

An Appraisal of The Marital Satisfaction Inventory: A Psychometric Process

Kyeremeh Tawiah Dabone (PhD)^{1*}, Prof. Joseph Kwesi Essuman (PhD)¹, and Prof. Eric Nyarko-Sampson (PhD)²

¹*Counselling Centre, University of Cape Coast, Ghana*

²*University of Environment and Sustainable Development, Somanya, Ghana*

Abstract: The Marital Satisfaction Inventory is a standardised instrument which has been used in estimating the satisfaction levels of married people in their marriages mostly in Ghana. This study sought to further validate Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI). The inventory has 35 items in all and categorised into two sections sub-categorised into seven scales. The multi-stage sampling procedure was used in selecting 210 married people in the Berekum municipality to participate in the study. The method used in validating the instrument included translational validity (content validity and face validity), construct validity (factor analysis) and reliability by internal consistency approach. The results using the revealed that principal component analysis with varimax rotation put the items under six factors instead of seven. The reliability coefficient was found to be 0.94 alpha level. In all, the instrument was found to have good psychometric properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Cherlin (2012), marriage is seen as a universal activity where two individuals from different backgrounds, with different interests and with different character traits decide to live together. In most cases, the reason cited for marriage is love. Aside love, other reasons given for marriage, include feelings of belongingness, affection, compatibility, desire, and closeness and tenderness. Over the years people have withdrawn from their marriages and yet there are others who want to withdraw. Mostly when people are asked why they have left their marriages or want to leave, the excuse they give is that they are not satisfied in their marriages.

White (2019) defines marriage as an institution that is legally and socially sanctioned and that is defined by the rules of law as well as by the customs and beliefs of the people who live in it (if any). Marriage is also a long-term commitment that limits one's tendency toward self-indulgence, gratification, and self-centeredness. Couples can better prepare and condition themselves for the community in this relationship. Marriage serves as a foundation for social order by reining in selfishness and promoting love for one another (Feder, 2017). Couples are happy when their expectations for their marriage are met, which is the case for most unions. A couple's dissatisfaction occurs when these expectations are not met; moreover, couples who are unhappy in their marriages face a number of detrimental consequences. Abuse can be both physical and emotional for some couples.

This has a negative impact on their overall well-being and productivity.

The cultural and historical traditions of a people can have a great effect on the way they define marriage. This is due to the fact that every culture has its own notions about how a married couple should behave towards one another. In general though, the institution of marriage can be said to be shared by all human societies. Marriage is a connection between two people that is generally accepted by society. When two individuals are socially accepted to begin a family together, it is an arrangement that is deemed to be favourable to both parties. As a direct consequence of this, it is now considered to be an acceptable social norm (Haviland, Prins, McBride & Walrath, 2011). Olson and DeFrain (2000) described marriage as an emotional and legal commitment to share emotional, physical, and economic resources. Both Haviland et al., and Olson and DeFrain state 'two people.' These two people could be a man and a woman, as in the United States, or they could be of the same sex. This inquiry will centre on a married couple.

In Ghana, marriage is defined as a connection between a man and a woman acknowledged by both families. Marriage provides friendship, support, and a legal avenue for sexual enjoyment and reproduction. In Ghana, marriages often involve not just immediate relatives but also distant kin (Wreh & Kofitse, 1998).

Marital satisfaction connotes positive feelings about marriage (Essuman, 2010). According to Kaplan and Maddux (2002), marital satisfaction refers to a personal evaluation of married persons with regard to the extent of pleasure and happiness about their marriage experiences.

Couples that have a mutually supportive relationship tend to be happier with one another, according to studies. "The less likely couples are to contact one another in an effort to obtain support, and the more favourably each spouse will react to these pleas" (Dabone, 2018). Each spouse's sense of support is bolstered when they feel heard and affirmed by their partner. In addition, spouses' feelings of support may grow as they seek to repair their marriage. Greater degrees of marital discontent, higher levels of sadness, and less controllable stress levels were seen in those who reported reduced spousal support (Purdum, Lucas & Miller, 2006).

Marital discontent surges when spousal support is reduced (Purdom et al., 2006).

Even while the age of the children and the quantity of children have an outcome on the satisfaction of the marriage, what happens when one spouse is under stress owing to the daily responsibilities, the characteristics of the children, or the interactions between the parents and the children? Even married individuals who have well-developed coping strategies and capacities may discover it challenging to utilize those skills when faced with challenging circumstances (Karney & Bradbury, 2005). Marriages that occur in circumstances with high levels of stress may be extra challenging owing to the greater gravity of the challenges that spouses must overcome both within and beyond their relationship (Karney & Bradbury, p. 173).

It is critical to know whether or not the couples that remain together are actually happy. It has been shown that most married people want or anticipate marital contentment, according to the authors Esquer, Burnett Baucom and Norman (1997). Fifty-two percent of marriages in 1992 were regarded unsatisfying by the spouses involved, according to the U.S. Bureau of Census. In light of these and other data, researchers are looking at the impact of marital discontent on health outcomes. There are several indicators of marital stability and discontent. There have been numerous studies conducted that provide conclusive evidence regarding the following topics: effects of past and present satisfaction with one's partner and living conditions; autonomy/relatedness; the Empty Nest Syndrome; types of premarital relations and their effect on marital satisfaction; and the effect of premarital relations on marital satisfaction.

The body of research showing a correlation between satisfying marriages and good premarital relationships is ever-expanding. There is a lot of evidence in literature that relationship contentment decreases in the early two to three years of marriage and that marital discontent does not necessarily result in marital instability. As a result, it is critical to identify the many premarital antecedents that impact marital pleasure. Based on their research, Fowers and Olson (1992) identified four distinct categories of premarital couples. Prior to marriage, and two to three years later, all couples completed a pre-marital inventory provided by a psychologist or psychiatrist. Relationship-related strengths and weaknesses were assessed using an instrument created for this purpose. Couples that were energised reported the greatest levels of marital contentment, with excellent communication skills, high levels of happiness with love, physical intimacy, time spent together, shared wealth, and a firm conviction in the significance of religion.

Despite the fact that most parents continue to have a part in their children's lives even after they are no longer living with them, the empty nest period has been shown to improve marital happiness (Katz, 2001). There are many more aspects that add to a "happy" marriage, but these are by no

means the only ones. It has been discovered that autonomy and relatedness, or a good feeling of spousal independence and perceptions of closeness, have a favourable impact on marital satisfaction. Both partners' contentment with their marriage was favourably influenced by the critical parental stage of childlessness, known as the Empty Nest era (Pacey, 2004).

Researchers Amstutz-Haws and Mallinckrodt (1996) conducted a study of twenty-five heterosexual couples ages eighteen to thirty who were married for at least six to thirteen months and had separated from their parents psychologically. In addition, each spouse was questioned whether they thought their marriage was going well; if they were happy; if they received enough love; and if they agreed sufficiently on different matters. Couples who grew up in a household with both parents were more likely to struggle in their new marriages. Both couples reported increased levels of modification and fulfilment in their marriage after the husband was freed from overwhelming feelings of contriteness, worry, suspicion, obligation, embarrassment, anger, and rage toward their mother. When the women had husbands who were better able to handle and steer their practical concerns without the backing of the father, the marriages of these women were likewise more successful. It appeared that the ease with which the husbands were able to separate themselves from their parents was a decisive factor in the adjustment process for the wives while moving from dating to marriage. However, male spouse's adjustment to marriage relied on how successfully both couples were able to remove themselves from the influence of their parents. People who marry someone who has the same psychological type and interests as they do are more likely to remain married and be happy with the choice they made, according to Amstutz-Haws and Mallinckrodt (1996).

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) was designed to ascertain the satisfaction levels of married people and over the years, some studies have been carried out using the inventory to collect marital satisfaction data (Ahene, 2011; Dabone, 2012; Akummey, 2013; Asamoah, 2014, & Ntuah, 2015). In this study, the researchers aimed at further validating the instrument, and also to ascertain whether the items were well placed under the various scales as designed by the author.

II. METHOD

The methods used to validate the MSI included the following. For:

1. Translational validity, content validity and face validity were used.
2. Construct validity, factor analysis method was used.
3. Reliability internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) method was adopted.

The inventory comprises 35 items. The demographic items are five while there are 30 items measuring the extent of

marital satisfaction. The 30 items are categorised under seven scales with names as listed below:

- Scale 1: Relationship (six items)
- Scale 2: Affection, Love and Appreciation (five items)
- Scale 3: Character (six items)
- Scale 4: Temperament (three items)
- Scale 5: In-law Issues (three items)
- Scale 6: Marital Roles (three items)
- Scale 7: General Evaluation (four items)

The inventory is designed using both positive and negative items. The negative items are 15 in number and the positive items are also 15. The reliability coefficient as established by the Ahene (2009), Akummey (2013) and Dabone (2012) stand at 0.91, 0.80 and 0.86 respectively. The psychometric properties of the various scales are however not indicated.

To find out whether or not individuals in the married individuals are satisfied or not in their marriages, respondents were given a four-point Likert-type scale inventory to respond to. The scoring was based on the four-point Likert scale of measurement of Very True (VT), True (T), Not True (NT) and Not at all True (NAT). The options of the items were weighted as VT = 4, T = 3, NT = 2 and NAT = 1. This was reversed for the negative items. The total score a married person could obtain for all the 30 items was 120, with a minimum of 30.

The less the score, the closer a person was to the verge of divorce in marriage. The intervals for the categories were as follows:

At the verge of divorce	30 – 44
Not satisfied	45 – 74
Satisfied	75 – 104
Very satisfied	105 – 120

III. TRANSLATIONAL VALIDITY

Content validity

In establishing the extent to which the content of the instrument was adequate and relevant, a content validation was undertaken. Content validity indicates the extent to which the items of an instrument cover the entirety of elements being studied. It is mostly carried out by seven or more experts (Pilot & Hunger, 1999; DeVon, Block, Moyle-Wright, Ernst, Hayden, Lazzara, et al. 2007, Parsian & Dunning, 2009). To assess the content validity of the MSI, the researchers clearly defined a theoretical and conceptual framework of marital satisfaction by conducting an in-depth literature review and gathering views from practising professionals. After establishing the conceptual framework, ten experts in the fields of Guidance and Counseling, psychology and Measurement and Evaluation reviewed the 35-item MSI to ensure it had good content validity. They all agreed that the MSI had good content validity.

Face validity

In ascertaining whether the inventory is fitting regarding the structure, face validity was deemed appropriate. This is deemed to be validation procedure which is easy to carry out even though it is the weakest means of establishing validity (Parsian & Dunning, 2009). This form of validity assesses the outlook of the instrument regarding its viability, eligibility, uniformity of style and lay out, and lucidity in terms of the language used (Haladyna, 1999; Trochim 2001; DeVon et al. 2007). The responses of the 210 respondents on the MSI with regard to clarity and understanding of the items, showed that most of them indicated the items were clear.

Construct validity

Construct validity can be viewed as the extent to which the items of an instrument are connected to the key theoretical constructs (Kane 2001; DeVon et al. 2007). This form of validity takes a quantitative and not a qualitative form in describing what is “valid” and “invalid” (Parsian & Dunning, 2009). It is also seen as the amount of relatedness between the dependent or construct variable and the independent or indicator variable (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). In situations where the indicator or independent variable comprises several items, factor analysis can be used to establish construct validity. The multi-stage sampling procedure was used to get the sample (married men and women) for this study. Stratified, quota and simple random sampling procedures were used in selecting the sample of 210.

Factor analysis

Factor Analysis is a statistical approach which is usually used in the developing a data collection instrument to group items into common areas or factors, interpreting each of the factors on the basis of the specific items loading highly on the factors and summarising them under the various factors (Bryman & Cramer, 1999; Pallant, 2010). Loading can be seen as the means of measuring the correlation between a specific item and a factor (Bryman & Cramer, 2005; Pallant, 2010). On the other hand, a factor is seen as the grouping of items which fit together. The extent of relatedness among a group of items defines the specific construct for the factor. Items that are not related do not form part of a specific construct. This means that items that are not related cannot be grouped together and as such do not form part of a specific construct and thus should be taken out (Munro, 2005).

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is a technique of doing factor analysis which analyses the association and correlation among variables without defining any specific theoretical model (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). EFA assists researchers to specify the construct on the basis of the theoretical framework which gives the direction or course of the instrument (DeVon et al., 2007) and recognizes the highest difference in scores using the fewest number of factors (Delaney, 2005; Munro, 2005).

Large samples are necessary to allow factor analysis to be carried out reliably (Bryman & Cramer, 2005; Pallant, 2010). Even though the number of respondents necessary for carrying out factor analysis is still debated, it is argued that a minimum of five respondents per variable is suitable or appropriate (Munro, 2005). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy and factor loadings and the correlation between a variable and a factor were undertaken to make sure the sample size is suitable for the study.

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) are the two most common forms of extraction methods (Bryman & Cramer 2005). In PCA, the total variance of a variable is examined whereas in PAF, analysis is conducted on only common variance (Bryman & Cramer 2005). Total variance comprises both specific and common variances. In terms of definition, common variance is seen as the variance shared by different variables while specific variance connotes the variance within a single variable (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). Thus, PCA was considered to be reliable without faults and thus perfect to be used on the 35 items on the MSI (Bryman & Cramer, 2005).

In the view of Bryman and Cramer (2005, p. 330), two main conditions under which factors can be retained are:

1. *“The Kaiser criterion to select those factors that have an eigenvalue ≥ 1 . However, the general criterion of an eigenvalue ≥ 1.00 could misrepresent the most appropriate number of factors (Gorsuch, 1983; Heppner, Lee, Wang & Park, 2006).*
2. *A Scree Plot to depict the descending variances that account for the factors extracted in graph form. The factors that lie before the point at which eigenvalues begin to drop can be retained. Varimax, the most commonly used orthogonal rotation was undertaken to rotate the factors to maximise the loading on each variable and minimise the loading on other factors (Field, 2005; Bryman & Cramer, 2005)”*.

Reliability

Reliability is the consistency or stability of test scores (Gay, Geoffrey, & Peter, 2009, Hair, Causby, & Miller, 2005, Johnson & Christensen, 2004). This implies that an assessment tool is to produce the same or almost the same scores anytime it is administered to the same individual. Even though reliability is deemed necessary, it is not sufficient to completely authenticate an instrument, since an instrument can satisfy condition of reliability but not validity (Beanland, Schneider, LoBiondo-Wood, & Haber, 1999; Pilot & Hunger, 1999, DeVon et al., 2007).

Issues that should be in consideration when ascertaining reliability include “Standard error of the instrument (considered to be most significant data on reliability to report), independence of sampling, heterogeneity of content and how the instrument is used” (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004, p. 13). Internal consistency was used in

establishing the reliability of the MSI. Internal consistency establishes that association that exists among items on an instrument and shows the fitting nature of the various items (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; DeVon et al., 2007). Further, in estimating the consistency of the entire instrument, the total score of the various items is calculated (Parsian & Dunning, 2009).

There are two main ways of establishing internal consistency. These are Split-half reliability and Cronbach’s alpha correlation coefficient method (Trochim, 2001). According to Parsian and Dunning (2009), split-half reliability involves dividing a set of items on an instrument into two parts and finding the correlation between them. Cronbach’s alpha method however involves finding the average of all the likely split-half estimations and is mostly used in research for estimating internal consistency reliability (Trochim, 2001; DeVon et al. 2007). In this paper, the internal consistency of the MSI was established using the Cronbach’s alpha. It has been documented in the literature that if an instrument has different scales or sections, Cronbach’s alpha have to be computed for the various sections and for the overall instrument (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994; DeVon et al. 2007). In this regard, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each of the seven subscales of the MSI.

IV. RESULTS

Translational validity

Content validity

According to Pallant (2010) and Lynn (1996), in assessing Content Validity Index (CVI), it is expected that three different ratings would indicate that the content is valid and reliable in relation to the conceptual framework dealing with ten experts. All the items on the MSI were deemed to be valid. This is because ten experts from the fields of Measurement and Evaluation, Psychometrics and Guidance and Counselling assessed the items and deemed them valid.

Face validity

In establishing face validity, all the participants read through the instrument using a four-point likert scale. Eighty nine percent of them noted that they had clear understanding of the questions and had an ease in answering them while 94% revealed that they were satisfied with the outlook or form of the instrument.

Factor analysis

In ensuring that the sample size was suitable for factor analysis, it was necessary to carry out the KMO sampling adequacy on the MSI. This was found to be 0.93. The KMO statistic ranges between 0 and 1. Specifically, a value of 0 shows that the addition of the partial correlations is huge when compared to the sum of correlations indicating diffusion in the nature of the correlation and thus suggesting that it may be inappropriate to conduct factor analysis (Parsian & Dunning, 2009). As the value draws closer to 1, the

indication is that factor analysis is appropriate (Field, 2005). Kaiser (1974) indicated that KMO values between 0.5 and 0.7 are average; 0.7 and 0.8 are good, 0.8 and 0.9 are great, and > 0.9 are superb. This implies that the sampling adequacy value (0.9) was superb using Kaiser's scale.

Similarly, Steven (2002) posited that a factor is considered to have reliable fit if about 10 or more of its items load with 0.4 for more than 150 respondents. In this study, the KMO of the MSI was 0.93 with all the items having loadings of greater or equal to 0.4, using a sample of 210, factor analysis was seen to be appropriate.

After running PCA, it was revealed that the total variance of the MSI was 71.23%. This implies that at least 50% of the variance was probably due to common factors which made it rational (Field, 2005). Also, the communalities of the variables on the MSI were greater than 0.5. After using Kaiser's criterion on the MSI, seven factors were shown to have eigenvalues greater than 1.00 in the PCA. The scree plot

created was observed and it was shown that four to six factors could be selected. In essence, the two different measures revealed that different set of factors could be retained. In the view of Steven (2002) and Field (2005), the scree plot and eigenvalues are precise determinants of the number of factors that can be retained in factor analysis when dealing with a sample greater than 250 and communalities greater or equal to 0.6, or in situations where the instrument has over 30 items with communalities greater or equal to 0.7.

From the forgoing, in examining four to seven factors, a six factor solution using the Varimax rotation was considered most suitable for the MSI inferring from a statistical or conceptual perspective. To ensure that the data was interpreted appropriately, the guidelines given by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998) in checking for practical significance were used. Following the guidelines, factors which load ± 0.3 indicate low or minimum significance, those which load ± 0.4 indicate being more important while those which load ± 0.5 give the impression of being significant.

Table 1: Results of the six factor solution of the MSI according to the Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation

No.	Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	I always feel fulfilled, happy when I have my wife by me.	.613					
2	I like the way my wife converses and shares her experiences with me.	.792					
5	We (I and my wife) quarrel over petty disagreements and each other's feelings very often.	.599					
10	My wife always seeks my opinion on important issues concerning our marriage. I like this.	.846					
20	Our conversation always ends in a quarrel. So we scarcely converse these days.	.652					
21	I and my wife accept disagreement without hurting each other's feelings.	.641					
25	I like the way my wife keeps in touch when she travels. She phones and converses to my liking.	.531					
30	I enjoy my wife's company most times.	.693					
3	I am satisfied sexually with my marriage.		.784				
4	I am very disturbed because my wife does not appreciate all the sacrifices I put in my marriage		.761				
8	My wife is the best I can ever have.		.597				
16	I notice that my wife is becoming more attractive to me. I am growing to love her more and more.		.748				
23	My wife appreciates very much how I help her in the home (with the household chores).		.782				
27	My wife respects and admires me very much. She says I work hard.		.764				
6	My wife cannot be trusted. She is very cunning, not reliable.			.731			
12	I am fed up with my wife because she is stubborn, never ready to change her bad ways (like her keeping bad friends).			.738			
18	One thing I like about my wife is that she admits her faults and apologises.			.624			
19	My wife is insolent. She speaks to me without respect.			.581			
22	My wife nags almost everyday and makes my life very uncomfortable.			.637			
28	My wife complains too much. Nothing I do at home pleases her.			.682			

7	I will feel much happier if I move out of my present marriage.				.667		
13	My wife is too cold for my liking. I do not enjoy her company.				.562		
14	My wife is indifferent. She does not care about what I do with my life.				.691		
29	My wife is fond of hitting me with objects to harm me when she is angry. I feel unsafe because she is very violent.				.573		
11	My in-laws are very helpful and give me respect.					.784	
17	My in-laws are my worst enemies in my marriage. They make my life miserable.					.548	
24	My wife does not like my relatives. She treats them badly when they visit. This makes me highly displeased.					.613	
9	I like my wife a lot for her financial support in the marriage.						.562
15	My wife keeps her money to herself. She does not contribute to the upkeep of the home and family.						.771
26	My wife cooks well and takes good care of the home. I love her for this.						.893

Internal Consistency Reliability

Following the validation process, the MSI was revised, after which the Cronbach’s alpha was used to check the reliability. A coefficient of 0.94 was obtained indicating that the MSI was reliable with high correlation among the various items. Thus, there was high internal consistency. Even though there are different views about which alpha values are appropriate or suitable, some of the experts in the literature suggest alpha of at least 0.90 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) while others argue for alpha of at least 0.70, particularly for newly designed instruments (DeVellis 1991; DeVon et al., 2007). In this paper, the alpha obtained for each of the seven sub-scales also surpassed the minimum value: all subscales were > 0.70, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Classical Psychometric Properties

Scale	Mean	Std	α
Relationship	1.214	.621	.913
Affection, Love and Appreciation	1.323	.341	.942
Character	1.134	.657	.901
Temperament	1.341	.381	.925
In-Law Issues	1.231	.465	.911
Marital Roles	1.461	.581	.934
General Evaluation	1.194	.460	.903
All items	1.271	.493	.944

IV. DISCUSSION

Eight items loaded onto Factor 1. It is evident from Table 1 that these eight items all relate to issues of companionship. This factor loads onto I always feel fulfilled, happy when I have my wife/husband by me, I like the way my wife/husband converses and shares her experiences with me, We (I and my wife/husband) quarrel over petty disagreements

and each other’s feelings very often, My wife/husband always seeks my opinion on important issues concerning our marriage. I like this, Our conversation always ends in a quarrel. So we scarcely converse these days, I and my wife/husband accept disagreement without hurting each other’s feelings, I like the way my wife keeps in touch when she travels. She phones and converses to my liking and I enjoy my wife’s/husband’s company most times. This factor was labelled, “Relationship”

Six items load onto a second factor related to married peoples’ reported perceptions about admiration and indebtedness. This related to I am satisfied sexually with my marriage, I am very disturbed because my wife does not appreciate all the sacrifices I put in my marriage, My wife is the best I can ever have, I notice that my wife is becoming more attractive to me. I am growing to love her more and more, My wife/husband appreciates very much how I help her/him in the home (with the household chores) and My wife/husband respects and admires me very much. She says I work hard. This factor was labelled, “Affection, Love and Appreciation”.

The six items that load onto Factor 3 relate to issues of trust and integrity. The related items are My husband/wife cannot be trusted. He/she is very cunning, not reliable, I am fed up with my wife/husband because he/she is stubborn, never ready to change his/her bad ways (like his/her keeping bad friends), One thing I like about my husband/wife is that she admits his/her faults and apologises, My wife/husband is insolent. He/she speaks to me without respect, My husband/wife nags almost everyday and makes my life very uncomfortable and My husband/wife complains too much. Nothing I do at home pleases him/her. This factor was labelled, “Character”.

The four items that load onto Factor 4 identify the issues of personality and disposition. These include; I will feel much happier if I move out of my present marriage, My wife/husband is too cold for my liking. I do not enjoy his/her company, My wife/husband is indifferent. He/she does not care about what I do with my life, My wife/husband is fond of hitting me with objects to harm me when he/she is angry. I feel unsafe because he/she is very violent. This was labelled, "Temperament".

Items loaded for Factor 5 related to issues of the external family. This was labelled, "In-law issues". The items that loaded include; My in-laws are very helpful and give me respect, My in-laws are my worst enemies in my marriage. They make my life miserable, and My wife/husband does not like my relatives. He/she treats them badly when they visit. This makes me highly displeased.

Items for Factor 6 related to spousal responsibilities. The items included; I like my husband/wife a lot for his/her financial support in the marriage, My husband/wife keeps his/her money to himself/herself. He/she does not contribute to the upkeep of the home and family, and My husband/wife cooks well and takes good care of the home. I love him/her for this. This factor was labelled, "Marital Roles".

V. CONCLUSION

The MSI is a valid and reliable instrument in measuring marital satisfaction however we recommend that the instrument be reviewed from its current seven sub-scales to six scales as the analysis revealed. Items under general evaluation sub-scale can fit under the other scales. We also encourage a confirmatory factor analysis be carried on the instrument.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abra, R. C. (2011). Determinants of marital satisfaction among Ghanaian Couples. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
- [2] Ahene, C. (2011). Religion and marital satisfaction in Cape Coast. Unpublished master's dissertation. University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
- [3] Akumme, G. (2013). Marriage and family counselling in the Cape Coast metropolis: Contemporary theories perspective. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Cape Coast: Cape Coast.
- [4] Amstutz-Haws, A., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1996). Separation-individuation from parents and marital adjustment in newlywed couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 91-106.
- [5] Asamoah, A. (2014). Choice, exchange, and the family: Marriage the integrating factor. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Cape Coast: Cape Coast.
- [6] Beanland C., Schneider Z., LoBiondo-Wood G., & Haber, J. (1999). *Nursing research: Methods, critical appraisal and utilisation*. Sydney: Mosby.
- [7] Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (1999). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS release 8 for windows. A guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.
- [8] Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2005). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS12 and 13. A Guide for Social Scientists*. East Sussex: Routledge.
- [9] Cherlin, A. J. (2012). *Marriage, divorce, remarriage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- [10] Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My Current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64 (3), 391-418.
- [11] Dabone, K. T. (2012). Marital satisfaction among married people in the Sunyani municipality. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Cape Coast: Cape Coast.
- [12] Dabone, K. T. (2018). Impact of couple-oriented and group-oriented approaches on marital satisfaction of couples at the verge of divorce in Sunyani Municipality, Ghana. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Cape Coast: Cape Coast.
- [13] Delaney, C. (2005). The Spirituality Scale, Development and Psychometric Testing of a Holistic Instrument to Assess the Human Spiritual Dimension. *Journal of Holistic Nursing*, 23 (2), 145-167.
- [14] DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [15] DeVon, H. A., Block, M. E., Moyle-Wright, P., Ernst, D. M., Hayden, S. J., Lazzara, D. J. et al. (2007). A psychometric Toolbox for testing Validity and Reliability. *Journal of Nursing scholarship*, 39(2), 155-164.
- [16] Esquer, R., Burnett, L., Baucom, C., & Norman, E. (1997). Marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marital Satisfaction*, 5, 236-312.
- [17] Essuman, J. K. (2010). *Marital satisfaction inventory*. Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast Press.
- [18] Feder, J. (2017). Mindfulness and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Adult Development*, 12(1), 43-51.
- [19] Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- [20] Fowers, B. J., & Olson, D. H. (1992). Four types of premarital relationships: An empirical typology based on PREPARE. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6, 10-21.
- [21] Gay, L. R., Geoffrey, E. M., & Peter, A. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. London: Pearson.
- [22] Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [23] Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*, (5th ed.). Prentice-Hall: Upper Saddle River.
- [24] Hair, K., Causby, V., & Miller, D. (2005). The nature and function of fusion in the dynamics of lesbian relationships. *Journal of Women and Social Work*, 14(1), 78-93.
- [25] Haladyna, T. (1999). *Developing and validating multiple-choice test items*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [26] Haviland, J., Prins, F., Mc Bride, D., & Walrath, A. (2011). *The future of marriage*. Bantam.
- [27] Heppner, P.P., Heppner, M. J., Lee, D., Wang, Y., & Park, H. (2006). Development and validation of a collectivist coping style inventory. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 53(1), 107-125.
- [28] Hunter, J. E., Schmidt, F. L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting errors and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- [29] Johnson, D. R., & Christensen, A. (2004). Rural economic decline and marital quality: A panel study on farm marriages. *Family Relations*, 39, 159-165.
- [30] Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity *Psychometrika*, 39 (1), 31-36.
- [31] Kane, M. (2001). Current concerns in validity theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 38, 319-342.
- [32] Kaplan, M., & Maddux, J. E. (2002). Goals and marital satisfaction: Perceived support for personal goals and collective efficacy for collective goals. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 21, 157-164.
- [33] Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2005). Contextual influences on marriage. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(4), 171-174.
- [34] Katz, R. (2001). Nonfiction children & youth divorce emotions psychology family counselling. *Family Journal*, 9, 86-107.
- [35] Lynn, M. R. (1996). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, 35, 382-385.
- [36] Munro, B.H. (2005). *Statistical methods for health care research*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.

- [37] Ntuah, C. (2015). Counselling for marital adjustment in Assin Fosu. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Cape Coast: Cape Coast.
- [38] Nunnally, J.C., Bernstein, I.H. (1994). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [39] Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (2000). Marriage and the family: Diversity and strength (3rd.ed.). Mayfield Publishing Co.
- [40] Pacey, S. (2004). Couples and the first baby. *Sexual & Relationship Therapy*, 19(3), 223.
- [41] Pallant, J. (2010). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS (4th ed.). Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press/McGraw Hill
- [42] Parsian, N., & Dunning, T. (2009). Developing and validating a questionnaire to measure spirituality: A psychometric process. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 1(1), 2-11.
- [43] Pilot, D., & Hunger, B. (1999). *Nursing research: Principles and methods*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- [44] Purdom, C. L., Lucas, J. L., & Miller, K. S. (2006). Couple type, parental status, and the mediating impact of social support. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://www.tkdesigns.com/AboutTrMarriage.asp>
- [45] Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base*. Cincinnati: Atomic Dog.
- [46] White, L. (2019). Emptying the nest and parental well-being: An analysis of national panel data. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 235-242.
- [47] Wreh, K., & Kofitse, O. (1998). Ghanaian traditional marriage customs. Retrieved from <http://www.tkdesigns.com/AboutTrMarriage.asp>