

Construction and Validation of Marital Well-being Inventory

¹Dr. Fashiya. P. S., ² Dr. C. Jayan.

¹Psychologist, ²Professor (Retd).

¹Department of Psychology

¹University of Calicut, Kerala, India.

Abstract: While talking about marriage, people have different opinions about their experience of marital life. Couples enter marriage with highest expectations. Sometimes these expectations are more than fulfilled. For others bright promises are not fulfilled so that they may part with sadness, disillusionment, bitterness, and ultimately sometimes separation. The experience of well-being is also possible in couple relationship. It is entirely different from other synonyms which is commonly used in marital studies. By the present research, the investigators were making an attempt to define a workable definition of Marital well-being, and also to construct a standardised tool for measuring it.

Key words:- Couples, Marriage, Marital well-being, Reliability, Validity.

Marriage is blissful when intimacy and companionship are easy, feelings of trust and commitment are strong, partners treat one another with love and consideration, then the marriage seems indestructible (Rusbult, Bissonnette, Arriaga, & Cox, 1998). Most of the previous research in the field of marriage have used self-report questionnaires for the interviews. Since 1970 systematic observation and experimental researches on the mutual relationships between couples have been undertaken (Gottman, 1994). Researchers commonly judge marital success with one or more of the following measures: stability, duration, satisfaction, adjustment, and commitment.

Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) is one of the pioneering test to measure marital adjustment which was developed by Locke and Wallace (1959). It measures dimensions such as conflict resolution, sex, leisure, money, conventionalism, friends, and affection.

Spanier (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) was also commonly used scale in the early years to measure dyadic adjustments among couples. The scale measured four dimensions of dyadic adjustment:- *dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, and affectional expression*. DAS has been the most frequently used measure of relationship satisfaction (Funk & Rogge, 2007).

Both MAT and DAS included items that assessed both interaction patterns (interpersonal processes) and subjective evaluations of the marriage (intrapersonal processes). Both of them ignored the conceptual distinctions just outlined (Fincham & Rogge, 2010).

Different synonyms were found to be used in marriage researches and most of the tools were based on them. **Marital quality** is a general term which serves as an umbrella term and incorporates three concepts such as *marital satisfaction, marital happiness and marital adjustment* (Rosen-Grandon, 2001). **Marital satisfaction** is viewed as a function of the comparison between one's marital expectations and one's marital outcome (Lenthall, 1977). Marital satisfaction is not a property of the relationship. It is a subjective experience and opinion. It depends upon the individual's needs, expectations, and desires for the relationship. Individuals are usually satisfied when their needs are being met, and when the individual's expectations and desires are being satisfied (Rosen- Grandon, 2001). **Marital happiness** is defined as the level of personal happiness an individual feels about his/her marriage. Like marital satisfaction, it is a private evaluation which can only be made by the individual. Since it is an emotional state, it has been known to be affected by the mood swing of the individual (Rosen- Grandon, 2001). Marital satisfaction and marital happiness are related concepts since only the individual is able to say how happy or satisfied they are (Rosen- Grandon, 2001). **Marital adjustment** refers to the process whereby individuals adjust their lifestyles to the lifestyle of marriage. Marital adjustment can be evaluated by an outside observer who determines whether a couple appears well-adjusted or poorly adjusted. Marital adjustment often occurs regardless of marital happiness or marital satisfaction. People often adjust to situations where there is no happiness or satisfaction (Rosen- Grandon, 2001). A relationship that ends cannot be said to be satisfactory. **Marital stability** refers to the stability of the marital relationship, rather than to the condition of individual spouses. In stable marriages, there is no plan to divorce. Marital stability refers to the relationship, not to the spouses as individuals (Rosen- Grandon, 2001). Marital stability means a marriage held together by the following things as being good listeners, respecting one another, having a good sense of humor, knowing how to have fun, being willing to adapt, accepting that one cannot change his/her partner, thinking rationally, and effective communication (Sheri & Stritof, 2005). Marital stability refers to whether a marriage remains intact or dissolves (Wright, Nelson, & Georgen, 1994, as cited in Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, & Gh. Lavasani, 2010). Marital stability is viewed as a function of the comparison between one's best available marital alternative and one's marital outcome (Lenthall, 1977). **Marital cohesion** refers to the degree of connectedness, togetherness, and emotional bonding between marital partners. Even though cohesion in marriages is related to positive relationship qualities, including greater relationship satisfaction and lower hostility between partners, extremely high levels of cohesion may be unhealthy for marriages, reflecting too much dependence between partners (Doane, 2016).

While going through different synonyms of harmony in marriage, it was found that there were differences in the concepts. Marital well-being a little more broad concept which can be studied extensively. For this purpose the investigators went through previous researches on marriage and neither standard definition nor tool for measuring Marital Well-being were found.

Objectives of the study

1. To define the construct Marital well-being.
2. To develop a tool for measuring Marital well-being.

Variable Selection

After reviewing the theories and empirical studies including the previous ones, most commonly occurred variables in marital studies were identified. Also an unstructured interview was conducted among 75 common married people to get their idea regarding the factors that predicted marital well-being. Both of them were considered and listed as follows:

a) Variables obtained from literature.

Compromising (accepting influence from the partner), forgiveness and atonement (apology, compensation and the like), Gratitude, Showing mutual interests, Respect both own and partner's values and principles, Feel commitment towards each other, Co-operate with one another, Decision to be together under any circumstances, Appropriate conflict resolution strategies, Sexual relationship, Having leisure activities, Conventionalism, Affection, Being friends, Division of household chores, Duration of being beside each other, Sexual intimacy, Emotional intimacy, Attraction to partner, Intra-personality variables such as personality similarities, intelligence, attitudes, and so forth, Similarity in religious beliefs, Being trustful, Control mutuality (the extent to which both partners agreed on who has the right to influence the other), Satisfaction in the couple relationship, Equality, Positive communication styles, Fidelity, Romantic love, Self-disclosure, Perception of level of trust in the marital relationship, Partner's physical attractiveness, Having humor sense, Communication, Flexibility, Closeness, Honesty, Sacrifice, Commitment, Being realist, Trust, Patience, Understanding, Valuing each other, Knowing how to have fun, Being willing to adapt, Accepting the partner as he/she is, Think rationally, Emotionally supportive, Open, Involved, Focused on the needs of each partner, Intimacy, Willingness to sacrifice for the good of a relationship, Forgiveness, Responsiveness, True sense, Equality, Optimism, Love, Affection, Attachment, Emotional support, and Empathy.

b) Variables obtained through unstructured interview

Social adjustment, Emotional maturity, Emotional regulation, Being responsible, Autonomy, Sincerity, Trust, Fidelity, Helpful, Empathy, Friendly, Passionate, Having freedom, Admiration, Sacrifice, Compromise, Compassion, Kindness, Politeness, Criticism (that enable to make positive changes in the partner), Appreciation, Encouragement, Perseverance, Patience, Modesty in lifestyle, Calmness, Love, Lust, Consideration of the partner, Loyalty, Flexibility in nature, Forget and forgive, Make a sense of being special, Showing respect to the partner as an individual, Having peaceful nature, Maturity in behavior, Soothing, Gratitude, Humility, Being hygienic, Beauty, Spirituality, Listening, Make jokes and have fun with each other, Try to learn more things together (it may be just learning to play a new game), Sharing of ideas and feelings, Feedback, True sense, Mutual discussion, Expression of emotions, Affection, Keeping confidentiality regarding spousal matters from others, Physical intimacy, Companionship, Compassion, Relationship maintenance behaviors such as positivity or being cheerful and upbeat, not criticizing the partner, assurances such as stressing one's commitment and love; and openness (refers to directly discussing the nature of the relationship, social networks or attempts to involve friends and family in various activities, and sharing tasks and the like).

Among them the most commonly occurred variables were selected and they were undergone discussion with a panel of 15 experts in Psychology. Based on their opinion, the factors for the test were selected, and they were clustered into sub variables and variables on the basis of their similarity in concepts. Thus, Marital well-being included six major variables such as *Communication, Intimacy, Concern for relation, Commitment, Personal characteristics, and Romanticism*.

Then again married people were asked to describe about the selected variables; that is, what did they meant with the 'so-called variables' in marriage. The data availed from unstructured interview and the findings of various reviews were put in the form of sentences, for each variable. The sentences were arranged under appropriate variables. Later the sentences were put in the form of 86 items. Each of the variables or dimensions related to Marital well-being are discussed in detail as follows:

Communication

Communication is integral to human relationships. Relationships are involved in all aspects of communication, and communication is the central process that gives shape to relationships. Interpersonal processes such as communication, develop with the marriage and tend to be related to changes in satisfaction (Karney & Bradbury, 1995).

Satisfied couples report that positive, intimate communication is central to make changes in the relationship. It is a kind of exchange of ideas and feelings. Communication is a dynamic process of creating meaning through verbal or non-verbal symbols. Communication is necessary to develop, maintain, and end relationships. The various forms and means of communication are unique to each couple. Communication between the couples may take different forms and contents.

In the opinion of Davidson and Moore (1996), couples must learn how to communicate each other in a way that will reveal their deepest feelings and their underlying needs, to establish an emotionally fulfilling relationship. In the words of Dickson-Markman and Markman (1988), quality communication involve self-disclosure, recognizing the partner's point of view, and being satisfied with the interaction.

The sub themes of Communication involves *self-disclosure, openness, responsiveness, perceiving in an actual meaning and mutual discussion*.

Self-disclosure is a process of voluntarily revealing about oneself to the partner, including their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in daily lives, using conflict resolution strategies appropriately, sexual disclosure, and so forth. Marital therapists believe self-disclosure as critical for maintaining love and intimacy in marriage because it expresses one's feelings about how one

is affected by interactions with one's partner, and allows for asking one's partner to change his or her behavior (Greenberg & Johnson, 1986; Hendrick, 1981).

Through self-disclosure, the partner is being felt as easily accessible to the other partner for communicating whatever comes to mind. Proulx, Helms, and Payne (2004) suggested that *marriage work* (discussions about concerns and problems in the marriage) in the domains of marital communication, spouses' support for wives' work roles (both inside and outside the home), and social life and leisure were significant predictors of marital satisfaction. It may be that the more wives engage in marriage work with their spouses in these domains, the greater their marital satisfaction. Olson and Olson (2000, as cited in Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, & Gh. Lavasani, 2010) found to be reporting as happy couples indicated comfort in sharing their feelings with their spouse. At the same time unhappy couples reported that their partners did not know how they felt.

Constructive conflict resolution strategies are associated with high levels of marital satisfaction (Greeff & DeBruyne, 2000; Marchand & Hock, 2000; Fincham & Beach, 1999; Gill, Christensen, & Fincham, 1999). Constructive processes in conflict resolution strategies include interactions involving cooperation, problem solving behaviors, intentions to learn about the other's needs, willingness to talk about disagreements, and focus on the relationship rather than the individual.

Sharing preferences can lead to better sexual and relational satisfaction (MacNeil & Byers, 2005). If little to no sexual disclosure occurs in a marital relationship, dissatisfaction could result when partners are unable to understand each others' interests, desires, or concerns (Coffelt & Hess, 2014). Sexual communication contributes to sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction (Montesi, Fauber, Gordon, & Heimberg, 2010), marital satisfaction (Chesney, Blakeney, Cole, & Chan, 1981) and marital quality (Sprecher & McKinney, 1992). These findings imply that revealing sexual information is positively associated with relational outcomes, and concealing sexual information is negatively associated with relational outcomes (Coffelt & Hess, 2014). It has been found that when women make self-disclosures about their sexual likes and dislikes, they experience more emotional intimacy, which leads to greater sexual satisfaction (Theiss, 2011).

But existing evidence also shows that sharing deeply personal information about oneself is found to be less appropriate in some cultures like China (Chen, 1995, as cited in Gere & MacDonald, 2013). Also it was suggested by Sandhya (2009) that self-disclosures that may be perceived as negative to one's partner or partner's significant family members may not promote intimacy between the couples.

Openness is an important aspect in communication that increases the level of intimacy in a relationship. Montgomery (1981) defined openness as being able to disclose one's feelings and being able to accept the disclosures that come from others. Openness increases the level of intimacy in a relationship. Eseré and Idowu (2000) have reported that spouses achieve marital happiness and satisfaction when they are sufficiently open to each other. Women's self-perceived relationship satisfaction was more determined by the openness of men (Neyer & Voigt, 2004). Lack of openness has been cited as a common problem in romantic relationships (Baxter, 1986).

Responsiveness is another important pattern necessary in couple interaction, which includes behaving in a warm, sensitive manner that is contingent on and supportive of the other person's needs, emotional states, and circumstances. People who perceive their relationship partners as responsive feel close, satisfied, and committed to those relationships (Reis, Clark, & Holmes, 2004, as cited in Gable & Reis, 2012). Sandhya (2009) suggested that perceived responsiveness by the partner is critical for the marital happiness of Indian couples. Reis and Shaver (1988) emphasized the importance of responses to disclosure that confirm and validate the partner's feelings. Since responsiveness tends to be reciprocated, it serves to build up positive feelings (Huston & Houts, 1998).

Perceiving in an actual meaning when communicating something in a particular context is also important. The messages sent in communication are not always the message received because of the layers of meaning. To pick up the right meaning, one's spouse has to vibrate with him/her on a feeling level (Eseré, 2002). Ellis (1973) explained that marital relationship could be ended because of spouses' faulty and irrational perceptions which do not encourage marital joy or happiness, satisfaction, and emotional stability (Eseré, Ake-Yeyeodu, & Oladun, 2014).

Mutual discussion in this context means reaching in a conclusion only after discussing with the spouse, regarding the matters related to spouses. They may include matters related to finance such as buying loans, family planning such as usage of contraceptives or the decision to have children, and so forth. Reaching conclusions after making decisions together in such matters have been reported as increasing wellness in the couple relationship, than taking decision alone.

Couple interaction is one of the most human relationship which involves non-verbal communication. Most of the time, non-verbal communication is expressed in the form of emotions, especially in couple relationship. If the spouse is felt as easily accessible to the other spouse for expressing any kind of emotion, then the spouse is felt as a comfortable figure, in the opinion of interviewees; that is, when the spouse is able to understand the particular situation which cause the emotion. It was emphasized by the findings of Cordova, Gee, and Warren (2005) in which it was proposed that emotional skillfulness and the ability to express emotions was found to be positively related to marital adjustment.

Intimacy

Without intimacy, marriage is meaningless. Intimacy is considered as universal drive (Buss, 1985; De Munck, 1996, 1998). Sandhya (2009) suggested that if individuals value intimacy, then violations of their expectations of intimacy may be expressed through conflicts within couples and affect their happiness. She added that the expression of intimacy in the form of behaviors was critical for marital happiness, rather than its avoidance.

Intimacy can be built by working or reaching a consensus together, thus unpleasant circumstances and unexpected crises cannot easily destroy it (Eseré & Idowu, 2000). Intimacy of marriage forces hidden elements of each partner's personality into the open (Waller, 1938).

Intimacy among couples can take various forms such as physical intimacy and psychological intimacy. Sexual intimacy

relates to emotional intimacy (Harbin & Gambel, 1977).

The study conducted by Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, & Gh. Lavasani (2010) shows that those couples who self-described their marriage as happy, had intimate relationships with each other and with other people. Greeff and Malherbe (2001) found that higher levels of intimacy were associated with higher levels of marital satisfaction.

Intimacy is expressed by keeping *confidentiality* in couple matters from others; and also by showing *attachment* and *companionship* to the spouse. Attachment between men and women cause to develop enduring affiliate bonds, which are the origins of family ties. Attachment keep partners together for a particular time necessary for generating and raising children which results in an affective partnership (Fisher, Aron, Mashek, Li, Strong, & Brown, 2002).

Feeling and showing *affection* is another important characteristic of intimacy. Rusbult, Bissonnette, Arriaga, and Cox (1998) discussed that healthy couple functioning includes expression of physical and verbal affection, engaging in shared activities, and so forth. In the words of Huston and Houts (1998), husbands and wives married to mates who are affectionate see their spouses as having a “responsive” personality.

Companionateness with their partners is a powerful predictor of well-being in stable marriages. Companionateness with spouse tends to be related to marital happiness for wives (Veroff, Douvan, Orbuch, & Acitelli, 1998). Mckenzie (2003, as cited in Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, & Gh. Lavasani, 2010) suggested that happy couples had friendly relationship.

Concern for relation

It is relationship-strengthening feelings of closeness. It is expected from people who are concerned about relations some factors such as *compassion, physical support, emotional support, kindness, empathy, appreciation, compromise, caring, soothing, encouragement, taking responsibility and acceptance as a beloved one*.

Spousal support is found to be significant in marital well-being. Greater the support, the greater the marital well-being (Broman, 1993). The support can be in the form of both physical and emotional support.

Spouses find several ways to reach a *compromise*. Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, and Gh. Lavasani (2010) reported that in the case of any disagreements, after a short period of time, both husbands and wives tried to convince each other through reasoning or one of them made concessions to end the argument between them. Esere and Idowu (2000) found that when spouses work together to resolve issues and problems that derive between them, they achieve marital happiness and satisfaction. Ayodele (2001) opined that for marriage stability, couples should always sit together and talk over their differences. As a part of compromising, couples engage in problem-solving behaviors such as use of constructive communicative patterns which are associated with satisfaction, while more dysfunctional patterns, such as the demand-withdraw pattern and mutual avoidance and withholding, are associated with relationship dissatisfaction (Noller & White, 1990). When spouses used more solution-oriented strategies and less nonconfrontation and control, there was more satisfaction and love in the marriage (Wheeler, Updegraff, & Thayer, 2010).

Commitment

Personal commitment refers to being committed to the relationship or the partner (Amato, 2007). Personal commitment is defined as a decision or a deliberate intention to continue a marital relationship, and a psychological attachment to a specific partner and relationship (Adams & Jones, 1997; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Zhang & Tsang, 2013). It is the motivation to maintain a relationship, which requires investments in the relationship. Also it can be considered as a psychological attachment to a specific partner and relationship and also the willingness to invest effort. It is the degree to which spouses intend to maintain their marriage.

Adams and Jones (1997) argued that marital commitment reflects the degree to which spouses intend to maintain their marriage (a) because of their devotion to and satisfaction with the partner, and (b) because of their belief in the sanctity of marriage as a sacred institution as well as their personal sense of obligation to honor their marriage vows.

Personal commitment is an internally based choice to be in the relationship (Lydon, 1999) and is primarily focused on relational rewards, including companionship and psychological attachment (Rusbult & Verette, 1991).

People having commitment in marital relationship are supposed to make *social adjustments, togetherness, providing equality* in couple relationship, *being flexible, forget and forgive, feeling trust and showing trustworthiness*.

Spouses' time together is an important predictor of marital satisfaction (Dew, 2008; Kingston & Nock, 1987). Spending time together allows spouses to establish and maintain their couple identity (Kingston & Nock, 1987). Good times are essential to the maintenance of a successful relationship because these are the times when couples increase their knowledge of each other while expressing their pleasure and concern for each other. Through spending such good times together that range from taking a “trip together” to “sharing a difficult task” couples attempt to bring in novelty to the relationship and tide over difficult phase.

Facing and dealing variety situations in life as pairs also found to be helpful. Lyons, Mickelson, Sullivan, and Coyne (1998) suggested that communal coping which involves the process of viewing the stressor as “our” problem, rather than “yours” or “mine” may be helpful in coping stress between couples.

Couples are supposed to have *equal* power in the couple relationship. Equality is most conducive for building intimate relationships (Mckenzie, 2003; Pillemer, Hatfield, & Sprecher, 2008; Steil & Turetsky, 1987; Walster, Traupmann, & Walster, 1978, as cited in Asoodeh, Khalili, Daneshpour, & Gh. Lavasani, 2010). Pina and Bengtson (1993) reported that wives report lower levels of marital quality when they perceive the division of domestic labor as unequal. The commitment of husbands to role sharing, equity, and being a parent are associated with their marital well-being (Veroff, Douvan, Orbuch, & Acitelli, 1998).

The importance of being flexible was emphasized in the work of Bonanno, Papa, Lalande, Westphal, and Coifman (2004); that is, the successful adaptation of an individual depends on the ability to flexibly enhance or suppress emotional expression in accord with situational demands.

Interpersonal forgiveness in couple therapy was emphasized in the work of Meneses and Greenberg (2014). It emphasizes the

need of forgetting and forgiveness in couple relationship. Olson, Marshall, Goddard, and Schramm (2015) also emphasized spousal forgiveness as a buffer against stressful marriage. Forgiveness is associated with positive marriage outcomes including marital longevity, dyadic adjustment, empathy and positive interpersonal interactions (Burr, Marks, & Day, 2012).

Positive relation was found between forgiveness and various indicators of marital well-being including positive assumptions towards self and partner, psychological closeness with partner, investment in marriage, shared power in marriage, and generally marital adjustment (Gordon & Baucom, 2003). Spouse's ability to forgive transgressions was associated with relationship satisfaction and marital commitment (Braithwaite, Selby, & Fincham, 2011; Kachadourian, Fincham, & Davila, 2004; Paleari, Regalia, & Fincham, 2005; Tsang, McCullough & Fincham, 2006).

Trust have been identified as critical for a relationship to be successful (Rempel, Ross, & Holmes, 2001). Trust is considered as one of virtues which became important as the partners disclose to one another (Fowers, 2001). Trust is enhanced by the perception that one's partner is willing to accommodate, or to depart from immediate self-interest for the good of the relationship. Trust represents confidence in the strength and quality of the partner's commitment (Rusbult, Bissonnette, Arriaga, & Cox, 1998). In his opinion, *trustworthiness* is another virtue that is necessary for mutual self-disclosure. Being able to rely on one's partner to respond to one's self-revelations in a compassionate and caring manner at the time and to avoid misusing it later is only possible when the partner is faithful and trustworthy.

Personal characteristics

It is meant by the acquisition of some personal characteristics such as *patience, calmness, modesty, politeness, sincerity, emotional maturity and optimism*. People are simply unaware of or confused about the characteristics that are important in a mate (Dijkstra & Barelds, 2008).

Romanticism

Romanticism refers to a set of beliefs about the nature of love and romantic relationships, and more specifically about the characteristics of, or criteria for an ideal relationship. Romanticism commonly involves the idealization of the partner and relationship, or the idea that in true love the relationship will be perfect and the partner will meet all of the individual's needs. Second theme involves the idea that there is one perfect person in the world for everyone and that individuals have only one true love in their lives. Romanticism also tends to involve the belief that love is the only legitimate basis for mate selection. Romantic beliefs act as cognitive schema that are believed to be relatively persistent and form a frame of reference for attending to, interpreting, and responding to information and experiences in romantic relationships (Bartell, 2009).

It is a composition of romantic characters that include *sexual gratification, make flirts with the partner, sexual attachment, expression of romantic love, showing fondness in the partner, keeping fidelity*, and so forth.

Marital satisfaction is significantly and positively associated with sexual satisfaction (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Henderson-King & Veroff, 1994). Sex is considered as an essential element of relational intimacy, key to personal fulfillment, and crucial for relationship longevity (Michael, Gagnon, Laumann, & Kolata, 1994). Sexual intimacy relates to emotional intimacy (Harbin & Gambel, 1977). An abundance of past research has indicated that frequency of intercourse, as well as frequency of orgasm, is positively associated with sexual satisfaction (Barrientos & Paez, 2006). Moreover, Santilla and colleagues (2008) indicated that specific sexual behaviors could impact one's sexual satisfaction (Ashdown, Hackathorn, & Clark, 2011). Many men and women view sexual activity as a gauge of marital success and they considered sex as an integral part of marital success (Elliott & Umberson, 2008).

The study conducted by Hess and Coffelt (2012), Cameron and Kulick (2003), and Litzinger and Gordon (2005) reported that the use of sexual vocabulary as more important to marital relationship; to relational satisfaction as well as closeness. Lack of warm relations and inability in revelation and exchange of emotions is from specifications of couples who suffer sexual inactivities (Farah & Shahram, 2011). Thus in several forms communication, sexual satisfaction and marital satisfaction are highly interdependent (Burlison & Denton, 1997).

Bartels and Zeki (2000) stated romantic love as a complex sentiment involving erotic, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. Romantic love has been considered as the basis of modern Western marriage by Giddens (1992). Romantic love is characterized by obsessive thinking of the loved one and desire of emotional union with the partner (Tennov, 1979). Love is also considered as a universal drive (Buss, 1985; De Munck, 1996) which promotes positive states and emotions (Gala & Kapadia, 2013) and thus relationship satisfaction (Aune & Wong, 2002). Love is considered as the key to long-term relationships and its presence assure endurance of the relationship among the spouses. In such context love provide sexual access to the partner, thus ensure his or her sexual fidelity and promote exclusivity in the relationship. Love indicate relevant resources for parental investment, and sexual and emotional satisfaction (Buss, 2007, as cited in Rebello, Silva Junior, & Brito, 2014).

The foundation of every marriage is fidelity- the moral and legal agreement between two parties that says, "you are the one for me." The unusual characteristic of a man to commit himself to one sexual partner and to maintain that commitment is what civilized man calls fidelity, and the violation of that commitment infidelity. Infidelity is commonly understood as a violation of the marital agreement, a betrayal of one's trust, and a threat to the marital bond. Researches on infidelity has addressed two types of betrayal such as sexual and emotional infidelity. Online infidelity has also been identified (Mao & Raguram, 2009). Online infidelity may occur even in the absence of any inherent problems in marriage and among 'happily married' couples.

In this way, the sub-dimensions of Marital well-being were formed.

Item Construction

The success of psychometric test depends largely upon the construction of effective and objective items which is composed and hence the following points were taken into consideration.

- * In order to reduce overlapping among items it was decided to write most of the items in sub variable wise.
- * To ensure explicit items of the scale, it was written in such a way that can be simply comprehended by individuals having

even moderate knowledge of either Malayalam or English language.

- * Similar words or sentences from one item to another were avoided.
- * It was also kept in mind that the scale would not be lengthy one that it takes only a reasonable time in its completion.

Based on each variable, 86 items were generated in Malayalam language and were translated to English. These items were given to experts in various fields of Psychology and translators to make further modifications regarding clarity of thought, simplification of the language, and any kind of omissions or additions. The tool consisted of only positive items.

Item Analysis

Samples of 407 married people (324 females & 143 males) from different age groups, occupation, culture, education, income, status, and so forth were randomly selected from different districts of Kerala.

A clear instruction in a very simple language both in Malayalam and English were printed on the first page of the scale so that each subject might be able to follow them before he/she starts responding to items. The items were also written both in Malayalam and English languages. Responses on the items were elicited in terms of 5 - point Likert scale, such as *always true*, *usually true*, *sometimes true*, *seldom true*, and *never true*. The subjects were provided with separate space on the scale to mark their answers. The subject could mark his/her responses for each item by putting a tick (✓) mark in the corresponding space given for each item.

Items measuring particular dimension positively and responded as *always true*, *usually true*, *sometimes true*, *seldom true*, and *never true* were given the scores of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. All the items were positive in nature.

Item Selection for the Final Scale

Marital well-being inventory consisted of six variables with a total of 86 items for item analysis. Item analysis was done as per the method suggested by Edwards (1969).

The total score obtained for each variable by each individual has been obtained by finding the sum of the scores of each item in the subscales. The response sheets were arranged in the order of the criterion score (total score) in the descending score. 100 subjects with the lowest score and 100 subjects with the highest total score were taken.

100 subjects having the highest criterion score constituted the upper group; and 100 subjects having the lowest criterion score constituted the lower group. The *t* value of the items of the low and high group was then computed. The value of the *t* obtained was a measure of the extent to which a given statement differentiated between the high group and low group. Any *t* value equal or greater than 1.96 (at .05 level of significance) and 2.58 (at .01 level of significance) were considered to indicate a significant difference. Those items which showed significant difference between high and low groups were usually supposed to be included in the final form of the inventory which is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Marital Well-Being Inventory: t-values of the Draft Scale

Item No:	t-value	Item No:	t-value	Item No:	t-value
1.	5.99**	*30.	9.56**	*59.	8.50**
*2.	9.22**	31.	6.36**	60.	11.34**
3.	10.32**	32.	6.83**	61.	11.56**
4.	7.28**	33.	10.40**	62.	9.05**
5.	7.93**	34.	10.53**	63.	11.94**
6.	9.81**	35.	11.55**	64.	10.98**
7.	9.41**	*36.	12.17**	*65.	10.25**
8.	8.10**	37.	12.35**	66.	10.18**
9.	9.81**	*38.	8.66**	67.	9.95**
10.	9.91**	39.	10.46**	68.	11.94**
11.	11.72**	*40.	9.25**	69.	9.20**
12.	6.10**	41.	8.41**	70.	8.07**
*13.	8.12**	42.	10.40**	71.	8.60**
14.	10.96**	43.	8.76**	72.	7.53**
15.	11.22**	44.	10.19**	73.	6.97**
16.	10.66**	45.	9.11**	74.	11.40**
17.	11.87**	46.	11.78**	75.	7.78**
18.	9.23**	47.	11.25**	76.	10.05**
*19.	8.85**	48.	8.45**	77.	12.08**
*20.	10.31**	49.	9.10**	*78.	13.18**
21.	11.74**	50.	11.93**	*79.	10.32**
22.	13.27**	51.	8.66**	80.	8.64**
23.	7.09**	52.	8.84**	81.	9.62**
24.	10.35**	53.	8.36**	82.	8.19**
*25.	11.05**	*54.	9.81**	83.	9.98**
26.	7.60**	*55.	9.57**	84.	8.05**
27.	7.15**	56.	6.51**	85.	8.43**
28.	8.88**	57.	8.89**	86.	5.51**

*29.	8.70**	58.	3.69**		
------	--------	-----	--------	--	--

**significant at .01 level

Note: Item numbers not selected for final scale are marked with asterisk (*) in the item number.

Usually the items which are marked with (***) are significant at .01 level, were selected for the final scale. Here even though all the items were having high discriminating value for measuring each dimension of Marital well-being, similar items were discarded by the opinion of experts, for the purpose of reducing the length of the inventory and to avoid boredom. They are item numbers 2, 13, 19, 20, 25, 29, 30, 36, 38, 40, 54, 55, 59, 65, 78, and 79. The final form of the inventory on the basis of item analysis was limited to 70 statements in which Communication involves item numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 19; Intimacy 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 63; Concern for relation 20, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49; Commitment 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58; Personal characteristics 59, 60, 61, 62, 64 and 65; and Romanticism 66, 67, 68, 69 and 70.

Thus all the selected items were positive statements and were to be answered with five response categories. Thus a subject could score from a minimum of 70 to a maximum of 350. Higher scores in the final scale indicate individuals having high Marital well-being and low score indicates low Marital well-being.

Reliability and Validity

For the present tool, the reliability of the test has been established by the method of Cronbach's alpha. The inventory was found to be reliable and the Cronbach's alpha was .979.

The inventory has content validity. The face validity of the scale has been assured by many experts in the field. The predictive validity was assured as all items in the final scale had high discrimination power revealed by the significant *t* values during item analysis. The criterion related validity of the scale was found to be 0.68 with the Relationship Quotient Inventory (Jayan & Sreelatha, 2010).

Defining the construct Marital well-being

Marital well-being can be defined as a dynamic state of perceiving reasonable amount of gratification in couple relationship which is characterised by *Communication, Intimacy, Concern for relation, Commitment, Personal characteristics, and Romanticism* which will be facilitated by cognitive, behavioural, and affective domains.

Communication involves behavioural component, Intimacy includes cognitive component, and Concern for relation involves affective component. Commitment is composed of both affective and cognitive component. Romanticism and Personal characteristics are composed of cognitive, behavioural and affective components.

References

- Adams, J. M., & Jones, W. H. (1997). The conceptualization of marital commitment: An integrative analysis. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 72(5), 1177-1196.
- Amato, P. R. (2007). Transformative processes in marriage: Some thoughts from a sociologist. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 69(2), 305-309.
- Ashdown, B. K., Hackathorn, J., & Clark, E. M. (2011). In and out of the bed room: Sexual satisfaction in the marital relationship. *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Assodeh, M.H., Khalili, S., Daneshpour, M., & Gh. Lavasani, M. (2010). Factors of successful marriage: Accounts from self-described happy couples. *Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 5, 2042-2046.
- Aune, K. S., & Wong, N. C. H. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of adult play in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 9(3), 279-286.
- Ayodele, M. O. (2001). Gender agenda, marital stability and predictive adult life. *Nigerian Journal of Gender & Development*, 2(2), 193-200.
- Barrientos, J. E., & Paez, D. (2006). Psycho sexual variables of sexual satisfaction in Chile. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 32(5), 351-368. doi: 10.1080/00926230600834695
- Bartell, D. (2009). Romanticism. In H. T., Reis, & S, Sprecher. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships*(Vol 3, pp.1391-1392). London: SAGE.
- Bartels, A., & Zeki, S. (2000). The neural basis of romantic love. *Neuro Report*, 11(17), 3829-3834.
- Baxter, L. A. (1986). Gender differences in the heterosexual relationship rules embedded in break-up accounts. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 3(3), 289-306. doi: 10.1177/0265407586033003
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex*. New York: William Morrow.
- Bonanno, G. A., Papa, A., Lalande, K., Westphal, M., & Coifman, K. (2004). The importance of being flexible: The ability to both enhance and suppress emotional expression predicts long-term adjustment. *Psychological Science*, 15(7), 482-487.
- Braithwaite, S. R., Selby, E. A., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). Forgiveness and relationship satisfaction: Mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25(4), 551-559.
- Broman, C. L. (1993). Race differences in marital well-being. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 55(3), 724-732. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/353352>.
- Burleson, B. R., & Denton, W. H. (1997). The relationship between communication skill and marital satisfaction: Some moderating effects. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 59(4), 884-902.
- Burr, W. R., Marks, L. D., & Day, R. D. (2012). *Sacred Matters: Religion and Spirituality in Families*. New York: Routledge.
- Buss, D. M. (1985). Human mate selection. *American Scientist*, 73, 47-51.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). *Language and Sexuality*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chesney, A. P., Blakeney, P. E., Cole, C. M., & Chan, F. (1981). A comparison of couples who have sought sex therapy with couples who have not. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 7(2), 131-140. doi: 10.1080/00926238108406099
- Coffelt, T. A., & Hess, J. A. (2014). Sexual disclosures: Connections to relational satisfaction and closeness. *Journal of Sex &*

- Marital Therapy*, 40(6), 577-591. doi: 10.1080/0092623X.2013.811449
- Cordova, J. V., Gee, C. B., & Warren, L. Z. (2005). Emotional skillfulness in marriage: Intimacy as a mediator of the relationship between emotional skillfulness and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 24(2), 218-235. doi: 10.1521/jscp.24.2.218.62270
- Davidson, J. K., & Moore N. B. (1996). *Marriage and Family: Change and Continuity*. USA: A Simon & Schuster Company.
- De Munck, V. C. (1996). Love and marriage in a Sri Lankan Muslim community: Toward a re-evaluation of Dravidian marriage practices. *American Ethnologist*, 23(4), 698-716.
- De Munck, V. C. (1998). *Romantic love and Sexual Behaviour: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Dew, J. (2008). Debt change and marital satisfaction change in recently married couples. *Family Relations*, 57(1), 60-71.
- Dickson- Markman, F., & Markman, H. (1988). The effects of others on marriage: Do they help or hurt? In P. Noller & M. A. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Perspectives on marital interaction* (pp.294-322). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Dijkstra, P., & Barelds, D. P. H. (2008). Do people know what they want: a similar or a complimentary partner? *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6(4), 595-602.
- Doane, M. J. (2016). Cohesion, Marital. In *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Family Studies*, doi: 10.1002/978119085621.wbefs289. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/978119085621.wbefs289/abstract;jsessionid=98FCECC548D0D3D51F7C712AAF897.f03t01>
- Edwards C. J. (1969). *Statistical Power Analysis in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Elliot, S., & Umberson, D. (2008). The performance of desire: Gender and sexual negotiation in long-term marriages. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 70(2), 391-406.
- Ellis, A. (1973). *Humanistic Psychotherapy: The Rational-Emotive Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Esere, M. O. (2002). Approaches to marital therapy. *The Nigerian Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 8(1), 61-85.
- Esere, M. O., & Idowu, A. I. (2000). The effects of cognitive restructuring in resolving marital conflicts among selected couples in Ilorin. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6(1), 87-98.
- Esere, M. O., Ake-Yeyeodu & Oladun, C. (2014). Obstacles and suggested solutions to effective communication in marriage as expressed by married adults in Kogi State, Nigeria. *Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 584-592.
- Farah, L. K., & Shahram, V. (2011). The effect of sexual skills training on marital satisfaction. *Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 30, 2581-2585.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. (1999). Marriage in the new millennium: Is there a place for social cognition in marital research?. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 16(6), 685-704.
- Fincham, F. D., & Rogge, R. (2010). Understanding relationship quality: Theoretical challenges and new tools for assessment. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 2(4), 227-242. doi:- 10.1111/j. 1756-2589.2010.00059.x
- Fisher, H., Aron, A., Mashek, D., Li, H., Strong, G., Brown, L. (2002). Defining the brain systems of lust, romantic attraction and attachment. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 31(5), 413-419.
- Fowers, B. J. (2001). The limits of a technical concept of a good marriage: Exploring the role of virtue in communication skills. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 27(3), 327- 340.
- Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the couples' satisfaction index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(4), 572-583.
- Gable, S. L., & Reis, H. T. (2012). Good news! Capitalizing on positive events in an interpersonal context. In H. T. Reis (Ed.), *Psychology of Close Relationships* (Vol. 4, pp. 305-364). London: Sage.
- Gala, J., & Kapadia, S. (2013). Romantic relationships in emerging adulthood: A developmental perspective. *Psychological Studies*, 58(4), 406-418, doi: 10.1007/s 12646-013-0219-5.
- Gere, J. G., & Macdonald, G. (2013). Assessing relationship quality across cultures: An examination of measurement equivalence. *Personal Relationships*, 20(3), 422-442.
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. U.S.A: Stanford University Press.
- Gill, D. S., Christensen, A., & Fincham, F. D. (1999). Predicting marital satisfaction from behaviour: Do all roads really lead to Rome? *Personal Relationships*, 6(3), 369-387. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00198.x
- Gordon, K. C., & Baucom, D. H. (2003). Forgiveness and marriage: Preliminary support for a measure based on a model of recovery from a marital betrayal. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31,179-199.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce?* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Greeff, A. P., & De Bruyne, T. (2000). Conflict management style and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 26(4), 321-334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/009262300438724>
- Greeff, A. P., & Malherbe, H. L. (2001). Intimacy and marital satisfaction in spouses. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 27(3), 247-257. doi: 10.1080/009262301750257100
- Greenberg, L. S., & Johnson, S. M. (1986). Emotionally focused couples therapy. In N. S. Jacobson., & A. S. Gurman (Eds.). *Clinical Handbook of Marital Therapy* (pp. 253- 276). New York: Guilford.
- Harbin, H., & Gambel, B. (1977). Sexual conflicts related to dominance and submission. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, 11(1), 84-89.
- Henderson- King, D., & Veroff, J. (1994). Sexual satisfaction and marital well-being in the first years of marriage. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 509-534. doi: 10.1177/0265407594114002
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 40 (6), 1150-1159.

- Hess, J. A., & Coffelt, T. A. (2012). Verbal communication about sex in marriage: Patterns of language use and its connection with Relational outcomes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(6), 603-612. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2011.619282
- Huston, T. L., & Houts, R. M. (1998). The psychological infrastructure of courtship and marriage: The role of personality and compatibility in romantic relationships. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The Developmental Course of Marital Dysfunction* (pp. 114-151). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jayan, C., & Sreelatha, N. (2010). *Relationship Quotient Inventory* (Unpublished test). Department of Psychology, University of Calicut.
- Kachadourian, L. K., Fincham, F. D., & Davila, J. (2004). The tendency to forgive in dating and married couples: The role of attachment and relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 11(3), 373-393.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(1), 3-34.
- Kingston, P. W., & Nock, S. L. (1987). Time together among dual-earner couples. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 391-400.
- Lenthall, G. (1977). Marital satisfaction and marital stability. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 3(4), 25-32. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.1977.tb00481.x
- Litzinger, S., & Gordon, K. C. (2005). Exploring relationships among communication, sexual satisfaction, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 31(5), 409-424.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living*, 21, 251-255.
- Lydon, J. E. (1999). Commitment and adversity: A reciprocal relationship. In J. M. Adams., & W. H. Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Commitment and Relationship Stability* (pp. 193-203). New York: Springer.
- Lyons, R. F., Mickelson, K. D., Sullivan, M. J. L., & Coyne, J. C. (1998). Coping as a communal process. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 15(5), 579-605.
- MacNeil, S., & Byers, E. S. (2005). Dyadic assessment of sexual self-disclosure and sexual satisfaction in heterosexual dating couples. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 22(2), 169-181. doi: 10.1177/0265407505050942
- Mao, A., & Raguram, A. (2009). Online infidelity: The new challenge to marriages. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51(4), 302-304.
- Marchand, J. F., & Hock, E. (2000). Avoidance and attacking conflict-resolution strategies among married couples: Relations to depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction. *Family Relations*, 49(2), 201-206. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00201.x
- Meneses, C. W., & Greenberg, L. S. (2014). Interpersonal forgiveness in emotion focused couples' therapy: Relating process to outcome. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 40(1), 49-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2012.00330.x
- Michael, R.T., Gagnon, J. H., Laumann, E. O., & Kolata, G. (1994). *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. USA: Little Brown.
- Montesi, J. L., Fauber, R. L., Gordon, E. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (2010). The specific importance of communicating about sex to couples' sexual and overall relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 28(5), 591-609. doi: 10.1177/0265407510386833
- Montgomery, B. M. (1981). The form and function of quality communication in marriage. *Family Relations*, 30, 21-30.
- Neyer, F. J., & Voigt, D. (2004). Personality and social network effects on romantic relationships: A dyadic approach. *European Journal of Personality*, 18(4), 279-299. doi: 10.1002/per.519
- Noller, P., & White, A. (1990). The validity of the Communication Patterns Questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2(4), 478-482. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.2.4.478>
- Olson, J. R., Marshall, J. P., Goddard, H.W., & Schramm, D. G. (2015). Shared religious beliefs, prayer and forgiveness as predictors of marital satisfaction. *Family Relations*, 64(4), 519-533. doi: 10.1111/fare.12129
- Paleari, F. G., Regalia, C., & Fincham, F. (2005). Marital quality, forgiveness, empathy and rumination: A longitudinal analysis. *Personality & Social Bulletin*, 31(3), 368-378.
- Pina, D. L., & Bengtson, V. (1993). The division of household labour and wives' happiness : Ideology, employment and perceptions of support. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 55(4), 901-912. doi: 10.2307/352771
- Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Payne, C. C. (2004). Wives' domain-specific "marriage work" with friends and spouses: Links to marital quality. *Family Relations*, 53, 393-404.
- Rebello, K., Silva Junior, M. D., & Brito, R. C. S. (2014). Fundamental factors in marital satisfaction: An assessment of Brazilian couples. *Psychology*, 5, 777-784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2014.57088>
- Reis, H., & Shaver, P. R. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 367-389). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Rempel, J. K., Ross, M., & Holmes, J. G. (2001). Trust and communicated attributions in close relationships. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 81(1), 57-64. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.57
- Rosen-Grandon, J. (2001). *Charisma Test*. Retrieved from www.charismatest.com/research/4/what-is-marital-satisfaction
- Rusbult, C. E., & Buunk, B. P. (1993). Commitment processes in close relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 10(2), 175-204.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Verette, J. (1991). An interdependence analysis of accommodation processes in close relationships. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 19, 3-33.
- Rusbult, C. E., Bissonnette, V. I., Arriaga, X. B., & Cox, C. L. (1998). Accommodation processes during the early years of marriage. In T.N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The Developmental Course of Marital Dysfunction* (pp. 74-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandhya, S. (2009). The social context of marital happiness in urban Indian couples: Interplay of intimacy and conflict. *Journal of*

Marital & Family Therapy, 35(1), 74- 96.

Santtila, P., Wager, I., Witting, K., Harlaar, N., Jern, P., Johansson, A.,...Sandnabba, N. K. (2008). Discrepancies between sexual desire and sexual activity: Gender differences and associations with relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 34(1), 31-44. doi: 10.1080/00926230701620548

Sheri, A., & Stritof, B. (2005). *Marital Adjustment and Irrational Beliefs* (3rd ed., pp. 303-305). US: University of Chicago Press.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring Dyadic Adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 38(1), 15-28. doi:- 10.2307/350547.

Sprecher, S., & McKinney, K. (1992). *Sexuality*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tennov, D. (1979). *Love and Limerence: The Experience of Being in Love*. New York: Stein and Day.

Theiss, J. A. (2011). Modelling dyadic effects in the associations between relational uncertainty, sexual communication, and sexual satisfaction for husbands and wives. *Communication Research*, 38(4), 565-584. doi: 10.1177/0093650211402186

Tsang, J. A., McCullough, M. E., & Fincham, F. D. (2006). The longitudinal association between forgiveness and relationship closeness and commitment. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 25(4), 448-472.

Veroff, J., Douvan, E., Orbuch, T. L., & Acitelli, L. K. (1998). Happiness in stable marriages: The early years. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The Developmental Course of Marital Dysfunction* (pp. 152-179). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Waller, W. (1938). *The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation*. New York: Cordon.

Wheeler, L. A., Updegraff, K. A., & Thayer, S. M. (2010). Conflict resolution in Mexican-origin couples: Culture, gender, and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 72(4), 991-1005. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00744.x

Zhang, H., & Tsang, S. K. M. (2013). Relative income and marital happiness among urban Chinese women: The moderating role of personal commitment. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(5), 1575-1584. doi: 10.1007/s10902-012-9396-5

MARITAL WELL-BEING INVENTORY

		Always true	Usually true	Sometimes true	Seldom true	Never true
1.	I can openly talk to my partner about everything.					
2.	We usually discuss about my relationship with other family members of the partner.					
3.	I used to tell my partner whatever thoughts that come to my mind.					
4.	We openly talk our likes and dislikes about sex					
5.	Open communication between us in easy.					
6.	We share with each other interactions with other family members.					
7.	I talk to my partner like a friend.					
8.	We openly talk about sexual enjoyment.					
9.	While discussing matters we pay attention to each other.					
10.	We have the ability to understand the things communicated between us in a proper manner.					
11.	No such situations arise for me where I have to think that I shouldn't have said that.					
12.	We decide everything after discussing with each other.					
13.	I used to express all my feelings to my partner.					
14.	I feel uneasy whenever my partner is not with me.					
15.	We are faithful to each other.					
16.	My partner doesn't expose simple issues between us before others					
17.	There have been incidents where my partner read my mind before myself disclosing it.					
18.	My partner is someone who gives me courage.					
19.	My partner doesn't use words with inner meaning.					
20.	We deliberately try to stop our disagreement from lasting long.					
21.	At times we try to build a world of our own.					
22.	We try to make our presence feel to each other at any given situations.					
23.	We try to be together whenever it is possible.					
24.	We try to have food together.					
25.	We call atleast once in a day, even if we are away from each other.					
26.	I feel like I can't live without the love of my partner.					
27.	I feel my partner is like a friend.					
28.	My partner promises to be with me whenever I'm facing a problem.					
29.	My partner is able to forget and forgive my mistakes.					
30.	We don't look back the issues of the past.					
31.	If I'm working alone, my partner tries to help / offers to share the work.					

		Always true	Usually true	Sometimes true	Seldom true	Never true
32.	My partner keeps aside his or her things and tries to help me when I'm in need.					
33.	My partner provides emotional support by understanding the situation.					
34.	My partner's support empowers me during crucial situations.					
35.	My partner empathises with me.					
36.	My partner has the ability to think from my perspective in different situations.					
37.	My partner feels my pain with the same intensity.					
38.	My partner appreciates my activities.					
39.	We move forward by correcting mistakes and trying not to repeat them.					
40.	In all matters my partner is concerned about me.					
41.	We ask each other about daily events.					
42.	My partner is careful about my health.					
43.	We talk, make jokes and laugh at each other while on outing.					
44.	While talking we look at each other's face.					
45.	We console each other.					
46.	My partner encourages me in my success.					
47.	My partner notices things at home without any indications from my side.					
48.	I feel like I am very dear to my partner.					
49.	My partner accepts my love completely and loves me in return.					
50.	My partner respects my relatives.					
51.	My partner has compromising attitude.					
52.	My partner has the ability to behave according to the situation.					
53.	We together make decisions regarding family planning.					
54.	While moving on with our life, we never distinguish as 'I' and 'you', we always take it as 'us'.					
55.	My partner stands with me during problems.					
56.	We could overcome obstacles.					
57.	Wife and husband have equal importance in our relationship.					
58.	My partner gives me freedom as an individual.					
59.	My partner has patience.					
60.	My partner doesn't suppress me by getting angry, staring and also not by other means.					
61.	My partner maintains austerity in life.					
62.	My partner doesn't hold the attitude that I can't do anything without his/her help.					
63.	We feel that only death can separate us.					
64.	Arguments are less between us.					
65.	We are optimistic.					
66.	We seek novel ideas in sex.					
67.	My partner flirts with me when I am free.					
68.	My partner expresses romance towards me.					
69.	There is love between us.					
70.	I am not interested in extra marital affairs.					