- [41]. Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital Quality and Personal Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(3), 576–593. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00393.x>.
- [42]. Qadir, F., Silva, P. de, Prince, M., & Khan, M. (2005). Marital satisfaction in Pakistan: A pilot investigation. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 20(2), 195–209. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14681990500113260>.
- [43]. Quek, K. M., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2013). Cultural values, self-disclosure, and conflict tactics as predictors of marital satisfaction among Singaporean Husbands and wives. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 21(2), 208-216.
- [44]. Rogers, S. J., & May, D. C. (2003). Spillover Between Marital Quality and Job Satisfaction: Long-Term Patterns and Gender Differences. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(2), 482–495. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00482.x>.
- [45]. Rollins, B. C., & Cannon, K. L. (1974). Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle: A reevaluation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 271-282.
- [46]. Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(2), 139-157.
- [47]. Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. S., & Gelfand, M. J. 1995. Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29 (3), 240-275
- [48]. Skinner, K. B., Bahr, S. J., Crane, D. R., & Call, V. R. A. (2002). Cohabitation, marriage, and remarriage: A comparison of relationship quality over time. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(1), 74–90. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02023001004>.
- [49]. Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring Dyadic Adjustment: New Scales for Assessing the Quality of Marriage and Similar Dyads. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 38(1), 15–28. <http://doi.org/10.2307/350547>.
- [50]. Sternberg, R. J. and Hojjat, M. (1997) *Satisfaction in Close Relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.
- [51]. Sümer, N., & Cozzarelli, C. (2004). The impact of adult attachment on partner and self-attributions and relationship quality. *Personal relationships*, 11(3), 355-371.
- [52]. Thornton, A. (2001). The developmental paradigm, reading, and family changes. *Demography*, 38(4), 449–465.
- [53]. Toth, K., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2009). Divorce attitudes around the world distinguishing the impact of culture on evaluations and attitude structure. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 43(3), 280-297. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1069397109336648>.
- [54]. Umberson, D., Williams, K., Powers, D. A., Liu, H., & Needham, B. (2006). You Make Me Sick: Marital Quality and Health Over the Life Course. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 47(1), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002214650604700101>.
- [55]. Wasti, A.S. & Erdil S.E. (2007). Bireycilik ve toplulukçuluk değerlerinin ölçülmesi: Benlik kurgusu (self construal scale; scs) ve mdcölçeklerinin Türkiye geçerlemesi. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7, 39-66.
- [56]. Wilmoth, J. D., Blaney, A. D., & Smith, J. R. (2015). Marital satisfaction, negative interaction, and religiosity: A comparison of three age groups. *Journal of Religion, Spirituality & Aging*, 27(2-3), 222-240. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15528030.2014.997955>