ISSN: 0976-2876 (Print) ISSN: 2250-0138(Online)

# THE RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING WITH MARITAL QUALITY AND THE DIMENSIONS OF THE MARRIED STUDENTS

## AMIRHESAM KHAJEH<sup>a1</sup>, MOHAMMAD GOODARZI<sup>b</sup> AND FATEMEH SOLEIMANI<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>M.A. in Family Counseling, Counseling Department, Esfahan University Branch, Esfahan, Iran <sup>b</sup>M.D, General practitioner, Islamic Azad University of Najafabad <sup>c</sup>M. A. in Clinical Psychology, Islamic Azad University Najafabad Branch

#### **ABSTRACT**

The present study examined the relationship of psychological well-being and quality of marital relationships. Study sample of 100 married students (50 females and 50 males) were available for sampling from the married students of Islamic Azad University in the academic year 2009-2010. Data collectionwas used by the marital quality scale (Fletcher et al, 2000) and psychological well-being scale (Reef, 1980). For statistical test, regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Results indicated that marital quality may be to predict a percentage of married men and women's psychological well-being.

KEYWORDS: Psychological Well-Being, Marital Quality, Student

Since very long time, the question has been what makes the happiness and well-being. Ryff & Keyes (1995) proposed a model of psychological well-being in the last decade; a model was which is widely used in the world by researchers such as Clark & Marshall & Wheaton (2001), Dierendonek (2005), Cheng & Chan (2005) and Lindfors & Berntsson & Lundberg (2006). Psychological well-being is a multi-component concept and including:

1-Self-acceptance: the positive attitude of selfacceptance and positive aspects like good and bad characteristics, and positive feeling about past life; 2-Positive relation with others: a sense of satisfaction and intimacy relationships with others and understanding the dependencies 3-Autonomy: independence effectiveness of the active role of life events and behaviors; 4 - Environmental mastery: a sense of mastery over the environment, outdoor activities and effective utilization of the opportunities around 5 - Purpose in life: having a purpose in life and a belief that life past and present life is significant; 6 - Personal growth: a sense of sustained growth and to gain new experiences as one of the potential talents (Reef and Chassis 1995; Reef and Singer, 1998).

In Case and Shamokinand Reef's view (2002), psychological well-being and quality of life encompasses other social units. Marital quality is including compatibility and high level of quality is determinant of tangible characteristics of relationship (partners) such as Companionship, good communication and a lack of conflict that characterizes the relationship between

adaptation and satisfaction of the relationship and the wife and the structure of marital quality combines consistency satisfaction in a broader sense in more comprehensive and extended sense (Lavee, Y.Katz, R, 2002).

So the multidimensional marital quality marital quality include not only the characteristics of the individual, but also the characteristics of the individual partners and therefore Gong, M (2007) knows a relative agreement of couple about significant issues such as contributing common activities and cooperation in the work and love to each other as marital quality. Marital quality reflects internal evaluation of some aspects of the couple's relationship and scope of the evaluation that includes a range of values and wide specification of interactivity and marital function, high marital quality leads to the desired consistency, and good communication and high levels of marital satisfaction (Tabrizi2006). Marital qualityis a process that has been identifiedby mediatingamong marital quality and marital conflict, anxiety, relationship satisfaction, and consensus decisionmaking (Spanier&Lewise, 1980; Nielsen, 2005; quoted King Black, 2008). Obrien (1995) examined 120 out of 60 married couples who married for twenty or more years passed the many qualities of researchers concentrated who were involved in the marriage last long, , they found a sympathetic understanding of one's spouse, significant effects on wives' marital satisfaction and quality in the early years and later years (Larned, AG 2006).

Quality of marriage among men and women has a gender perspective, for example, Locksley (1980) reported that women who reported dissatisfaction towards the relationship and misunderstandings about the fact that most of the wives are misunderstanding each other (Ayles 2004).

Rowan & et al (1995) examined the relationship self-actualization and between empathy, satisfaction and began making assumptions that both selfactualization and empathy also directly affect marital satisfaction (quoting Larnd, 2006). Kimweli & Stilwell (2002) in a research studied factors that increase subjective well-being and quality of life for communities and individuals and are important to identify those who had looked after the welfare and quality of life; psychological factors such as consistency with the basic values of society, personal progress and regress, belonging adaption, having the ability and the power of personal and demographic variables such as age, gender, religion and other variables involved in the promotion of these variables.

Based on what was said, the present study found a relationship between psychological well-being and marital quality among married students (male and female).

### RESEARCH METHOD

The population and sample: it is a correlation study and the population is married students (male and female) from Islamic Azad University of Shahreza in the academic year 2009 to 2010 and the sample included 50 couples (100 individuals) of married students (male and women) and sampling was conducted in the sample in access due to lack of students' issues.

## RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Psychological Well-Being Scale: This scale was developed in 1980 by Reef (1995). Original form had 120 questions but further studies were shorter forms of 84, 54 questions, 18 questions that were proposed. 84-item scale was used in this study in terms of form factor; 84-item questionnaire included six autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, and positive relationships with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance, and each factor has 14 questions. Reef's Cronbach's Alpha for each factor listed above were reported0.83, 0.86, 0.85, 0.88, 0.88 and 0.91. In Iran this scale was translated by Bayani et al (2008) they reported the total alpha coefficient 0.89 and alpha coefficients for the subscales of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships with others, purpose in life and self-

acceptance were 0.65,0.75, 0.76, 0.66, 0.57 and 0.59, respectively.

## **Marital Quality Scale**

This scale contains 18 items that every three questions measures an area and a total of six domains include: satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, trust, passion and sexual excitement and quality of love. These scales were made by Fletcher and colleagues in 2000 and Cronbach's alpha for each scale were noted in 0.91, 0.96, 0.86, 0.78, 0.86 and 0.89 of the total alpha 0.85 were reported. Thisscale was translated by Nilforushan in Iran (2009) and validity of the scale has been confirmed by several university professors and Counseling Psychology Department. Nilforushan has reported Cronbach's alpha of the 0.95 based on sex in women 0.95 in males 0.94 and reliability coefficients were reported in method of retest for the total scale0.95 and in the terms of sex, women 0.96 males 0.91.

#### RESULTS

In this part of the research data is presented in descriptive and inferential statistics.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of variables (Psychological Well-being and marital quality)

Variables	Mean	ST	Number
psychological well-being	301.22	39.15	100
marital quality	98.22	19.33	100

Table 1 shows mean and standard deviation of variables (psychological well-being, marital quality). As shown in Table 1 isobserved, mean variables of psychological well-being and quality of marital relationships were 301.22 and 98.22 and standard deviation, 15.39 and 33.19 respectively.

Table 2: Pearson correlation coefficient between the criterion variable (psychological well-being), and the predictor variables (marital quality)

Variable		Marital quality
Psychological well-being	Pearson correlation	0.61
	Significance	0.000

Table 2 summarizes the results of Pearson correlation coefficients between variables, psychological

well-being (the criterion variable) and marital quality (predictive variable)

the significance level of the variables (0.05> P) which suggests the relationship between variables is significant.

Pearson correlation of psychological well-being with marital quality is 0.61. As observed in above table,

Table 3: Share of marital quality variables that is predicted by psychological well-being (stepwise method)

variables c	correlation coefficient	determination (R2)	(R)	standard error estimates	
Marital quality	0.21	0.21	0.61	35.12	

As shown in Table 3, in the stepwise regression there is correlation coefficient of 0.31 between predictive (marital quality) and the criterion variable (psychological well-being). These variables and the correlation

coefficient indicate that predictive variable (marital quality) is able to explain about 31.0 of the variance of the criterion variable (psychological well-being).

Table 4: Summary of one-way analysis of variance and regression in Login method

Model	F	Mean	Degrees of	Sum of squares	Significance level	
		squares	freedom (df)			
Regression	19.35	555.26	1	555.26	0.000	
Remaining	-	125.12	98	6222.41	-	
Total			99	6822.31		

Table (4) regression analysis (log) indicates that the predictive variable between (marital quality) is able to predict(P<0.05) the psychological well-being.

Table 5: Coefficients of standard and non-standard in login method

Variables	valuest	Non-standardized coefficients	Non-standardized coefficients	Significance level	
		Beta	Standard error	Beta	
Constants	3.52	-	3.05	14.65	0.000
Marital quality	3.55	0.32	0.08	0.63	0.000

As shown in Table 5 is observed between predictive variable of marital quality beta coefficients between (32.0), having the ability to predict predictive cognitive significance for psychological well-being.

Regression equation derived from regression (enter) is as the following method:

Psychological Well-Being = (65.14) + constant (0.63) variable of marital relationships

Table 6: Summary of Results of simple correlation coefficients between marital quality and its subscales (satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, trust, passion and sexual excitement, love) with psychological well-being

	Passion and	Trust	Intimacy	Commitm	Satisfactio	Marital		
Variable	sexual excitement			ent	n	quality		
0.14	0.24	0.18	0.25	0.18	0.26	.0.26	Correlation	
0.03	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	Significant	
							levels	

As shown in Table (6) there is a meaningful relation between marital quality and psychological well-being subscales (P<0.05).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This issue of Psychological Well-Being and its association with marital quality among married students (male and female), branch of Shahreza, and statistical analysis indicated that the relationship between psychological well-being and quality of marital relationship, according to the obtained correlation coefficient is significant. In research of Sheibani (2007) he investigated the relationship between subjective wellbeing and quality of life as married men and women in Sirjan, the results showed that there was a meaningful mean correlation between subjective well-being and quality of marriage for men and women. The researches of Stutzer & Frey (2006) conducted showed that married people can be effective in increasing the well-being of individuals and studies of Depaulo (2004) Kim & Mckenry (2002) also reported higher happiness by marriage. Research of Forste & Heaton (2004) showed that divorced or widowed people together even when they are married, their new position to increase their personal well-being and other researchers (Diener, 1991; Argyle, 2000; Waite & Gallagher, 2000; Quoted by Kohler & Rodgers & Scythe s, 2004) also concluded that married ones have invariably well-being than those never married.

Accordingly, the results of research, and all these studies have emphasized on the relationship between psychological well-being and marital quality and showed participated in the training program based skills,their quality of life has increased, and this increase in quality of life was also effective in enhancing the well-being of couples consistently. Another finding of the survey subscales of marital quality (satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, trust, passion and sexual excitement, love) and psychological well-being, there is a significant positive relationship. Studies of Emit et al. (1996; quoted Litzinger & Gordon, 2005) and Young et al. (2000), quoted Litzinger and Gordon, 2005) showed that sex and love causesto increase consistency and quality of marital happiness and psychological well-being.

Frozety and Rubio - Kanret (1998, quoted fromGottman & Notarious, 2000) found that personal intimacy and relationship satisfaction, and happiness of the people have relation both cross-sectional and long-term relationship. Spinner and Lewis, 1980 (quoting Litzinger and Gordon, 2005) also stated that a positive association of persons agreed upon marital problems and

causes a person to express love and affection, satisfaction happiness in the marital relationship.

The study on the relationship between psychological well-being and quality of marital relationships has emphasized that the results obtained can be stated that marital quality may be somewhat predictor of psychological well-being, and for this finding it could be said to be married. Recent research centers and marriage counseling can also be used. From limitations of this study, is that we perform research in a sample of university students, Branch of Shahreza who noted that this technique can be extended to reduce the scope of the results and to be followed. It is recommended that further research on the psychological well-being and with more samples and taking into account other factors affect the psychological well-being.

## REFERENCES

- Ayles, C. (2004). Biographical determinates of marital quality. www.oneplusone.org.uk
- Berchard, G. A., Yarhouse, M. A. Kilian, M. K. & Worthington, E. L. (2003). A. study of to marital enrichment programs and couples quality of life. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 31, 3, 240-252.
- Cheng, S., & Chan, A. (2005). Measuring psychological well-being in the Chinese. Personality and individual Differences, 38, 1307-1316.
- Clark, P. J., Marshall, V. W., Ryff. C. & Weaton. B. (2001). Measuring psychological well-being in the Canadian study of the health and aging. International psychogeriatric, 13, 79-90.
- Depaulo, B. M. (2004). The Scientific study of people who are single: An Annotated bibliography. Academic Advisory Board of spectrum Institute, Research and policy Division of the American Association for single people (AASP), Glendale, CA, USA. Retrieved 1 may 2007.
- Desety, J. (2002). Neutralizer I, empathy. Journal of L, Encephala, 28, 9-20.
- Dierendonck, V. D. (2005). The construct validity of Ryff,s Scales of psychological well-being and its extension Differences, 36, 629-648.

- Gong. M. (2007). Does status in consistency matter for marital quality? Journal of family Issues, 28,1582-1610.
- Hajiran, H. (2006). Toward a quality of life theory: Net domestic product of happiness. Social In dictators Research 75:31-43
- Keyes, Corey Lee.M., Dovshomotkin& Carol D. Ryff. (2002). optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of tow traditions. Journal of personality and social psychology 82(6): 1007-1022
- Kimweli, D. M. s., & Stilwell, W. E. (2002). Community subjective well-being personality traits and quality of life therapy. Social indicators research, 60, 1-3, 1930
- Kohler, H., Joseph. L. R. & Axel. S. (2004). Subjective well-being, Fertility and partnerships: A bibliographic perspective. Paper presented at the 2005 Annual meeting of the Population Association of America, 31 march-2 April 2005, Philadelphia, PA. USA.
- Larned. A. G. (2006). Examining expressed empathy, received empathy and a need for power as

- predictors of marital satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, university of Clark.
- Lavee, Y.&Katz,R. (2002). Division of Labor, Perceived Fairness, and Marital quality: The effect of gender ideology. Journal of marriage and family, 64, 27-39.
- Letzinger, S.& Kristina. G. (2005). Exploring Relationship among Communication, Sexual Satisfaction, and marital Satisfaction. Journal of Sex and marital Therapy 31(5): 409-424.
- Lindfors, P., Berntsson, L., & Lundberg, U. (2006). Factor Structure of Ryff
- Psychological Well-being Scales in Swedish me ale and ale white-collar workers. Personality and Individual Differences, 40. 1213-122
- Ryff. C. D. & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of personality and social psychology, 69, 716-727.
- Ryff. C. D. & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. Psychological Inquiry, 9, 1-28.
- Stutzer, Alois.& Bruno. S.F. (2006). Does marriage make people happy or do happy people get married? Journal of Socio-Economics 35(2): 326-347.