

Development of the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale: Validity and Reliability Study*

Ayşegül Sayan Karahan¹

Ibrahim Yıldırım²

Abstract

The literature emphasizes that the divorce rate has increased in recent years. This situation brings up another important issue, the issue of post-divorce adjustment. Prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce is an important and significant predictor of post-divorce adjustment. However, there is a gap in instruments assessing prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce. For this reason, in this study, it was aimed to introduce the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale. The validity and reliability studies of the scale were conducted on data obtained from 315 divorced individuals. The validity of the scale was examined by exploratory factor analysis. The reliability of the scale was tested with Cronbach-alpha coefficient and split-half method. According to the psychometric characteristics of the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale, it is concluded that it is a valid and reliable instrument to assess prescriptive beliefs of divorced individuals. Recommendations related to the use of the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale were presented.

Keywords: Divorce, post-divorce adjustment, prescriptive beliefs, divorce beliefs, scale development

Introduction

Divorce is the process of legally terminating the union of marriage which has been established within the law (Özgülven, 2000). According to Akıntürk (2002), divorce can be defined as "to terminate the union of marriage by the decision of the judge as a result of a suit filed by one of the spouses based on a reason prescribed by law while the spouses are still alive". In law and family research literature, divorce is defined as the termination of the relationship of marriage (Plummer & Koch-Hattem, 1986).

Unlike other stressful events, divorce is seen as a process that involves different phases with different levels of stress rather than a specific life incident (Pledge, 1992). Divorce is among the situational crises of modern life and became a case having higher prevalence in Turkey. Divorce is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. It is a psychological and social process taking place over a long period of time. This process can differ in terms of social, cultural and personal characteristics. Divorce, which confronts us as an experience that affects individuals deeply and necessitates individuals to adapt to some changes in their lives, can also be described as a transition period because of this characteristic (Uçan et al, 2005).

In addition, it could be noted that divorce causes different results in each individual (Yılmaz, 2002). It is reported that divorce usually has negative effects (Mastekaasa, 1997). It is stated that most individuals

*This study was a part of Ayşegül Sayan Karahan's doctoral dissertation.

¹ Dr., Justice Academy, Turkey, ps kaysegulsayan@hotmail.com, , ORCID: 0000-0002-5580-0617

² Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University, Turkey, iyil@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-7874-8404

get through divorce as a life crisis in which they need special support and guidance (Qygaard & Hardeng, 2001).

There are two different views on divorce. According to the first view; marriage should be a legal bond that would be maintained throughout the life of married couples with the thought of that marriage is established for the growth of generations and for the continuity of a society consisting of healthy individuals. According to the second view; marriage should give joy to spouses, and unless they find happiness with each other, they should have the opportunity to decide on divorce with their own free wills as the marriage would not provide benefit. In Turkish Law, the law system accept in the middle of these two opposite views. Accordingly, upon the existence or occurrence of certain reasons for divorce, divorce would take place with the decision of the judge (Kaya, 2009; Keskin, 2007; Oztan, 2004).

While examining the history of divorce, it could be seen that divorce is always tried to be restricted by society or law since it is an undesirable situation. However, this situation has not been prevented throughout history (Sucu, 2007). In parallel with the changes and transitions in economic and social life, divorce rate has increased in recent years in Turkey. In the past few years, a new approach concerning divorce concept emphasizes that divorce does not mean the end of the family and that the family enters into a new process of structuring because even though the marriage of the spouses ends, their parental relationship is permanent and perpetual. With such a consciousness, protective and preventive programs which aim post-divorce adjustment gain importance before and after divorce (Çamkuşu-Arifoglu, 2006).

In order to have effective interventions, an understanding regarding post-divorce adjustment is needed. There are several theoretical explanations. According to the attribution theory; attributions for events are related to the individual's cognitive, affective and behavioral responses to incidents. Attributions have functions of control, protecting and increasing the self-esteem and self-presentation of the individual. The form and manner of thinking and explaining the termination of marriage can improve individuals' adjustment to divorce difficulties and self-blame feelings. The control feeling arises mainly from the attributions that define the inner and commutable reasons for the failure of marriage. Self-image is seen to be related to the degree of self-blame of the individual for the termination of marriage (Grych & Finchman, 1992).

According to another theoretical explanation, Hill (1949) has studied to determine which families are able to adjust to stressful situations under which conditions, using which resources or coping behaviors. According to ABCX model; A (stressful situation) interacts with B (family resources) and C (family definition of the situation) to determine X (crisis). In this approach; as a life event that creates a change in the family system, hardship is defined as the demands that accompany the stressful situation. Family stress is defined as a situation that results from real or perceived demand-ability imbalance in the family functioning. If this circumstance creates disapprobation, it is defined as family distress. Resources are defined as being able to prevent the event that causes change in the family system without causing a crisis. Definitions include the subjective perception of the family regarding the stressful situation, its difficulty and how they will be affected from it. This subjective meaning reflects the family's values and former coping experiences. Three factors together affect family's ability to prevent change before crisis occurs: (a) stressful situation, difficulties and stress, (b) family resources to deal with the change, and (c) family definition for the situation. In the double ABCX model, post crisis variables are defined in

addition to the ABCX model. These variables include; (a) other life stressors and strains that may complicate family adjustment, (b) family efforts to arouse or acquire new resources, (c) changes made by the family in the perception of the whole crisis situation, (d) role of the family's coping strategies in order to ensure the short term and the final adjustment. Coping appears to be a complex process in which resources, perceptions, behavioral reactions interact while trying to reach a balance in family functionality. In the double ABCX model, coping is conceptualized as a bridge that links the family's behavioral responses to accumulation with the resources and perceptions. Stress and coping theory suggests that the accumulation of stressors, the existence of the resources and individuals' definitions regarding the event determine individual's adjustment degree and speed to life after divorce (Amato, 2000; McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Double ABCX model redefines pre-crisis variables in order to describe confounding factors that shape the course of adaptation such as (a) added life stressors and strains which result in the accumulation of demands and which occur before or after an event that causes a crisis, (b) the range of results in family processes that become a reaction to the accumulation of stressors (from maladjustment to full adjustment), (c) family resources, integrity, meaning, related coping strategies, and adds post-crisis variables. The accumulation of demands with factor aA expresses the cumulative effect of stressors and strains throughout time before and after the crisis. Regarding the first factor which is the accumulation of stressors, divorce often triggers a series of preventive life changes. Stressors includes other preventive life events such as taking the responsibility of the children care alone, losing contact with children, continuing conflict with the former spouse, losing emotional support due to decreased contact with relatives, friends, neighbors and moving. Adaptive resources with bB factor refer to existing and expanded resources developed and strengthened in response to the demands created by the stressful event. Adaptive resources of the family are (a) personal resources (personal characteristics that can be potentially accessible when needed such as self-respect, knowledge and skills), (b) family system resources (inner characteristics of the family unit such as unity, adaptiveness and communication), (c) social support (network of people or institutions in which the family members feel that they are cared, loved, valued and felt belongingness. When the second factor which is resources is examined; education, work and income are examples of personal resources that can help individuals to cope with stress related to divorce. New intimate relationships are found to be particularly useful while supportive friends and relatives point to another source. Regulatory or protective factors act as shock absorbers and ease the connection between events related to divorce and the individual's stress. Thus, they alleviate the degree of negative emotional, behavioral and health consequences following divorce. Resources that reduce the negative effect of divorce can be found inside the individual (self-sufficiency, coping skills, social skills), in interpersonal relationships (social support) and in structural roles and regulations (business, social services, supportive government policies). Perceptions and coherence with cC factor refer to the general tendency of the family to all situations and conditions. It reflects the sense of understanding and acceptance of the general structure in which the situation is defined and perceptions are judged. The stressful event, the added strains shape the meaning given to the whole crisis situation which includes all of the family's resources to meet the demands. Family adaptation states the outcome of family phases in response to the crisis. It is a continuous variable in the range from maladjustment to full adjustment. The maladjustment, which is the negative end, refers to the imbalance between the accumulation of demands and the capacities of the family to meet these demands. Full adjustment, which is the positive end, refers to reaching the balance between the accumulation of demands and the

capacities of the family in family functionality with minimal level of differences. In addition, demographic variables such as gender, age, race, ethnicity and culture shape the effects of divorce on individuals' well-being levels in complex ways (Amato, 2000; Lavee et al., 1985; Wang & Amato, 2000).

The Family Adjustment and Adaptation Response model (FAAR, Patterson, 1988) highlights the links between family stress theory and family resilience. According to the FAAR model, the active phases that the family is involved interact with the family meanings and reach to a certain level of family adaptation or adjustment in order to balance the family demands and the family capacities. Family demands consist of normative and non-normative stressors (divergent change events), ongoing family strains (unsolved tensions) and daily difficulties. Family capacities include psychosocial resources (what the family owns) and coping behaviors (what the family does). Risk factors show parallelism with demands and protective factors have parallels with capacities. The meaning of family which is an important structure in the FAAR model takes less part in the individual resilience perspective however it can bring an additional understanding to how the resilience process spreads. In the FAAR model, the meaning of family is described at three levels; (a) the family's definitions with regards to demands (primary assessments) and capacities (secondary assessments), (b) the definition of their identities as a family (how they view themselves only as a unit), (c) worldviews (how they view their own families in relation to the system outside their families). Meanings shape the nature and the degree of both the risk and the protective capacity. There are two types of results in the FAAR model. Family's process of maintaining the balance (reducing the demands, increasing the capacities, and/or changing the meanings) is defined as a regenerative power and if the result is positive, the family is in full adjustment. If adjustment is poor, then this would result in vulnerability. Among coping behaviors, attributing a positive meaning to the situation is a fundamental method that combines with family resilience. The ability of changing or educating from significant risk experiences is emphasized by scientists. In any stressful situation, families assess how difficult the situation is or will be (primary assessment). The level of stress experienced is related to these subjective assessments. Some sources of stress exist only because of the family's high expectations (e.g. if our child has birth defect, then we are bad parents). Every stressful situation is also evaluated in relation with the family capacities (secondary assessment). Most of the capacities are actually subjective. This sense-making process affects how the family copes with stress. The belief of the family in the ability to find solutions and new resources plays a primary role in developing protective mechanisms. To succeed in dealing with this situation provides resources to generalize this belief to other situations and ultimately to the complete meaning of the family unit and family identity. The worldview of the family is effective in forming the daily family functionality. The worldview of the family shapes the tendency towards the world outside the family and is generally based on cultural and religious beliefs (Patterson, 2002).

There are several reported studies that investigate the effects of individuals' cognitive evaluation of divorce on after divorce adaptation. Longitudinal studies which are carried out by Booth and Amato (1991) and Simon and Mascuseen (1999) have shown that individuals who believe that marriage is a lifelong commitment, particularly report higher level of distress after divorce. Previous studies highlight that individuals who initiate divorce tend to adapt better during the period after divorce compared to those who do not want to end the marriage (Amato, 2000; Gray & Silver, 1990; Kitson, 1992). General attitudes towards divorce seem to affect the process of adapting to life after divorce. Booth and Amato (1991) found out that individuals with conservative attitudes towards divorce were more depressed and

less happy after ending a marriage compared to those who have an open-minded and liberal attitude (Wang & Amato, 2000). In other words, attitudes are influential factors for post-divorce adjustment. In line with this, it has been reported that irrational beliefs are good predictors for adjustment to life after divorce (Munoz-Eguileta, 2007).

After reviewing the theoretical explanations, the prescriptive beliefs can be defined as the manner of explaining the termination of marriage, or the C factor as the definition, meaning or perception of the divorce situation. In literature review, a measurement tool intending to evaluate the prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce was not found. Therefore, developing this scale that aims at measuring the prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce was a necessity. Professional staff who works in family and juvenile courts operating under the Ministry of Justice, educational institutions operating under the Ministry of National Education, health institutions operating under the Ministry of Health, family consulting centers operating under the Ministry of Family and Social Policies provides services in the fields of family, marriage and divorce to individuals before, during and after divorce. These professionals need to determine individual's evaluations about the divorce. It is thought that this scale which aims to measure the prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce can be used by professionals such as psychologists, psychological counselors, psychiatrists, social service specialists who especially work in the field of family, marriage and divorce. In addition, it is thought that researchers conducting scientific studies in the field of family and marriage can validate data using this scale. This tool is expected to serve the purpose of revealing the meanings that individuals attribute to the divorce experience and providing insight with regards to the cognitive interventions to be offered to individuals. For all these reasons, the aim of this study is to develop a measurement tool to determine prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce

Method

This section provides information regarding participants, process, measures and data analysis of this descriptive study.

Participants

The validity and reliability studies of the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale were conducted on the data collected from individuals whose divorce decisions were finalized in the family courts located in the central district of Ankara.

A total of 315 people; 251 women (79.7%) and 64 men (20.3%) aged between 21 to 67 participated in the study. Of the participants, 15.9% ($n=50$) were primary school graduate, 29.2% ($n=92$) were secondary school graduate and 54.9% ($n=173$) were university graduates. 68.6% ($n=216$) of the participants were employed and 28.6% ($n=90$) were unemployed.

Process

In order to develop the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale, an item pool was generated through writing these items by reviewing the literature about prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce and by analyzing personal interview contents conducted between the individuals who are in a divorce process by the researcher. Permission was taken from the Ministry of Justice to have divorcees who had

cases at family courts in Ankara as participants. Participants were informed and asked for participation. Clarification of the items, their comprehensibility, their content, their suitability in terms of format were evaluated and necessary corrections, removals and additions were made by taking the expert's opinion. Considering that the scale is a 5-grade Likert type scale, it was decided to be ranked as (1) *strongly disagree*, (2) *disagree*, (3) *partially agree*, (4) *agree* and (5) *strongly agree*. The instruction of the scale was methodized. A pilot scheme was applied to a group of 30 people for the item selection, and the application form of the scale was generated by evaluating the data obtained from the pilot scheme. The application form of 50 items was applied to 315 divorced individuals.

Measures

The information form that was generated for the purpose of obtaining the demographic information of the participants, and the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale were used.

Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale is 5-point Likert-type scale with 32 statements developed in order to measure the prescriptive opinions, beliefs and judgments of divorced individuals.

Data Analysis

SPSS program was used for the data analysis. Firstly, whether the data were suitable for factor analysis or not was examined by KMO coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test. As the data were found to be appropriate for factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the construct validity and factor structure of Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale. Principal component analysis and varimax rotation were chosen as factorization technique. In the analysis, the common factor variance of the factors on each variable, factor loadings of the items, explained variance ratios and run chart were examined. Cronbach alpha and split-half method were used for the reliability coefficients of Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale.

Findings

The Validity Study for the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale

The construct validity of the scale was tested by using factor analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test were used to determine whether the data were appropriate for factor analysis or not. KMO coefficient was .956 and Barlett test was significant.

In order to examine the factor structure of the scale, exploratory factor analysis was used. Principal component analysis was selected as the factorization technique. In the analysis, the common factor variance of the factors on each variable, factor loadings of the items, explained variance ratios and run chart were examined. Factor loadings of the items were selected as at least .30. Varimax rotation technique was chosen in order for the related items to come together to form a factor and to make it easier to interpret the factors.

It was seen that the common factor variance of the factors on each variable ranged between .430 and .727. Five factors which have eigenvalues greater than 1 were identified. It was observed that the first factor represents 43.967% of the variance by itself, the total variance stated was 60.734%, and the factor loadings of the statements ranged between .823 and .395 in the first factor.

After Varimax rotation technique, it was observed that the first factor consists of 10 items (39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49), the second factor consists of 7 items (8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 24), the third factor consists of 8 items (16, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 34, 36), the fourth factor consists of 5 items (2, 4, 10, 14, 30) and the fifth factor consists of 2 items (9,27). The contents of items found in each factor were examined and the names were given to the factors. The first factor was named as "social-communal understanding", the second factor was named as "life in the future", third factor was named as "traditionalism", the fourth factor was named as "overgeneralization" and the fifth factor was named as "positive approach". The factors were not planned due to lack of theoretical explanations and previous empirical findings, rather factors were named empirically due to the findings of this study.

The rapid decrease after the first factor in the run chart, the values related to the common factor variance and the loading values in the first factor before rotation were examined. It was concluded that the scale was multifactorial as well as it had a general factor and the total score could be used.

Table 1

Factor Analysis Results Regarding Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale

Item	Common Factor Variance	Loading Value After Rotation							
		Item Factor-1		Item					
		No	Loading Value	No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
1	,439	24	,824	40					
2	,432	45	,772	42					
3	,481	25	,770	41					
4	,452	39	,767	47	,768				
5	,583	22	,764	45	,750				
6	,652	40	,762	39	,744				
7	,500	18	,758	44	,716				
8	,609	42	,745	43	,680				
9	,637	47	,744	46	,678	,667			
10	,503	46	,741	49	,617	,650			
11	,611	43	,737	18	,613	,641			
12	,683	11	,736	12	,612	,633			
13	,632	17	,714	17	,497	,628			
14	,653	23	,713	11		,562			
15	,728	44	,704	15		,554			

Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale

16	,624	15	,703	8	
17	,709	28	,692	24	
18	,728	14	,683	26	,772
19	,726	36	,682	28	,753
20	,562	41	,659	23	,594
21	,601	26	,650	34	,584
22	,556	8	,630	22	,538
23	,690	16	,582	36	,522
24	,724	9	,564	16	,503
25	,648	34	,545	25	,478
26	,699	2	,529	10	,739
27	,603	4	,511	30	,514
28	,559	49	,510	14	,497
29	,670	12	,508	4	,469
30	,589	30	,426	2	,436
31	,676	10	,325	27	,817
32	,476	27	,396	9	,423

Explained Variance: Total: % 60,73

Factor-1: %43,967% Factor-2: 5,127%, Factor-3: 4,398% Factor-4: 3,841%,
 Factor-5: 3,4 %

Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale Reliability Study

The reliability of Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale has been tested in two ways. Firstly, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was determined (Alpha= .954). Secondly, two half tests' reliability was reviewed. Scale's two half forms which were containing 16 statements each were evaluated. The value of the first part was .91 and the value of the second part was .92 and the correlation between the two forms was $r=.83$. Spearman Brown coefficient and Guttman coefficient were found to be .90. The obtained reliability coefficients indicate that the scale can be used as a reliable tool in order to evaluate individuals' beliefs about divorce.

Discussion

As mentioned before, according to Hill's ABCX model; A (situation and related difficulties) interacts with B (the family's resources to face the crisis) and C (how the family define the situation) to create X

(crisis). Burr (1973) proposed changes in the model. Pursuant to this model; stressful events and related difficulties and vulnerability of the family affect the severity of the crisis in the family. How family defines the severity of the change effects the vulnerability of the family to the crisis. The regenerative power explains the variability of the family's ability to heal from a defect resulting from a stressful event. Normative and non-normative events identify the importance of stressful situations and include the C factor - perceptions of Hill (1958) which are critical factors in determining whether the family will have a crisis or not. As a part of the family's coping behaviors, perceptions include the meanings that the family attaches to the stressful event (McCubbin, Joy, Cauble, Comeau, Patterson & Needle, 1980).

Hill's C factor (definition of the event, perception, meaning, evaluation) affects how the individual sees the stressful event and resources; everything begins and ends with perceptions. Although resources are important, they can be neutralized by perceptions. Whether the change is labeled as loss or gain is determined by the perception of the individual. Divorce may be positive for some people and negative for others. It is necessary to listen to the family members' interpretation and meaning regarding the reality (Boss, 1992).

In the Double ABCX model, there are two types of perceptions depending on the family's pre-crisis or post-crisis reactions. The first factor *c* is the perception of the most important stress-causing event, change or demand that is believed to cause the family system imbalance, in other words, the crisis. The second factor *C* is the family's perception concerning the whole crisis situation including added stressors and strains, old and new resources, predictions of what needs to be done to bring the family back to the equilibrium condition. Unlike the initial perception (*c* factor) of the situation which focuses on stressful events and related difficulties, the post-crisis perspective of the family tends to redefine the crisis situation. When these efforts are constructive, the family (a) clarify the issues, difficulties and tasks in a way that ensures them to be more manageable, (b) reduce the severity of the emotional burden accompanies the crisis and (c) encourage the task of enhancing the social and emotional development of the family unit members. This redefinition process also involves the effort to integrate individual perceptions that may be different. In general, redefining the situation as a challenge, as an opportunity to develop and as God's will appears to facilitate the coping and adjustment of the family. When considering this, family perceptions (*cC* factor) become a critical component for the family coping (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Compared with those who have a positive attitude towards divorce, those who have a negative attitude are more likely to see their divorce as a moral failure. Individuals who want to terminate the marriage are more prone to see divorce differently than individuals who want to continue the marriage (Wang & Amato, 2000). Some individuals see divorce as a personal tragedy while others see it as an opportunity for personal development or a getaway from a nonfunctional marriage (Amato, 2000). With the notion of the importance of meaning or perceptions, we can say that the C factor which refers to the meaning or perception of the event is an important component of divorce adjustment. As an important component there is a need to assess it, however there is a gap in this field.

In addition to this gap, similar to family and marriage, divorce can be observed differently in different societies. Based on the thought that beliefs about divorce can be influenced by the culture that one lives in, Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale is a scale developed within the context of Turkish society and culture. In addition to importance of cultural differences, due to lack of such measurement

tolls regarding prescriptive beliefs, scale development was preferred rather than adaption. It can be defined as both a limitation and a recommendation for future research. It can be defined as a limitation due to lack of criteria. It can be defined as a recommendation for future research, as this scale can be tested in different samples and some other related measurement tools can be developed. As the data were obtained from divorced individuals, to address this limitation, testing the scale in married or single samples can be recommended for future research.

In particular, the importance of measuring the prescriptive beliefs of the individuals regarding divorce emerges from the knowledge that the individual's prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce have a decisive role in evaluating the divorced individuals' adjustment to life after divorce. Since changing the individuals' prescriptive beliefs that they have regarding divorce will create a change in their adjustment to life after divorce as well, it is considered as a necessity to develop psycho-educational programs in this direction. It is thought that the scale can also be used in such studies. It is expected that the scale would be beneficial in these practices either with total points or by studying individual items.

The results obtained show that the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale can be used as a valid and reliable measure for individuals' beliefs about divorce. This scale, which is developed for divorced individuals, can be used as a valid and reliable measurement tool for measuring the opinions, beliefs and judgments regarding divorce. Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale can be used by psychological counselors, psychologists, social service specialists, psychiatrists and researchers working in the field of family, marriage and divorce. It is suggested that the Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale can be used in the field of family and marriage counseling and divorce counseling with further supporting studies.

Although the development studies of the scale were conducted with individuals whose divorce decisions were finalized, the items of the scale were arranged to express the beliefs of the non-divorced people as well. In other words, instead of a personalized expression such as "being divorced", general expressions like "to be divorced" were used. The scale is intended to be used with individuals whose divorce decisions have not been finalized yet, that is, who are in their divorce process or with individuals whose marriages still continues. Primarily, it is recommended to apply the scale to the individuals who are in their divorce process but still married and to use it after reviewing their psychometric characteristics.

As another area of use, it will be possible for the professionals working with individuals in divorce phase to reach individuals' prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce and to make preventive studies about the prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce before divorce takes place. In addition, another area of use of the scale may be in marriage counseling studies conducted with individuals who are currently married. The prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce can be effective in the continuity of marriage and whether a divorce decision should be made. It may be useful for determining the effect of the continuation of marriage by reaching individuals' prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce. It would be especially beneficial for individuals who continue a problematic marriage with the effect of their prescriptive beliefs regarding divorce. Prescriptive Beliefs Regarding Divorce Scale can be used to create the contents of intervention programs aimed at strengthening the marriages of individuals experiencing some difficulties in their marriages.

References

- Akıntürk, T. (2002). *Türk medeni hukuku aile hukuku*. Beta Yayınevi.
- Amato, P.R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2*, 1269-1287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01269.x>
- Booth, A., & Amato, P. (1991). Divorce and psychological stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 32*, 396-407. DOI: 10.2307/2137106
- Boss, P. (1992). Primacy of perception in family stress theory and measurement. *Journal of Family Psychology, 6(2)*, 113-119. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_1008
- Çamkuşu-Arifoğlu, B. (2006). "Çocuklar için boşanmaya uyum programı"nın çocukların boşanmaya uyum, kaygı ve depresyon düzeylerine etkisi (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Gray, J. D., & Silver, R., C. (1990). Opposite sides of the same coin: former spouse's divergent perspectives in coping with their divorce. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(6)*, 1180-1191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1180>
- Grych, J. H., & Fincham, F.D. (1992). Marital dissolution and family adjustment: An attributional analysis. In Teri L. Orbach(Ed). *Close relationship loss theoretical approaches* Springer-Verlag: USA.
- Kaya, T. (2009). *İstanbul'da yaşayan boşanmış kadın ve erkeklerin boşanma deneyimleri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Keskin, I. (2007). *Boşanmanın sosyolojik ve psikolojik nedenleri ve boşanmanın ortaya çıkardığı sonuçlar (Niğde ili örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.
- Kitson, C. G. (1982). Attachment to the spouse in divorce: A scale and its application. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44*, 379-393. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351547>
- Lavee, Y., McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1985). The double ABCX model of family stress and adaptation: an empirical test by analysis of structural equations with latent variables. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47(4)*, 811-825. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352326>
- McCubbin, H. I. (1979). Integrating coping behaviour in family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41(2)*, 237-244.
- McCubbin, H. I., Joy, C. B., Cauble, A. E., Comeau, J. K., Patterson, J. M., & Needle, R. H. (1980). Family stress and coping: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4)*, 855-871. DOI: 10.2307/351829
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). Family stress and adaptation to crises : A double ABCX model to family behavior. *Family Studies Review Yearbook*. (pp. 87-106) Sage Publications Inc.
- Munoz-Eguileta, A. (2007). Irrational beliefs as predictors of emotional adjustment after divorce. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 25(1)*, 1-15. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10942-006-0031-4>

- Özgüven, İ. E. (2000). *Evlilik ve aile terapisi*. PDREM Yayınları.
- Öztan, (2004). *Aile hukuku*. Turhan Kitapevi.
- Qygard, L., & Hardeng, S. (2001). Divorce support groups: How do group characteristics influence adjustment to divorce. *Social Work with Groups*, 24(1), 69-87. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v24n01_06
- Patterson, J. M. (2002). Integrating family resilience and family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(2), 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00349.x>
- Pledge, D. S. (1992). Marital separation/divorce: A review of individual responses to a major life stressor. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 17(3/4), 151-181. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v17n03_10
- Plummer, L. P., & Koch-Hattem, A. (1986). Family stress and adjustment to divorce. *Family Relations*, 35, 523-529. DOI: 10.2307/584513
- Simon, R. W., & Marcussen, K. (1999). Marital transitions, marital beliefs and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40, 111-125. DOI: 10.2307/2676367
- Uçan, Ö., Yazar, H., & Sayıl, I. (2005). Bir boşanma olgusunun dört kurama bağlı olarak değerlendirilmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 14(2), 23-29. https://doi.org/10.1501/Kriz_0000000249
- Wang, H., & Amato, P. R. (2000). Predictors of divorce adjustment: Stressors, resources and definitions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 655-668. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00655.x>
- Yılmaz, A.E. (2002). *The prediction of divorced parents' emotional / social adjustment and psychological distress from perceived power / control over child related concerns, perceived social support and demographic characteristics* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.