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ABSTRACT

MEDIATING ROLES OF SATISFACTION WITH DUAL-CAREER LIFESTYLE AND RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION IN THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN INVESTMENTS AND COMMITMENT

Üçok, S. Burcu
Ph.D., Department of Educational Sciences
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Hatipoğlu Sümer

August 2019, 209 pages

The aim of the current study is to explore the potential mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments (past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, planned intangible) and commitment, in Turkish dual-career married couples. The participants of the study comprise of 213 dual-career married couples (N=426) between the ages of 19-60, who have been married for at least 7 months. Participants were reached via snowball and purposive sampling techniques. Turkish versions of the Investment Model Scale, Past and Planned Investments Measure, and Satisfaction with the Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale along with a demographic form were used to gather data.

Two models were proposed in the current study. In the first model, the mediating roles of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction in the relationship between past investments and commitment were examined. In the second model, the mediating roles of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction...
in the relationship between planned investments and commitment were examined. Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) was conducted primarily to test the proposed models.

The results of APIMeM analyses revealed that the associations between past intangible investments and commitment were partially mediated through relationship satisfaction for both wives and husbands. Moreover, the associations between planned intangible investments and commitment were also partially mediated through relationship satisfaction for both wives and husbands.

Consequently, the findings were discussed in relation to the relevant literature, implications for counselors were mentioned, and recommendations for future research were presented.

**Keywords:** investments, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, relationship satisfaction, commitment, actor-partner interdependence model
Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’deki çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerde yatırımlar (geçmiş maddi, geçmiş manevi, gelecek maddi, gelecek manevi) ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyum ve ilişki doyumunun aracı rollerinin incelenmesidir. Çalışmanın örneklemi, yaşları 19 ile 60 arasında olan, en az 7 aydır evli, 213 çift-kariyerli (her ikisi de çalışan) evli çift (N= 426) oluşturmıştır. Katılımcılar, kartopu ve amaçlı örneklemeye yöntemleriyle ulaşılmıştır. Çalışmada veri toplama amacıyla, İlişki İstikrarı Ölçeği, Geçmiş ve Gelecek Yatırımlar Ölçeği, Çift-Kariyerli Yaşam Tarzı Doyumu Ölçeği ve demografik form kullanılmıştır.

Çalışmada iki model test edilmiştir. Birinci modelde, geçmiş yatırımlar ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyum ve ilişki doyumunun aracı rolleri incelenmiştir. İkinci modelde ise, gelecek yatırımlar ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyum ve ilişki doyumunun aracı rolleri incelenmiştir. Önerilen modelleri test etmek amacıyla Aktör-Partner Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Aracılık Modeli (APIMeM) kullanılmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, çalışmanın bulguları ilgili alan yazıları ışığında tartışılmış, psikolojik danışmanlara yönelik uygulama önerilerinde bulunmuş ve gelecek araştırmalar için öneriler sunulmuştur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** yatırımlar, çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumu, ilişki doyumu, bağlılık, aktör-partner karşılıklı bağımlılık modeli
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Over the past three decades, researchers in the field of social sciences have put forth a substantial effort towards understanding why some relationships persevere over time while others deteriorate or die. Social scientists have inferred that the best way to understand persistence in a relationship is to investigate the determinants and the consequences of positive feelings in a relationship such as love, attraction, or satisfaction (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). The basic assumption is that if partners love each other or if they are feeling happy with their relationship, it is more probable that they will persist in that relationship. To some degree, this assumption seems logical since partners would choose to stay in their relationship given that the positive feelings outweigh the negative. However, some other researchers have suggested that it is an oversimplification to explain the cause of persistence as stemming only from a high level of happiness (Rusbult et al., 1998). Therefore, three issues that happiness/satisfaction cannot explain were discussed by Rusbult and her colleagues (1998). First issue is that, despite dissatisfaction, some relationships persist. Secondly, it is known that some satisfying relationships come to an end. Couples leave their happy relationships for the sake of their tempting alternatives, and the third issue is standing tall against fluctuations in a relationship or not. Even in the strongest of the relationships, satisfaction levels may destabilize, and desirable alternatives may threaten even the most affected couples. Under such circumstances, how some relationships survive against the fluctuations and some does not worths searching for (Rusbult et al., 1998).
Acknowledging that relationship satisfaction and relationship persistence are mostly independent variables, social scientists have produced several theories to explain commitment. What all share is that, commitment is the key feature in understanding why some relationships persist while others do not (e.g., Adams & Jones, 1997; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Brickman, Dunkel-Schetter, & Abbey, 1987; Johnson, 1991; Kelley, 1983; Levinger, 1979; Rusbult, 1980; Stanley & Markman, 1992).

Among these theories, the Investment Model has been proven to be reliable in explaining commitment and its determinants. The Investment Model emerged from the Interdependence Theory and utilizes interdependence structures to explain the dynamics of persistence in a relationship (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Interdependence Theory has a unique and powerful emphasis on the interdependence structure, which characterizes an existing relationship irrespective of the character, attitudes, and outlook of the individuals in the current relationship. Dependence is the key feature of interdependence (Kelly, 1979; Rusbult et al., 1998), and level of dependence refers to degree in which an individual needs a specific relationship (Kelly, 1979; Rusbult et al., 1998). Here, the question of how individuals become dependent on any given relationship emerges. Interdependence Theory suggests two main processes through which dependence grows. Firstly, and consistent with the emphasis on positive affect in the field, individuals are usually dependent as long as they are highly satisfied in their current relationship (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Satisfaction is defined as the positive versus negative affect experienced in a relationship. If the individual’s needs are fulfilled by their partner, the individuals’ satisfaction of the relationship remains high (Rusbult et al., 1998). Nevertheless, satisfaction is not the sole measurement of dependence; rather, quality of alternatives is a significant factor, too (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The quality of alternatives refers to an alternative to the primary relationship, which is perceived to be attractive, desirable, and available (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Rusbult et al., 1998; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The quality of alternatives is determined by the extent to which needs are met outside of the current relationship, by friends, family, or on his/her own (Rusbult et al., 1998). Hence, Interdependence Theory (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) posits that
so long as an individual desires to stay in a relationship with a given partner (satisfaction level is high) and inasmuch as the individual has no available choice outside of the relationship (alternatives are poor), dependence on the relationship increases.

The Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980, 1983), which is embedded in Interdependence Theory (Rusbult et al., 1998; Rusbult, Arriaga, & Agnew, 2001), extends the theory and suggests that neither satisfaction nor quality of alternatives solely and fully explains dependence. The relationship may also falter in the case of poor outcomes along with attractive and available alternatives, such as partners, family members, friends, or loneliness. Few relationships endure if only the positive affect keeps the couples together when the possible positive outcomes already exist outside of the relationship (Rusbult et al., 1998). Virtually, some relationships persevere despite an attractive and available alternative and despite a lower happiness factor. This assumption arises a question: How can persistence be explained in situations where alluring alternatives and undulating satisfaction are present? Accordingly, the Investment Model affirms that a third factor influences dependence, which is investment size (Rusbult et al., 1998).

Investment size is defined as “the magnitude and importance of the resources that are attached to a relationship” (Rusbult et al., 1998, p.359). Couples invest many resources to their relationships as their relationships mature, hoping that those investments will enrich and improve them. Rusbult et al. (1998) argue that some investments are indirect and appear when external resources like common friends, self-identity, children or joint properties serve as anchor in the relationship. These resources enhance commitment since investments magnify the negative ramifications of terminating a relationship. In Rusbult’s Investment Model, investments include resources already provided for the relationship that would be lost following a breakup; however, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) propose that the future plans couples have made either individually or with their partner also contribute to a feeling of loss when a relationship ends. In this regard, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) have reconceptualized investments as varying along a temporal dimension including both
past and planned investments. As for the timing of the investments, they have also extended the concept of investments in terms of materiality as tangible and intangible. Tangible investments refer to the “resources that physically exist and are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008, p.2) such as the possessions purchased together, pets, or shared debts. Intangible investments, conversely, are the “resources without material being that are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” such as self-disclosure, time, and effort put into the relationship (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008, p.2). Research findings regarding the relationship between reconceptualized investments and commitment have consistently shown that future-plans are strongly predictive of romantic relationship commitment above and beyond past investments (Agnew, Arriaga, & Wilson, 2008; Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008; Lehmiller, 2010). The literature also suggests that past intangible, planned intangible, and planned tangible investments are significant contributors to the variance in commitment whereas past tangible investments are less powerful in predicting commitment when compared to the other investment types (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008; Lehmiller, 2010). Moreover, they posit that partners who wish to enhance their relationship commitment had better engage in future-plans regarding their relationship. In the current study, both past and planned investments, along with the materiality of each, have been taken into consideration as an addition to Rusbult’s ‘investment’ proposition.

To date, satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investments have been mentioned as bases of dependence. With the increase in dependence, relationship commitment - which refers to the intention to stay in a relationship, in a sense of “we-ness,” - has increased, as well (Agnew, Van Lange, Rusbult, & Langston, 1998; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1998). Empirical findings have indicated that commitment is positively associated with satisfaction and investments and is negatively related to quality of alternatives. Each of these variables has a crucial contribution in explaining commitment (Agnew et al., 1998; Guerrero & Bachman, 2008; Panayiotou, 2005; Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult et al., 1998; Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). Moreover, the studies done in Turkey have revealed findings consistent with the literature that higher satisfaction level, poorer quality of alternatives, and greater investment size lead to
higher levels of commitment (Büyükşahin, Hasta, & Hovardaoğlu, 2005; Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007).

Research also supports the theoretical background of the Investment Model with consistent results in different samples. Cross-sectional studies with college students (Büyükşahin et al., 2005; Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007; Lin & Rusbult, 1995; Rusbult, 1980, 1983), dating, married and cohabiting heterosexual adults (Bui, Peplau, & Hill, 1996; Buunk, 1987; Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007; Lin & Rusbult, 1995; Kurdek, 1993; Rusbult, 1980, 1983; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986c), and homosexual adults (Beals, Impett, & Peplau, 2002; Duffy & Rusbult, 1986; Kurdek, 1991) have also displayed that satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investments are significant predictors of commitment.

Dual-career couples are defined as two people in a committed relationship, each having a career (Hester & Dickerson, 1984; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969) and each actively working (Perrone & Worthington, 2001). The number of dual-career couples has increased in recent years (Neault & Pickerell, 2005) due to the striking changes in the world of work and nature of the family (Bhowon, 2013). In Turkey, Turkish Statistical Institute data on families (TUIK; 2016) have indicated that household obligations and family responsibilities were still gender segregated. While 91.2% of the women reported being responsible for cooking, only 8.8% of the men reported cooking at home. Thereby, most of the people who are in dual-career relationships report to have difficulties in terms of balancing work, family, and personal time (Neault & Pickerell, 2005). The empirical findings have also indicated that dual-career couples experience hardships at individual level, such as lower levels of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, marital, and family satisfaction and increased distress (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Boles, Johnston, & Hair, 1997; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; Kinunnen & Mauno, 1998; Ernst Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). As a result of these hardships and the difficulty to balance work and family life among dual-career married couples, divorce rates increased all over the world, as well in Turkey (Can & Aksu, 2016; Cherlin, 1992; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Eryurt, & Koç, 2012). Moreover, since both of the
couples work in dual-career marriages, investments especially the tangible investments in form of shared possessions, joint debts done by both of the couples have strong impact on stay or leave behavior as well as the intangible investments such as children, time and effort spared for the relationship. Studies indicate that women tend to suffer economically more when compared to men in case of a breakup while men focus more on losing intangible investments like the decreased frequency of seeing their children (Kalmijn, 1999; Kalmijn & Poortman, 2003; Waite & Lillard, 1991). Despite the validation of Investment Model as a reliable theory with various samples, to the knowledge of the researcher, it has not been tested with dual-career married couples which comprised the sample of the current study.

The current study aims to examine the relationship between investments and commitment via relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. Relationship satisfaction has been proven to be both a strong predictor of commitment and a mediator in the associations between relational variables such as attachment (Etcheverry, Le, Wu, & Wei, 2013), physical, psychological, and overall dating violence victimization (Toplu-Demirtaş, Hatipoğlu-Sümer, & White, 2013) and commitment. In spite of its relationship with commitment, satisfaction has received limited attention as a mediator in the relationship between commitment and investments. A similar trend is true for lifestyle satisfaction, which is defined as the positive evaluations of an individual’s life conditions, or an overall assessment of feelings and attitudes about one’s life at a specific point in time ranging from negative to positive (Diener, 1984; Sumner, 1966). There are studies focusing on mediating impact of lifestyle satisfaction in the relationship between psychological well-being and cognitive symptoms (Senol-Durak & Durak, 2011), and between distressing event and neurotic impairment (Baruffol, Gisle, & Corten, 1995). However, despite its strong relationship with job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, and marital quality, life satisfaction has also received limited attention as a mediator. Particularly, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle has been found to mediate the relationship between job-family role strains and marital quality in Perrone and Worthington’s (2001) study with 52 dual-career married couples. Apart from these, the studies in literature fall short of explaining the mediating impact of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-
career lifestyle in the relationship between relational variables and commitment, especially with dual-career married couples. Gender is an important variable to be studied in the current study as well since studies in the literature emphasize that commitment along with investments, relationship satisfaction, and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle differ with respect to gender. There is increasing evidence in the literature that commitment has a more important role for men than women in terms of determining relationship behaviors and outcomes (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004; Stanley, Whitton, Sadberry, Clements, & Markman, 2006). Stanley, Rhoades, and Whitton (2010) theorized that whereas women’s behavior in the relationship is mostly influenced by feelings of love and attachment, men’s is driven by commitment, which is built upon interdependence over time. According to the study of Rusbult et al. (1998), women, when compared to men, tend to exhibit higher levels of satisfaction and greater investments in their relationships, which results in more dependence on the relationship and a higher level of commitment. Fitzpatrick and Sollie (1999), Duffy and Rusbult (1986) also reported similar findings that women were more committed than men. On the contrary, in a recent study, men reported higher investments than women (Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). Moreover, there were the studies of Le and Agnew (2003) and Impett, Beals, and Peplau (2001) which found no significant difference between men and women in terms of Investment Model variables.

In conclusion, the world of work and nature of family has been changing (Bhowon, 2013) and Turkey has been a part of this striking change with women being involved more in labor force. This change brings together the economic freedom of women. They earn money, they have words to say, and economic barriers have not been obstacles any more in case of a leave or stay decision. The new lifestyle in which both wives and husbands have been working, not only the men are the breadwinners but women, too (William, Appiah, & Botchway, 2015), doing and planning investments which encourage them to stay in their relationship. However, in the literature, there are not any studies which have examined the relational commitment of dual-career married couples and its relationship with the investments they have done along with the new dual-career lifestyle they have been experiencing. Considering the theoretical
arguments and research findings in the literature, the present study aims to examine the mediating role of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments and commitment in dual-career marriages.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

With the stream of research in mind, the purpose of the current study is to investigate the relationship between investments and commitment in Turkish dual-career married couples, through the potential mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. More specifically, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between past investments and commitment, and the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between planned investments and commitment were investigated in two separate models.

1.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Study

Consistent with the aforementioned purpose of the study, conceptual diagrams of the proposed models are as illustrated in Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2. According to the proposed models, the study addresses following research questions:

*R.Q.1.* To what extent do relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career married lifestyle mediate the relationship between past investments (past tangible, past intangible) and commitment in dual-career married couples? (See Figure 1.1 for the conceptual diagram of the proposed model)

*R.Q.2.* To what extent do relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career married lifestyle mediate the relationship between planned investments (planned tangible, planned intangible) and commitment in dual-career married couples? (See Figure 1.2 for the conceptual diagram of the proposed model)
Based on the purpose and research questions, the following specific hypotheses are to be tested in the current study.

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their own past investments.

- **H1a:** There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on commitment.
- **H1b:** There will not be a significant actor effect of past tangible investments on commitment.

**Hypothesis 2 (H2):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their past investments.

- **H2a:** There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.
- **H2b:** There will be a significant positive actor effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction will be explained by their past investments.

- **H3a:** There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction.
- **H3b:** There will be a significant positive actor effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

- **H4a:** There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on commitment.
- **H4b:** There will not be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on commitment.
Note: PTI = Past Tangible Investments; PITI = Past Intangible Investments; SWDCLS = Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle; RS = Relationship Satisfaction

Figure 1.1 Conceptual diagram of the hypothesized model SWDCLS and relationship satisfaction as mediators, past investments as the predictor variables
Note: PLTI= Planned Tangible Investments; PLITI= Planned Intangible Investments; SWDCLS= Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle; RS=Relationship Satisfaction

Figure 1.2 Conceptual diagram of the hypothesized model SWDCLS and relationship satisfaction as mediators, planned investments as the predictor variables
Hypothesis 5 (H5): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

H5a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H5b: There will be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

H6a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H6b: There will be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction.

Hypothesis 7 (H7): Relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will mediate the relationship between past investments and commitment of couples.

H7a: The relationship between past tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H7b: The relationship between past tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction.

H7c: The relationship between past intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H7d: The relationship between past intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction.

Hypothesis 8 (H8): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their own planned investments.

H8a: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on commitment.
H8b: There will be a significant actor effect of planned tangible investments on commitment.

Hypothesis 9 (H9): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their planned investments.

H9a: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H9b: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

Hypothesis 10 (H10): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction will be explained by their planned investments.

H10a: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction.

H10b: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction.

Hypothesis 11 (H11): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

H11a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on commitment.

H11b: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on commitment.

Hypothesis 12 (H12): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

H12a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H12b: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.
Hypothesis 13 (H13): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

H13a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H13b: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction.

Hypothesis 14 (H14): Relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will mediate the relationship between planned investments and commitment of couples.

H14a: The relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H14b: The relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction.

H14c: The relationship between planned intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

H14d: The relationship between planned intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction.

Hypothesis 15 (H15): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction.

H15a: There will be a significant positive actor effect of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle on commitment.

H15b: There will be a significant positive actor effect of relationship satisfaction on commitment.

Hypothesis 16 (H16): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction.
H16a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle on commitment.

H16b: There will be a significant positive partner effect of relationship satisfaction on commitment.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The aim of this study is to examine the roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with the dual-career lifestyle as potential mediators of the relationship between investments and commitment, in Turkish dual-career married couples.

To the best of researcher’s knowledge, the current study is the first in Turkey to test Investment Model constructs with dual-career married couples, considering the importance of future-plans for relationship commitment at a dyadic level. Although dual-career married couples perform their nuptials with the knowledge and approval of each other’s active involvement in the labor force, they still face hardships throughout their marriages. In this regard, instead of staying in a relationship, couples tend to divorce due to unresolved conflicts, as well as undefined and unmanageable roles, which is easier with women’s economic freedom (Can & Aksu, 2016; Cherlin, 1992; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Eryurt, & Koç, 2012). In the current study, the answer to how dual-career married couples commit to their relationships and which factors affect their commitment are clarified. Therefore, the selection of this specific sample adds to the uniqueness of the current study.

In addition, in the present study, Past and Planned Investments Measure and the Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Questionnaire were adapted to Turkish. Some items of the Past Intangible Investments Subscale overlapped with the items of Investment Size Subscale of the Investment Model Scale; however, the Planned Investments Measure was unique in terms of measuring future-plans of the couples. Utilization of these scales in the current study verifies their usage with Turkish samples and contributes to the evidence of their validity and reliability. Additionally, with the
adaptation of these instruments, it would be possible to carry out cross-cultural research.

Moreover, the current study contributes to the Turkish literature with the methodology used. The Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) was utilized while conducting the main analyses of the study. Particularly, commitment and its correlates have been tested mostly with correlational and regression analysis thus far (Bevan, 2008; Büyüksahin et al., 2005; Panayiotou, 2005; Rusbult et al., 1998; Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). However, recent studies posit that in close relationships while there is an impact of the individual on relationship dynamics, there is also the role of interaction between the couples, affecting each other’s outcome variables, too (Kenny, 1996; Kenny & Cook, 1999). Therefore, instead of reporting individual effects, the current study aimed to take into accounts both the actor and partner effects that dual-career married couples have on each other.

As for counseling, the conceptual research findings recommend strengthening dual-career married couples in terms of the stress created by their changing roles, tasks, and responsibilities (Bebbington, 1973; O’Neil, Fishman, & Kinsella-Shaw, 1987). Most of the dual-career couples probably have grown up in families in which their fathers took the role of a breadwinner and their mothers, a housewife, due to the dominating patriarchal ideology in cultures (Hartman, 1981; Millett, 1970). Although they have been experiencing a new and different lifestyle themselves, they may still have been trying to maintain the traditional roles they were born to apply. Hence, in counseling sessions, the nature of dual-career marriages along with the traditional roles imposed so far can be evaluated. The reflections of these conflicts and the stress arose out of these conflicts on the marriage and on couples’ intention to stay in a relationship (Godenzi, 2012), can be worked on. Moreover, dual-career married couples may ask for counseling to maintain and flourish their relationship, as well (Maples, 1981).

The present study sheds light on the practitioners’ implications regarding their counseling sessions by presenting findings on how investments, relationship satisfaction, and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle are related to the commitment
1.5 Definition of the Terms

In the succeeding section, the definitions of the terms used throughout the study are presented.

**Satisfaction:** Satisfaction is defined as the positive versus negative affect experienced in a relationship as a result of the evaluations of outcomes obtained in the course of interaction with a relational partner (Agnew, Arriaga, & Wilson, 2008).

**Commitment:** Commitment refers to the intention to stay in a relationship, in a sense of “we-ness”, including long-term orientation toward the involvement (Agnew et al., 1998; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1998).

**Past Tangible Investments:** Past tangible investments are the resources which “physically exist and are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” like the
things bought together, having a common pet, etc. (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008; p.1640).

**Past Intangible Investments:** Past intangible investments are defined as “the resources without material being that are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008, p.1640) such as one’s disclosing him/herself, time, and emotional effort.

**Planned Tangible Investments:** Planned tangible investments refer to tangible plans that partners make – either individually or together – regarding the relationship, like planning to buy a house together (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).

**Planned Intangible Investments:** Planned intangible investments are the intangible plans that partners make – either individually or together – regarding the future of their relationship, like planning to have an intellectual life together (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).

**Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle:** Satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle refers to an individual’s satisfaction with life as a whole, in which both of the couples have a career and each working actively (Pavot & Diener, 1993; Perrone & Worthington, Jr., 2001).

**Dual-career Married Couples:** Dual-career married couples refer to two people who are in a committed relationship and working actively (Hester & Dickerson, 1984; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the literature on the constructs of Investment Model, along with the extended description of investments and their relationship to satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle are presented. More specifically, the first section explains (a) the definition and the nature of commitment, (b) theories of commitment (Tripartite Typology, Cohesiveness Theory of Commitment, Interdependence Theory, and Investment Model), and (c) empirical studies of the Investment Model. In the second section, (a) the definition and nature of dual-career marriages along with life satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career married lifestyle, are mentioned.

2.1 Definition and Nature of Commitment

The literature on commitment goes back to the 1950s. The first studies mentioned commitment in the frame of interpersonal relationships (Edwards, 1954; Festinger, 1957), being committed to an institution (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) or feeling committed to a workplace. Examination of commitment to romantic relationships dates to 1960s (Adams & Jones, 1999). Afterwards, since the 1980s, commitment in close relationships has been tested frequently with various samples, in different cultures.

Commitment is a multifaceted phenomenon defined and measured in different ways by multiple researchers through several studies. Considering the close relationships literature, commitment has been defined in various ways; however, its connection with relationship maintenance and persistence has been under focus most of the time. For example, since commitment has been proven to be associated with relationship persistence, strong commitment to a relationship has been defined as having an association with voluntary continuance in the relationship (Bui, Peplau, & Hill, 1996;
Drigotas & Rusbult, 1992; Rusbult, 1983). In this regard, commitment has been described as the causal mechanism by which a variety of relationship-promoting factors lead to relationship persistence (Johnson, 1973; Rusbult, 1983) along with relationship maintenance behaviors such as accommodative behavior, sacrifice for the sake of the partner, and positive illusions concerning the relationship (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993).

Studies of commitment already posit that there are two dimensions affecting commitment. One is the intent to continue a relationship and the other one is to break up. In the relationship, there occurs a tension between orienting towards a partnership and receding from the partnership (Le & Agnew, 2003). In this regard, commitment is considered to evolve because of attractive powers outpowering the resisting ones (Adams & Jones, 1997; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Levinger, 1988; Johnson, 1991; Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Likewise, Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, and Lipkus (1991) have proposed that commitment is the basic determining factor in terms of continuing with or leaving a relationship. Consistent with Rusbult and her colleagues’ (1991) explanation, Fehr (1988) asked college students to choose the words best defining relational commitment and as a result, most of the participants stated that “decisiveness in terms of maintaining a relationship” best defined commitment. The other studies in the literature consistently relate commitment with relationship maintenance and persistence. For example, according to Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, and Agnew (1999), commitment involves intentions to maintain a relationship and psychological attachment. Moreover, for Arriaga and Agnew (2001), commitment is the possibility that an involvement in a relationship will persist. On the other hand, Rusbult and Buunk (1993) state that commitment is more than the intention to maintain a relationship. According to them, commitment represents the willingness to stay in a good or a bad relationship as well as a long-term orientation towards attaching to a partner. Moreover, they suggest that commitment is a subjective situation, and this involves cognitive and emotional dimensions which affect various
behaviors in an ongoing relationship. To summarize the definitions of commitment in the literature, Arriaga and Agnew (2001) have proposed that:

A committed couple member has been described as an individual who (a) has a strong personal intention to continue the relationship (Johnson, 1973; Levinger, 1965; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993), (b) feels attached or linked to the partner (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Stanley & Markman, 1992), (c) feels morally obligated to continue the relationship (Johnson, 1991; Lydon, Pierce, & O’Regan, 1997), (d) imagines being with the partner in the long-term future (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993), (e) places primacy in a relationship over other aspects of life (Stanley & Markman, 1992), (f) has overcome challenges to the relationship (Brickman, Dunkel-Schetter, & Abbey, 1987; Lydon & Zanna, 1990), (g) has relatively poor alternatives to the current relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), (h) has many tangible and intangible resources that would be lost if the relationship were to end (Hinde, 1979; Johnson, 1973; Lund, 1985; Rosenblatt, 1977), and (i) confronts difficulties in ending (or strong social pressure to continue) a relationship (Johnson, 1991; Levinger, 1965; Rosenblatt, 1977) (p. 1191).

This list suggests that relationship commitment is a multifaceted concept (Adams & Jones, 1997). Notwithstanding the variety of definitions, commitment in close relationships has largely been conceptualized as the intention to maintain the relationship in the future, despite its costs or rewards and possible fluctuations in positive feelings (Dandurand, Bouaziz, & La Fontaine, 2013).

2.1.1 Theories of Commitment

Several theories, models or classifications have been proposed aiming to explain commitment (e.g., Agnew et al., 1998; Goode, 1959; Hinde, 1979; Johnson, 1973; Johnson, 1991; Kelley, 1983; Levinger, 1965; Lund, 1985; Rusbult, 1980, 1983). These theories, models or classifications were developed with the aim of explaining why and how individuals commit to their relationships (Berscheid & Regan, 2005; Givertz & Sergin, 2005).

Early theories of commitment pointed out to the positive factors which made people stay in a relationship, like love for a partner or the relational satisfaction level (Agnew,
Later theories counted the important role of positive factors that influence people to continue their relationships. However, they also included the factors which prevent people from leaving their relationships, for example societal disapproval of divorce or the unwillingness to get to know a new person (Agnew, 2009). Currently, the most pervasive theories of relationship commitment are Michael Johnson’s Tripartite Typology, George Levinger’s Cohesiveness Theory, Thibaut and Kelley’s Interdependence Theory, and Caryl Rusbult’s Investment Model (Agnew, 2009).

In especially Turkish literature, Investment Model, which is embedded in Interdependence Theory, is a highly valid model in terms of explaining commitment and its possible associates, when compared to Tripartite Typology and Cohesiveness Theory. Therefore, Tripartite Typology and Cohesiveness Theory are summarized below but Interdependence Theory and Investment Model, which sets the theoretical background of the current study, are presented more in details.

2.1.1.1 Tripartite Typology

Michael Johnson’s Tripartite Typology presents three types of commitment that keeps individuals in a relationship: structural commitment, moral commitment, and personal commitment (Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Caughlin & Houston, 1999). The tripartite framework is different from the Investment Model and Cohesiveness Theory of Commitment since rather than a unidimensional construct, Johnson conceptualizes commitment as a multidimensional construct.

Structural commitment is feeling that the person should remain in a relationship, the feeling of having no choice other than sustaining the relationship (Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Caughlin & Houston, 1999). Structural commitment has four components which complicates ending a relationship (Agnew, 2009). These components are (1) potential alternatives to the current relationship, (2) perceived social pressure to remain with the current partner, (3) irretrievable investments accrued over the course of the relationship, and (4) the perceived difficulty of terminating the relationship (Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Caughlin, & Houston, 1999).
Moral commitment is the feeling that one should remain in a relationship and it consists of three dimensions: feeling obliged not to divorce one’s spouse, feeling personal obligation to the partner, and feeling the need to maintain consistency in one’s own general values and specific beliefs (Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Caughlin & Houston, 1999).

Lastly, personal commitment refers to the feeling that one wants to stay in a relationship, in other words, an individual’s own will to sustain a relationship (Johnson, 1991; Johnson, Caughlin & Houston, 1999). It also has three components: being attracted to a partner, being attracted to the relationship, and one’s relational identity.

Although these models display some differences, they share common points, proposing that there are elements in relationships that may encourage us to stay in the relationship and that may prevent us from breaking up from a partner (Agnew, 2009).

2.1.1.2 Cohesiveness Theory of Commitment

Levinger (1976) specifically aimed at elaborating on the processes involved in both keeping relationships together and breaking them apart. He proposed the Cohesiveness Theory of Commitment, in which he suggested that the chances a marriage will survive depend on three main factors: “the attractions of the relationships (e.g., emotional security, sexual satisfaction); the barriers to leaving the marriage (e.g., social norms, financial pressures); and the presence of attractive alternatives (e.g., a more desirable partner)” (Eysenck, 2004, p.710).

In addition, in 1999, Levinger added another factor to the model, which is ‘barriers around alternative relationships’. For example, a woman may be less likely to leave her husband in favor of another man if the other man is married and has a family. Divorce is most likely “when the marriage has few attractions, when there are only
weak barriers to leaving the relationship, when there are very attractive alternatives, and when there are few barriers to pursuing attractive alternatives” (Eysenck, 2004, p.710).

2.1.1.3 Interdependence Theory

Interdependence Theory is one of the few vital theories to provide a comprehensive evaluation of interpersonal structure (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Rooted in Social Exchange Theory, Interdependence Theory defends a basic assumption: individuals start and continue relationships at least partly because of the benefits supplied in the relationships (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). That is, persistency of a relationship is linked to the benefits and satisfaction of the outcomes coming from that relationship, supplied to the individuals involved in the relationship (Le & Agnew, 2003). In this regard, Interdependence Theory suggests that individuals in a relationship are dependent on each other in terms of the outcome of their behavior since cognitive, affective, and behavioral acts of an individual in a relationship influences his/her partner’s outcomes as well as his/her own outcomes. As individuals in the relationship influence the other partner’s outcomes to be achieved and as the partner has an influence on the individual’s outcomes to be achieved, a condition of mutual dependence develops (Le & Agnew, 2003). Dependence is explained as an individual’s need and reliance on a specified relationship with the aim of obtaining desired outcomes (Le & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1998; Rusbult & Van Lange, 1996).

Outcome value, which is an individual’s subjective evaluation of a relationship regarding the positive and negative aspects associated with it, is a key concept of Interdependence Theory. This concept takes its bases from Social Exchange Theory’s propositions of maximize rewards, minimize costs. Rewards are the things to be appreciated in a relationship, whereas costs are the things to be perceived as unrewarding (Regan, 2011). In this regard, according to Thibaut and Kelley (1959), people evaluate the quality of the outcomes of their relationships based on two criteria: comparison level (CL) and comparison level for alternatives (CLAlt). Comparison
level refers to a standard that people use in order to evaluate the attractiveness or quality of a relationship. People determine an average quality of outcomes expected from a relationship, based on their previous relationship experiences and social comparison. If an individual has gone through a series of highly satisfying relationships, this can increase the comparison level. On the other hand, if a person has experienced not satisfactory relationships, then this would likely decline the comparison level. From this point of view, the degree to which people are satisfied with their relationship is a function of their current outcomes compared to their expectations (CL) (Rusbult, 1980; Rusbult & Arriaga, 1999). When the outcomes in a relationship exceed the comparison level of the individuals, people tend to become more satisfied with their relationship whereas if the outcomes stay lower than the CL, people feel dissatisfied in that relationship. Incidentally, the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is affected by the level of the discrepancy between outcomes and the comparison level. To decide whether a person is satisfied in the current relationship, both quantity and quality of what has been received should be taken into consideration.

Comparison level for alternatives (CLalt) is another standard that people use when deciding to maintain a relationship or not. In this standard of evaluating a relationship, people compare the outcomes from their current relationship to the ones that could be obtained from an alternative relationship (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007; Regan, 2011; Rusbult, 1980; Rusbult & Arriaga, 1999). CLalt is closely associated with the concept of dependence. In case the outcomes from the current relationship exceed CLalt, individuals become dependent on their partners and the relationship follows more stable patterns (Rusbult & Arriaga, 1999). When the outcomes are lower than the CLalt, individuals may decide to break up for the sake of an alternative.

Based on these two comparison levels (comparison level and comparison level for alternatives), the two major processes in which dependence grows through, should be elaborated. One is satisfaction and the other one is quality of alternatives. Interdependence Theory argues that individuals in a close relationship become dependent if they are highly satisfied in that relationship (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Satisfaction is defined as the positive versus negative affect
experienced in a relationship (Rusbult, 1980, 1983). Individuals evaluate the outcome value of their current relationships with their comparison level (CL) and as a result, they define satisfaction levels of their relationship. If the outcomes exceed CL, the relationship is considered as satisfying. In social psychology literature, satisfaction was defined as the happiness in a relationship and was considered as the core element of relationship persistence (Rusbult et al., 1998). However, it was also criticized that happiness would not solely explain persistence (Rusbult et al. 1998). Rather, satisfaction by itself does not determine if a person is committed to a relationship or not although it is one of the strongest factors that contributes to commitment (Macher, 2013; Rusbult, Olsen, Davis, & Hannon, 2004; Rusbult & Martz, 1995; Toplu-Demirtaş, et al., 2013) but quality of alternatives, too.

Quality of alternatives is the quality of the options outside of the current relationship. These options are perceived to be attractive, desirable, and available and have the potential to replace the current relationship (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Rusbult et al., 1998; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Quality of alternatives also refers to the extent that an individual’s needs could be met out of the current relationship, meaning an alternative could provide better outcomes than the existing relationship does (Rusbult et al., 1998). These alternatives need not be another relationship or other people, but loneliness, too. Rusbult and Buunk (1993) state that, “in a general sense, quality of alternatives refers to the strength of the forces pulling an individual away from the relationship, or the degree to which an individual believes that important needs could be effectively fulfilled outside the relationship” (p.182). The research in the literature indicate that people whose relationships end mostly report lower satisfaction in their relationship along with more attractive alternatives when compared to the people whose relationships persist (Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986b; Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985; Simpson, 1987).

In summary, in the Interdependence Theory, dependence is the key feature of interdependence, and it emerges as a result of the interaction between satisfaction and quality of alternatives (Rusbult et al., 1998). Dependence is greater in relationships as long as a relationship provides positive outcomes and the outcomes available outside
of the current relationship are poor (Agnew et al., 1998). Interdependence Theory argues that “the most stable relationships will be those in which partners do not expect a great deal (have a low CL) but actually get quite a lot (receive many positive outcomes) from the relationship (and consequently experience high levels of satisfaction) and have very few attractive alternatives to the relationship (have a low CLalt)” (Regan, 2011, p.101).

2.1.1.4 Investment Model

The fourth most substantial classification of relationship commitment is Rusbult’s Investment Model. As cited in Rusbult (1980), Schelling in 1956 and Becker in 1960 mentioned extrinsic investments; Rubin came up with the concept of entrapment in 1975, a concept very similar to commitment; and Blau covered almost all concepts of the Investment Model in 1967 by referring to the role of alternatives and investments in increasing commitment. Although it was introduced in 1980s, the Investment Model dates to the previous literature (Rusbult, 1980).

Rusbult’s Investment Model (1980; 1983) evolved out of Interdependence Theory. Like Interdependence Theory, the Investment Model argued that more rewards and fewer costs accompanied with lower expectations make people more satisfied with their relationships (Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult, et al, 1986a). Besides agreeing on the two bases of dependence (satisfaction and quality of alternatives), the Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980, 1983) extended Interdependence Theory’s propositions of dependence (Rusbult, Arriaga, & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1998). Just like Interdependence Theory, the Investment Model also suggested that dependence increases to the extent that (a) satisfaction is high, meaning the individual’s most important needs (e.g., the needs for intimacy, sexuality, support, etc.) are gratified in the relationship, and (b) quality of alternative relationships is poor, (e.g., other romantic partners, friends, family, or one’s own). However, Rusbult (1980) has stated that satisfaction and quality of alternatives are not the sole determinants of commitment. According to Rusbult (1980), if these two were the only determinants of commitment, then a very few numbers of relationships would survive. It is observed that people stay in relationships
despite having high quality alternatives and dissatisfaction with their current relationship. In this regard, Rusbult has stated that commitment has been affected by a third dimension, which is investment size (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993).

Investment size is defined as “the magnitude and importance of the resources that are attached to a relationship”. Resources are conceptualized as “the things that would decline in value or be lost in case the relationship ends” (Rusbult et al., 1998, p.359). Specifically, the Investment Model posits that the attraction and dependence in a relationship are highly influenced by the degree of investments one has in a relationship (Agnew, et al, 1998; Rusbult, 1983). Investments in a relationship are in two forms: intrinsic and extrinsic investments as proposed by the Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980). Intrinsic investments are the resources that are directly embedded into the relationship, such as money, emotional efforts, time, and self-disclosures (Rusbult & Martz, 1995); on the other hand, extrinsic investments are the ones that are related to the loss of a subject in case of any break up (Rusbult, 1980). Rusbult has proposed that when people contemplate breaking up with a partner, the reason that keeps them in the relationship is their investments in the relationship. These investments lead people to stay in their relationships because investment behaviors are psychological power to maintain the relationship and they increase the offsets/pays of the relational breakup (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoglu, 2007). In this way, investments increase commitment by trapping the person into the relationship (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993) since, as mentioned before, having invested a lot into the relationship demonstrates that ending the relationship will be costly. In any case, terminating a relationship is sacrificing the resources invested in it. Stanley and Markman (1992) stated that “today’s dedication is tomorrow’s constraint” (p.597).

Investments were mentioned by different scholars in the literature by different names, such as Becker’s “side bets,” Levinger’s “barrier forces,” or Rubin, Blau, and Staw’s entrapment (Rusbult, 1980; Rusbult, 1983). Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) have also proposed an alternative way of considering investments. They categorized investments along a temporal (past and future investments) dimension as well as in terms of whether investments are tangible or intangible (concrete or nonmaterial). To consider
the materiality of the investments, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) have indicated that there are **tangible** and **intangible** investments. **Tangible investments** refer to the resources which “physically exist and are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” (p.1640) like material items bought together, having a shared pet, to name a few. **Intangible investments** are defined as “the resources without material being that are either directly or indirectly tied to the relationship” (p.1640) such as one’s disclosing him/herself, time, and emotional effort (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).

Considering the timing of the investments, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) extends the explanation of Rusbult and her colleagues stating that since investments are the resources to be lost when the relationship ends, the plans partners make together for the future can be lost as well when the relationship ends. This means that the loss of future investments may also influence the decision to stay or not in the relationship. Combining the materiality and the timing of the investments, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) proposed four types of investments: past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments. Past tangible investments would be money spent on the relationship while past intangible investments might be the time spent in the relationship. Planned investments represent the goals and future investments such as buying a home, getting married, having children, or retiring and traveling around the world (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).

Findings in the study of Goodfriend and Agnew (2008), with 173 students (112 females, 61 males) supported this argument that future-plans were strongly predictive of romantic relationship commitment above and beyond past investments. The experimental study of Agnew, Lehmiller, and Goodfriend (2008) has also proven the causal effect of making relationship plans on non-marital romantic relationship commitment. Data from five studies that involved both dating and married couples and college students sample found that intangible and planned investments contribute significantly to the strengthening of commitment (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). Higher levels of planned investments serve as buffers to relationship dissolution (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). Moreover, the studies in Turkey also indicated that increases in satisfaction and commitment were positively correlated with the making of plans regarding the future of the relationship (Öner, 2001; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2003).
Öner’s (2001) study with 226 undergraduate students, eagerness to breakup was found negatively correlated with future-time orientation. Moreover, the relationship satisfaction was found to mediate the relationship between commitment and future-time orientation. Sakallı-Uğurlu (2003) found that high levels of relationship satisfaction led to increases in future-time orientation of 413 (208 males, 205 females) university students. According to these authors, these plans were crucial investments to the relationships (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007). Moreover, in their study with 271 participants who were in ongoing heterosexual relationships, Büyüksahin and Hovardaoğlu (2007) found that future time orientation was a significant contributor to relationship satisfaction and investment size since as the frequency of making future-plans increased, both relationship satisfaction and investment size increased. So far, when the studies of investment were evaluated, it was observed that intangible investments and planned investments counted for the prediction of commitment as well as tangible investments and past investments.

Investment Model hypothesizes that it is not merely the positive qualities that attract partners to each other (satisfaction), but the ties that bind them together (investments) and the absence of a better option out of the current relationship (lack of alternatives) also contribute to the understanding of dependence. As a result, this strengthens the intention to stay in a relationship (commitment). Commitment refers to the degree a person feels attached to a relationship (Le & Agnew, 2003). It is defined as the intention to stay in a relationship, in a sense of “we-ness” including long-term orientation toward the involvement (Agnew, Van Lange, Rusbult, & Langston, 1998; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1998). It is a multifaceted and blended phenomenon, which emerges as a result of the integration of several factors that either attracts people to a relationship or draws them away from the relationship (Le & Agnew, 2003). The Investment Model posits that dependence produces the psychological experience of commitment (Agnew et al., 1998). Although sometimes used interchangeably in the literature (Dedekorkut, 2015), commitment and dependence are disparate concepts. While dependence is the descriptive, structural state of a relationship (Le & Agnew, 2003), commitment is the subjective experience of that dependence (Agnew et al., 1998; Rusbult et al., 1998).
Commitment harbors *conative, cognitive, and affective* components. The conative component of commitment is *intent to persist* which is feeling intrinsically motivated to continue a relationship; the cognitive component is *long-term orientation*, which refers to being involved in a relationship for a foreseeable future, and the affective component is *psychological attachment* in which emotional well-being of the individual is influenced by the partner and the relationship itself (Agnew et al., 1998; Rusbult et al., 2004). As a result, the decision to stay in or leave a relationship is most directly brought to terms by commitment level (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Most of the individuals, if not all, who end their relationships have low levels of commitment (Impett et al., 2001) in spite of the fact that not all of them end their relationships.

To sum up, Rusbult (1980) proposed the Investment Model grounding it theoretically within Interdependence Theory, to examine the processes of persistence in interpersonal relationships. Specifically, commitment is considered as intending to remain in a relationship, psychologically attaching to a partner, and gravitating for a long-term partnership (Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Furthermore, commitment is seen as “(a) strengthened by the amount of satisfaction that one drives from a relationship and (b) weakened by possible alternatives to that relationship. Both concepts are derived directly from Interdependence Theory. In addition, Rusbult introduced (c) the concept of investments, holding that they further fuel commitment.” (Le & Agnew, 2003, p. 38). Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) extended the definition of investment size proposed by Rusbult (1980) and reconceptualized investments in terms of timing and materiality. Planned and intangible investments were found to be above and beyond predictors of commitment when compared to past and tangible investments.

### 2.1.1.4.1 Empirical Studies of Investment Model

The literature reveals good support for predictions of the Investment Model. A number of empirical studies have indicated that (a) commitment is significantly linked to bases of dependence, being positively associated with satisfaction and investment size, while
negatively associated with quality of alternatives; (b) satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size accounts for approximately 40% to 80% of the variance in commitment (Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986b; Simpson, 1987), and (c) bases of dependence separately account for unique variance in commitment (Cox, Wexler, Rusbult, & Gaines, 1997; Rusbult, 1983).

Initially, the Investment Model was tested in dating relationships in college. In her survey, Rusbult (1980) carried out two experiments with 282 university students. The first experiment was a role-playing activity with 82 male and 89 female students. She gave the students relationship scenarios that they were to imagine themselves in. Then, they were asked to fill out a questionnaire which assessed their satisfaction and commitment. The results indicated that greater commitment results from poorer alternatives, larger intrinsic and larger extrinsic investments. As costs increased, commitment decreased; however, it was not a statistically significant effect. In the second experiment, participants were 58 male and 53 female students involved in a real ongoing or past relationship. By considering the ongoing or past relationship they were asked to complete a survey which assessed rewards, costs, alternatives, investments, satisfaction, and commitment. The results suggested that commitment was predicted by rewards and costs, alternative value, and investment size.

After completing the 7-month longitudinal study (N=34), Rusbult (1983) provided strong evidence for the main assumption of the Investment Model: Commitment increased with increased satisfaction, decreased quality of alternatives, and increased investments in 17 male and 17 female undergraduate students, who have been involved in heterosexual dating relationships. Commitment was also a critical predictor of stay/leave behavior, better than the other Investment Model factors. The study also supplied information about the long-term changes in the Investment Model eventually. Over the time, the rewards, costs, level of satisfaction, size of the investment and level of commitment increased whereas the quality of the alternatives decreased. Increased rewards were associated with increased satisfaction and commitment; however, changes in costs did not change satisfaction or commitment. Relationship termination and the Investment Model were also considered by another finding of the study. There
were three groups of participants at the end of the study: (1) stayers, whose relationships remained, (2) leavers, who instigated a breakup, and (3) abandoned, whose partner chose to breakup. For stayers, rewards, costs, satisfaction, investments, and commitment increased and alternatives decreased in terms of quality. For leavers, rewards almost remained the same, costs and quality of alternatives increased a lot, and satisfaction and commitment decreased. When compared with stayers, less of an increase in rewards and satisfaction and a greater increase in costs were experienced by abandoned individuals. Besides, they disclosed a decreasing quality of alternatives and increasing level of investment.

Later, Rusbult et al. (1986b) carried out the generalizability of the Investment Model to adults by including married people in their study (N=130) and they came across the fact that the model applied well to married adults, too. They found out that among various demographic groups, the Investment Model can be generalized as a powerful model. Impett, Beals, and Peplau (2001) also found support for the appropriateness of the model for married people in their longitudinal study in which they recruited both partners of 3627 married couples, as well. They also found out that couples’ relationship satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investments were unique contributors of their commitment.

The Investment Model has also been experimentally examined in hypothetical relationships. Carter, Fabrigar, Macdonald, and Monner (2013) carried out two studies with university students. Participants were selected according to their attachment styles. In the first study, they provided 180 participants with relationship scenarios with various costs and rewards stated and they discovered that individuals with different attachment styles used rewards and costs differently in evaluating satisfaction. Results revealed that compared to others, individuals with anxiety and avoidance attachment styles, put less weight to rewards in case of determining relationship satisfaction. In the second study, 178 participants were provided with scenarios that included information about the investments they had put into the relationship and an alternative partner. From the results of the second study it was concluded that investments, quality of alternatives, and satisfaction level were used by
the people differently with different attachment styles to assess commitment. Individuals low in anxiety and high in avoidance have put forth more weight to investments and quality of alternatives, and less to relationship satisfaction in case of determining commitment.

In addition to relationship satisfaction’s predictive role of commitment, satisfaction had also a strong mediator role in the relationship between attachment and commitment in a study done with 334 undergraduates (Etcheverry et al., 2013). In that study, relationship satisfaction was found to mediate the prediction of commitment by avoidance attachment and to mediate the prediction of commitment by anxiety attachment. Moreover, in their study which comprised 69 participants who have been recruited via battered women’s service organizations, Rhatigan and Axsom (2006) found that, relationship satisfaction mediated the relationship between psychological abuse and commitment.

The findings regarding the Investment Model in Turkey were consistent with the international literature. Büyükşahin, Hasta, and Hovardaoğlu (2005) tested the validity and reliability of Investment Model Scale (IMS) with 325 university students who were currently in a relationship. They discovered that the Turkish IMS was valid and reliable with the sample of university students. Later, two separate studies with the Investment Model were conducted by Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2007). The first one was conducted with 271 university students and aimed to explore the variables predicting relationship attachment and to compare individuals with divergent attachment styles with regard to Investment Model variables. They found that Investment Model variables significantly predicted relationship satisfaction, positive regard for relationship, feeling safe in relationship, commitment to relationship, and future orientation. The second study compared individuals with various relationship types (e.g., married, engaged, dating) from the point of Investment Model variables. In their study, the sample comprised of 100 dating, 74 engaged and 76 married individuals. They discovered that individuals in dating relationships had lower levels of satisfaction, and investment than those who were engaged or married. On the other hand, individuals in a dating relationship perceived their alternatives as more
attractive. Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2007) also found that men appraised the quality of their alternatives higher than women and married women evaluated the quality of their alternatives the most negative when compared to the dating and engaged women.

Understanding what leads to increases in commitment is of obvious importance because it has been implicated in many important relationship functions, most notably decisions on whether to leave or stay (Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Arriaga, Reed, Goodfriend & Agnew, 2006; Le & Agnew, 2003). The studies in the literature indicate how validated and strong the Investment Model is in terms of explaining commitment and its related basic constructs (Duffy & Rusbult, 1986; Le & Agnew, 2003; Lin & Rusbult, 1995; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Sprecher, 1988). There are also several other factors which have been found to contribute to the explanation of Investment Model variables.

Gender counts as a crucial variable in terms of explaining the nature of commitment. There is building evidence in the literature that commitment has a more important role for men than women in terms of determining relationship behaviors and outcomes (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004; Stanley, Whitton, Sadberry, Clements, & Markman, 2006). Stanley, Rhoaades, and Whitton (2010) theorized that while women’s behavior in a relationship is mostly influenced by feelings of love and attachment, men’s behavior is driven by commitment, which is built upon interdependence over time. However, according to Fitzpatrick and Sollie’s (1999) study with 254 young adults, women were found to be more committed than men. According to the study of Rusbult and her colleagues (1998), women, when compared to men, tend to exhibit higher levels of satisfaction and greater investments in their relationships, which turns to more dependence on the relationship and higher level of commitment. In Duffy and Rusbult’s (1986) study, the similar findings were obtained that women were more invested and committed than men. On the contrary, in a recent study with 484 emerging adults, aged between 18 and 25, men reported higher investments than women (Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). On the other hand, Impett and her colleagues
(2001) found no significant difference between men and women in terms of Investment Model variables, in their study with both partners of 3627 married couples.

The other correlate of Investment Model variables is relationship duration. According to Rusbult (1980; 1983), as the length of the relationship increases, commitment increases, as well since the length of the relationship is one of the most important investments made in the relationship. A meta-analysis testing the Investment Model assessed the degree to which relationship satisfaction, the presence of relationship alternatives, and investment size predicted commitment and subsequent relationship duration (Le & Agnew, 2003). In their meta-analyses of Rusbult’s Investment Model, across 52 studies with 60 independent samples and 11,582 participants, Le and Agnew (2003) asserted that relationship satisfaction was a better predictor of relationship duration than the presence of alternatives and investment size, although all three predicted commitment and commitment was a good predictor of decisions to stay or leave. Thus, commitment is a key to a relationship’s longevity. Length of relationship has also been found to predict investment size (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007).

On the other hand, Rusbult and her colleagues (1998) have found in their study with 415 undergraduates that there was not a significant association between the duration of relationship and satisfaction level. Moreover, length of relationship and quality of alternatives were not significantly correlated either. These results indicate that the mere passage of time is not sufficient to have greater satisfaction from the relationship or lower quality alternatives. On the other hand, the association of relationship duration to commitment level and investment size has been found to be positive but weak, which indicate that the investments cumulate in time and lead to commitment with the passage of time (Rusbult et al., 1998).

Moreover, relational status is an important indicator, too. Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2007), in their comparisons with respect to relationship types, found that married women have evaluated the quality of their alternatives the most negatively when compared to individuals in relatively non-serious relationships. According to this study, as the relationships get more serious, both relationship satisfaction and
investment size increases while the positive evaluation of alternative relationships decreases (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007).

In terms of methodology, the Investment Model and its related constructs have been tested mostly with correlational and regression analysis thus far (Bevan, 2008; Büyükşahin et al., 2005; Panayiotou, 2005; Rusbult et al., 1998; Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). However, recent studies have indicated that in close relationships while there is an impact of the individual on relationship dynamics, there is also the role of interaction between the couples, affecting each other’s outcome variables, too. Therefore, Macher (2013) formed a new model called actor-partner-interdependence-Investment Model (API-IM) in order to examine Investment Model from a dyadic perspective. In her study with 324 married couples, she found that commitment level is affected by one’s satisfaction, investments, and alternatives as well as the partner’s satisfaction, investments, and alternatives. API-IM gives priority to the effect of partner’s satisfaction level on commitment together with the assumptions of Rusbult’s Investment Model.

Furthermore, research also supports the theoretical background of the Investment Model with consistent results in different samples. Cross-sectional studies with college students (Büyükşahin et al., 2005; Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007; Lin & Rusbult, 1995; Rusbult, 1980, 1983), dating, married and cohabiting heterosexual adults (Bui, Peplau, & Hill, 1996; Buunk, 1987; Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2007; Kurdek, 1993; Lin & Rusbult, 1995; Rusbult, 1980, 1983; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986c), and homosexual adults (Beals, Impett, & Peplau, 2002; Duffy & Rusbult, 1986; Kurdek, 1991) have also displayed that satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investments are significant predictors of commitment. However, Rusbult’s Investment Model has been found to be limited to dating heterosexuals (Bui et al., 1996); therefore, in order to replicate and extend the generalizability of the model to married couples, Impett, Beals, and Peplau (2001) have conducted a longitudinal study with 3627 married couples in the US. They have conducted path analysis to assess the overall Investment Model and have found that satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investments were significant predictors of commitment, while satisfaction was a much stronger predictor of
commitment which is a consistent finding with the studies that have been conducted with dating participants (Guerrero & Bachman, 2008; Rusbult, Olsen, Davis, & Hannon, 2001). Yet, they have found that the overall percentage of variance in commitment explained by these three factors was less than 20%, which is relatively modest. This was lower than the overall percentage found in the previous studies that have been conducted with dating couples (Bui et al., 1996; Duffy & Rusbult, 1986; Rusbult, 1980, 1983) and in the one previous study with married couples (Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986c). Although the Investment Model has been tested with married couples, it is difficult to come across studies in the literature with dual-career married couples.

To sum up, Rusbult’s (1980) Investment Model has been proven to be a highly validated and strong model explaining commitment and its possible associates. The Investment Model has been tested with various samples along with different research designs (experimental, longitudinal, and correlational) in Turkey and across the world. In all, investment size, quality of alternatives, and relationship satisfaction were found to have a strong predictive role in explaining commitment. Moreover, in consistence with the study of interest, relationship satisfaction had a mediating effect in the relationship between specific variables and commitment.

2.2 Definition and Nature of Dual-Career Marriages

For about 150 years, from 1830s to the 1980s, women were given the role of being a homemaker (Bernard, 1981). Since the women’s movements of the 1960s, firstly women’s role in society as mothers, afterwards models of marriage have gone through a social and demographic shift (Godenzi, 2012).

The traditional marriage model was an “interpersonal marriage between work and family,” in which the husband worked outside of the home and the wife inside of it (Silberstein, 1992, p. 3). In the past, “male career success has been predicated on the existence” of a stay-at-home wife (Hertz, 1986, p. 185). Husbands were not responsible for any housework or child-care. Wives “provided the stability of home
life” and “were flexible and adapted to the special needs” of the husbands and children. Men were “socialized to believe that their primary family obligation is to be the breadwinner” and women were socialized to “believe that their primary family obligation is to be caregiver” (Slaughter, 2012, p. 9). A career was a “means to self-fulfillment and material interests,” and the definition of a good mother included self-sacrifice and giving up “things so that your children can have things” (Hays, 1996, p. 126). “Part of women’s work is marriage,” and women were expected “to work at marriage more” than men. At the same time, there was a cultural assumption that wives should “put their career second” to their families (Epstein, 1971, p. 344). A career woman’s success was evaluated not only by her professional accomplishments but also by her marriage and her ability to handle the responsibilities of the household. Halpern and Cheung (2008) argued that men were never asked if they could “successfully combine work and family” (p. 230). However, over the last 50 years, women have been involving in labor force increasingly, in great numbers (Godenzi, 2012; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969) and this is leading to many changes in marital relationships such as new role definitions at home and sharing of the responsibilities. These changes inevitably have created a new lifestyle in which both partners were working, which has been referred to as dual-career marriage.

There are different explanations for dual-career marriages. In the literature, they are either called dual-career or dual-earner with little nuances in their definitions. The dual-earner family is the one in which both spouses are involved in the paid labor force (Rachlin, 1987). The dual-career family is a specific subtype of the broader category of dual earner families (Hiller & Dyehouse, 1987; Rachlin, 1987). The dual-career family has two career-committed individuals, both of whom are trying to fulfill professional family roles as well. But the pursuit of a career requires a high degree of commitment and continuous development. In this regard, Maples (1981) defines dual-career marriages as involving “two married individuals who are each deeply committed to his/her work role; who devoted a considerable amount of time preparing, either through formal training or years of experience, for the positions they hold” in consistency with Fogarty, Rapoport, and Rapoport’s (1971) definition that dual-career
couples are the individuals who have high degrees of commitment to their work, involving full participation and expertise in their professions.

The prevalence rates of dual-career married couples indicate that the number of dual-career married couples has been almost multiplied two times from 1970s to 2000s in European countries and the US (Darrah, Freeman, & English-Lueck, 2007). From 1970 to 2000, for mothers of children ages zero to three, labor-force participation increased from 24 to 58 percent. In 1950, 12 percent of mothers with children under age six worked in the paid labor force in US, and by 1993, that number had more than quadrupled, 58 percent of mothers with children under age six worked in the paid labor force (Hays, 1996). In 1963, 60 percent of children lived in traditional families, in which one parent worked outside of the home and the other worked inside of it (Schneider & Waite, 2005). However, currently, the data on household division of labor suggest that men are becoming more involved in household tasks and even taking over completely if the wives have very demanding work schedules. This is a marked contrast to the past, when wives were largely in charge of the household work, even if they worked outside of the home.

When Turkey is taken into consideration, it was explored that there was not any statistical data directed specifically on the number of dual-career married couples. According to Turkish Statistical Institution’s reports on women from 2007 to 2016, women’s participation to labor force increased from 24 percent to 33 percent. This change in women’s involvement in labor force inevitably brought a change in the married couples’ lifestyle and in their satisfaction with this new lifestyle, as well.

2.2.1 Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle

The new lifestyle in which both partners have been working was referred to as dual-career lifestyle. Satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was the interest of this study. However, the literature on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was limited. To the knowledge of the researcher, there is only one study which has referred to satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and has examined its possible associates. Therefore, the
The concept of ‘Life Satisfaction’ emerged in 19th century as a means for providing people with a life full of high standards. By the 20th century, researchers aimed to define ‘Life Satisfaction’ properly and to measure it sufficiently (Prasoon & Chaturvedi, 2016). Several explanations for life satisfaction arose. Neugarten, Havighurst, and Tobin (1961) defined life satisfaction as ‘successful aging’ while for Sumner (1966), life satisfaction was a positive evaluation of one’s life conditions, taking into consideration the standards or expectations of the individual. Diener (1984) and Veenhoven (1984) referred to subjective well-being and considered life satisfaction as one of the judgmental or cognitive components of well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976). In this regard, life satisfaction was conceptualized as the person’s cognitive judgment about comparing the compatibility of one’s own living conditions with the standards (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffen, 1985).

After the conceptual definitions of life satisfaction were established, the nature of life satisfaction was explored for a better understanding. Life satisfaction had its roots in all domains of work, family, and personality traits (Prasoon & Chaturvedi, 2016). Thus, Veenhoven (1984) summarized life satisfaction as the extent to which an individual positively assesses the overall quality of his/her life. Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith (1999) extended this explanation and suggested “desire to change life,” “satisfaction with current life,” “satisfaction with past,” “satisfaction with future” and “significant others’ views of one’s life” as parts of life satisfaction (p.277).

Considering the literature on life satisfaction, Perrone and Worthington (2001) introduced the concept of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. They proposed that satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle would be influenced by the factors influencing life satisfaction. In this regard, empirical studies done on the nature of life satisfaction were taken into basis in order to explain satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, indirectly.
Among the crucial predictors of life satisfaction, gender counts a significant place. Findings of gender differences in life satisfaction have been discordant in the literature (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; Diener, 1984). For example, the study done with a sample of over 1,000 individuals from the United States by Clemente and Sauer (1976) indicated no significant differences between men and women in their life satisfaction. Another study by Inglehart (2002) which has utilized the data from the World Values Survey revealed that the direction of the gender difference showed variances according to the age group, where younger women (between the ages of 18-44) had higher levels of life satisfaction than younger men, and older women (between the ages of 44 and 65) had lower levels of life satisfaction than older men. The most recent study by Tay, Ng, Kuykendall, and Diener (2014) done with full-time workers across the United States and over 150 other countries stated that full-time working women had higher life satisfaction than full-time working men. On the other hand, a 15-year follow-up data of Finnish Twin Cohort Study with twin adults between the ages of 18-40, marked no gender difference in life satisfaction (Koivumaa-Honkanen, Viinamäki, & Koskenvuo, 2005). In case of Turkey, there were studies which found gender differences with respect to life satisfaction (e.g., Şahin, Zade, & Direk, 2009; Uz-Baş, 2011) as well as studies which did not find any gender differences (e.g., Çecen-Erogul & Dingiltepe, 2012; Çetinkaya, 2004; Telef, 2011). In Turkey, in the study of Recepoğlu and Ülker Tümlü (2015), no gender differences were detected among 94 academic personnel regarding their life satisfaction, as well. On the other hand, a study done with 562 participants working in the industrial sector (Keser, 2005), as well as another study done with 619 teacher candidates (Recepoğlu, 2013) indicated that women’s life satisfaction was higher than men’s life satisfaction. When satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was considered, gender was one of the potential contributors examined in Perrone and Worthington’s (2001) study, which was conducted with 52 dual-career married couples. However, they did not find any gender differences in terms of couples’ satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle.

The financial rewards in dual-career marriages are considerable as well, especially if both spouses are earning salaries as professional people (Hanson & Ooms, 1991). The standard of living is relatively high, with the couples able to afford costly leisure
activities and go on expensive vacation, which in turn would enable them to do tangible and intangible investments to their relationship. Hereby, empirical studies indicate that income is a strong correlate of life satisfaction (Diener, 1984; Kapteyn, Smith, & Van Soest, 2008; Marum, Clench-Aas, Nes, & Raanaas, 2014). A high income was found to improve life satisfaction throughout the telephone interviews done with 1000 participants (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010). It had a direct effect on life satisfaction in a study done with 85,072 individuals settled in 59 countries between the ages of 16 and 99, with a mean age of 41.63 (Plouffe & Tremblay, 2017). Furthermore, income was found to be associated with satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle (Perrone & Worthington, 2001), too. Rusbult (1980) defined the intrinsic investments with examples of time and money. Afterwards, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) extended this explanation and regrouped it under tangible investments. In this regard, it can be stated that income as a tangible investment was related to satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. Moreover, the report of Rapoport and Rapoport (1972) stated that when married couples feel that they are achieving a lot from both career and family responsibilities and when they feel economically well enough, they tended to have more strong marriages.

Communication, which involves self-disclosure (Derlega & Berg, 1987) as well, was found to be related with satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle (Perrone & Worthington, 2001). Communication, especially self-disclosure, counts as an intangible investment in romantic relationships (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). Thus, it can be concluded that communication as part of intangible investments had a predictive role in explaining satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. This proposition was supported by the findings of Epstein (1971) with 137 participants, that when couples engaged in both career and marital experiences, they tended to display more effective communication and a sense of purpose in their marriages which in turn promoted their intangible investments.

Moreover, marital status, its quality, and the changes throughout marriage have been found to predict life satisfaction (Evans & Kelley, 2004; Kinnunen & Pulkkinen, 2003) as well as relationship satisfaction. The findings in the literature were consistent and all pointed to the link between relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with life
(Boyce, Wood, & Ferguson, 2016; Heller, Watson, & Illies, 2004; Perrone-McGovern, Boo, & Vannatter, 2012). The study of Nye (1974), done with 210 couples, compared the levels of mutual satisfaction in single provider (husband) families, dual work (working wives) families, and dual-career relationships. Results of the study indicated that women in dual-career marriages reported to have more satisfaction in their marriages when compared to the single provider and dual work families. On the other hand, no significant difference in marital satisfaction levels of homemaker wife and the working wife was identified. The most successful dual-career marriages were those in which the spouses treated each other as equal partners. As a result, they shared not only in earning the income but also in caring for children and in performing household tasks that fostered doing more tangible and intangible investments into their relationship. These results were consistent with the findings of the studies in Turkey. A study done in Turkey with 294 married individuals with a mean age of 37.52 indicated that relationship satisfaction and life satisfaction were significant correlates to each other, and relationship satisfaction emerged as a strong predictor of life satisfaction (Yıldız & Baytemir, 2016). That is, satisfaction individuals experienced in their marriages had an important role in explaining life satisfaction, too (Celenk & Van de Vijver, 2013; Ng, Loy, Gudmunson & Cheong, 2009). Moreover, Yıldız and Baytemir (2016) have found that marital satisfaction and life satisfaction were closely related to each other, in their study with 294 married individuals (123 females, 171 males). In another study done with 230 working and married women, the relationship between marital satisfaction and satisfaction with life was found significant (Ünüvar & Tagay, 2015). Soylu and Kabasakal (2016) have also aimed to investigate the relationship between satisfaction and satisfaction with life. The findings of their study with 311 married women indicated that women who were involved in the labor force expressed more life satisfaction when compared to nonworking women. Moreover, they also found that marital satisfaction and satisfaction with life were directly associated.

When the relationship between life satisfaction and commitment was considered, it was seen that life satisfaction has been studied frequently in terms of job and organizational commitment, indicating that either job satisfaction predicts life
satisfaction (e.g., Andrews & Withey, 1976; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989) or life satisfaction influences job satisfaction (Judge & Watenebe, 1993; Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982). However, there were not any studies explicitly examining the association between life satisfaction and relational commitment.

2.3 Summary

Researchers in the field of social science have put forth an enormous effort towards understanding why some relationships persevere over time while others deteriorate. Therefore, commitment as a predictor of relationship maintenance has been focused on extensively via several research studies in the literature. Among various explanations of commitment (e.g., Agnew et al., 1998; Goode, 1959; Hinde, 1979; Johnson, 1973; Johnson, 1991; Kelley, 1983; Levinger, 1965; Lund, 1985), Investment Model has attracted most of the attention in terms of explaining commitment. According to the model, as long as people are satisfied with their relationship, as long as they evaluate the quality of alternatives negatively, and as long as they invest in their relationship, they will be more committed (Rusbult, 1980; 1983; Rusbult et al., 1998). However, their proposition of investment size has been found limited by Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) because of its focus on already done investments. Hence, they have argued that the plans regarding the future of the relationship and making intangible as well as tangible investments will lead to increases in commitment, as well (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). In spite of their proposition, planned investments and their relationship to commitment has not been studied frequently in the literature.

As another point, Investment Model has been proven to be valid across several samples (Rusbult, 1980, 1983). However, the model and its constructs have not been tested with dual-career married couples, yet whereas this specific sample needs to be studied with valid reasons. First of all, women have been in labor force with increasing numbers (Godenzi, 2012; Hays, 1996; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969) and this brings along the changes in the nature of family, in the dynamics of the marriages, and the
lifestyle the dual-career married couples have been experiencing. Economical responsibility of the home is not any more solely men’s responsibility, therefore the investments of men to the marriage as householders and the investments of women to the marriage as house-wives have been altered to be shared among the couples. This means that, along with their roles, their lifestyle has been going under several changes, which leads to the need to test dual-career married couples’ satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle. Secondly, rises in divorce rates is associated with the economic freedom of women and the changing roles in the family (Can & Aksu, 2016; Cherlin, 1992; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Eryurt, & Koç, 2012). Testing the constructs of Investment Model with this specific sample would help to understand dual-career married couples’ commitment and its possible associates.

The intention of the couples to stay in a marriage may not solely be determined by their relationship satisfaction and past investments but also by their planned and intangible investments along with satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. This change constitutes the need to investigate the relational constructs along with planned investments and commitment level of dual-career married couples both in Turkey and in other cultures. Hence, it is expected that dual-career married couples’ satisfaction with their life along with their relationship satisfaction would have an explanatory role in the relationship between their investments and relationship commitment.

In this regard, taking into account the theoretical explanations and research findings, the aim of the current study is to test the relationship between investments and commitment through the mediating role of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction, in Turkish dual-career married couples.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

In this chapter, the methodological procedures, in order to reach the aim of the current study are introduced. Firstly, the overall design of the main study is described. Secondly, the characteristics of the participants are mentioned. Thirdly, psychometric properties of the data collection instruments are provided in detail, along with pilot study. Information regarding the pilot sample, procedure, assumption tests, and the results of the pilot studies regarding the measures, are presented. Fourthly, data collection procedures are explained. Afterwards, in the data analyses section, Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) is discussed along with basic concepts of Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM). Finally, the variables are operationally defined, and the limitations of the study are mentioned.

3.1 Overall Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationships between investments and commitment among Turkish dual-career married couples. In order to test this, two models were created. In the first model, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between past investments and commitment of couples were investigated. In the second model, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between planned investments and commitment of couples were explored. Turkish versions of the Investment Model Scale, Past and Planned Investments Measure, Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale and a demographic information form were utilized to collect data for the current study.
Depending upon the purpose of the study, correlational research design was adopted to explore the associations among the variables. Correlational design, as defined by Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2011), “describes the degree to which two or more quantitative variables are related” (p. 331) and it uses a correlation coefficient for describing the degree of that relationship. Moreover, Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM; Kenny, 1996) was utilized in order to investigate the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments (past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, planned intangible) and commitment of Turkish dual-career married couples.

3.2 Participants

In the current study, the main data were collected from Turkish dual-career married couples, whom have been married for at least seven months. The sample of the study consisted of 213 dual-career married couples. For sample selection, purposive and snowball sampling techniques were utilized in order to increase the chances of reaching the Turkish dual-career married couples, which was the most crucial inclusion criteria of the study along with being married for at least six months, both couples’ being involved in their first marriages, and being voluntary.

The age range of the participants were between 19 and 55, with a mean of 34.07 years ($SD = 5.56$). When considered separately for women, their age ranged from 19 years to 52 years ($M = 33.29, SD = 5.17$) while men’s age ranged between 19 years and 55 years ($M = 34.85, SD = 5.83$). Of the sample, only a notably small percentage (0.5%) of the participants was graduated from elementary school, and none of the participants reported to have graduated from secondary school. Majority of the participants (54%) were graduated from university and had a master’s degree (28.6%). Most of the participants were working in managerial positions (23.76%). While 15.84% of the participants reported working as an officer, 19.8% reported that they were working as a teacher or psychological counselor at schools. Of the sample, 7.92% were academicians and only a small percent were engineers (4.95%) and doctors (4.95%). When the income level of the participants is evaluated, it should be noted that income
of the participants reported here is not per couple but per person. Almost half of the participants reported to have an income less than 4000 TL as illustrated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
*Education Level and Total Monthly Income of the Participants (N = 426)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2000TL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000TL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000TL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000TL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-6000TL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001TL and above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along with demographics, relational characteristics of the participants were also explored to obtain dual-career married couples’ relationship profile (Table 3.2). The couples were married for at least seven months and it was the first marriage of all couples. The length of the marriages of the participants ranged from seven months to 25 years ($M = 91.21$ months, $SD = 71.60$). One hundred ninety-seven (92.5%) of the married couples reported that they have a nuclear family while eight (3.8%) of them have been living in extended families. Of the couples, a substantial percentage of dual-career married couples (43.7%) had no children, 74 (34.7%) had only one child, 38 (17.9%) had two children and more. When asked how they met their spouse, majority of the couples (42.3%) has stated that they met by the way of their friends, while a
fairly small percentage of the couples (2.8%) met via internet, as illustrated in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

*Relationship Characteristics of the Dual-career Married Couples*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children from the marriage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How They Met</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By ways of friend</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

The current study involved the collection of quantitative data. An online survey was formed in order to obtain information about couples’ relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle, past and planned investments, and their
commitment in addition to their demographic and relational characteristics. Satisfaction Subscale and Commitment Subscale of Investment Model Scale (IMS; Rusbult et al., 1998), were used to get data for relationship satisfaction and commitment (see Appendix A for sample items), Investment Size Subscale of Investment Model Scale (IMS; Rusbult et al., 1998) was used in order to explore the criterion-related validity of the Past and Planned Investments Measure (PPIM). For measuring investments in terms of both timing and materiality, Past and Planned Investments Measure (PPIM; Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008 [see Appendix B for sample items]), and to measure dual-career lifestyle satisfaction, Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale (SWDCLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985 [see Appendix C for sample items]) were employed. Besides, a demographic form was used to gather information about the demographics and relational characteristics of the dual-career married couples (see Appendix D for sample items). Prior to the main study, a pilot study was conducted to assess the reliability and the validity of the questionnaires used in the current study.

3.3.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in order to test the validity and the reliability of the data collection instruments, which were used in the main study. Information regarding the sample characteristics, data collection procedure, and assumption tests were given below. Subsequently, the instruments were introduced, accompanied with the findings of the validity and reliability analyses that have been conducted for each instrument separately. The pilot study data were not used in the main analyses. For the main study, a different data collection procedure was followed.

3.3.1.1 Pilot Sample

The pilot sample comprised of 264 dual-career married individuals (178 women and 82 man) aged between 19 and 60 years ($M = 33.16$, $SD = 6.72$). The length of the marriages of the sample ranged from six months to 65 months (approximately five years). Of the total sample, 60.2% had an undergraduate degree, and 25% had a
graduate degree. Of the participants, 29.9% had an income between 2001-3000 TL, 25.4% had an income between 3001-4000 TL, and 13.6% had an income of 6001 TL and above as illustrated in Table 3.3. Of the sample, 94.3% had a nuclear family. Only a notably small percentage (2.7%) had a marriage before and almost half of them had children.

Table 3.3

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of the Pilot Study (N=264)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/ PhD</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2000TL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000 TL</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000 TL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000 TL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-6000 TL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6000TL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income of the Spouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2000 TL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000 TL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000 TL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000 TL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-6000 TL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6000 TL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How they met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By way of friends</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind date</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any marriage before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s marriage before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children from the current marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1.2 Procedure

The questionnaires used in the current study were firstly submitted to Middle East Technical University, Human Subjects Ethics Committee, for approval (see Appendix E). After receiving approval from the committee, purposive and snowball sampling techniques were utilized for collecting data from dual-career married individuals. Snowball sampling technique is referred to as referral or chain referral sampling, too in the literature (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). In this technique, one subject provides the researcher the name of another subject, who in turn gives another third name, and
so on (Vogt, 1999). In this sampling technique, participants are reached through referrals made among people who share or know of others who have same characteristics that are of research interest (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). Purposive sampling is the deliberate choice of participants considering the predetermined qualities they possess. It is a nonrandom technique in which the researcher decides what needs to be known and attempts to find people who can and are willing to provide the information by virtue of knowledge or experience (Bernard, 2002). In the current study, being a Turkish dual-career married couple, being married for at least six months, and being involved in the first marriage were the most crucial inclusion criteria.

In the pilot study, data collection was started with paper-pencil questionnaires. The questionnaire packages were placed in envelopes. Participants were informed that the current study was about their marital relationship and the dimensions which keep them committed to their relationship. Dual-career married individuals of participants’ information were asked whether they could share the contact information of the dual-career married individuals they have known (snowball sampling). Data were collected on a voluntary basis and informed consent was obtained from each participant. However, it was noticed by the feedback of the participants that they had difficulties to answer paper-pencil questionnaires honestly because their spouse wanted to see their answers. Moreover, although the questionnaires were delivered in envelopes, and any identification was not asked for, the participants found the questions so private and they hesitated to deliver their answers back, although the researcher had organized a closed box full of other questionnaires in envelopes. Moreover, since the sampling procedure applied in the current study was snowball-sampling procedure, the participants even hesitated to deliver their answers to the people who gave those questionnaires to them, with the worry that they would open the envelopes and check out their answers. Therefore, the data collection procedure was altered to online survey which was shared via social media: Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. The questionnaires took about 15-20 minutes to be filled out.
The pilot sample at total comprised of 264 dual-career married individuals as mentioned before. Before collecting the data via online survey, 77 of the participants were reached ahead. Thus, out of 264 cases, 187 of them (70.8%) accounted for the participants who have filled out the questionnaires online, while 77 of them (29.2%) counted for the participants who have filled out the questionnaires using paper-pencil. Since the pilot study involved data coming from both online survey and paper-pencil questionnaires, the data from these two sources were compared via one-way ANOVA.

According to the results of one-way ANOVA, the data from online survey and the data from paper-pencil questionnaires were not significantly different from each other in terms of the variables of the study (Bases of Dependence, Commitment, Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle, and Planned Investments) except for Past Investments. When the eta square was calculated, it was found .02 which is a notably small percentage (see Table 3.4). Therefore, the data were collapsed.

Table 3.4
Data Collection Procedure Differences in Bases of Dependence, Commitment, Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle, Past Investments, and Planned Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bases of Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58212.70</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>245.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58239.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>11119.14</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11148.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9581.02</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>38.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9629.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>Within Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Investments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1188.17</td>
<td>52363.45</td>
<td>53551.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>220.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Investments</strong></td>
<td>858.92</td>
<td>78535.18</td>
<td>79394.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>334.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p* < .05

### 3.3.1.3 Assumptions of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Prior to the analysis of the pilot study, pilot data were screened, and the assumptions of CFA were tested including sample size, missing values, normality, outliers, linearity, and multicollinearity (Ullman, 2001). In order to conduct CFA, at least 200 participants were suggested (Kline, 2011). In the pilot study, this criterion has been met with a sample size of 264.

After the sample size requirement for CFA was met, the data were screened for missing values. According to the results of Little’s MCAR Test (Little & Rubin, 1987), p value was found non-significant for Quality of Alternatives ($\chi^2 = 21.34, p = .44$), Investment Size ($\chi^2 = 21.24, p = .17$), Commitment ($\chi^2 = 8.35, p = .10$), and Past Investments ($\chi^2 = 69.65, p = .79$). Since the p value for Little’s MCAR test is not significant, the data for these variables was assumed to be MCAR (missing completely at random) and missingness was assumed not to matter for conducting the analyses. On the other hand, Little’s MCAR Test (Little & Rubin, 1987) yielded in significant Chi-square values for the measures of Satisfaction ($\chi^2 = 65.49, p = .00$), Planned Investments ($\chi^2 = 185.29, p = .00$), and Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle ($\chi^2 = 26.16, p = .02$), pointing out that the missing data pattern was not perfectly random for the aforementioned variables. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) states that chi-square test is
sensitive to sample size and they have mentioned that chi-square test may yield significant values when the sample size is over 200 cases. In this regard, the suggestion – comparing the cases with complete data and the cases with missing data – of Allison (2002) was followed in order to analyze the pattern and the reason of missing data in the current study. New scores of complete and missing data were created. Alpha correction was done ($p = .05/7$). Complete and missing data were compared in terms of the variables studied in the current study, at the .01 p value. One-way ANOVA was utilized for comparing complete and missing data in terms of the studied variables.

According to the results of the comparisons, there were not any significant differences between the cases with complete scores and cases with missing scores in terms of the Relational Satisfaction Level and Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle. However, a significant difference between planned investments and quality of alternatives was found ($F(1,246) = 8.90, p < .01$) which can be theoretically understandable that if an individual evaluates the quality of alternatives positively, s/he would rather not do any planned investments into his/her relationship.

Allison (2002) stated that listwise deletion is robust to the violation of missing at complete random assumption. As also stated in the article of Dong and Peng (2013), there is not an established cutoff from the literature referring to an acceptable percentage of missing data in a data set. Tabachnick and Fidell (2012) posit that the missing data mechanisms and the pattern in the missing data have a greater effect on research results than the proportion of the missing data. When the missing data in the current study was evaluated, it was found out that the rate of missing value for all the measures ranged from 3.8% to 6.1%. Taking into consideration that generally the data for the variables studied in the current study were missing at random and that there were not significant differences between cases with complete scores and the cases with missing scores, imputation was done utilizing expectation maximization (He, Zaslavsky, Landrum, Harrington, & Catalano, 2008).

Thereafter, normality assumption was tested. Kline (2011) stated that a kurtosis value close to 3 indicates a normal distribution. Values higher than 3 point to a positive
kurtosis and values lower than 3 indicate negative kurtosis. Moreover, if the value for skewness is higher than 3, the distribution is so called to be skewed. Results of the normality analyses indicated that the sample of the current study did not have a normal distribution. Transformation is a method used to handle non-normal data however, it is also stated in the literature that this technique may cause some problems while interpreting the findings from the transformed data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In this regard, it was decided to continue with non-normally distributed data in order to keep the original reports of the participants instead of manipulating the data. However, bootstrapping was used to eliminate the effects of non-normal distribution of the data. “Bootstrapping is a computer-based method of resampling” and one of its uses is making estimations for standard errors of non-normal distributions (Kline, 2011, p.42).

Afterwards, standardized Z scores were evaluated for exploring the role of outliers in non-normal distribution. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), z scores of cases lower than -3.29 and higher than +3.29 are labeled as outliers. In the current pilot study, for the Satisfaction Level, Commitment, Past Investments, Planned Investments, and Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle, there were cases lower than -3.29. In order to detect multivariate outliers, Mahalonobis distances were examined (Kline, 2011; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The results indicated that there were eight cases out of the Chi-square distance. In order to test whether the existence of outliers interfered with the results of the study, all the analyses were done twice, once with the outliers and without the outliers. The results of the analyses revealed no significant differences between two different data sets; therefore, outliers were kept in the data set in order not to lose variation in sample.

After the screening of the data, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted for testing the construct validity of the measures, utilizing AMOS Version 21 (Analysis of Moment Structures; Arbuckle, 2009). Moreover, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated in order to examine the internal consistency of the scales. According to Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2009), Cronbach’s alpha value can range from 0 to 1, and the lowest value to be accepted for social science research is .60.
Before conducting CFA, assumptions of linearity and multicollinearity were also tested. Linearity assumption was checked with the residual plots and scatterplots. Visual inspection of the plots showed that the assumption of linearity was met. Afterwards, the assumption of multicollinearity was checked. Bivariate correlation coefficients, tolerance value, and VIF (variance inflation factor) were examined. As Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) have stated, when two or more independent variables are correlated more than expected, multicollinearity could be considered as a problem. In this regard, the criterion proposed in the literature has been utilized which states that correlation coefficients should be lower than .85 (Kline, 2011), that VIF values must be less than 10, and tolerance values should be higher than .20 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the current pilot study, VIF and tolerance values were in the expected ranges. As a result, there is no evidence for multicollinearity for the current data and no multicollinearity assumption was met.

As the evaluation criteria for model fit in confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), the approximate fit indices, were used. Kline (2011) classified fit indices under three categories: absolute fit indices, incremental (comparative) fit indices, and parsimony-adjusted fit indices. The incremental fit indices used in the current study were TLI, CFI, and AGFI. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested using Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), since it compares the performance of the proposed model to the null model. Kline (2005) suggested the interpretation of comparative fit index (CFI), too. TLI and adjusted goodness of fit (AGFI) ranges between 0.00 and 1.00 (Brown, 2006). In the current study, the suggestion by Hu and Bentler (1999) was followed and the cutoff point for TLI, CFI, and AGFI were determined to be higher than .95 for a good model fit.

As part of absolute fit indices, $\chi^2$ and $\chi^2$/df-ratio (Brown, 2006) as well as standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR; Hu & Bentler, 1999) could be interpreted, too. Here, $\chi^2$ is expected to be close to zero for better fit. For $\chi^2$/df-ratio, the researchers have proposed different criteria, however in the current study, the suggestion by Kline (1998) was followed, and cutoff point was considered to be 3. Therefore, $\chi^2$/df-ratio
less than 3 was accepted for good model fit. For SRMR, Hu and Bentler’s (1999) recommendation was taken into account, a SRMR less than .08 was preferred.

Finally, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and goodness of fit (GFI) – parsimony adjusted fit indices – which provide information about how well the hypothesized model fit in the population, were recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). In the current study, the selected criteria for RMSEA were as follows: RMSEA < .05, good fit; .05 < RMSEA < .10, mediocre fit; RMSEA > .10, poor fit, as suggested by Browne and Cudeck (1993) and the selected criteria for GFI was as follows: GFI > .95.

**3.3.1.4 Investment Model Scale (IMS)**

This instrument was developed by Rusbult, Martz, and Agnew (1998) to measure four constructs proposed by the Investment Model, which are commitment and three bases of dependence-level of satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. It is a self-report measure and consists of 37 items including 10 items measuring Satisfaction (e.g., “Our relationship makes me very happy”), 10 items measuring Quality of Alternatives (e.g., “The people other than my partner with whom I might become involved are very appealing”), 10 items measuring Investment Size (e.g., “I have put a great deal into our relationship that I would lose if the relationship were to end”), and seven items measuring Commitment (e.g., “I want our relationship to last for a very long time”). The first five items – which are the facet items – of Satisfaction, Quality of Alternatives, and Investment Size Subscales have been measured on a 4-point Likert type scale (1 = don’t agree at all, 2 = agree slightly, 3 = agree moderately, 4 = agree completely). The other items – the global items – of all the subscales have been evaluated on a 9-point Likert type scale, “0” corresponding to “do not agree at all” and “8” to “agree completely” (Rusbult et al., 1998). Reverse coding was done for two items in the Commitment Subscale of IMS: “It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year” and “I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future”.
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Three studies have been conducted to test the reliability and the validity of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998). For all the three studies, the scales have been administered to university students who have been in an ongoing relationship at least for a one-week of duration (Bevan, 2008). For Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3, two types of items have been used in order to evaluate satisfaction, alternatives, and investment. One type of items is facet items, which have been developed to measure concrete examples of three bases of dependence. The other type of items is global items, which are the general measures of each construct (Rusbult et al., 1998). The aim of using facet items before global items is stated to be preparing the participants to global items by fostering participants’ thoughts about satisfaction, alternatives, and investments. Moreover, it has been proposed that the use of facet items enhances the understandability of the global items which in turn leads to increases in reliability and validity of the scale (Rusbult et al., 1998). The internal consistency of the subscales has been calculated by using Cronbach Alpha coefficient and has been found to be ranging from .91 to .95 for Commitment Subscale, .92 to .95 for Satisfaction Subscale, .82 to .88 for Quality of Alternatives Subscale, and .82 to .84 for Investment Size Subscale (Rusbult et al., 1998).

The adaptation of three subscales (Satisfaction, Quality of Alternatives, and Investment Size) of the Investment Model Scale has been done by Büyükşahin, Hasta, and Hovardaoğlu (2005). Except for the first five items of Satisfaction, Quality of Alternatives, and Investment Size Subscales, the evaluation of all the items were done using 9-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 indicating “disagree completely” to 9 indicating “agree completely” (Büyükşahin et al., 2005). Higher the scores in each subscale indicate higher satisfaction, higher quality of alternatives, higher investment size, and higher commitment (see Appendix A).

The evaluation of these subscales in terms of reliability and validity was conducted with Turkish university students. For measuring reliability, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient has been utilized and has been found to be .90 for Satisfaction.
The translation of Commitment Subscale has been conducted afterwards by Büyükşahin and Taluy (2008); however, has not been encountered a published article on the adaptation and psychometric properties of the Commitment Subscale of the Investment Model Scale. Nevertheless, in another study, reliability measures of the Investment Model Scale have also been conducted with dating couples in Turkey (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2013) and Cronbach Alpha coefficient has been found to be .94 for Satisfaction Subscale, .85 for Quality of Alternatives Subscale, .88 for Investment Size Subscale, and .93 for Commitment Subscale.

In the current study, the psychometric properties of Investment Model Scale with four subscales were tested. However, in the main study, Satisfaction and Commitment subscales were used to test relationship satisfaction and commitment of dual-career married couples, and Investment Size Subscale was used for examining the criterion-related validity of Past and Planned Investments Measure.

3.3.1.4.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of IMS

For the Investment Model Scale, four-factor structure was tested by utilizing CFA (see Figure 3.1). Kline (2011) suggests item parceling while conducting CFA with questionnaires of five and more items. Therefore, item parceling technique was used with 22 items, four-factor structure. Nine parcels were created taking into consideration the mean score of each item.
Figure 3.1 Confirmatory factor analysis for the Investment Model Scale (IMS)

Four-factor confirmatory factor analysis yielded to a good fit of four-factor model for the data (see Table 3.5). Results indicated a significant Chi square statistic, $\chi^2 (21) = 54.85, p = .00$, and $\chi^2/df$ ratio was 2.61 which was within the range of suggested criteria of good fit, which is 3 (Kline, 2011). Goodness of fit indices – CFI, TLI, GFI, AGFI, RMSEA, and SRMR – for the four-factor model of Investment Model Scale all showed a good fit.

Table 3.5

*Goodness of Fit Indices for Four- Factor Model of Investment Model Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>54.85*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p< .001$*
Standardized estimates ranged from .91 to .97 for Satisfaction, from .82 to .87 for Quality of Alternatives, from .71 to .99 for Investment Size, and from .67 to .94 for Commitment (see Table 3.6) indicating acceptable results since they were above the cutoff point .30 as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

3.3.1.4.2 Reliability Analyses

Internal consistencies of the subscales were all high. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was found .94 for relational satisfaction subscale, .86 for quality of alternatives subscale, .82 for Investment Size Subscale, and .84 for commitment subscale, in the pilot study. When tested separately for the main study, the Cronbach alpha coefficients were .94 for wives and .93 for husbands in behalf of satisfaction subscale; .88 for both wives and husbands as for the quality of alternatives subscale; .80 and .82 for wives and husbands, respectively for the Investment Size Subscale; .84 for wives and .87 for husbands in behalf of the commitment subscale.

Table 3.6

*Standardized Regression Weights and Squared Multiple Correlations of IMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Parcel</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimates</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>satparcel1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satparcel2</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives</td>
<td>altparcel1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>altparcel2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Size</td>
<td>invparcel1</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>invparcel2</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>comparcel1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparcel2</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparcel3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* satparcel1= first parcel of relationship satisfaction subscale; satparcel2= second parcel of relationship satisfaction subscale; altparcel1= first parcel of quality of alternatives subscale; altparcel2= second parcel of quality of alternatives subscale; invparcel1= first parcel of Investment Size Subscale; invparcel2= second parcel of Investment Size Subscale; comparcel1: first parcel of commitment subscale; comparcel2= second parcel of commitment subscale; comparcel3= third parcel of commitment subscale. All t values are significant at *$p<.001$.*
3.3.1.5 Past and Planned Investments Measure

This instrument was developed by Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) in order to examine the investments in terms of timing (past vs. planned) and materiality (tangible vs. intangible). It is a self-report measure consisting of 26 items. Thirteen items measure the degree to which the participants have already invested each of the resources into their relationship. The other 13 items measure the degree to which they have planned to invest into their relationship. Twenty-six items have been presented to the participants and they have been asked to rate them on a 9-point Likert type scale (0 = do not agree at all, 8 = agree completely). For both past and planned investments, there have been included eight items for measuring intangible investments and five items for measuring tangible investments. One sample item for past tangible investments is “My current partner and I have at least one joint bank account (checking account, etc.)”。 A sample item for past intangible items is “My current partner and I enjoy sharing leisure activities together”。 One sample item for planned tangible investments is “In the future, my current partner and I will have many major shared possessions”, and a sample item for planned intangible investments is “In the future, I will invest a great deal of time into my current relationship”. There were not any reversed items in the measure.

Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) have conducted confirmatory factor analysis in order to confirm the four-factor structure of the past and planned investment measure. The proposed factor structure consisted of Past Intangible, Planned Intangible, Past Tangible, and Planned Tangible factors. They have utilized two sample groups for these analyses. Sample 1 consisted of 384 undergraduate students who have been involved in heterosexual, non-marital romantic relationships of at least two weeks with an average 16.34 months of relationship length. Sample 2 consisted of 234 heterosexual adults who have been involved in a marital or cohabiting relationship with an average 112.31 months of relationship length. Participants have been asked to complete the Investment Model Scale. Hereby, “investment size” items have been included in the confirmatory analyses to test whether they load on a past intangible factor when evaluated with the new specific items (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).
The results of the confirmatory factor analysis with the two different samples indicated that the items from “Investment Size Subscale” of the Investment Model Scale had loaded significantly to the past intangible factor. In this regard, all 13 items which were hypothesized to load on past intangible factor loaded significantly on that factor, all eight items have loaded significantly on planned intangible factor, all five items hypothesized to load on past tangible factor have loaded on that factor significantly, and lastly all five items which were hypothesized to load on planned tangible factor have loaded significantly on that factor with both sample 1 and sample 2. Results of CFA with sample 1 stated that a four factor model demonstrated a reasonable fit to the data: $\chi^2(387) = 668.16$, Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) = .90, with a chi-square to degrees-of-freedom ratio of 1.72 and with sample 2, results of CFA indicated that a four factor model demonstrated a satisfactory fit to the data: $\chi^2(387) = 726.93$, GFI = .88, with a chi-square to degrees-of-freedom ratio of 1.87 (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).

In their cross-sectional study with 173 university students with average relationship duration of 45.77 months, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) have calculated the reliability of the scales by utilizing Cronbach Alpha coefficients. Alpha value has been calculated to be .90 for Past Intangible Measure, .95 for Planned Intangible Measure, .89 for Past Tangible Measure, and .94 for Planned Tangible Measure (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). Moreover, they have computed the correlations between global items of investments of Investment Model Scale and the four new types of investments proposed. The results have indicated that the correlations between global items and planned in/tangible investments and past in/tangible items ranged from .47 (correlation between the global items and planned tangible items) to .70 (correlations between the global items and past intangible investments). In their longitudinal study, reliability analyses indicated alpha levels of .90 for Past Intangible Investments Measure, .95 for Planned Intangible Investments Measure, .74 for Past Tangible Investments Measure, and .97 for Planned Tangible Investments Measure (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).
3.3.1.5.1 The Translation Process of PPIM

To use in the current study, a permission request for translating the instrument into Turkish has been made by the researcher to Dr. Wind Goodfriend and Dr. Christopher R. Agnew. They permitted the translation and use of Past and Planned Investments Measure in the study (see Appendix F).

Firstly, the translation of the measure was done by five professionals and the researcher, advanced in English. One of the translators was assistant professor in the field of Developmental Psychology and one of them was assistant professor in the field of Counseling. Two of them were continuing their PhD in the field of Counseling and one was a psychological counselor working with adults and couples in the field.

After all the translations were completed, they were compared with each other. The translations were mostly consistent. In a line with the translations, a Turkish version of the Past and Planned Investments Measure was formed (see Appendix B). The Turkish translation of the questionnaire was backtranslated by an English teacher to English and it was compared with the original form. It was noticed that the translated form indicated the same content with the original form. Afterwards, the form was evaluated by an independent expert of psychological counseling and feedback was taken from her. After some minor grammar revisions the Turkish version of the scale was completed. The last version of the scale was given to an experienced Turkish literature teacher to check the structure and the wording of the items. Corrections in wording, structure of the sentences, and punctuation were taken into consideration and the last form was formed.

Following this process, cognitive interviews were conducted with eight people from different backgrounds such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status. The terms that were not understood were considered and necessary changes have been done staying loyal to the original form of the scale. However, it was noticed that the questionnaire tended to be understood better with higher educated groups. The appropriateness of PPIM to the sample of interest and to the Turkish culture was assessed throughout
expert opinions and cognitive interviews and the face validity of the scale was provided.

Language equivalency of the last form of the scale was tested with 38 bilingual individuals who have been in a relationship. Twenty-two of the participants were female (57.9%) and 16 of them were male (42.1%). Age of the participants ranged from 24 to 47 ($M = 33.02$, $SD = 5.10$). Fifteen of the participants were university graduates (39.5%), 12 of them had a master’s degree (31.6%), and 11 of them had PhD degree (28.9%). While six of them were dating (15.8%), five of them were engaged (13.2%), and 27 of them were married (71.1%). Fourteen of the participants had children (36.8%) and 24 of them did not have children (63.2%).

Firstly, the English form was delivered to the participants. After approximately three weeks of time, the Turkish version was given, and the participants were asked to fill out the forms. The correlations between the English and Turkish forms of the Past Investments Measure were calculated utilizing Pearson correlation coefficient and found to be .86. The correlation between the English and Turkish forms of the Planned Investments Measure was found to be .79.

### 3.3.1.5.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of PPIM

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to test whether the four-factor structure of the Past and Planned Investments Measure fits the present data. Klein (2011) suggested that for questionnaires with items of five and more, item parceling technique can be utilized. The item parceling technique is used to decrease the number of indicators of long scales, to get more continuous and normally distributed data and to improve the fit of the confirmatory factor analysis (Bandalos & Finney, 2001).

In this regard, for Past and Planned Investments Measure, item parceling technique was used with 26 items and four-factor (see Figure 3.2). Ten parcels were created taking into consideration the mean score of each item.
Confirmatory factor analysis yielded to a poor fit of four-factor model for the data, \( \chi^2(29) = 204.60, p = .00 \), and \( \chi^2/df \) ratio was 7.06; CFI = .90, TLI = .84, RMSEA = .15, SRMR = .05. When the parameter estimates were examined, it was noticed that the 7th item of Past Tangible Investments Factor had a low loading. Therefore, the item was removed from the analysis. Afterwards, confirmatory factor analysis yielded to a good fit of four-factor model for the data (see Table 3.7). Results indicated a significant Chi-square statistic (\( \chi^2(26) = 46.76, p = .01 \)) and \( \chi^2/df \) ratio was 1.80 which was within the range of suggested criteria of good fit, which is 3 (Kline, 2011). Goodness of fit indices – CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR – for the four-factor model of Past and Planned Investments Measure all showed good fit.
Table 3.7

*Goodness of Fit Indices for Four-Factor Model of PPIM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimates</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>parcel4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITI</td>
<td>parcel1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI</td>
<td>parcel9</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI</td>
<td>parcel6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcel8</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PTI = past tangible investments; PITI = past intangible investments; PLTI = planned tangible investments; PLITI = planned intangible investments. All t values are significant at *p < .001.*

3.3.1.5.3 Criterion-related Validity of PPIM

Criterion-related validity of the Past and Planned Investments Measure was calculated based on the correlations between the four factors of Past and Planned Investments Measure (PPIM) and Investment Size Subscale of Investment Model Scale (IMS). Especially, a significant relationship between investment size and past intangible investments was expected. The criterion-related validity was calculated by Pearson
Correlation coefficient. The results of Pearson correlation coefficient revealed significant positive correlation between investment size and past intangible investments \((r = .46, p < .01)\), suggesting that participants with a high score on Investment Size Subscale tended to score higher on Past Intangible Investments Subscale of PPIM. Significant, positive but weak correlations were found between Investment Size Subscale and Past Tangible Investments Subscale \((r = .16, p < .01)\), between Investment Size Subscale and Planned Tangible Investments Subscale \((r = .28, p < .01)\), but relatively high correlations between Investment Size Subscale and Planned Intangible Investments Subscale \((r = .43, p < .01)\).

### 3.3.1.5.4 Reliability Analyses

Internal consistency of Past and Planned Investments Measure was tested utilizing from Cronbach alpha coefficient. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was found .68 for Past Tangible Investments Subscale (7th item was removed), .82 for Past Intangible Investments Subscale, .77 for Planned Tangible Investments Subscale, and .89 for Planned Intangible Investments Subscale.

The internal consistencies were also calculated for the main study, separately for wives and husbands. The Cronbach alpha coefficients were .69 for wives and .74 for husbands in behalf of the Past Tangible Investments Subscale; .74 for wives and .79 for husbands for Past Intangible Investments Subscale; .74 for wives and .76 for husbands on the side of Planned Tangible Investments Subscale; and .88 for wives and .83 for husbands in behalf of Planned Intangible Investments Subscale.

### 3.3.1.6 Satisfaction with the Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale

Satisfaction with the Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale has been formed as a result of modifying The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985). The aim of the original SWLS is to measure global personal life satisfaction. The SWLS contains five items (e.g., “The conditions of my life are excellent”, “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing”). Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale, 1 indicating
“strongly disagree,” 7 indicating “strongly agree.” Test-retest reliability of SWLS was .87. Item-total correlations for the five SWLS items have been found to be between .61 and .81 (Diener et al., 1985).

For Satisfaction with the Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale to be formed, the SWLS has been modified by Perrone and Worthington, Jr. (2001). It consists of five items in the same format to measure satisfaction with the dual-career lifestyle (e.g., “For me, having a career and having a partner with a career is my ideal lifestyle”, “So far, I have gotten the important things I want out of my dual-career lifestyle”). There were not any reversed items in the scale.

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Questionnaire has been found to be .87. It has been found that item-total correlations for the combination of SWLS items and the satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale items range from .74 to .89 (Perrone & Worthington, Jr. 2001).

3.3.1.6.1 The Translation Process of SWDCLS

To use in the current study, the permission request for translating the instrument into Turkish has been made by the researcher to Dr. Kristin Marie Perrone-McGovern. She permitted the translation and use of Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale in the study (see Appendix G).

Firstly, the translation of the measure was done by two professionals and the researcher, advanced in English. One of the translators was assistant professor in the field of Developmental Psychology and one of them was assistant professor in the field of Psychological Counseling. After the translations were completed, they were compared. The translations were mostly consistent. In a line with the translations, a Turkish version of the Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale was formed.

The Turkish translation of the questionnaire was backtranslated by an English teacher to English and it was compared with the original form. It was noticed that the translated
form indicated the same content with the original form. Afterwards, the form was evaluated by an independent expert of counseling psychology and feedback was taken from her. Minor revisions of wording were done.

The last version of the scale was given to an experienced Turkish literature teacher. She checked the structure and the wording of the sentences. Corrections in wording, structure of the sentences, and punctuation were taken into consideration and the last form was formed.

Following this process, cognitive interviews were conducted with four people from different backgrounds such as gender, age, and socioeconomic status. The term “dual-career” was not easily understood when translated into Turkish, by Turkish people. It was understood in the way that a person has two careers at a time. Therefore, an explanation was done ahead that the specific term “dual-career” means two people, each working separately.

Language equivalency of the last form of the scale was tested with 23 bilingual dual-career married individuals. Eleven of the participants were female (47.8%) and 12 of them were males (52.2%). Age of the participants ranged from 29 to 47 ($M = 34.35, SD = 4.44$). Eight of the participants were graduates of university (34.8%), 8 of them had master’s degree (34.8%), and 7 of them had PhD degree (30.4%). Eleven of the participants had children (47.8%) and 12 of them did not have children (52.2%).

The English form was delivered first to the participants. After approximately three weeks of time, the Turkish version was given, and the participants were asked to fill out the forms. The correlation between the English and Turkish forms of the Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale have been calculated utilizing Pearson correlation coefficient and found to be .81 (See Appendix C for the sample items of the measure).
3.3.1.6.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of SWDCLS

One-factor solution was tested for Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale utilizing from CFA (see Figure 3.3).

The results showed mediocre fit of one-factor model to the data (see Table 3.9). Therefore, the modification indices were checked and the error covariance of item 2 and item 5 was freely estimated. When the items were examined, it was found out that there is theoretical justification for relating the covariance of errors of these terms since they were measuring similar perception of dual-career lifestyle. The modification improved the model fit. CFA yielded to a good fit of one factor model for the data (see Table 3.9). Results indicated a non-significant Chi-square statistic: $\chi^2 (4) = 4.79$, $p = .31$, and $\chi^2/df$ ratio was 1.20 which was within the range of suggested criteria of good fit, which is 3 (Kline, 2011). Goodness of fit indices—CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR—for the one factor model of Satisfaction with Dual-career Married Lifestyle all showed good fit.
Table 3.9

*Goodness of Fit Indices for One Factor Model of SWDCLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>12.08*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *$p < .05$*

Standardized estimates ranged between .38 and .92 as seen in Table 3.10 indicating acceptable results since they were above the cutoff point .30 as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

Table 3.10

*Standardized Regression Weights and Squared Multiple Correlations of SWDCLS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimates</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td>item1</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td>item2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td>item3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td>item4</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS</td>
<td>item5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SWDCLS = satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle
All $t$ values are significant at *$p < .001$.*

### 3.3.1.6.3 Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency of Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle was tested utilizing from Cronbach alpha coefficient. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was found .83 for the scale which indicates a high internal consistency. When tested for the main study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was found .86 for both wives and husbands, separately.

### 3.3.1.7 Demographic Information Form

The researcher developed a demographic information form (DIF; see Appendix D) for obtaining basic information about the demographic and relational characteristics of the
participants. The demographic information such as age, gender, education level, and income besides relational characteristics such as family structure, how they met, the length of their marriage, if they have children or not, and whether they had married before or not, were asked throughout demographic information form.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

In order to start data collection, firstly the approval from Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (see Appendix E) was obtained. Data collection was started at the beginning of July 2016 and was carried on till February 2017. The sample of the current study was recruited via snowball and purposive sampling procedures and the data were collected from volunteer participants. Since snowball and purposive sampling techniques were utilized in this study, couples who voluntarily participated to the study, suggested their couple friends -who were both working- to complete the online survey, too.

The experience of pilot data collection showed that it was so difficult to reach and ask the dual-career married couples to fill out paper-pencil questionnaires. As aforementioned, participants had difficulties to answer paper-pencil questionnaires honestly because their spouse wanted to see their answers. Moreover, although the questionnaires were delivered in envelopes, the researcher had organized a closed box full of other questionnaires in envelopes and any identification was not asked for, the participants found the questions so private and they hesitated to deliver their answers back. Moreover, since the sampling procedures applied in the current study involved snowball-sampling procedure, the participants even hesitated to deliver their answers to the people who gave those questionnaires to them, with the worry that they would open the envelopes and check out their answers. Therefore, the researcher collected the data online in the main study. A survey was prepared including the demographic form and the questionnaires, and it was shared via social media; Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. Utilizing online surveys somehow guaranteed spouses not to pressure on each other to see each other’s answers since they got the chance to either answer the questions on phone or their PC’s or while they were at work. The questionnaires
took about 15-20 minutes of time to be filled out. Partners were not asked for any identification rather to write common pseudonyms the same with their spouses in order to match their data for dyadic analyses.

3.5 Description of Variables

In this section, the variables of the study were described and operationally defined. Aforesaid, the proposed model in the current study aims to investigate the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments and commitment. In order to reach this aim, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the dyadic model were tested separately for past investments and planned investments.

The past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments were the predictor variables; relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were mediating variables; commitment was the outcome variable.

Relationship Satisfaction: In this study, satisfaction was measured by the total score obtained from Satisfaction Subscale of Investment Model Scale, which ranged from the least 5 points to the most 45 points. Higher the score, higher the relational satisfaction is.

Commitment: In this study, commitment was measured by the total score obtained from Commitment Subscale of Investment Model Scale, which ranged from the least 7 points to the most 63 points. Higher the score, higher the commitment is.

Past Tangible Investments: In this study, past tangible investments were measured by the total scores obtained from the Past Tangible Investments Subscale of Past and Planned Investments Measure, which ranged from the least 0 points to the most 40 points. Higher the score, higher the past tangible investments are.
Past Intangible Investments: In this study, past intangible investments were measured by the total scores obtained from the Past Intangible Investments Subscale of Past and Planned Investments Measure, which ranged from the least 0 points to the most 64 points. Higher the score, higher the past intangible investments are.

Planned Tangible Investments: In this study, planned tangible investments were measured by the total scores obtained from the Planned Tangible Investments Subscale of Past and Planned Investments Measure, which ranged from the least 0 points to the most 40 points. Higher the score, higher the planned tangible investments are.

Planned Intangible Investments: In this study, planned intangible investments were measured by the total scores obtained from the Planned Intangible Investments Subscale of Past and Planned Investments Measure, which ranged from the least 0 points to the most 64 points. Higher the score, higher the planned intangible investments are.

Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle: In this study, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was measured by the total score obtained from the Satisfaction with the Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale, which ranged from the least 5 points to the most 35 points. Higher the score, higher the satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle is.

3.6 Data Analyses

The main aim of the current study was to test the mediating effects of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments and commitment. In order to reach this aim, two models were tested. In the first model, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between past investments and commitment of wives and husbands was examined. In the second model, the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between planned investments and commitment of wives and husbands was examined.
For this purpose, several steps were followed to analyze the data. Prior to the main data analyses, initial procedures of data screening and data cleaning on the raw data were completed. After data screening, assumptions (missingness, sample size, outliers, normality, linearity, and multicollinearity) were tested. In the second step, descriptive statistics were conducted in order to supply information about the demographics and relational characteristics of the participants. Thirdly, several Confirmatory Factor Analyses were performed to test the construct validity of the Turkish versions of the Investment Model Scale, Past and Planned Investments Measure, and Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle Questionnaire. Penultimately, criterion-related validity of the Past and Planned Investments Measure was calculated based on the correlations between the four factors of Past and Planned Investments Measure (PPIM) and Investment Size Subscale of Investment Model Scale (IMS), utilizing from Pearson Correlation Coefficient. Finally, mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments and commitment were examined via path analyses using API MeM analyses (Kenny, 1996). All the preliminary analyses were done with SPSS Version 22 (IBM Corp., 2013). Confirmatory factor analysis and dyadic path analyses were conducted with AMOS 18 (Arbuckle, 2009).

3.6.1 Overview of the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM)

Most of the studies in social sciences have concentrated on the individual effects, especially in interpersonal relationships. However, recent arguments have pointed out to the possible errors and misinterpretations in case only the individual effects are taken into account (Fitzpatrick, Gareau, Lafontaine, & Gaudreau, 2016). Therefore, the influence that members of a dyad have on each other were started to be measured.

The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) is the most popular model used, providing a conceptual framework for collecting and analyzing dyadic data (Kenny, 1996). It mainly emphasizes the interdependence that exists between dyad members (Kenny, 1996; Kenny & Winguist, 2001). Data from married couples are interdependent since each member of the couple influences the outcomes of the other
member of the dyad; therefore, in the current study APIM, which is a dyadic approach was employed.

APIM model supplies the researcher to investigate the actor and partner effects simultaneously. In APIM analyses, the actor effect on both the participant’s own outcome variable and partner’s outcome variable are tested based on the assumption that each member of the dyad influences the functioning and outcomes for both members of the dyad (Kenny, 1996). Put differently, APIM helps researchers to understand “the impact of a person’s causal variable on his or her own outcome variable (actor effect) and on the outcome variable of the partner (partner effect)” (Ledermann, Macho, & Kenny, 2011, p.3). This approach allows the researcher to test the statistical equivalency of the effects across dyad members through an assessment of whether observed actor and partner effects differ significantly between dyad members (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). In this regard, APIM enables researchers to differentiate from traditional analyses through investigation of the richness of the dependency across partners of a dyad (Fitzpatrick, Gareau, Lafontaine, & Gaudreau, 2016).

Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM; Ledermann et al., 2011), which was utilized in the current study, is as an extension of APIM. It allows for testing the effects of individuals’ predictors and mediators on both their own (actor) and their significant others’ outcomes (partner effects). The APIMeM consists of two exogenous variables and two endogenous variables, which are linked by two mediator variables (Landis et al., 2014).

In a standard Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) for distinguishable dyad members, “the saturated model has 27 free parameters: six actor effects, six partner effects, one mean, and one variance for each initial variable, one intercept for each mediator and outcome, one variance for each error term, one covariance between the initial variable, one covariance between the mediator’s error terms and one between the outcomes’ error terms” (Ledermann et al., 2011, p.5).
APIMeM aims to show that significant relationships exist between exogenous variables and endogenous variables, between exogenous variables and potential mediators, and between the mediators and the endogenous variables (Ledermann & Bodenmann, 2006). Specifically, with the model of the current study, the interpersonal effects of one partner’s investments on the other partner’s commitment (partner effect) and on his/her own commitment (actor effect) through the mediating role of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle is aimed to be tested.

3.7 Limitations of the Study

Besides its possible contributions to the literature, the current study has some limitations as well. First shortcoming of the present study is that the findings were subject to common method bias due to the usage of self-report measurement tools. Participants were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with their relationship and their lifestyle, and their commitment in addition to the investments they have done and have been planning. For some couples, it might be challenging to face how satisfied or not, how committed or not they are with their relationship, besides having plans for their relationship. Thus, there was the risk of participants’ keeping some certain and private information to themselves and giving socially desirable responses.

Secondly, despite APIM (Actor-Partner Interdependence Model) framework’s use in the present study, its cross-sectional nature prevents any arguments on the causal directions of investments, relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and commitment.

Thirdly, purposive and snowball sampling techniques were utilized in the current study. Since they are not random sampling techniques, sampling method was a threat to external validity (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011). Although these techniques are useful for reaching populations with specific characteristics, there is little control over the sampling method. Moreover, the participants comprised a highly educated group. Therefore, the results of the current study can only be generalized to the highly
educated dual-career married couples who have the similar characteristics as the sample of the current study.

Penultimately, in the current study the age and marital duration has a wide range. Since the current study did not focus on the age, duration of marriage, family type, and the children of the dual-career married couples, that is specifically on the life cycle of the couples, this prevents understanding how the measured variables of the study differ with respect to the family life cycle characteristics of the couples.

Lastly, online survey was used to collect data in the current study. Couples were able to sign into online survey on their own smart phones or PC’s. Moreover, the Google forms where the online survey was formed, was not allowing the participants to answer the questions from the same device. Besides its advantages, online survey limits the accessibility of certain populations who are less likely to have internet access and to respond to online questionnaires. Moreover, there is not a researcher to whom participants may ask their questions or ask for clarifications in questionnaires. This may interfere with the reliability of the data.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the statistical analyses of the main study are presented. Firstly, the results of the preliminary analyses were explained in detail. Preliminary analyses included data screening in terms of missing data, influential outliers, sample size adequacy, and the assumptions (normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity, distinguishability, and nonindependence) required for further analyses. Secondly, the descriptive analyses were conducted to identify the characteristics of the dual-career married couples, and correlations among the variables were examined, separately for wives and husbands. Thirdly, hypotheses were tested by using dyadic path modeling (APIMeM). Lastly, a brief summary of the results was presented.

4.1 Preliminary Analyses

Firstly, data were screened in order to test whether the data were accurate and appropriate for conducting path analysis following Actor-Partner Interdependence framework. SPSS Version 22 (IBM Corp., 2013) was used in order to examine all the items by frequency tables, inspecting minimum and maximum values for data accuracy. Some unusual numbers were detected, and softcopy of the questionnaires were checked and corrected by the researcher. Afterwards, reversed items were recoded. Thus, the dataset was ready for further assumption checks for running the analyses.
4.1.1 Data Screening Prior to Analyses

Prior to conducting the analyses, all variables were examined for non-missingness, outliers, and sample size adequacy along with the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity.

4.1.1.1 Missing Data

For dealing with the missing data, firstly researcher pointed out to the importance of non-missing data in the introduction of the scales, which were delivered via online survey link. All the items in the current study had missing data less than 5%. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that if the missing data is less than 5%, any technique to deal with the missing data would be appropriate. Therefore, ways of dealing with the missing data were investigated. Kline (2011) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest two main procedures to handle the missing data: listwise deletion and imputation of the missing data. Before choosing the best way to handle the missing data, Little’s MCAR test (Little & Rubin, 1987) was conducted to investigate whether there is a pattern in the missing data.

According to the results of Little’s MCAR Test (Little & Rubin, 1987), p value was found non-significant for Satisfaction and Past Tangible Investments. Since the p value for Little’s MCAR test is not significant, the data for these variables was assumed to be MCAR (missing completely at random) and missingness was assumed not to matter for conducting the analyses. On the other hand, Little’s MCAR Test (Little & Rubin, 1987) yielded in significant Chi-square values for the measures of Commitment ($\chi^2 = 130.88$, $df = 23$, $p = .00$), Past Intangible Investments ($\chi^2 = 68.71$, $df = 35$, $p = .00$), Planned Tangible Investments ($\chi^2 = 36.30$, $df = 14$, $p = .00$), Planned Intangible Investments ($\chi^2 = 110.03$, $df = 40$, $p = .00$), and Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle ($\chi^2 = 45.91$, $df = 16$, $p = .00$), pointing out that the missing data pattern was not perfectly random for the aforementioned variables. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) states that Chi-square test is sensitive to sample size and they have mentioned that Chi-square test may yield significant values when the sample size is over 200 cases. In this
regard, the suggestion – to compare the cases with complete data and the cases with missing data – of Allison (2002) was followed to analyze the pattern and the reason of missing data in the current study. New scores of complete and missing data were created. Alpha correction was done (\(p = .05/6\)). Complete and missing data were compared at the .01 p value. One-way ANOVA was utilized for comparing complete and missing data in terms of the studied variables. According to the results of the comparisons, there were not any significant differences between the cases with complete scores and cases with missing scores in terms of variables under investigation.

As Allison (2002) has stated, listwise deletion is robust to the violation of missing at complete random assumption. Moreover, as mentioned above, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) any technique to deal with the missing data would be appropriate if the missing data is less than 5% of the whole data as it is in the current study. In this regard, considering the non-significant differences between cases with complete scores and the cases with missing scores, imputation was done utilizing expectation maximization (He et al., 2008).

### 4.1.1.2 Influential Outliers

Following missing value analyses, outliers were detected, and the data were analyzed for univariate and multivariate outliers. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) define univariate outliers as the cases with an unusual score on a variable. They define multivariate outliers as the cases which have an unusual combination of scores on two or more variables.

In the current study, for exploring the role of outliers, standardized Z scores were evaluated. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), cases lower than -3.29 and higher than +3.29 are labeled as outliers. For Satisfaction, Commitment, Past Investments, and Planned Investments, there were cases lower than -3.29. In order to detect multivariate outliers, Mahalonobis distances were examined (Kline, 2011; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The results indicated that there were six cases out of the
chi-square distance. In order to test whether the existence of outliers interfered with the results of the study, all the analyses were done twice, once with the outliers and without the outliers. The results of the analyses revealed no significant differences between the two different data sets, therefore in order not to lose variation in sample, outliers were kept in the data set.

4.1.1.3 Sample Size Adequacy

There are various guidelines for appropriate sample size in order to conduct path analyses in AMOS. According to Kline (2011), at least 200 participants were suggested for running path analyses. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p.123) recommend a formula for calculating appropriate sample size: N> 50 + 8m (m= number of independent variables). In addition, Stevens (2002, p.143) suggests 15 subject per predictor. The current study was conducted with 213 couples (N= 426). All the criteria given above were met with the sample size, for the present study.

4.1.1.4 Normality

Univariate normality assumption was tested utilizing from skewness and kurtosis values. Kline (2011) stated that skewness values higher than 3 and kurtosis values higher than 20 points to a non-normal distribution. Results of the normality analyses for the current study indicated that skewness and kurtosis values except for the skewness value for Commitment were in the expected range. In addition, histograms and Q-Q plots were visually inspected and they did not show a perfect normal distribution of the sample. Transformation as proposed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) is a method used to handle non-normal data; however, it is also stated in the literature that this technique may cause some problems while interpreting the findings from the transformed data. In this regard, it was decided to continue with non-normally distributed data in order to keep the original reports of the participants instead of manipulating the data and creating a new data set by transformation. Therefore, bootstrapping – which “is a computer-based method of resampling” was used in order
to eliminate the effects of non-normal distribution of the data by making estimations for standard errors of non-normal distributions (Kline, 2011, p.42).

4.1.1.5 Linearity and Homoscedasticity

Hair and his colleagues (2009) define linearity as an assumption which tests the linear relationship between scores which is required for correlational analyses and homoscedasticity as an assumption that dependent variable (s) display equal levels of variances throughout the predictor variables. Residual plots were examined, and visual inspection of the plots displayed almost elliptical shape indicating that dependent variable showed equal variance through the range of independent variables. Thus, the linearity assumption was met (Stevens, 2009). Moreover, bivariate scatterplots were examined, and they were oval shaped indicating that the variances of the variables were distributed homogenously (Hair et al., 2009).

4.1.1.6 Multicollinearity

As Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) have stated, when two or more independent variables are correlated more than expected, multicollinearity could be considered as a problem. Therefore, the assumption of multicollinearity was checked. Bivariate correlation coefficients, tolerance value, and VIF (variance inflation factor) were examined. In this regard, the criteria proposed in the literature has been utilized which states that correlation coefficients should be lower than .85 (Kline, 2011) and that VIF values must be less than 10 and tolerance values should be higher than .20 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the present study, none of the correlation coefficients exceeded .85 and they ranged between -.03 and .77. All the VIF values were less than 10, ranging from 1.16 to 2.31, and the tolerance values were also within the expected ranges, between .43 and .86, higher than .20. In this regard, the results did not indicate a multicollinearity problem.
4.1.1.7 Distinguishability of the Dyad Members

A crucial point in dyadic research and in utilizing APIM is whether the dyad members are distinguishable or indistinguishable (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). For the two dyads to be referred to as “distinguishable”, they should be able to be assigned to two different groups for valid reasons. For example, husband and wife, mother and child are distinguishable dyad members. On the other hand, same-sex twins and homosexual couples are considered to be indistinguishable dyad members (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). In the current study, the sample comprised of dual-career married couples. The data were collected from both husbands and wives, which are distinguishable dyad members.

4.1.1.8 Nonindependence

The data in the studies of dyadic design are considered to be violating the assumption of independence. Although most of the statistical analyses assume that a sample is randomly selected from a population, the study of dyadic relationships violates this assumption since both members of a dyad are sampled to test the effect they may have on one another (Fitzpatrick, Gareau, Lafontaine, & Gaudreau, 2016). Hence, the analysis of dyadic data can be considered as the study of non-independence (Kenny, et al., 2006). Kashy and Kenny (2000) argue that both dyads of a couple are not two independent individuals. In fact, they share something in common, which is referred to as nonindependence (Kashy & Kenny, 2000). Nonindependence means that “the scores from both partners of a couple on the same variable are more similar to (or different from) another than are two scores from two individuals who are not members of the same dyad” (Macher, 2013). In consideration of nonindependence, both actor and partner effects are observed. Kenny and Cook (1999) proposes that people’s being a part of an interdependent system is proven by the existence of partner effects. Kenny and his colleagues (2006) suggest Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients to be computed in order to test for nonindependence of observation in the variables studied. In the current study, their suggestion was followed and as it is demonstrated in Table 4.2, the correlations were computed. Results indicated that both partners’ past
tangible investments ($r = .40, p < .01$), past intangible investments ($r = .30, p < .01$), planned tangible investments ($r = .38, p < .01$), planned intangible investments ($r = .12, p < .05$), relationship satisfaction ($r = .50, p < .01$), satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .44, p < .01$), and commitment ($r = .15, p < .05$) were correlated within dyads, indicating nonindependence in each of the variables.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

In this section, firstly, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and ranges) for the main study variables and secondly the correlations among these variables were presented in Table 4.1 and 4.2, respectively.

4.2.1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Gender Differences on the Main Study Variables

The means, standard deviations, and ranges of investments, relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and commitment were presented. In addition, before testing the hypotheses of the study, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted in order to examine the potential gender differences in the main study variables.

As seen in Table 4.1, the mean scores obtained from dual-career married couples for past tangible investments were 21.52 ($SD = 9.57$) for wives and 23.03 ($SD = 8.84$) for husbands; the mean scores for past intangible investments were 50.40 ($SD = 8.85$) for wives and 52.21 ($SD = 9.17$) for husbands; the mean scores for planned tangible investments were 29.86 ($SD = 8.83$) for wives and 30.85 ($SD = 9.35$) for husbands; and the mean scores obtained for planned intangible investments were 52.43 ($SD = 10.08$) for wives and 55.13 ($SD = 9.83$) for husbands. One-way ANOVA results regarding the gender differences in the predictors of the current study, revealed that husbands reported having done more past intangible investments to their relationship ($F(1,424) = 4.29, p < .05$) and having more planned intangible investments ($F(1,424) = 7.84, p < .01$) for their relationship when compared to their wives, while there was no
significant gender difference in terms of past tangible investments and planned tangible investments, respectively \((F_{(1,424)} = 2.89, p = .09; F_{(1,424)} = 1.25, p = .26)\). As seen in the Eta\(^2\) (strength of associations) in Table 4.1, despite the significant gender differences, they were relatively weak. The largest difference between wives and husbands was on planned intangible investments. When the mediator variables were taken into account, results indicated that the means obtained for relationship satisfaction were 37.72 (SD = 7.59) for wives and 38.73 (SD = 7.07) for husbands; the means for satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were 26.27 (SD = 6.71) for wives and 24.86 (SD = 7.70) for husbands. One-way ANOVA results revealed that husbands and wives did not differ in terms of their relationship satisfaction scores \((F_{(1,424)} = 2.01, p = .16)\), while there was a significant gender difference in satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle scores, \(F_{(1,424)} = 4.06, p < .05\), wives reporting more satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle \((M_{\text{wives}} = 26.27 \text{ and } M_{\text{husbands}} = 24.86)\) as compared to their husbands, still with a small effect size. Lastly, according to the one-way ANOVA results, there was not a significant gender difference on the criterion variable of the study: commitment \((F_{(1,424)} = .40, p = .53)\).

### Table 4.1

**Gender Differences on the Main Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives ((N = 213))</th>
<th>Husbands ((N = 213))</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>Eta(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>37.72 (SD = 7.59)</td>
<td>38.73 (SD = 7.07)</td>
<td>5-45</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.00470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>58.33 (SD = 7.47)</td>
<td>58.81 (SD = 7.96)</td>
<td>7-63</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCL</td>
<td>26.27 (SD = 6.71)</td>
<td>24.86 (SD = 7.70)</td>
<td>5-35</td>
<td>4.06*</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>21.52 (SD = 9.57)</td>
<td>23.03 (SD = 8.84)</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITI</td>
<td>50.40 (SD = 8.85)</td>
<td>52.21 (SD = 9.17)</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI</td>
<td>29.86 (SD = 8.83)</td>
<td>30.85 (SD = 9.35)</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI</td>
<td>52.43 (SD = 10.08)</td>
<td>55.13 (SD = 9.83)</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>7.84**</td>
<td>.0181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SWDCL = Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle; PTI = Past Tangible Investments; PITI = Past Intangible Investments; PLTI = Planned Tangible Investments; PLITI = Planned Intangible Investments.

*p < .05; **p < .01.*
4.2.2 Bivariate Correlations

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated in order to test the relationships among the main study variables. Bivariate correlations among the predictors (past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments), mediators (relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle), and the criterion variable (commitment) are presented in Table 4.2.

Field (2005) determined the cut off points of strength of correlations as followed: ± .10 is small; ± .30 is medium; ± .50 is determined to be a large correlation. The size of the correlations between the study variables were all in the expected directions for both wives and husbands as seen in Table 4.2. There was no indication of multicollinearity for both samples.

Examination of correlations among the predictor variables revealed that there were no significant relationships between wives’ past tangible investments and husbands’ planned intangible investments ($r = .08$); wives past intangible investments and husbands’ past ($r = -.04$) and planned tangible investments ($r = .04$); husbands’ past tangible investments and wives’ planned intangible investments ($r = -.05$); wives’ planned intangible investments and husbands’ planned intangible investments ($r = .12$). Except for these, both wives’ and husbands’ past and planned tangible and intangible investments were significantly correlated to each other (see Table 4.2).

Wives’ past tangible investments were only correlated positively and significantly with their own relationship satisfaction ($r = .20, p < .01$) and their own satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .15, p < .05$). That is to say, dual-career married couples with higher scores on past tangible investments tended to get higher satisfaction scores in terms of both relationship and dual-career lifestyle. On the other hand, there was not a significant relationship between wives’ past tangible investments and either their commitment or husbands’ commitment level as demonstrated in Table 4.2.
There was a significant, positive, and a large relationship between wives’ past intangible investments and their relationship satisfaction ($r = .61, p < .01$); moreover, a positive and significant relationship with husbands’ relationship satisfaction as well ($r = .25, p < .01$). Results revealed significant and positive correlations between wives’ past intangible investments and both their satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .41, p < .01$) and their husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .14, p < .05$). While wives’ past intangible investments were significantly and positively correlated with their own commitment ($r = .31, p < .01$), they did not correlate significantly with their husbands’ commitment (see Table 4.2).

When husbands’ past tangible investments were considered as illustrated in Table 4.2, the correlation analysis displayed that they only correlated significantly and positively with their relationship satisfaction ($r = .26, p < .01$) and their commitment ($r = .29, p < .01$). On the other hand, husbands’ past intangible investments, far beyond past tangible ones, indicated positive and significant correlations with their own relationship satisfaction ($r = .65, p < .01$), satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .22, p < .01$), and their commitment ($r = .64, p < .01$) as well as with their wives’ relationship satisfaction ($r = .34, p < .01$), and wives’ commitment ($r = .15, p < .01$).

Wives’ both planned tangible investments and planned intangible investments were significantly and positively correlated with their relationship satisfaction ($r = .29, p < .01; r = .44, p < .01$, respectively); their commitment ($r = .33, p < .01; r = .45, p < .01$, respectively); their satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .25, p < .01; r = .33, p < .01$, respectively) as well with their husbands’ relationship satisfaction ($r = .24, p < .01; r = .14, p < .05$, respectively); their husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .14, p < .05; r = .14, p < .05$, respectively). There was no significant correlation of wives’ both planned tangible investments and planned intangible investments to their husbands’ commitment (see Table 4.2).

As demonstrated in Table 4.2, husbands’ planned tangible and planned intangible investments were significantly and positively related with their relationship satisfaction ($r = .47, p < .01; r = .60, p < .01$, respectively); their commitment ($r = .45, p < .01$).
their satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($r = .17, p < .05; r = .17, p < .05$, respectively). Moreover, there was a significant and positive relationship between husbands’ planned intangible investments and their wives’ relationship satisfaction ($r = .23, p < .01$).

For testing the indirect effects in a model, some researchers state that in case an independent variable does not have a significant relationship with the dependent variable, it is not essential to inspect the indirect effect claiming that if there is no direct relationship then there is no mediation to seek for, considering this as a prerequisite for the mediation analyses (Baron & Kenny, 1986). On the other hand, some recent researchers state that indirect effects are independent of mediation, hence they can be checked and reported even if there is no direct relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Following the recent theoretical arguments, although there were independent variables which did not have direct relationships with commitment as stated above, they were included in the further analyses and the indirect effects were inspected for those variables.

Likewise, the relationships between mediator and outcome variables revealed that there was not any significant relationship between wives’ satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle and either their or their husbands’ commitment. Moreover, there was not any significant relationship between husbands’ satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle and their wives’ commitment, while a significant and positive relationship with their own commitment ($r = .20, p < .01$). When the other mediator variable, relationship satisfaction, was examined, the results revealed that wives’ satisfaction and both their commitment ($r = .33, p < .01$) and their husbands’ commitment ($r = .17, p < .05$) were positively and significantly related. The same was true for husbands’ relationship satisfaction that their satisfaction and both their commitment ($r = .67, p < .01$) and their wives’ commitment ($r = .16, p < .05$) were positively and significantly related.

Lastly, following the suggestions of previous studies in the literature, the correlation of demographic variables- age and duration of marriage- to the mediator and outcome
### Table 4.2

**Bivariate Correlations between Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SAT_W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. COM_W</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SAT_H</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COM_H</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SWDCL_W</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SWDCL_H</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PTI_W</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PITI_W</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PTI_H</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PITI_H</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PLTI_W</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PLITI_W</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. PLTI_H</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PLITI_H</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** SAT_W= Wives’ Satisfaction; SAT_H= Husbands’ Satisfaction; COM_W= Wives’ Commitment; COM_H= Husbands’ Commitment; SWDCL_W= Wives’ Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle; SWDCL_H= Husbands’ Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle; PTI_W= Wives’ Past Tangible Investments; PITI_W= Wives’ Past Intangible Investments; PTI_H= Husbands’ Past Tangible Investments; PITI_H= Husbands’ Past Intangible Investments; PLTI_W= Wives’ Planned Tangible Investments; PLITI_W= Wives’ Planned Intangible Investments; PLTI_H= Husbands’ Planned Tangible Investments; PLITI_H= Husbands’ Planned Intangible Investments.

*p < .05; **p < .01.
variables were examined separately. The results were not reported in the table but mentioned in this section. It was found that the correlation of women’s age with their commitment \( (r = .01, p > .05) \), relationship satisfaction \( (r = -.22, p < .05) \), and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle \( (r = -.18, p < .05) \) were found either nonsignificant or small, thus was not included in the APIMeMs. The correlation of men’s age with their commitment \( (r = .01, p > .05) \), relationship satisfaction \( (r = -.17, p < .05) \), and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle \( (r = .03, p > .05) \) were found either nonsignificant or small, thus was not included in the APIMeMs. Moreover, the correlation of duration of marriage with wives’ commitment \( (r = -.03, p > .05) \), husband’s commitment \( (r = -.06, p > .05) \), wives’ relationship satisfaction \( (r = -.16, p < .05) \), husband’s relationship satisfaction \( (r = -.20, p < .05) \), wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle \( (r = -.08, p > .05) \), and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle \( (r = -.02, p > .05) \) were found either nonsignificant or small, thus was not included in the APIMeMs.

4.3 Testing the Main Hypotheses

The aim of the present study is to investigate the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, in the relationship between investments and commitment in Turkish dual-career married couples. In order to test the mediating and predictive roles of variables, APIMeM framework for distinguishable partners (i.e., wives and husbands) was utilized. Firstly, the mediating role of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between past investments and commitment were investigated via APIMeM. Secondly, the mediating role of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between planned investments and commitment were explored utilizing from APIMeM. In these analyses, investments of wives and husbands were used as predictor variables, wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle, were the mediating variables, and commitment of wives and husbands were employed as the outcome variables. The correlations among IV’s (past tangible investments and past intangible investments; planned tangible investments and planned intangible investments)
investments) and correlated errors between mediating (relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle) and outcome variables (commitment) were added to the model.

Since investments were theoretically related to commitment, following the suggestions of Kenny and colleagues (2006), firstly saturated models were investigated. If any paths from predictor variables to outcome variables were not significant, they were dropped from the model until all the paths in the model were significant. Specifically, the final models included only the significant paths.

4.4 Mediating Roles of Relationship Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle in the Relationship between Past Investments and Commitment of Couples

The proposed model suggested that relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will mediate the relationship between past investments and commitment. First, a saturated model, which included all the paths from past investments to relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and commitment as well as the paths from relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle to commitment, was tested and the non-significant paths were dropped from the model. The final model with standardized regression weights was given in Figure 4.1. As displayed in Table 4.3, the goodness of fit indices indicated that this model fit the data very well ($\chi^2(22) = 22.74$, $p = .28$, $\chi^2/df = 1.03$, $GFI = .98$, $AGFI = .95$, $TLI = 1.00$, $CFI = 1.00$, $RMSEA = .01$, $SRMR = .03$).

| Table 4.3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fit indices of the APIMeM Model for Past Investments |
| $\chi^2$(df) | GFI | AGFI | TLI | CFI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Model 1 | 0 | 1.00 | - | - | 1.00 | .28 | .00 |
| Model 2 | $\chi^2(22) = 22.74$ | .98 | .95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .01 | .03 |
In order to figure out the amount of variance explained by the hypothesized model, the squared multiple correlations (R²) of mediator (wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, wives’ relationship satisfaction, husbands’ relationship satisfaction) and outcome (wives’ commitment, husbands’ commitment) variables were evaluated. According to the results, past intangible investments of wives and husbands account for 15% of the variance in wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, 5% of the variance in husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, 38% of the variance in wives’ relationship satisfaction, 43% of the variance in husbands’ relationship satisfaction. The overall hypothesized model explained the 13% of the variance in wives’ commitment and 60% of the variance in husbands’ commitment.

Below, the direct and indirect effects of the independent variables (wives’ past tangible investments, husbands’ past tangible investments, wives’ past intangible investments, and husbands’ past intangible investments), mediator variables (wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, wives’ relationship satisfaction, husbands’ relationship satisfaction) and outcome variables (wives’ commitment, husbands’ commitment) were reported. The direct and indirect effects for the proposed model were conducted with mediators (for wives’ past intangible investments: β = .14, p < .01; for husbands’ past intangible investments: β = .34, p < .01) and without mediators (for wives’ past intangible investments: β = .27, p < .01; for husbands’ past intangible investments: β = .59, p < .01). Boothstrapping, a widely used method for testing the significance of the effects was performed in this step (Bollen & Stine, 1990). In addition, Cohen’s guideline (1998) was followed in evaluating the beta coefficients. The correlations between .10 and .29 are defined as small (weak), .30 and .49 as medium (moderate) and, .50 and 1.00 as large (strong).

4.4.1 Actor Effects

As can be seen in Table 4.4, there were direct actor effects between past intangible investments, relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and
commitment. Specifically, past intangible investments of wives positively and significantly predicted their relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .54, p < .01$) displaying a strong effect; satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($\beta = .39, p < .01$), showing moderate effects; and commitment ($\beta = .17, p < .05$) having the lowest effect. For husbands, their past intangible investments predicted their relationship satisfaction strongly ($\beta = .65, p < .01$); satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($\beta = .22, p < .01$) showing a small effect, and commitment ($\beta = .41, p < .01$) positively and significantly, as well. Moreover, wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction positively and significantly predicted their commitment, ($\beta = .24, p < .01; \beta = .47, p < .01$), with respectively low and moderate effects.

In addition, when the indirect effects were taken into consideration, it was seen that actor effects revealed two important mediations. Firstly, the indirect effect of wives’ past intangible investments on commitment via relationship satisfaction was significant and positive, $\beta = .13, p < .05$, [CI .04, .25]. That is, wives’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of wives’ past intangible investments on their commitment. Secondly, the indirect effect of husbands’ past intangible investments on commitment via relationship satisfaction was also significant and positive, $\beta = .31, p < .001$, [CI .04, .25]. Husbands’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of husbands’ past intangible investments on their commitment. These results suggested when wives and husbands have done high levels of intangible investments into their relationship at past, they are more likely to feel more satisfied with their relationship which in turn, results in increases in their commitment.
Note: PTI = Past Tangible Investments; PITI = Past Intangible Investments; SWDCLS = Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle; RS = Relationship Satisfaction

Figure 4.1 Structural model using SWDCLS and relationship satisfaction as mediators, past investments as the predictor variables.
4.4.2 Partner Effects

There were also two partner effects. Specifically, past intangible investments of wives significantly and negatively predicted husbands’ commitment ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$), displaying a low effect. Moreover, husbands’ past intangible investments predicted wives’ relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$), significantly and positively although showing a low effect (see Table 4.4). There was no mediation regarding the partner effect; however, an indirect effect, from husbands’ past intangible investments to wives’ commitment, through wives’ satisfaction was observed. That is, husbands’ past intangible investments significantly predicted wives’ relationship satisfaction which led to increase in wives’ commitment, indirectly, $\beta = .04$, $p < .01$, [CI .01, .10].

Table 4.4

Actor and partner effects of past investments, satisfaction, and SWDCLS in predicting commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI- - -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITI- - -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI- - -&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITI- - -&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDCLS - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI - Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 4.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-5.95</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction- Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWDCLS- Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Mediating Roles of Relationship Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Dual-career Lifestyle in the Relationship between Planned Investments and Commitment of Couples

The proposed model suggested that planned investments would predict commitment both directly and indirectly through relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. First, a saturated model, which included all the paths from planned investments to relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and commitment as well as the paths from relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle to commitment, was tested. Non-significant paths were dropped from the model. The final model with standardized regression weights was given in Figure 4.2. The goodness of fit indices indicated a mediocre fit of the proposed model to the data, $\chi^2(21) = 22.37$, $p = .38$, $\chi^2/df = 1.07$, $GFI = .98$, $AGFI = .95$, $TLI = 1.00$, $CFI = 1.00$, $RMSEA = .02$, $SRMR = .03$ (Table 4.5).

### Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indices of the APIMeM Model for Planned Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>χ²(df)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to figure out the amount of variance explained by the hypothesized model, the squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) of mediator (wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, wives’ relationship satisfaction, husbands’ relationship satisfaction) and outcome (wives’ commitment, husbands’ commitment) variables were evaluated. According to the results, planned intangible investments of wives and husbands account for 8% of the variance in wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, 3% of the variance in husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and 20% of the variance in wives’ relationship satisfaction. Moreover, husbands’ planned tangible investments together with planned intangible investments account for 37% of the variance in husbands’ relationship satisfaction. The overall hypothesized model explained the 22% of the variance in wives’ commitment and 59% of the variance in husbands’ commitment.

Below, the direct and indirect effects of the independent variables (wives’ planned tangible investments, husbands’ planned tangible investments, wives’ planned intangible investments, and husbands’ planned intangible investments), mediator variables (wives’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, wives’ relationship satisfaction, husbands’ relationship satisfaction) and outcome variables (wives’ commitment, husbands’ commitment) were reported. The direct and indirect effects for the proposed model were conducted with mediators (for wives’ planned intangible investments: $\beta = .26, p < .01$; for husbands’ planned intangible investments: $\beta = .29, p < .01$) and without mediators (for wives’ planned intangible investments: $\beta = .32, p < .01$; for husbands’ planned intangible investments: $\beta = .53, p < .01, \beta = .27, p < .01$). Boothstrapping, a widely used method for testing the significance of the effects, was performed in this step (Bollen & Stine, 1990). Cohen’s guideline (1998) was followed in evaluating the beta coefficients. The correlations between .10 and .29 are defined as small (weak), .30 and .49 as medium (moderate) and .50 and 1.00 as large (strong).
4.5.1 Actor Effects

As can be seen in Table 4.6, there were direct actor effects between planned investments, relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and commitment. Specifically, both planned tangible and planned intangible investments of husbands predicted their relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .17, p < .01; \beta = .49, p < .01$). Wives’ planned intangible investments predicted their relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .39, p < .01$), satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($\beta = .29, p < .01$), and commitment ($\beta = .36, p < .01$) as well, displaying moderate effects. Moreover, husbands’ planned intangible investments resulted in higher levels of commitment ($\beta = .35, p < .01$) and more satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). For both wives ($\beta = .19, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .49, p < .01$), relationship satisfaction was a significant predictor of commitment. Although wives’ relationship satisfaction had a low effect on their own commitment, husbands’ relationship satisfaction had a moderate effect on their own commitment.

When the indirect effects were observed, it was noticed that actor effects revealed two important mediations. Firstly, the indirect effect of wives’ intangible investments on commitment via relationship satisfaction was significant and positive, $\beta = .07, p < .001, [CI .03, .14]$. That is, wives’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of wives’ planned intangible investments on their commitment. Secondly, the indirect effect of husbands’ planned intangible investments on commitment via relationship satisfaction was also found significant and positive, $\beta = .24, p < .001, [CI .16, .33]$. Husbands’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of husbands’ planned intangible investments on their commitment. These results indicated that when wives and husbands plan to do intangible investments into their relationship in the future, they are more likely to feel more satisfied with their relationship which in turn, results in increases in their commitment. Lastly, there was a significant and positive indirect effect of husbands’ planned tangible investments on their own commitment via their relationship satisfaction, $\beta = .09, p < .001, [CI .03, .16]$. That is, husbands’ planned tangible investments are also eager to contribute to their own commitment, through their relationship satisfaction.
4.5.2 Partner Effects

There were also two partner effects between planned intangible investments and relationship satisfaction and commitment. Specifically, planned intangible investments of wives significantly and negatively predicted husbands’ commitment ($\beta = -0.24, p < .01$). That is, as wives’ planned intangible investments increase, their husbands’ commitment decreases. Moreover, husbands’ planned intangible investments predicted wives’ relationship satisfaction ($\beta = 0.18, p < .01$), significantly and positively as seen in Table 4.6. There was no mediation regarding the partner effect; however, an indirect effect, from husbands’ planned intangible investments to wives’ commitment, through wives’ satisfaction was observed. That is, husbands’ planned intangible investments significantly predicted wives’ relationship satisfaction which led to increase in wives’ commitment, indirectly; $\beta = 0.03, p < .01$, [CI .01, .07].
Note: PLTI = Planned Tangible Investments; PLITI = Planned Intangible Investments; SWDCLS = Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle; RS = Relationship Satisfaction

Figure 4.2 Structural model using SWDCLS and relationship satisfaction as mediators, planned investments as the predictor variables
Table 4.6

*Actor and partner effects of planned investments, satisfaction, and SWDCLS in predicting commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI - -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI - -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI - -&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI - -&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI - -&gt; Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI - -&gt; Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction - -&gt; Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Actor Effect</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLTI - -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI- - --&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
<td>.001***</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI- - --&gt; SWDCLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLTI- - --&gt; Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives’ Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands’ Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLITI- - --&gt; Commitment</td>
<td></td>
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**Note.** *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

### 4.6 Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses mentioned in the Introduction were elaborated below.

*Hypothesis 1 (H1):* A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their own past investments.

*H1a:* There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on commitment. This hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .17, p < .05$) and husbands ($\beta = .41, p < .01$).
$H1b$: There will not be a significant actor effect of past tangible investments on commitment. The hypothesis was confirmed for both wives and husbands separately.

**Hypothesis 2 (H2):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their past investments.

$H2a$: There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was confirmed for wives ($\beta = .39, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .22, p < .01$).

$H2b$: There will be a significant positive actor effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. This hypothesis was rejected since past tangible investments of both wives and husbands did not have a significant actor effect on their own satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction will be explained by their past investments.

$H3a$: There will be a significant positive actor effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction. The hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .54, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .65, p < .01$).

$H3b$: There will be a significant positive actor effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction. This hypothesis was rejected since past tangible investments of both wives and husbands did not have a significant actor effect on their own relationship satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

$H4a$: There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on commitment. This hypothesis was rejected for husbands since their past intangible investments did not have a significant relationship with their wives’ commitment. However, for wives although the relationship was
significant, the hypothesis was rejected since the relationship was negative ($\beta = -.27, p < .01$).

\textit{H4b}: There will not be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on commitment. The hypothesis was confirmed.

\textit{Hypothesis 5 (H5)}: A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

\textit{H5a}: There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since there was not a significant relationship either for wives or husbands.

\textit{H5b}: There will be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since there was not a significant relationship either for wives or husbands.

\textit{Hypothesis 6 (H6)}: A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction will be explained by their partners’ past investments.

\textit{H6a}: There will be a significant positive partner effect of past intangible investments on satisfaction. The hypothesis was rejected for wives since there was not a significant partner effect. However, it was confirmed for husbands ($\beta = .18, p < .01$).

\textit{H6b}: There will be a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on satisfaction. This hypothesis was rejected for both wives and husbands.

\textit{Hypothesis 7 (H7)}: Relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will mediate the relationship between past investments and commitment of couples.

\textit{H7a}: The relationship between past tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between past tangible investments and commitment.
**H7b**: The relationship between past tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction. The hypothesis was rejected since satisfaction did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between past tangible investments and commitment.

**H7c**: The relationship between past intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between past intangible investments and commitment.

**H7d**: The relationship between past intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was confirmed both for wives ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) and husbands ($\beta = .31, p < .001$).

**Hypothesis 8 (H8)**: A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their own planned investments.

**H8a**: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on commitment. This hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .36, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .35, p < .01$).

**H8b**: There will be a significant actor effect of planned tangible investments on commitment. This hypothesis was rejected for both wives and husbands since planned tangible investments did not have a significant actor effect on commitment.

**Hypothesis 9 (H9)**: A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their planned investments.

**H9a**: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .29, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .16, p < .05$).

**H9b**: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. This hypothesis was
rejected since planned tangible investments did not have a significant actor effect on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

Hypothesis 10 (H10): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction will be explained by their planned investments.

H10a: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction. This hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .39, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .49, p < .01$).

H10b: There will be a significant positive actor effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction. This hypothesis was rejected since planned tangible investments did not have any significant actor effect on relationship satisfaction.

Hypothesis 11 (H11): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

H11a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on commitment. This hypothesis was rejected for husbands since there was not a significant partner effect of husbands’ planned intangible investments on their wives’ commitment. The hypothesis was rejected for wives, too since the relationship was negative in spite of its significance ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$).

H11b: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on commitment. The hypothesis was rejected since there were not significant partner effects of planned tangible investments of wives and husbands on their spouses’ commitment.

Hypothesis 12 (H12): A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

H12a: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since there were not significant partner effects of planned intangible
investments of wives and husbands on their spouses’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

*H12b*: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since there were not significant partner effects of planned tangible investments of wives and husbands on their spouses’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle.

**Hypothesis 13 (H13)**: A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction will be explained by their partners’ planned investments.

*H13a*: There will be a significant positive partner effect of planned intangible investments on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. This hypothesis was rejected for wives but confirmed for husbands ($\beta = .18, p < .01$).

*H13b*: There will be a significant partner effect of planned tangible investments on satisfaction. The hypothesis was rejected since there were not significant partner effects of planned tangible investments of wives and husbands on their spouses’ relationship satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 14 (H14)**: Relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle will mediate the relationship between planned investments and commitment of couples.

*H14a*: The relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The hypothesis was rejected since satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment.

*H14b*: The relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was rejected for both wives and husbands since relationship satisfaction did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between planned tangible investments and commitment.

*H14c*: The relationship between planned intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. The
hypothesis was rejected since satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a significant mediator role in the relationship between planned intangible investments and commitment.

*H14d:* The relationship between planned intangible investments and commitment will be mediated by relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .07, p < .001$) and husbands ($\beta = .24, p < .001$).

**Hypothesis 15 (H15):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction.

*H15a:* There will be a significant positive actor effect of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle on commitment. The hypothesis was rejected for both wives and husbands since satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a significant actor effect on commitment.

*H15b:* There will be a significant positive actor effect of relationship satisfaction on commitment. This hypothesis was confirmed for both wives ($\beta = .24, p < .01; \beta = .19, p < .01$) and husbands ($\beta = .47, p < .01; \beta = .49, p < .01$) respectively for Model I and Model II.

**Hypothesis 16 (H16):** A statistically significant amount of variance in wives’ and husbands’ commitment will be explained by their partners’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and relationship satisfaction.

*H16a:* There will be a significant positive partner effect of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle on commitment. The hypothesis was rejected since wives’ and husbands’ satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have any significant partner effect on their spouses’ commitment.

*H16b:* There will be a significant positive partner effect of relationship satisfaction on commitment. The hypothesis was rejected since wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction did not have any significant partner effect on their spouses’ commitment.
4.7 Summary of the Findings

Overall, APIMeM results yielded that past tangible and planned tangible investments did not have a direct or indirect actor or partner effect on commitment, independent of all other factors. However, past and planned intangible investments had a positive direct effect on commitment in addition to an indirect effect through relationship satisfaction, for both dyads. To explain, relationship satisfaction of wives partially mediated the relationship between wives’ past intangible investments and commitment. In the same direction, relationship satisfaction of husbands partially mediated the relationship between husbands’ past intangible investments and their commitment. Despite the actor mediation effects, there was not a partner mediation effect. However, an indirect effect of husbands’ past intangible investments on wives’ commitment, through wives’ relationship satisfaction was found out. These results were parallel to the findings obtained regarding the second proposed model, in which the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were examined in the relationship between planned investments and commitment. Results revealed that relationship satisfaction of wives partially mediated the relationship between wives’ planned intangible investments and commitment. In the same direction, relationship satisfaction of husbands partially mediated the relationship between husbands’ planned intangible investments and their commitment. In spite of the actor mediation effects, there was not a partner mediation effect; however, an indirect effect of husbands’ planned intangible investments on wives’ commitment, through wives’ satisfaction was found out.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This final chapter outlines and demonstrates discussions in relation to the results derived from the statistical analyses. The first section is devoted to the discussion of the findings of the main study. Second section provides the implications drawn from the results of the study. Finally, the third section presents the recommendations for future research and practice.

5.1 Discussion of the Findings

With the increased attendance of women in labor force along with the changes in the role strains in marriages, and the increased divorce rates linked to the economic freedom of women (Can & Aksu, 2016; Cherlin, 1992; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Eryurt, & Koç, 2012), dual-career marriages have gained attention from researchers. Researchers who aim to develop strategies which would help dual-career married couples manage their role-strains in the family emphasize the rigorous need to unearth the underlying mechanisms which maintain dual-career marriages. To support dual-career married couples sustain their marriages, researchers need to understand the possible factors that have an impact on dual-career married couples’ intention to stay in their relationships. Given that Investment Model is highly valid in terms of explaining commitment, researcher consulted to the literature on the basic constructs of Investment Model to understand the factors that keep dual-career married couples committed to their marriages. Based on the existing literature, investment size has been a strong predictor of commitment throughout several research which have rested their studies on Investment Model (Le & Agnew, 2003; Rusbult et al., 1998). However, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) proposed that commitment can not only be explained by past investments but with planned investments, too. With this proposition, they
extended the conceptualization of investments and they categorized them in terms of materiality (tangible and intangible) and timing (past and planned). Hence, investments as extended by Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) as past and planned, tangible and intangible appear to relate to commitment. Relationship satisfaction as an outstanding predictor of commitment has already been proven almost to be the strongest elucidative of commitment (Impett et al., 2001). Since the research of interest is dual-career married couples, it is inevitable to consider their satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle as a possible correlate of commitment, in spite of the shortfall of research designating the relationship between them. To the knowledge of the researcher, no research however has been conducted to understand the role of these impacting factors in dual-career marriages.

In the present study, two models that examine the mediating roles of relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle in the relationship between investments and commitment were tested. Past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments of both wives and husbands were included as predictors in the current study and both husbands’ and wives’ commitment as the outcome variables, while relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were determined as mediator variables in both models. In the first model, relationship between past investments (past tangible and past intangible) and commitment via relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle; in the second model, relationship between planned investments (planned tangible and planned intangible) and commitment via relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were examined. The aim of the study was achieved through Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model (APIMeM) by analyzing data from dual-career married couples.

Findings from the two models are very similar to each other. In general, the results revealed several actor and partner effects of investments and relationship satisfaction as well as direct and indirect relationships between investments and commitment. Mainly, past intangible and planned intangible investments along with relationship satisfaction of wives and husbands were found to be directly and positively related to
their own commitment. Past intangible and planned intangible investments of wives were found to be negatively related to their husbands’ commitment. In addition, relationship satisfaction was observed to partially mediate the relationship between past intangible investments and commitment and planned investments and commitment, separately.

It was hypothesized in congruence with the literature that, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments would have actor and partner effect on commitment while past tangible investments would not have any actor or partner effect on commitment of couples. Moreover, relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were hypothesized to mediate the relationship between past intangible investments and commitment in the first model and in the second model, relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were hypothesized to mediate the relationship between planned tangible and planned intangible investments and commitment.

Following the hypotheses of the study, actor, partner, and mediation effects were discussed in below sections.

5.1.1 Discussion of Actor Effects

In this section, the actor effects found in both models were discussed.

As mentioned in Hypothesis 1a and Hypothesis 8a, as wives’ and husbands’ past intangible and planned intangible investments increased, they reported that they were more committed to their relationship. Moreover, as argued in Hypothesis 1b past tangible investments of wives and husbands were not related to their own commitment. Although planned tangible investments of wives and husbands were hypothesized to predict commitment, they were not found significantly related to their own commitment (Hypothesis 8b).
Past tangible investments of wives and husbands did not have either an actor or a partner effect on commitment, as hypothesized. These results were consistent with both the cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) in which they have found that past tangible investments failed to significantly predict commitment. On the other hand, in Lehmiller’s (2010) study where he compared heterosexual and gay couples in terms of their tangible and intangible investments, it was found that tangible investments significantly predicted commitment among heterosexual men but not gays. This is understandable as stated in Lehmiller’s (2010) study, since for heterosexual couples especially married ones, tangible investments such as joint financial investments, material possessions, and children, are comparatively easier to create; however, these investments may also put formal barriers to leaving the relationship. In case of a breakup, courts and lawyers might be involved to best divide or share the investments among couple members. Consequently, these investments may be especially strong in keeping some heterosexual relationships going, because there is the potential for these investments to be significantly decreased in value if the partnership were to end (Lehmiller, 2010). The inconsistency between Lehmiller’s findings and the findings of the current study may be due the fact that Lehmiller was primarily interested in the tangible versus intangible distinction in his study and he reported that whether the investments were created in the past or planned was not of his research interest. But, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) argue that tangible investments and its power in explaining commitment differ with respect to the timing of the investments as well. Since the reconceptualizations of investments done by Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) were followed out throughout the study, it can be concluded that the findings of the current study that past tangible investments did not have either an actor or partner effect on commitment, showed consistency with Goodfriend and Agnew’s propositions. However, it is interesting to observe that planned tangible investments of wives and husbands did not have any actor or partner effects on couples’ commitment, either. When these findings were considered, it could be concluded that investments and their relationship to commitment acted independent of timing of the investments. Although in the US, planned tangible investments were found to be a significant contributor to commitment (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008), in our culture, planned tangible
investments as with the past tangible investments did not have any relationship to commitment. It can be speculated that this is due to the uniqueness of the sample of the current study. In Turkey, dual-career married couples have been increasing in number; however, traditional gender roles keep remaining and this puts a lot of pressure on women on balancing work and home issues. Hence, what keep especially women satisfied with their relationship and makes them feel committed may be the intimacy felt in the relationship via intangible investments, such as being able to disclose themselves, putting effort in the relationship, and being able to share leisure time activities with their partners. Therefore, regardless of the materiality of the investments, intangible investments were meant to keep Turkish dual-career married couples committed to their relationship. Moreover, it can be speculated that economical ambiguity may also interfere with this finding. Couples may hesitate to make tangible investments, and they may feel themselves unsafe about planning to buy a house or making a joint debt. Therefore, making planned tangible investments for especially this specific sample group of the study would not count.

Intangible investments refer to time and effort put into the relationship, couples’ self-disclosure in the relationship, sharing an intellectual life and leisure activities together, and doing sacrifices and compromises for the sake of the relationship (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). Although as discussed above, tangible investments can be considered as valued resources and leaving them behind might not be easy, several distinct research studies posit that psychological importance of nonmaterial resources outweigh material resources. For instance, Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith (1999) argue that the origins of individual happiness are rooted in nonmaterial resources rather than material ones. Kasser and Ryan (1993, 1996) have shown that importance given to intrinsic aspirations like self-growth and personal identity is significantly related to subjective well-being. Beyond individual impacts of nonmaterial resources on well-being, they have relational effects, as well. The research in literature has shown that self-disclosure promotes relationship development (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993). In addition, intimacy as well is a relatively powerful dissuasive to leaving a relationship (Kurdek, 2006). Moreover, the items on Investment Size Subscale tap intangible resources, which are oriented toward the past (Goodfriend &
Agnew, 2008). Hence, it can be argued that the consistent association between investments (intangible ones) and commitment (Rusbult, 1980; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Rusbult & Martz, 1995) were supported by the findings of the current study. Consistent with the other research findings in the literature, past intangible and planned intangible investments were kept being a significant predictor of commitment for wives and husbands separately. These results were also parallel with the findings of both the cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) that past intangible and planned intangible investments accounted for variance in commitment above and beyond tangible investments.

Referring to the Hypothesis 2a and Hypothesis 9a, as wives’ and husbands’ past intangible and planned intangible investments increased, they reported that they were more satisfied with their dual-career lifestyle. However, on contrary to what was expected as mentioned in the proposed hypotheses 2b and 9b, past tangible investments and planned tangible investments of wives and husbands were not related to their own satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle.

Tangible investments refer to materialistic investments and involve money in general. The findings in the literature stated that there is a positive association between increased income and life satisfaction in dual-career married couples’ lives (Perrone & Worthington, 2001; Plouffe & Tremblay, 2017). Within the frame of the current study, dual-career married couples were of scope and since both partners work, there evolve increased income and more tangible investments to the relationship. However, the results of the current study did not supply the assumptions of previous findings and there were not found any associations between tangible investments and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. Passage of time might have interfered with these results since the researcher aimed to explore the relationship between investments done in the past or planned with today’s dual-career lifestyle satisfaction. The knowledge on how long the couple is being engaged in a dual-career marriage is not available to the researcher. Therefore, this needs to be examined in further studies, utilizing especially from longitudinal studies. Another explanation to this finding might be the income level of the participants in the current study. The participants of the current study were
highly educated but in terms of their income they represent more of middle class. Therefore, in consideration of income, their tangible investments may be limited and may not be enough to foster satisfaction with their dual-career lifestyle. Relationship duration might be another possible explanation for this finding. Le and Agnew (2003) categorized relationship duration as follows: a relationship length less than 18 months is short, and a relationship length longer than 18 months is long. In the current study, the average relationship duration of the dual-career married couples is 91.21 months, which is approximately 7.5 years which can be classified as long. As relationships get mature, satisfaction with life is affected from several other factors like relationship quality and relationship satisfaction (Gustavson, Røysamb, Borren, Torvik, & Karevold, 2016) not only by the tangible and materialist factors.

To consider the findings of the current study that past intangible and planned investments of wives and husbands predict satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle of couples, so far, the association between intangible investments and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was not studied in any research in the literature. However, based on the findings regarding the relationship between life satisfaction and self-disclosure (Nkongho, 1985), leisure time activities (Lyubomirksy, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005; Pagan, 2014), sense of identity (Huffstetler, 2006) as forms of intangible investments, it can be indirectly inferred that the finding of the current study showed consistency across studies in the literature.

As proposed in Hypothesis 3a and Hypothesis 10a, as wives’ and husbands’ past intangible and planned intangible investments increased, they reported that they were more satisfied with their relationship while past tangible ($H3b$) and planned tangible investments ($H10b$) were not significantly related to their own relationship satisfaction.

In the literature, prominent correlates of relationship satisfaction were found to be intimacy, passion, and love (Carandang & Guda, 2015), self-identity (Yadalijamaloye, Naseri, Shoshtari, Khaledian, & Ahrami, 2013), sexual attitudes and self-disclosure
(Hendrick, 1988), as constituting more of intangible investments. Therefore, it is thought that these findings support the research in literature.

Moreover, when the studies in the literature are considered, it is seen that satisfaction occurs as a result of cost-benefit analysis in which couples weigh experienced rewards against costs to evaluate the quality of outcomes. As a result of this calculation, couples evaluate the products they obtained and they compare it to personal expectations about what constitutes acceptable results, which is the comparison level (Hoffman, Agnew, Lehmiller, & Duncan, 2009). This cost and benefit analysis already seem to evaluate the intangible investments in a relationship: what one gets from the partner and what the partner gets from the one. Since, individuals are to be satisfied with a relationship in case the outcomes surpass what they consider acceptable (Hoffman et al., 2009), it is reasonable to find that either in the past or planned for future, intangible investments—as long as they surpass the expectations—seem to explain satisfaction with relationship, which results in higher commitments in the end.

Tangible investments, attaching material resources to the relationship, were expected to explain relationship satisfaction based on the previous findings in the literature positing that couples’ being able to obtain material components tend to experience higher relationship satisfaction (Emery & Le, 2014). However, in the current study either past or planned tangible investments were not found to relate to either wives’ or husbands’ relationship satisfaction. This may be due to a lack of expectation for either today or future ability to make material investments which tend to prevent couples’ current satisfaction with their relationship (Emery & Lee, 2014).

**As argued in Hypothesis 15b, as wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction increased, they reported that they were more committed to their relationship.**

Wives’ and husbands’ relationship satisfaction had a significant actor effect on commitment. This finding is consistent with the basic assumption of Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980) that satisfaction is the strongest predictor of commitment among other Investment Model variables (Cox, Wexler, Rusbult, & Gaines, 1997; Rusbult, 1983;
Rusbult et al., 1986a; Simpson, 1987). Model has been tested with various samples, and in all, commitment has been predicted strongly by relationship satisfaction (Rusbult, 1980). Especially, the examination of the relationship between satisfaction and commitment in married couples have demonstrated consistent results that, satisfaction keeps staying as one of the strongest predictors of commitment (Rusbult et al., 1986b; Impett et al., 2001). Moreover, Macher (2013) found actor effects of relationship satisfaction on commitment, in their study with dating, cohabiting, and married couples, as well. Taking into account the mediator role of satisfaction in the current study, it can be concluded that the way to commitment passes from satisfaction. Therefore, maintaining satisfaction in relationships, as the findings of the current study and the ones in the literature demonstrate, seem to play an important role in fostering the desire of couples to keep staying in a relationship. However, remembering the bidirectional nature of the relationship between satisfaction and commitment, increase in commitment may lead to increase in satisfaction as well. So, further research may focus on the outcome nature of satisfaction.

5.1.2 Discussion of Partner Effects

On the contrary to what has been proposed in Hypothesis 4a and Hypothesis 11a, past and planned intangible investments of wives negatively predicted their husbands’ commitment. That is, as long as women had done past intangible investments to their marriages in the past or they have been planning to do, their husbands’ commitment decreases.

Surprisingly, as the intangible investments of wives either done in the past or planned for the future increased, their husbands’ commitment level decreased. There were not any studies which have investigated the actor and partner effects of past tangible and past intangible investments on commitment in dual-career married couples, so far. The lack of literature regarding past tangible and past intangible investments in Turkey and absence of such research examining the partner effects of these investments made it difficult to compare these interesting findings of the present study with the previous ones. However, researcher thought of some speculations that could explain this
situation. First one is that; wives may be referring to what they have done for the sake of their relationship such as sacrifices, time and effort put, in either daily talk or in conflict situations, more than their husbands could stand for. In fact, Rusbult, Bissonette, Arriaga, and Cox (1998) argue that sacrifices—as one of the intangible investments—done for one’s partner and for the relationship, increase commitment in relationship, despite dissatisfaction with it. Moreover, as individuals plan to do sacrifices and compromises in their relationships, they report to become more satisfied with and committed to their relationship (Van Lange, Rusbult, Drigotas, Arriaga, Witcher, & Cox, 1997). On the other hand, if the past sacrifices were perceived to damage personal benefits in the relationship, marital satisfaction and commitment were observed to decrease (Whitton, Stanley, & Markman, 2007). The study of Topçu and Tezer (2013) proved this assumption with married couples in Turkey that if the sacrifices and compromises are perceived to be destructive for themselves, commitment and marital satisfaction decreases. These findings indicate that, husbands may perceive the intangible investments of their wives as destructive for themselves and they may be feeling under pressure of these intangible investments. Moreover, Topçu and Tezer (2013) found that women perceive their sacrifices more destructive for their sake when compared to men. Considering that Turkish culture is in between collectivism and individualism, but closer to collectivism (Ersöy, 2009), women are still expected to be responsible for household duties while men are expected to be active outside of the home (Bilgin, 2001). However, in more collectivist cultures, women are expected to have responsibilities at home but to be able to have a work outside, too (Triandis, 1995). In this regard, women may not perceive that they are doing sacrifices or doing intangible investments for the sake of their relationships instead fulfilling their roles imposed by the society (Topçu & Tezer, 2013). Furthermore, as they fulfill these roles, they may be referring to their husbands, maybe complaining about what they have done so far, and this may result in decreases in husbands’ commitment level. This needs further examination along with dual-career married couples’ perception of gender roles.

Another explanation to the finding that past and planned intangible investments of wives result in decreases in husbands’ commitment could be the attachment styles of
husbands. It is known from the literature that there are four different adult attachment categories: secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Containing these categories, two dimensions were identified: anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Saver, 1998). Among these, avoidance is the degree to which individuals want limited intimacy and choose to stay psychologically and emotionally independent. Attachment dimensions of the participants were not tested in the current study; however, husbands’ avoidance attachment style may interfere with wives’ past intangible investments, leading them to avoid high level of closeness. Rusbult et al. (1998) argue that women tend to exhibit higher levels of investments in their relationships which turn into more dependence on the relationship as a result when compared to men which is supported by Cross and Madson’s (1997) proposition that men are eager to construct an independent self-construal while women tend to construct and maintain an interdependent self-construal, which means that men want separateness. Most of the time, women’s sociality is directed towards dyadic close relationships while men’s social orientation is towards respectively larger groups. In this regard, wives’ past intangible investments and the way they transfer these investments to their husbands may interfere with men’s desire for independence and separateness, leading to decreased commitment.

Moreover, when partner effects of past tangible and planned tangible investments on commitment were evaluated, as proposed in Hypothesis 4b, there was not a significant partner effect of past tangible investments on commitment. However, although planned tangible investments were hypothesized to predict partner commitment, they failed to explain significantly (H11b).

In the literature, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is not any study which has investigated the partner effects regarding the relationship between tangible investments and commitment. The inferences can be driven from Goodfriend and Agnew’s (2008) cross-sectional and longitudinal studies in which they have found that past tangible investments failed to significantly predict commitment. Therefore, it can be concluded that the findings of the current study that past tangible investments did not have either an actor or partner effect on commitment, showed consistency with
Goodfriend and Agnew’s propositions. However, it is interesting to observe that planned tangible investments of wives and husbands did not have any partner effects on commitment. In fact, possessing a dog, a house, or having shared bank accounts are basic tangible resources linked to a relationship as central antecedents of commitment (Le & Agnew, 2003; Rusbult, et al., 1998). The reason why any partner effect of planned tangible investments were not found on commitment may be due to lacking hope for future ability to make tangible contributions to the existing relationship (Emery & Le, 2014). However, couples’ hope for future in terms of investing tangible resources was not tested in this study. Therefore, this needs further examination.

**As proposed in Hypothesis 6a and Hypothesis 13a, husbands’ past and planned intangible investments had a significant partner effect on wives’ relationship satisfaction that is as the past and planned intangible investments of husbands increased, their wives’ relationship satisfaction increased, as well.**

As stated above, relationship satisfaction associates with intimacy, passion, and love (Carandang & Guda, 2015), self-identity (Yadalijamaloye, Naseri, Shoshtari, Khaledian, & Ahrami, 2013), sexual attitudes and self-disclosure (Hendrick, 1988), as forms of intangible investments. Therefore, it is understandable that as husbands’ intangible investments increase, wives’ relationship satisfaction increase due to the increase in the felt intimacy. Another explanation may be the expectations of women from a marriage and a husband. Traditional marriages in which the man is the breadwinner and the women is the housework and childcare provider has been changing as the number of dual-career couples increase (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Rogers & Amato, 2000). Men are expected to engage in housework and childcare as well. These changing roles and expectations may impact marital satisfaction (Ogletree, 2015). For example, in Stevens, Kiger, and Riley’s (2001) study, women reported that when their partner helped with housework, this increased their housework satisfaction, and as a result their marital satisfaction, too. Riessman (1990) argues that husbands and wives should be each other’s closest companion and in marriages couple members need to feel intimacy. She adds that women want “deep talks”. In this regard, it can be concluded that if husbands’ intangible investments are more, they meet women’s
expectations from a partner and a marriage and in turn lead to higher levels of relationship satisfaction.

Considering past and planned tangible investments -attached material resources to the relationship-, they did not have any significant partner effect on relationship satisfaction \((H6b & H13b)\) which may be associated with Emery and Le’s (2014) proposition that couples may lack the ability to obtain material components resulting in lower relationship satisfaction (Emery & Le, 2014). This may be due to a lack of expectation for either today or future to make material investments which tend to prevent couples’ current satisfaction with their relationship (Emery & Lee, 2014). In the current study, the information regarding the expectations of couples for the future of their marriages were not obtained. Therefore, this needs further examination.

5.1.3 Discussion of Indirect/ Mediation Effects

In the current study, relationship satisfaction and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle were hypothesized to mediate the relationship of past and planned investments of wives and husbands to the commitment of couples.

Results indicated that relationship satisfaction partially mediated the relationship between intangible investments and commitment \((H7d & H14d)\) whereas satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle did not have a mediating role \((H7c & H14c)\).

Actor effects revealed four important mediations in the current study. Firstly, wives’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of wives’ past intangible investments on their commitment. Secondly, husbands’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of husbands’ past intangible investments on their commitment. Thirdly, wives’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of wives’ planned intangible investments on their commitment. Lastly, husbands’ relationship satisfaction partially mediated the effect of husbands’ planned intangible investments on their commitment. These results suggested when wives and husbands have done high levels of intangible investments into their relationship at past or if they
plan to do so, they feel more satisfied with their relationship which in turn, increase their commitment in their relationship.

In the current study, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was not found to be linked to commitment of dual-career married couples, neither having an actor nor partner effect (H15a & H16a). For the relationship between satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and commitment, the literature on satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle is limited and the findings in the literature lack the examination between satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and commitment. However, utilizing from literature on life satisfaction, it is known that the relationship between life satisfaction and commitment has been studied in the literature frequently in terms of job and organizational commitment, indicating that either job satisfaction predicts life satisfaction (e.g., Andrews & Withey, 1976; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989) or life satisfaction influences job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982). However, there have not been any studies explicitly examining the association between life satisfaction and commitment. Since there was not a significant relationship between these two constructs, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle was not found to mediate the relationship between investments and commitment (H7a, H7c, H14a, and H14c). However, researcher assumes that this may be due to the nature of satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. Firstly, as a limitation of the current study, couples were not asked how long they have been involved in dual-career marriages and how long they have been planning to continue working. Hence, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle appears not to predict commitment of dual-career married couples but to change with the relationship, as an interaction. Therefore, in further studies, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle can be examined as a moderator.

The mediating role of relationship satisfaction in the relationship between intangible investments and commitment was proven in the current study, for both wives and husbands. Although there is not any study in the literature, examining the relationship of past and planned intangible investments to commitment via relationship satisfaction, the results of the mediation analyses are almost parallel to the findings in the literature. In addition to the relationship between intangible investments (past and
planned) and commitment (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008), it is asserted that dual-career married couples also feel satisfied in their relationships. As couples do intangible investments, they feel satisfied in their relationship and as they feel satisfied, they feel more committed to their relationship (Cox, Wexler, Rusbult, & Gaines, 1997; Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult et al., 1986a; Simpson, 1987). Hence, it can be concluded that the findings indicated consistencies along with the existing literature. However, the partial mediation indicates that there are other constructs which contribute to the explanation of commitment rather than relationship satisfaction in dual-career married couples, which needs further examination.

5.2 Implications for Theory and Practice

In this section, firstly the implications for theory, afterwards implications for practice will be stated.

5.2.1 Implications for Theory

Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980) grounded theoretically within Interdependence Theory examines the processes of persistence in interpersonal relationships. Specifically, commitment is considered as intending to remain in a relationship, psychologically attaching to a partner, and gravitating for a long-term partnership (Arriaga & Agnew, 2001; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). According to the model, as long as people are satisfied with their relationship, as long as they evaluate the quality of alternatives negatively, and as long as they invest in their relationship, they will be more committed (Rusbult, 1980; 1983; Rusbult et al., 1998). However, their proposition of investment size has been found limited by Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) because of its focus on already done investments. Hence, they have argued that the plans regarding the future of the relationship and making intangible as well as tangible investments will lead to increases in commitment, as well (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008). In spite of their proposition, planned investments and their relationship to commitment has not been studied frequently in the literature. Therefore, this study appears important in terms of extending and testing Investment Model’s ‘investment’
proposition, taking into account the materiality and timing of investments with respect to the prediction of commitment.

As another point, Investment Model has been proven to be valid across several samples (Rusbult, 1980, 1983). However, the model and its constructs have not been tested with dual-career married couples although women have been in labor force with increasing numbers (Godenzi, 2012; Hays, 1996; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969) and this brings along the changes in the nature of family, in the dynamics of the marriages, and the lifestyle the dual-career married couples have been experiencing. In the current study, the answer to how dual-career married couples commit to their relationships and which factors affect their commitment are clarified. Firstly, the Turkish adaptation of Investment Model Scale with dual-career married couples contributes to the high validation of the scale. Afterwards, although all the constructs of Investment Model had not been tested, the predictive role of investments and relationship satisfaction in explaining commitment was proven with this unique sample, too. Even more, investments as extended by Goodfriend and Agnew (1998), were tested and their predictive role in explaining commitment except for past tangible investments was proven, too. Moreover, it was proven in the current study, rather than tangible investments, past and planned intangible investments play a role in fostering satisfaction and indirectly commitment.

Moreover, the Investment Model and its related constructs have been tested mostly with correlational and regression analyses thus far (Bevan, 2008; Büyükşahin et al., 2005; Panayiotou, 2005; Rusbult et al., 1998; Whitton & Kuryluk, 2012). However, recent studies have indicated that in close relationships while there is an impact of the individual on relationship dynamics, there is also the role of interaction between the couples, affecting each other’s outcome variables, too. In this regard, Macher (2013) formed a new model called Actor-Partner Interdependence-Investment Model (API-IM) in order to examine Investment Model from a dyadic perspective. She found that commitment level is affected by one’s satisfaction and investments as well as the partner’s satisfaction and investments. Utilization of Actor-Partner Interdependence Mediation Model for data analyses in the current study, supported the concept of social
interdependence in close relationships (Macher, 2013) and was evaluated as a sound dyadic extension of the Investment Model.

5.2.2 Implications for Practice

In the last years, dual-career marriages have become increasingly prevalent (Fouad & Tinsley, 1997). Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) define dual-career couples as the type of couple where both spouses have an active career and a family life. They have a high degree of commitment to a career, which generally accompanies with a higher education and cumulated experiences in the specific career field.

Dual-career couples emerged in 1960s in the US with almost 900,000 couples and this number was 3.3 million in 1983 (Conference Board, 1985). For Turkey, although there is not a specific report on the number of dual-career married couples, Turkish Statistics Institution’s report in 2017 indicated that women are being more involved in labor force, yet not even the half of men but less. However, it is for sure that, families in which both of the spouses work, have been the most common family pattern ever since (Hansen, 1997).

These statistics arose the need to prepare counselors to help dual-career married couples for finding overall satisfaction (Wilcox-Matthew & Minor, 1989) and for arranging their close relationships. Counseling psychologists who do career counseling (Nauta, Epperson, & Kahn, 1998) or marital counseling (Kurdek, 1998) need to understand the nature of dual-career marriages to counsel many of today’s couples, effectively. Especially, it would be important to evaluate the impact of resources, relationship characteristics, and investments of the dual-career married couples on their relationship satisfaction, dual-career lifestyle satisfaction, and commitment. Counselors should detect the strengths and weaknesses of in each of the three areas and tailor the intervention to the needs of the unique dual-career married couple (Sperry, 1993). In this regard, the Turkish adaptations of Past and Planned Investments Measure (PPIM) and Satisfaction with Dual-Career Lifestyle Scale (SWDCLS) are argued to contribute to the understanding of Turkish dual-career
married couples. Examination of the psychometric properties of PPIM provided evidence for the construct validity, face validity, and criterion-related validity of the measure, with acceptable reliability. Moreover, construct validity and face validity of SWDCLS was proven with a good internal consistency. This means that PPIM and SWDCLS can be used with Turkish dual-career married couples. Confirmation of the same factor structure of the scales also indicated that satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle and past and planned investments of Turkish dual-career married couples are similar to their international counterparts. These findings indicate that counselors may utilize international resources to derive conclusions about the nature of dual-career couples in Turkey, as well.

When the results of the current study were considered, it is seen that past and planned intangible investments were strong predictors of satisfaction with dual-career married lifestyle, relationship satisfaction, and commitment. In this regard, useful interventions for dual-career married couples might include helping the individuals or couples detect their past intangible investments together with their plans for future, especially the intangible plans in order to foster their life satisfaction, relationship satisfaction and commitment. On the other hand, the findings of the current study indicated that intangible investments of wives either in past or planned for future, decrease the commitment level of husbands. How the investments done in the past are transferred to husbands, whether they put pressure on men in terms of relationship or not, should be evaluated in counseling sessions, too. For sure, men and women are different in terms of evaluating their outcomes and investments to the relationship; therefore, the uniqueness of the interventions for each individual and couple appears important.

In addition, dual-career married couples were found to experience high quality marriages with more marital satisfaction (Wilcox-Matthew & Minor, 1989). In the current study as well, the intangible investments of the couples into their relationship either in the past or for the future contribute to their relationship satisfaction, and indirectly their commitment through relationship satisfaction, as well. Therefore, in the counseling sessions, the satisfaction level of the individuals and couples, with respect to their intangible investments, and their intention to stay in their relationship
would worth working. Counselor can emphasize that a satisfactory relationship does not just happen; it requires planning, too (Wilcox-Matthew & Minor, 1989).

Counselors may encourage couples to do arrangements to maintain a satisfactory relationship and life, which in turn will foster commitment, as well. Hence, Myers (1993) state that marital satisfaction has important influences on overall happiness and health of the couples and the relationships. Couples may make plans to spare leisure time with each other along with long working hours, they may do plans for arranging responsibilities for household and child care, supporting each other, giving time to communicate with each other, disclose themselves on how they have been going through in their dual-career marriage; all of which are part of intangible investments.

Moreover, psychoeducational groups or seminars in workplace settings can reach the members of dual-career married couples, who would utilize from the information given rather than a counseling session.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

Research on Investment Model indicates model’s validation with several relationship types and various samples, both in the international literature and in Turkish literature. However, extended reconceptualization of the investments and the sample studied in the current study are new. Hence, several recommendations can be done for future research. First of all, there may be different associates of past tangible, past intangible, planned tangible, and planned intangible investments. For extending the research field of investments, organizational, relational, individual, and familial factors are suggested to be tested further. Attachment styles, perception of types of investments, at an individual and familial level, are considered as the potential contributors to understanding the nature of these investments. Moreover, the associations of investments to relationship variables need further investigation.

Another variable which needs to be explored is satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle. There is a striking increase in the number of dual-career married couples all over the
world and in Turkey, as well. The possible factors, which affect satisfaction with this new lifestyle, are strongly recommended to be studied in further research. The number of years the couple has been in a dual-career marriage, their perception of this new lifestyle, role-strains, sharing of the responsibilities regarding household and childcare are the towering factors that need to be studied in further research. In addition, literature indicated that job satisfaction is a crucial predictor of both life satisfaction and relationship satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993). Therefore, for the future studies, job satisfaction of dual-career married couples can also be taken into consideration. A composite score of satisfaction, consisting of job satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle could be formed, and latent variables could be tested.

The current study with the proposed models is apparently useful for differentiating couples with general marital concerns from those whose dual-career lifestyle satisfaction is also an issue. Therefore, more research is needed to fully investigate the great diversity and complexity of marital, career, and life quality of dual-career married couples.

This study is generalizable only to highly educated, middle to upper middle SES dual-career couples in Turkey. Moreover, they were involved in heterosexual marriages. Therefore, there is a need to replicate the findings of the current study, with different sample groups, such as dual-career married couples of low SES, cohabitating heterosexual couples, and cohabitating homosexual couples. Moreover, in the current study, sample comprised of the individuals between the ages of 19-55, which is a quite wide range. In the future studies, cross-sectional designs could be utilized in order to test the hypotheses of the current study at different age groups. Also, all the couples in the current study were in their first marriages. Only 8 of them had 3 children, and the others did not have children more than 2. Therefore, the couples in the current study did not have to handle the issues of stepchildren or ex-spouses. Moreover, the length of the marriages of the participants ranged from seven months to 25 years, which is a wide range. Hence, how the investments, satisfaction, and commitment of the couples differ with respect to different life cycles of the relationship was not assessed. In future
studies, these dynamics could also be added to the research design and the effect of these dimensions on the relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with dual-career lifestyle, and commitment could be evaluated, taking into consideration the family life cycles specifically.

The data for the main study were collected via online surveys. It is suggested for further studies to collect data in a more structured environment, for example in a laboratory, in order to supply researcher with control over his/ her participants and testing situations.

This study utilized correlational design so inferences about cause and effect relationship cannot be made as mentioned in the limitations part of the study. Future research could utilize experimental designs in order to observe the relationship of different types of investments and commitment. For example, relationship scenarios as in the experimental studies of Carter, Fabrigar, Macdonald, and Monner (2013), with various past and planned investments they have put into their relationship, could be provided to the participants and participants’ evaluations of these investments in terms of both materiality and timing could be discovered with respect to their relationship commitment. Moreover, longitudinal studies are highly recommended. Data on planned investments at one time will be past investments at the second time. Therefore, the comparisons between these investments are thought to understand the nature of investments more in detail.

The use of APIM has shown a tremendous increase in recent years for investigating the familial dynamics or for the analysis of the data in close relationships (Kashy & Kenny, 2000; Kenny, 1996; Kenny & Cook, 1999). APIM has been used in various research area in recent years such as child-parent relationship (Pesonen, Raikkönen, Kajantie, Heinonen, & Strandberg, 2006), romantic relationships (Peterson, Pirritona, Christensen, & Schmidt, 2008), married couples (Landis, Peter-Wight, Martin, & Bodenmann, 2013), and siblings (Kenny & Cook, 1999). It has been just recently that dyadic analyses have been used in Turkish culture (Çakır, 2013; Özen, 2012; Tomar,
The further studies are recommended to study the recommended topics, taking into consideration couples’ interdependent structure, utilizing from APIM analyses.

To conclude, investments are promising for explaining satisfaction and commitment. They provide new and fresh knowledge for understanding the nature of commitment and the mediator role of satisfaction in dual-career married couples may lead the counselors to develop intervention programs and seminars on the relationship satisfaction and commitment of dual-career married couples. This study is the initial study in Turkey testing reconceptualized investments with dual-career married couples and it was proven to have a partial validity with Turkish dual-career married couples. It must be noted that this study is an exploratory study yet crawling but needs to be fed and developed in Turkey with different samples, different variables, and different methodologies.
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A. SAMPLE ITEMS FROM INVESTMENT MODEL SCALE (IMS)

İlişkimiz benim için doyum verici.
İlişkimize öyle çok yatırım yaptım ki, eğer bu ilişki sona erince çok şey kaybetmiş olurum.
İlişkimizin çok uzun bir süre devam etmesini istiyorum.
Birlikte olduğum kişiye ve ilişkilime çok bağlanmış hissediyorum.
Eşimle/ sevgilimle arkadaşlığımız var.
Eşimle/ sevgilimle yer doldurulması güçlü bir entelektüel yaşamımız (sinema, tiyatro, sergiye gitmek; kitap, dergi okumak ve paylaşılarda bulunmak vb.) var.
Gelecekte, eşimle/ sevgilimle ortak maddi yatırımlarımız (mal, hisseler, vb.) olacak.
Gelecekte, eşimle/ sevgilimle ne sadece benim ne de sadece onun olan, “bizim” dediğimiz evcil bir hayvanımız olacak.
C. SAMPLE ITEMS FROM SATISFACTION WITH DUAL-CAREER LIFESTYLE SCALE (SWDCLS)

Çift- kariyerli evliliğimizin koşulları mükemmeli.
Çift- kariyerli yaşam tarzımdan memnuniyem.
Bu zamana kadar, çift- kariyerli yaşam tarzımdan istediğim, önemli şeyleri elde ettim.
Yaşınız:

Cinsiyetiniz: K ( ) E ( )

Eğitim Durumunuz:
1- İlkokul mezunu
2- Ortaokul mezunu
3- Lise mezunu
4- Üniversitesi mezunu
5- Yüksek lisans mezunu
6- Doktora mezunu

Gelir Durumunuz:
0- 1001 TL:
1001- 2000 TL:
2001- 3000 TL:
3001- 4000 TL:
4001- 5000 TL:
5001- 6000 TL:
6000 TL ve üzeri:

Eşinizin Gelir Durumu:
0- 1001 TL:
1001- 2000 TL:
2001- 3000 TL:
3001- 4000 TL:
4001- 5000 TL:
5001- 6000 TL:
6000 TL ve üzeri:

Lütfen şimdiki aile yapınızı belirtiniz.
Çekirdek aile (anne- baba- çocuk/ılar) ( )
Geniş aile (vb.) (  )

Sizinle birlikte yaşayan kişileri lütfen belirtiniz.

Eşinizle nasıl tanıştınız?
Arkadaş ortamı (  )
Görücü usulü (  )
İnternet üzerinden (  )
İş yerinde (  )
Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz)

Evlilik kararını nasıl verdiniz?

Evlilik öncesi tanıma sürenizi lütfen belirtiniz.

Evlilik öncesi flört dönemi sürenizi lütfen belirtiniz.

Kaç yıldır evlisiniz?

Daha önce başka bir evliliğiniz/ evlilikleriniz oldu mu?
Evet (  ) Hayır (  )

Evet ise; bu kaçncı evliliğiniz? Lütfen belirtiniz.

Şu an içinde bulunduğunuz evliliğinizden çocuğunuz/ çocuklarınız var mı?
Evet (  ) Hayır (  )

Var ise; şu andaki evliliğinizden kaç çocuğunuz olduğunu lütfen belirtiniz.

Önceki evliliğinizden/ evliliklerinizden çocuğunuz var mı?
Evet (  ) Hayır (  )

Evet ise, her birinden kaç çocuğunuz olduğunu belirtiniz.
Önceki evliliğinizden/ evliliklerinizden çocuklarınız sizinle mi yaşıyor?
Evet ( )  Hayır ( )

Daha önce eşinizin başka bir evliliği/ evlilikleri oldu mu?
Evet ( )  Hayır ( )

Evet ise; bu kaçinci evliliği? Lütfen belirtiniz.

..........................................................................................................

Eşinizin önceki evliliğinden/ evliliklerinden çocuğu var mı?
Evet ( )  Hayır ( )

Evet ise, her birinden kaç çocuğu olduğunu belirtiniz.

..........................................................................................................

Önceki evliliğinden/ evliliklerinden çocukları sizinle mi yaşıyor?
Evet ( )  Hayır ( )

Mesleğiniz nedir?

..........................................................................................................

İş yerinize hangi görevde çalışıyorsunuz?

..........................................................................................................
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F. PERMISSION LETTER FOR PAST AND PLANNED INVESTMENTS MEASURE (PPIM)

From: Goodfriend@bv.edu
To: sbozguluk@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: Past and Planned Investments Measure
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2014 14:44:03 +0000

Hello Burcu,

Thank you for contacting me. I have been to Turkey twice, and it is very beautiful!

You are welcome to use the measure from my study, and to translate it. You can find all four of the measures on my website, using the link:
http://web.bvu.edu/faculty/goodfriend/Survey%20Pages/Relationship%20Investments%28planned%20and%20specific%29.html

You will see the first two measures on this page show the scales for planned investments (tangible and intangible). The second two measures show the scales for past investments (tangible and intangible). Please let me know if you have any questions. I am glad that someone is interested in this topic! Good luck with your Ph.D. research.

Wind Goodfriend, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Assistant Director, Gender & Women’s Studies Program
Principal Investigator, Institute for the Prevention of Relationship Violence
610 W. 4th Street, Storm Lake, IA 50588
Dear Dr. Goodfriend;

I am writing from Middle East Technical University, Ankara- Turkey. I am a Phd. student in Psychological Counseling department and I am writing my thesis. My topic is romantic relationship maintenance and commitment. I want to approach this issue based on the Bases of Relational Commitment Model. I read your article: "Sunken Costs and Desired Plans: Examining Different Types of Investments in Close Relationships". I read that you have used Past and Planned Investments Measure.

In this regard, would you please let me to use that measure in my thesis, translating to Turkish? If you do, would you please send me the measure?

Thank you in advance,

Yours sincerely,

S. Burcu Özuglund
G.PERMISSION LETTER FOR SATISFACTION WITH DUAL-CAREER LIFESTYLE SCALE (SWDCLS)

Re: About Satisfaction with the dual-career lifestyle Scale

Perrone-McGovern, Kristin Marie <kperrone@bsu.edu>
6.04.2015 Pzt 04:14

Thank you for your interest in using this scale. You are welcome to do so and I will include the scale here. It should be noted this was a modification to the Satisfaction with Life Scale by Diener et al.

***

Participants respond using the following scale:

1
2 3
4 5
6
Always
Most of
Some of
Rarely
Never
Not Applicable
the time
the time

Items are as follows:
1. I am satisfied with having a spouse who has a career.

2. I am satisfied with my career.

3. For me, having a career, and having a spouse with a career is my ideal.

4. The conditions of my "dual-career" marriage are excellent.

5. I would not change anything about the lifestyle my spouse and I share (two careers).

Best wishes,

Kristin Perrone McGovern, PhD, HSPP, LMHC
Professor
Department of Counseling Psychology
Ball State University
Department URL: www.bsu.edu/counselingpsychology

Fellow, American Psychological Association (Division 17)

From: burcu özgüülük <sbozguluk@hotmail.com>
Date: Monday, March 30, 2015 at 5:11 AM
To: Kristin McGovern <kperrone@bsu.edu>
Subject: About Satisfaction with the dual-career lifestyle Scale
Dear Dr. Perrone;

I am writing from Middle East Technical University, Ankara- TURKEY. I am a PhD student in the Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance and I am writing my thesis.

The sample of my study is dual- career married couples. I have read your article: "Factors Influencing Ratings of Marital Quality by Individuals within Dual- Career Marriages: A Conceptual Model". I have seen that you have developed Satisfaction with the Dual- Career Lifestyle Scale. I would like to use that scale in my study, too. Therefore, would you please permit me to use it in my thesis and to translate it to Turkish and examining its psychometric properties with Turkish sample?

In case you permit, would you also please share the full version of the scale with me?

Thank you in advance,

Best regards

S.Burcu Özgülük
H. CURRICULUM VITAE

S. Burcu Üçok
ozgulukburcu@gmail.com
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bogazici University Double Major Program of Preschool Education &amp; Guidance and Psychological Counseling</td>
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</tr>
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<td>2001</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

WORK EXPERIENCE

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
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<td>Part-time Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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I. TÜRKÇE ÖZET/ TURKISH SUMMARY

1 GİRİŞ


aile veya bireynin kendisi tarafından ne ölçüde karşılandığı ile belirlenir (Rusbult ve arkadaşları, 1998). Bu nedenle, Karşılıklı Bağımılık Kuramı (Kelley ve Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut ve Kelley, 1959), bir kişinin belirli bir eşle bir ilişkini sürdürme arzu ettiği sürece (doyum seviyesi yüksek) ve o ilişki dışında uygun hiçbir seçenek olmaması sebebiyle (seçeneklerin yetersiz olduğu) ilişkide bağımlılığının arttığını varsayar.


Rusbult, 1983; Rusbult ve arkadaşları, 1998; Whitten ve Kuryluk, 2012). Bununla birlikte, Türkiye’de yapılan çalışmalar, doyum düzeyinin daha yüksek, seçeneklerin niteliğinin daha düşük ve yatırım miktarının daha fazla olmasıının daha yüksek düzeylerde bağlılığa sebep olduğunu ilişkin bulgular ortaya koymuş ve bu bulguların alanyazınla tutarlı olduğu görülmüştür (Büyükşahin, Hasta ve Hovardaoğlu, 2005; Büyükşahin ve Hovardaoğlu, 2007).


1.1 Çalışmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın amacı çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerde yatırımlar ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin, ilişki doyumunun ve çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumunun aracı rollerini dikkate alınarak Türk örnekleminde incelemesidir.

1.2 Çalışmanın Önemi

Bu çalışmanın amacı, çift-kariyerli, evli, Türk çiftlerde, yatırım ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin potansiyel araçları olarak ilişki doyumunun ve çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumunun rollerini incelemektir. Bu çalışma, ilişki bağlılığı için gelecek planlarının önemini dikkate alarak, Türkiye’de çift-kariyerli, evli çiftlerle Yatırım Modeli’ni iki


2 YÖNTEM

2.1 Örneklem

Bu çalışmada veriler, en az yedi aydır evli olan Türk çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerden toplanmıştır. Çalışmanın örneklemini 213 çift-kariyerli evli çift oluşturmuştur. Örneklem seçimi için amaçlı örnekleme ve kartopu örnekleme yöntemlerinden yararlanılmıştır. Bu çalışmaya katılımın temel kriterleri, çift-kariyerli evli bir çift olmak, en az altı aydır evli olmak, çiftlerden her ikisinin de ilk evliliğinin olması ve çalışmaya katılmaya gönüllü olmaktır.

Katılımcıların yaş aralıkları 19 ile 55 arasında olup, yaş ortalamaları 34.07’dir (SS = 5.56). Kadınlar için ayrıca test edildiğinde, kadınların yaşlarının 19-52 arasında olduğu (yaş ortalaması = 33.29, SS = 5.17), erkeklerin yaşlarının ise 19 ile 55 yaşları arasında olduğu (yaş ortalaması: 34.85, SS = 5.83) bulunmuştur. Örneklemin sadece çok küçük bir bölümü ilkokul mezunudur (0.5%). Ortaokul mezunu herhangi bir katılımcı yoktur. Katılımcıların çoğunluğu (54%) üniversite mezunu ve yüksek lisans/doktora eğitimi mezunudur (37.5%). Katılımcıların yüzde 24,4’ü, aylık 2001-3000 TL geliri olduğunu belirtirken, yüzde 23,5’i aylık 3001-4000 TL gelirinin olduğunu belirtmiştir.

Demografik verilerin yanı sıra, katılımcıların kişisel özelliklerine dair bilgiler de edinilmiştir. Çiftler en az 7 aydır evlidiirler ve şu an içinde buldukları evlilik, ilk evlilikleridir. Katılımcıların evlilik süreleri yedi ay ile yirmi beş sene arasında değişmektedir (ortalama evlilik süresi = 91,21 ay, SS = 71.60). Katılımcılardan 197’si (92.5%) çekirdek ailelerinin olduğunu belirtmişken sadece sekiz katılımcı (3.8%) geniş ailedede yaşadıklarını dile getirmiştir. Çift-kariyerli evli çiftler arasında önemli bir bölümüün (43.7%) çocuğu yokken, 74 çiftin (34.7%) bir çocuğu, 38 çiftin (17.9%) ise iki ve daha fazla çocuğu vardır.
2.2 Veri Toplama Araçları


Ölçeğin dört faktörlü yapısı geçerliğini sınmak için doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır ve sonuçlar \( \chi^2 (21) = 54.85, p = .00, CFI = .97, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .04 \) olarak bulunmuştur. Ölçeğin dört faktörlü yapısı doğrulanmıştır. Doym Düzeyi alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık kat sayısı .94, Seçenekler Niteliği alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık kat sayısı .86, Yatırım Miktarı alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık kat sayısı .82 ve Bağlılık alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık kat sayısı .84 olarak bulunmuştur.

incelemek için geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek toplam 26 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçeğin 13 maddesi geçmiş yatırımları ve 13 maddesi gelecek yatırımları ölçmektedir. Her 13 maddeden 8’i manevi yatırımları ölçerken, 5’i maddi yatırımları ölçmektedir. Bu çalışmada ölçek Türkçe’ye çevrilerek, dil eşdeğerlik katsayları hesaplanmış ve geçerlik, güvenirlik çalışmaları yapılmıştır. Ölçeğin dört faktörlü yapısını test etmek amacıyla doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. İlk yapılan analiz sonuçları zayıf bir model uyumununu göstermiştir ($\chi^2 (29) = 204.60$, $p = .00$, $\chi^2/df$ ratio was 7.06; $CFI = .90$, $TLI = .84$, $RMSEA = .15$, $SRMR = .05$). Bunun üzerine, parametreler incelendiğinde Geçmiş Maddi Yatırımlar Ölçeği’nin 7.maddesinin çok düşük bir faktör yüklemesine sahip olduğu göze çarpmıştır. Bu sebeple, madde analizlerinden çıkarılmış ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizi tekrarlanmıştır. Yeni sonuçlar, ölçeğin dört faktörlü yapısını iyi bir model uyumyla doğrulamıştır: $\chi^2 (26) = 46.76$, $p = .01$, $CFI = .99$, $TLI = .98$, $RMSEA = .06$, $SRMR = .03$.

Ölçeğin, ölçü dayalı geçerliğini test etmek için ise, Geçmiş ve Gelecek Yatırımlar Ölçeği ile Yatırım Modeli Ölçeği’nin alt ölçeği olan Yatırım Miktari Alt Ölçeği arasındaki ilişkiler Pearson korelasyon katsayısı ile hesaplanmıştır. Korelasyon analizlerinin sonucu, yatırım miktarı ile geçmiş manevi yatırımlar arasında ($r = .46$, $p < .01$) anlamlı bir ilişkinin olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Yatırım Miktarı alt ölçeği ile Geçmiş Maddi Yatırımlar alt ölçeği arasında ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), Gelecek Maddi Yatırımlar alt ölçeği arasında ($r = .28$, $p < .01$) anlamlı ama zayıf ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Yatırım Miktarı alt ölçeği ile Gelecek Manevi Yatırımlar alt ölçeği arasında ise anlamlı, pozitif ve orta derecede iyi bir ilişki saptanmıştır ($r = .43$, $p < .01$).

Geçmiş Maddi Yatırımlar alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık katsayısı .68, Geçmiş Manevi Yatırımlar alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık katsayısı .82, Gelecek Maddi Yatırımlar alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık katsayısı .77 ve Gelecek Manevi Yatırımlar alt ölçeğinin iç tutarlılık katsayısı .89 olarak bulunmuştur.

Çift-kariyerli Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği, Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği’nden (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) uyarlanarak, Perrone ve Worthington, Jr. (2001)
tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek toplam 5 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, ölçeğin Türkçe’ye çevrilmesi, dil eşdeğerlik çalışmaları ile geçerlik ve güvenirlik hesaplamalarının yapılması gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Ölçeğin tek faktör yapısı, yapılan doğrulayıcı faktör analizi ile test edilmiştir ve sonuçlar tek faktör yapının mevcut veriye uyduğunu göstermiştir: \( \chi^2 (4) = 4.79, p = .31, CFI = 1, TLI = 1, RMSEA = .03, SRMR = .02 \). Ölçeğin iç tutarlılık katsayısı ise .83 olarak hesaplanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada kullanılan Demografik Bilgi Formu’nda, katılımcıların hem kişisel hem de ilişkisel özelliklerine dair sorular sorulmuştur. Kişisel bilgileri edinmek için sorulan sorular, yaş, cinsiyet, eğitim seviyesi, gelir seviyesi bilgilerini içerirken, ilişkisel bilgileri edinmek için sorulan sorular aile yapısı, evlilik süresi, çocuk sahibi olma durumu ve evlilik sayısı gibi soruları içermektedir.

2.3 İşlem


2.4 Verilerin Analizi

Araştırma kapsamında toplanan verilerin analizi birkaç adımda gerçekleştirilmiştir. Birinci olarak, veri analizi öncesinde, veri tarama ve veri temizleme süreçleri gerçekleştirilmiştir. Daha sonra SPSS programında, varsayımlar test edilmiş, betimsel analizler aracılığıyla, katılımcıların kişisel ve ilişkisel özellikleri hakkında bilgi


2.5 Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları


Çalışmanın ikinci sınırlılığı ise, bu çalışmada APIM (Aktör-Partner Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Modeli) kullanılmış olsa da çalışmanın kesitsel doğası yatırımların, ilişki doyumunun, çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumunun ve bağlılığın nedensel yönlerine ilişkin varsayımlara engel teşkil etmektedir.

Üçüncü sınırlılık, çalışmada amaçlı örnekleme ve kartopu örnekleme tekniklerinin kullanılması olmuştur. Bu teknikler seçkisiz örnekleme tekniği olmamaları sebebiyle,
Bu teknikler belirli özelliklere sahip popülasyonlara ulaşılması açısından faydalı olmalarına rağmen, örneklemeye yöntemi üzerinde az miktarda kontrol bulunmaktadır. Ayrıca, çalışmanın örneklemesi eğitim seviyesi yüksek kişiler oluşturmuştur. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın sonuçları, yalnızca bu çalışmanın örneklemiyle benzer özelliklere sahip çift-kariyerli, evli çiftler için genelleştirilebilir.


3 BULGULAR

Bu çalışmanın amacı, çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerde yatırımlar ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin, ilişki doyumu ve çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumu değişkenlerinin aracı rolleri dikkate alınarak incelenmesidir. Bu sebeple, 2 ayrı model test edilmiştir.

Birinci modelde geçmiş yatırımlar ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişki, ilişki doyumu ve çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumu değişkenlerinin aracı rolleri dikkate alınarak incelenmiştir. İlk olarak tüm yolların yer aldığı, tam doymuş model test edilmiş, daha sonra anlamlı olmayan yollar modelden çıkartılmıştır. Tablo 4.3’te de görüldüğü gibi, modelin uyum iyiliği indeksleri kabul edilebilir aralıktır ($\chi^2(22) = 22.74, \chi^2/df = 1.03, p = .42, GFI = .98, AGFI = .95, TLI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .01, SRMR= .03$).
Birinci modeldeki aktör etkileri dikkate alındığında, kadınların geçmiş manevi yatırımlarının, ilişki doyumlarını ($\beta = .54$, $p < .01$), çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumlarını ($\beta = .39$, $p < .01$) ve bağlılıklarını ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$) anlamli bir şekilde yordadığı görülmektedir. Erkeklerin geçmiş manevi yatırımlarının da benzer bir şekilde, ilişki doyumlarını ($\beta = .65$, $p < .01$), çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumlarını ($\beta = .22$, $p < .01$) ve bağlılıklarını ($\beta = .41$, $p < .05$) anlamli bir şekilde yordadığı görülmektedir. Ayrıca, kadınların ve erkeklerin ilişki doyumu, bağlılıklarını anlamli bir şekilde yordamaktadır ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .47$, $p < .01$).

Aynı zamanda, aktör etkileri iki önemli aracılık göstermektedir. Birinci olarak, kadınların ilişki doyumu, kadınların geçmiş manevi yatırımları ile bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkiye kısmi aracılıkla açıklamaktadır ($\beta = .13$, $p < .05$). İkinci olarak, erkeklerin ilişki doyumu, erkeklerin geçmiş manevi yatırımları ile bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkiye kısmi aracılıkla açıklamaktadır ($\beta = .31$, $p < .05$). Bu sonuçlar, kadın ve erkeklerin ilişkileri için geçmişte yaptıkları manevi yatırımlarının ilişki doyumlarını arttırdığını, ilişki doyumlarının ise nihayetinde bağlılıklarını artırdığını göstermektedir.

Modeldeki partner etkileri dikkate alındığında ise, iki partner etkinin olduğu görülmektedir. Kadınların geçmiş manevi yatırımlarını, erkeklerin ilişkiye bağlılıkları anlamli ve negatif yönde yordamaktadır ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$). Ayrıca, erkeklerin geçmiş manevi yatırımları kadınların ilişki doyumu olumu ve anlamli bir şekilde açıklamaktadır ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$). Partner etkileri üzerinden anlamli çıkan bir aracılık bulunmamıştır; fakat erkeklerin geçmiş yatırımlarının kadınların ilişki doyumuunu arttırdığını, bunun da kadınların ilişkiye bağlılıklarını artırdığını görülmektedir ($\beta = .04$, $p < .01$).

İkinci modelde gelecek yatırımlar ile bağlılık arasındaki ilişki, ilişki doyumu ve çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumu değişkenlerinin aracı rolleri dikkate alınarak incelenmiştir. İlk olarak tüm yolların yer aldığı, tam doymuş model test edilmiştir, daha sonra anlamlı olmayan yollar modelden çıkartılmıştır. Tablo 4.5’te de görüldüğü gibi,
modelin uyum iyiliği indeksleri kabul edilebilir aralıktadır ($\chi^2(21) = 22.37$, $p = .38$, $GFI = .98$, $AGFI = .95$, $TLI = 1.00$, $CFI = 1.00$, $RMSEA = .02$, $SRMR = .03$).

İkinci modelde, aktör etkileri dikkate alındığında, erkeklerin gelecek maddi ve gelecek manevi yatırımlarının ilişki doyumlarını anlamlı bir şekilde açıkladığı görülmektedir ($\beta = .17, p < .01$; $\beta = .49, p < .01$). Kadınların gelecek manevi yatırımlarının, ilişki doyumlarını ($\beta = .39, p < .01$), çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumlarını ($\beta = .29, p < .01$) ve bağlılıklarını ($\beta = .36, p < .05$) anlamlı bir şekilde yordadığı görülmektedir. Erkeklerin gelecek manevi yatırımlarının da, çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzı doyumlarını ($\beta = .16, p < .05$) ve bağlılıklarını ($\beta = .35, p < .01$) anlamlı bir şekilde yordadığı görülmektedir. Ayrıca, kadınların ve erkeklerin ilişki doyumu, bağlılıklarını anlamlı bir şekilde yordamaktadır ($\beta = .19, p < .01$; $\beta = .49, p < .01$).


Modeldeki partner etkileri dikkate alındığında ise, iki partner etkinin olduğu görülmektedir. Kadının gelecek manevi yatırımları, erkeklerin ilişkiyi bağlılıklarını anlamlı ve negatif yönde yordamaktadır ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$). Ayrıca, erkeklerin gelecek manevi yatırımları kadınların ilişki doyumunu olumlu ve anlamlı bir şekilde açıklamaktadır ($\beta = .18, p < .01$). Partner etkileri üzerinden anlamlı çıkan bir aracılık bulunımızdır; fakat erkeklerin geçmiş yatırımlarının kadınların ilişki doyumunu arttırdığı, bunun da kadınların ilişkiyi bağlılıklarını dolaylı olarak arttırdığı görülmektedir ($\beta = .07, p < .01$).
4 TARTIŞMA


Araştırmanın bulguları göstermiştir ki, kadınların ve erkeklerin ilişki doyumları arttıkça bağımlılıkları da artmaktadır. Yatırım Modelinin farklı örneklemelerle test edildiği çalışma bulguları tutarlı olarak ilişki doyumunun bağlılığın en güçlü yordayıcısı olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Bu bağlamda araştırma sonuçları alanyazındaki bulguları destekler niteliktedir.

ölçülmemiştir; fakat ilerideki çalışmalarında bu değişkenin de dikkate alınması önerilmektedir.


4.1 Kuram ve Uygulamaya Yönelik Çıkarımlar

Bu bölümde, öncelikle kuram açısından çıkarımlar, sonrasında uygulama açısından çıkarımlar belirtilecektir.
4.1.1 Kurama Yönelik Çıkarımlar


Agnew (1998) tarafından genişletildiği şekliyle yatırımlar test edilmiş ve geçmiş maddi yatırımlar dışında bağılılığın açıklanmasındaki yordayıcı rolleri de kanıtlanmıştır.


4.1.2 Uygulamaya Yönelik Çıkırmalar

Son yıllarda, çift-kariyerli evli ikili gittikçe yaygınlaşmıştır (Fouad ve Tinsley, 1997). Rapoport ve Rapoport (1976), çift-kariyerli çiftleri her iki eşin de çalıştığı ve bir aile yaşamına sahip olduğu, çift türü olarak tanımlar. Bu çiftler, genellikle iyi bir eğitim ve belirli bir kariyer alanında deneyim birikimiyle seyreden bir kariyere son derece bağlıdır.

fazla işgücüne katıldığını göstermiştir. Yine de her iki eşin çalıştığı ailelerin o zamandan beri en yaygın aile biçimi olduğu kesindir (Hansen, 1997).


Bu çalışmanın sonuçları dikkate alındığında, geçmiş ve planlanan manevi yatırımların, çift-kariyerli, yaşam tarzı doyumunu, ilişkı doyumunu ve bağımlılığın güçlü yordayıcıları olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bakımdan, çift-kariyerli, evli çiftlere yönelik müdahaleler, yaşam doyumlarını, ilişkı doyumlarını ve bağımlılıklarını geliştirmek için bireylerin ve


Bunun yanı sıra, bir psikolojik danışma oturumu yerine, işyeri çevrelere psikoeğitim grupları oluşturulup veya seminerler düzenlenerek, verilen bilgilerden yararlanabilecek çift-kariyerli, evli çiftlerin bu bilgilere ulaşmaları sağlanabilir.

4.1.3 Gelecek Çalışmalar için Öneriler


Bu çalışma ve önerilen modellerin, genel evlilik kayıolları olan evli çiftlerden, çift-kariyerli yaşam tarzının da sorun olduğu çiftler ayırtmakta önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu sebeple, çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerin evlilik, kariyer ve yaşam kalitelerini tam anlamıyla anlayabilmek için daha çok araştırmaya ihtiyaç vardır.


Çalışmanın verileri çevrimiçi anketlerle toplanmıştır. İleride yapılacak olan çalışmalarında, verilerin laboratuar gibi daha yapılandırılmış ortamlarda gerçekleştirilmesi önerilmiştir. Bu sayede araştırmacıların veri toplama süreci üzerindeki kontrolü artırılabilicektir.

Bu çalışmada korelasyonel desenden yararlanılmış ve bu nedenle sınırlılıkler bölümünde de bahsedildiği gibi sonuçlardan sebep- sonuç ilişkisi çıkarmak mümkün değildir. İleride yapılacak olan çalışmalar, farklı yatırım çeşitleri ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkii gözlemleme adına deneyisel çalışmalar olarak gerçekleştirilebilir. Örneğin,


Sonuç olarak, yatırımların, doyumu ve bağlılığı açıklamadaki rolü önemlidir. Bağlılığın doğasını anlamak, ilişki doyumunun çift-kariyerli çiftlerdeki rolünü anlamak ve psikolojik danışmanları çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerin ilişki doyumu ve bağlıklarıyla ilgili müdahale programları geliştirme ve seminerler vermeye yönlendirebilecek, çok yeni ve taze bilgiler sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma Türkiye’de çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerle yeniden kavrumsallaştırılmış yatırımları inceleyen ilk çalışmadır ve Türk çift-kariyerli evli çiftlerle kısmen geçerliği失眠mıştır. Unutulmamalıdır ki, bu çalışma emekleme sürecinde olan ama farklı örneklemeler, farklı değişkenler ve yöntemlerle beslenerek büyütülüp, geliştirilmesi gereken bir çalışmadır.
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