

PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE: THE EFFECTS OF JUSTICE
SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND GENDER

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY



BY
ZEYNEP ŞAKLAR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

OCTOBER 2021

Approval of the thesis:

**PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE: THE EFFECTS OF JUSTICE
SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND GENDER**

submitted by **ZEYNEP ŞAKLAR** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology, the Graduate School of
Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT
Head of Department
Department of Psychology

Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI
Supervisor
Department of Psychology

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Bengi ÖNER-ÖZKAN (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology

Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Derya HASTA
Ankara University
Department of Psychology

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayda BÜYÜKŞAHİN SUNAL
Ankara University
Department of Psychology

Assist. Prof. Dr. Leman KORKMAZ
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Zeynep ŞAKLAR

Signature:

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE: THE EFFECTS OF JUSTICE SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND GENDER

ŞAKLAR, Zeynep

Ph.D., The Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI

October 2021, 157 pages

How perceived justice in marriage (PJM) affects variables such as relationship satisfaction, commitment, and maintenance behavior have been studied extensively in the psychology literature. However, there is very little research about the factors that affect PJM. Therefore, this dissertation aims to test potential antecedents of PJM. Thus, based on the justice and gender psychology literature, justice sensitivity, ambivalent sexism, and gender were examined as the possible factors. A sequential mixed-method research design was conducted. In the first phase, qualitative data was collected through in-depth interviews with married females ($N = 7$) and males ($N = 7$) to gain comprehensive understanding about perceptions of marital justice. Based on these findings, a new Perceived Justice in Marriage Scale was developed which consisted four subscales: communicative, interpersonal, procedural, and distributive justice. The quantitative study was carried out using this scale. The survey data was obtained from married women ($N = 218$) and men ($N = 134$). The results showed that women perceived significantly less overall and distributive justice in their marriage compared to

men. Moreover, beneficiary justice sensitivity was a significant predictor of all PJM factors except distributive justice while victim justice sensitivity significantly predicted perceived communicative, interpersonal and overall justice. Besides, benevolent sexism did not predict any PJM variables while hostile sexism was a significant predictor only for perceived procedural justice. However, the associations of ambivalent sexism and justice sensitivity with PJM were very low. The study findings and limitations were discussed along with contributions and directions for future research.

Keywords: Perceived justice in marriage, Justice sensitivity, Ambivalent sexism, Gender

ÖZ

EVLİLİKTE ADALET ALGISI: ADALETE DUYARLILIK, ÇELİŞİK DUYGULU CİNSİYETÇİLİK VE CİNSİYETİN ETKİSİ

ŞAKLAR, Zeynep

Doktora, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI

Ekim 2021, 157 sayfa

Evlilikte algılanan adaletin, ilişki doyumu, bağlılık ve sürdürme davranışı gibi değişkenler üzerinde etkili olduğu araştırmalar sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak, algılanan adaleti etkileyen olası faktörler hakkında mevcut psikoloji çalışmalarında çok az araştırma bulunmaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmayla evlilikte adalet algısını etkileyen potansiyel öncülleri test etmek amaçlanmıştır. Güncel çalışmalarda yer alan bulguların ışığında adalete duyarlılık, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve cinsiyet değişkenleri evlilikte algılanan adaleti etkilemesi beklenen potansiyel faktörler olarak incelenmiştir. Araştırma deseni olarak sıralı karma yöntem kullanılmıştır. İlk aşamada insanların evlilikteki adalet algılarını kapsamlı bir şekilde anlamak için evli kadınlar ($N = 7$) ve erkekler ($N = 7$) ile derinlemesine görüşmeler yoluyla nitel veri toplanmıştır. Bu bulgulara dayanarak iletişimsel, dağıtımsal, kişilerarası ve prosedürel adalet olmak üzere dört alt ölçekten oluşan yeni bir Evlilikte Algılanan Adalet Ölçeği geliştirilmiştir. Nicel çalışma ise bu ölçek kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Anket verileri evli kadınlardan ($N = 218$) ve erkeklerden ($N = 134$) elde edilmiştir. Sonuçlar,

kadınların evliliklerinde erkeklere kıyasla anlamlı düzeyde daha az genel ve dağıtımsal adalet algıladıklarını göstermiştir. Faydalanıcı durumundayken adalete duyarlılık dağıtımsal adalet dışında evlilikte algılanan tüm adalet türleri için anlamlı bir yordayıcı iken, mağdur durumundaki adalete duyarlılık ise algılanan iletişimsel, kişilerarası, ve genel adaleti anlamlı olarak yordamıştır. Cinsiyetçilik değişkenlerinden korumacı cinsiyetçilik evlilikte algılanan hiçbir adalet türünü anlamlı olarak yordamazken düşmanca cinsiyetçilik sadece algılanan prosedürel adaleti anlamlı olarak yordamıştır. Ancak, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve adalete duyarlılığın evlilikte algılanan adaleti yordadığına dair anlamlı çıkan sonuçların etkilerinin çok düşük olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Çalışma bulguları ve sınırlılıkları önerilerle birlikte tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Evlilikte adalet algısı, Adalete duyarlılık, Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, Cinsiyet



To my mother Melda

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı, for her contributions, guidance and her responsiveness during my graduate education.

Secondly, I would like to thank my dissertation supervising committee members, Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Derya Hasta, for their support and important feedbacks and advice that they gave during the thesis preparation process.

Moreover, I would like to thank all of the examining committee members, including Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayda Büyükaşahin Sunal, and Assist. Dr. Leman Korkmaz, for their valuable comments and suggestions with a constructive approach.

Besides, I would like to express my gratitude to all my valued family members, especially my parents Melda and Feridun and my aunt Meltem, and my dearest friends, for their continuous and sincere support during the data collection process. Without them, this thesis would not exist today. I also owe them a debt of gratitude for their emotional support. It is a great chance to have people in life who lit the candle when the lights go off, and you do not know where to reach for. I am also thankful for the moral support that my grannies Nezahat and Sevim have provided me all throughout my education life.

I would also like to show my appreciation for the interviewees' participation and their contribution to the qualitative study and I would like to thank all participants who have shared their sincere thoughts and made significant contributions to this dissertation research.

Before the final words, I would like to mention how happy and grateful I am to walk through such an arduous and stressful path with a beloved supporter, my partner in life, Güvenç Şahin. His company and support for me, along with his faith that I will be successful, was very influential for me to hold on to what I was doing.

Finally, I would like to thank Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu (TÜBİTAK: The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) for supporting me financially throughout my Ph.D. education.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Defining Justice	3
1.2 Forms of Justice	3
1.2.1 Distributive Justice	4
1.2.2 Procedural Justice	6
1.2.3 Interactional Justice	7
1.2.4 Retributive Justice	8
1.2.5 Restorative Justice	10
1.3 Justice in Marriage	12
1.4 Justice Sensitivity and Perceived Justice	16
1.5 Sexism in Marriage	19
1.6 Demographics and Perceived Justice in Marriage	22
1.7 Overview of the Dissertation	23
2. STUDY 1: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOW JUSTICE IS PERCEIVED IN MARRIAGE	25
2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Method	25
2.2.1 Participants	25
2.2.2 Sampling Procedure	27

2.2.3 Interview Process.....	28
2.2.4 Data Analysis.....	29
2.3 Results	30
2.3.1 General Perception of Justice in Marriage	31
2.3.2 Experiences of Gender Based Injustices	34
2.3.3 Reactions to Experienced Injustices in Marriage	41
2.3.4 Dealing with Injustices in Marriage	44
2.3.5 Factors Linked to Gender Based Injustice Experiences in Marriage.....	47
2.4 Discussion.....	50
3. STUDY 2: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF JUSTICE SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON PERCEPTION OF JUSTICE IN HETEROSEXUAL MARRIAGE.....	55
3.1 Introduction	55
3.1.1 Assessment of Perceived Justice in Marriage.....	57
3.1.2 Research Hypotheses	60
3.2 Method.....	61
3.2.1 Participants	61
3.2.2 Instruments	63
3.2.2.1 Perceived Justice in Marriage Scale	63
3.2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Scale.....	63
3.2.2.3 Justice Sensitivity Scale.....	64
3.2.2.4 Relational Equity Scale	65
3.2.2.5 Relationship Assessment Scale	65
3.2.2.6 Demographic Measures	66
3.2.3 Procedure	66
3.3 Results	67
3.3.1 Scale Development.....	67
3.3.1.1 Factor Structure	67
3.3.1.2 Validity	69
3.3.2 Hypothesis Testing	74

3.3.2.1 Descriptive Statistics on Study Variables	75
3.3.2.2 Correlations among Study Variables	76
3.3.2.3 Testing the Effect of Gender on Perceived Justice in Marriage, Sexism and Justice Sensitivity.....	79
3.3.2.4 Regression Analyses for the Main Study Variables.....	81
4. DISCUSSION	84
4.1 The PJM Scale.....	85
4.2 The Effect of Gender.....	87
4.3 Linear Relationship Between Study Variables	90
4.5 Contributions of the Study	93
4.5 Limitations and Directions for Future Research	94
REFERENCES.....	96
APPENDICES	
A. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (STUDY 1)	111
B. INFORMED CONSENT (STUDY 2).....	112
C. PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE SCALE ITEM POOL.....	113
D. AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY	116
E. JUSTICE SENSITIVITY SCALES	118
F. RELATIONAL EQUITY SCALE	120
G. RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE.....	121
H. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM.....	123
I. HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM	125
J. CURRICULUM VITAE	126
K. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	129
L. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	157

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Socio-Demographic Information about the Participants	26
Table 2 List of Superordinate and Subordinate Themes	30
Table 3 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Sample ($N=352$)	62
Table 4 Final Factor Structure of the PJM	70
Table 5 Correlations between PJM Subscales, RES and RAS	73
Table 6 Descriptive Statistics of the Major Study Variables	76
Table 7 Correlations among Study Variables.....	78
Table 8 Correlations among Study Variables and Socio-Demographic Variables.....	80

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

If people were asked what kind of marriage they wish for the night before their wedding day, how many would answer “a just marriage”? Probably not so many while it is possible to wish for a happy, loving, and committed marriage. Although the importance of justice in marriage might be overlooked at first, over time it becomes clear that it is a fundamental factor affecting the quality of the relationship. The current literature shows that there are many studies which examine the effect of perceived justice (mostly equity) on variables such as relationship satisfaction, maintenance behavior, commitment and happiness (e.g., Baxter & Dindia, 1990; Berger & Janoff-Bulman, 2006; Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999; Canary & Stafford, 1992; Jackson, 2010; Stafford & Canary, 1991) which all contribute to the relationship quality. However, the same literature is lacking the research focusing on what variables predict perceived justice instead of what perceived justice predicts in a marital or close relationship. Therefore, this dissertation study focused on the possible predictors of perceived justice in marriage.

Since marriage is defined as the legally recognized union of two people “as spouses in a consensual and contractual relationship” (Merriam-Webster, n.d.), it is expected that two different characters interact with each other throughout the time and reveal their dispositional variations in justice evaluations. For instance, a person can perceive the events that victimized him/her as unjust, but would not see it as injustice when others experience the same victimization. In the marital context, while the person does not perceive the victimization of his/her spouse, s/he may perceive the same situation as a great injustice for himself/herself. Thus,

the dispositional justice evaluations are expected to affect the perceived justice level in the intimate relationship, which is the marital context in this dissertation.

In addition to the dyadic structure of the marriages, heterosexual marriages entail the interaction of two genders. As Sherrif (1966) mentioned, “Whenever individuals belonging to one group interact collectively or individually with another group or its members in terms of their group identification, we have an instance of intergroup behavior.” (p. 12). Thus, one can say that heterosexual marriage comprises not only the interpersonal processes but also the intergroup processes due to the advantaged position of men and the disadvantaged position of women in patriarchal societies, which reflects sexism. Thus, the discriminatory sexist attitudes that spouses hold toward their own and partner’s gender might be influential in making justice evaluations. Considering all these points, this study aimed to investigate the effects of social-psychological variables such as justice sensitivity, sexism, and gender, on the perception of justice in marriage.

For these purposes, two studies, one qualitative and the other quantitative, were conducted. In the qualitative study, which had never been performed in a Turkish sample before, the areas where justice is sought in marriage were investigated in the light of the interviews. In the second study, the quantitative one, a Likert-type scale was developed within the framework of the themes obtained from the first study. This new scale was used to measure the level of perceived justice in marriage. Then, by using this new measure, whether the perceived justice in marriage is affected by gender, ambivalent sexism and justice sensitivity was examined statistically.

Before presenting the study results, a comprehensive background information of the study is provided in this chapter. First a brief description of the justice concept is given. Then, different forms of justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, interactional, retributive and restorative) are briefly introduced in order to make distinctions which usually cause conceptual confusion. Following that, a succinct review on the social psychology of justice and how this literature integrates to the marriage concept is presented. This chapter proceeds with the presentation of the

main variables which are measurement of perceived justice in marriage, justice sensitivity and sexism. Finally, this chapter is concluded with an overview of the main research questions and relevant hypotheses of the dissertation study.

1.1 Defining Justice

Before tackling the subject of justice in marriage, it is essential that we comprehend what justice means by itself. According to the official definition, justice refers to “the maintenance or administration of what is *just*” (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). While the definition of justice is clear, what is considered ‘just’ is open to interpretation. In different parts of the world and in different times of human history, what constitutes ‘just’ has been shaped by various factors such as philosophical thoughts, political and social structures, religions, and ethics. Approaches to application of justice has also varied. For instance according to the Divine Command Theory justice is delivered by God, social contract theorists proposed that justice can be reached only through the mutual agreement of everyone (e.g., Rousseau, 1762/2004), while the utilitarian perspective posited that justice is secured when the greatest number of people receive the best outcomes (e.g., Mill, 1863/2012). Thus, the issues of determining what is ‘just’ and how justice should be applied makes it difficult to define justice in a simple way. Therefore, instead of pursuing for a comprehensive and precise definition of justice, introducing different forms and norms of justice will serve more purpose for this thesis. For this reason, in the following section primary forms of justice and related norms will be presented concisely. Then the literature regarding justice in marriage will be conveyed within this context.

1.2 Forms of Justice

There are many different types and theories of justice, where the four major forms can be listed as distributive, procedural, retributive, and restorative justice (Maiese, 2003b). However, in recent decades, studies in organizational justice elaborated the findings of procedural justice research. A new form of justice concept was developed by Bies and Moag (1986), which is called interactional

justice. Although some scholars (e.g., Barclay et al., 2005; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) treated interactional justice as a concept that can be used interchangeably with procedural justice, the research findings have proved that procedural and interactional justice cause different outcomes (Masterson et al., 2000) and their rules are distinct from each other (Bobocell & Holmvall, 2001). Therefore, while conveying the forms of justice in the following sections, interactional justice is presented as well, along with distributive, procedural, retributive and restorative justice.

1.2.1 Distributive Justice

Distributive justice focuses on the just (or fair) allocation of the resources between members of a group (Maiese, 2003a). In fact, distributive justice is not only concerned with the fairness in allocation of resources or rewards but also the distribution of costs and negative outcomes among group members (e.g., Hagan, Ferrales, & Jasso, 2008; Sabbagh & Schmitt, 1988). In social psychology, scholars are mainly concerned with the *perceived* justice in the distribution of resources and costs among group members (Forsyth, 2014). Related to this, Jasso et al. (2016) posited a framework to explain the perception of distributive justice among people. According to their framework there are three actors in the distributive justice process. These actors are the Allocator, the Rewarder, and the Observer where an actor can be both Rewarder and the Observer at the same time depending on the situation. They theorize that distributive justice happens as the relationship between four key processes: actual reward, just reward, justice evaluation and justice consequences. The actual reward process refers to where only the allocator decides what actual reward should be that the rewarder gets and then assigns this reward. Just reward process entails an observer (this can be the real Observer, the Allocator, Rewarder or all of them) determining what a just reward is that the Rewarder should get. The justice evaluation process is the time when the Observer compares the actual and just reward and comes up with a justice evaluation. Finally, the justice evaluation initiates justice consequences which are outcomes of the evaluation process (such as revenge, disintegration, collective action

etc.). For instance in a marital relationship, just rewards in other words fair distribution of resources (also the responsibilities) between women and men is usually determined by the society and when the allocator (either man or woman) assigns the actual reward to the rewarder (wife or husband) then the actual reward is compared to the 'just reward' that society has determined already. These just rewards are usually shaped by prescriptive and proscriptive gender stereotypes for married men and women (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2021) indicating what should men and women do or what they deserve in the marital context.

While determining the just reward or the fair share that a person should get in a heterosexual marriage, individuals and society adopt different norms or rules of distribution, such as prescriptive and proscriptive gender stereotypes for married men and women (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2021). Regarding the general rules, Forsyth (2014) described five principles of distributive justice which are equality, equity, need, power, and responsibility where the first three (i.e., equality, equity and need) are the dominant ones in many cultures (e.g., Deutsch, 1985).

According to the equality norm, all group members should be treated equally, and regardless of the inputs that group members invest, everyone should receive the same amount of rewards (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983). In the equity norm the input/output ratio is taken into consideration, and distribution of the rewards and costs is done according to the amount of inputs that the group members made (Adams, 1965; Walster et al., 1973). If a group member contributes a significant amount of inputs, then s/he would receive a higher amount of outputs/rewards. Need principle proposes that the distribution of resources should be based on the needs of the group members regardless of their inputs for the society (Schwartz, 1975, 1977). Affirmative action can be an example of public policy in which underrepresented people are provided with more recruitment opportunities to meet the needs of disadvantaged people in society. The last two principles, power and responsibility norms, are hardly seen in governmental policies but still exist in meso and micro level justice relations. According to Forsyth (2014) the power principle suggests that people who have more power, authority, or control over the

group should obtain fewer rewards when compared to the ones at less power and the responsibility principle proposes that people who own most of the resources are responsible for sharing these resources with the ones who have less.

Regarding intimate relationships, scholars like Deutsch (1985), and Steil and Turetsky (1987) claimed that equality principle is the most beneficial and instrumental norm in building close and intimate relationships where both partners receive the same degree of outcomes irrespective of their inputs. On the other hand, the psychological research area is dominated by the focus on the equity norm. Although, equity and equality are two distinct norms, scholars have found that both norms significantly correspond to each other (e.g., Michaels et al., 1984) and might be used interchangeably (Sprecher & Schwartz, 1994). These two norms are elaborated in the following sections (see section 1.3) under the framework of equity theory.

1.2.2 Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the decision making processes that are conducted by the authorities. Procedural justice is searched for mostly in legal proceedings, the organizational environment, and educational settings. Whereas in distributive justice, the fairness of the allocation of the outcomes (rights and resources) are taken into consideration, in procedural justice, the fairness of how this allocation decision was made is of concern. The opportunity of being heard (principle of voice), respected and considered by the authorities, unbiased and trustworthy decision-makers, and a transparent decision-making process constitute the main elements of procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1978).

Regarding the close relationships, perceived procedural justice has been studied in intimate conflict cases (e.g., Van Erp et al., 2011) and mutual decision-making processes (e.g., Kluwer et al., 2009). These studies were initiated by Tyler and Blader (2003) when their findings revealed that perceived procedural justice was more effective than perceived distributive justice in determining the levels of

collaboration between partners. The research conducted by Peleg-Koriat et al. (2017) also provided support for this finding. They showed that when participants perceived their partner as procedurally just then, they were more inclined to collaborate and less inclined to avoid.

Dispositional and contextual moderators for perceived procedural justice were also examined. For instance, the relation between the level of perceived procedural justice of the spouse and responsiveness to this justice level was moderated by gender where men were less responsive to perceived procedural justice when compared to women (Kluwer et al., 2009). Nelson et al. (2018) tested whether the attachment style (as a dispositional variable) moderated the relationship between perceived procedural justice and responsiveness where the results showed that anxiously attached people tended to lower their collaboration with their spouse in marital conflicts whereas powerful and independent participants tended to be less responsive.

Consequently, the perceived procedural justice is a critical indicator of one's importance and inclusiveness in the intimate relationship (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Therefore, while developing measurements for perceived justice in marriage, the strength of procedural justice should be taken into consideration since it refers to an area different than what distributive justice does.

1.2.3 Interactional Justice

Expanded research on procedural justice generated a new form which is called interactional justice. Interactional justice is mostly sought in organizational settings and mainly refers to fair dynamics in communication (Bies & Moag, 1986). After the development of the concept, Greenberg (1990) divided it into two; interpersonal and informational justice. In addition to being treated with dignity and respect (interpersonal justice), interactional justice also refers to whether people are provided with adequate information regarding why the decisions are made in a certain way (informational justice) (Collins & Mossholder, 2017; Colquitt et al., 2001).

Interactional justice has been studied mainly in organizational settings. Most of the research findings showed that perceived interactional justice was related to higher organizational commitment (Lather & Kaur, 2015), loyalty and job satisfaction (Ismail & Zakaria, 2009). However, there has not been any research focusing on how interactional justice would work or how it would be adapted in the close relationship context. In fact, studies have shown that procedural justice and interpersonal respect are effective in determining the quality of the interpersonal relationships and they affect how well people would identify with their own group based on these justice cues (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Simon & Strümer, 2003). Therefore, the perceived interactional justice might influence the feelings of belongingness, involvement and identification with the relationship. So, measuring interactional justice in close relationships and in marriage might provide a bigger picture of the overall justice experience of a person in his/her relationship.

1.2.4 Retributive Justice

If there is perceived wrongdoing or violation of norms, rules, or laws, retributive justice comes into play. When the offenders (individuals or groups) are given subjectively appropriate (or proportionate) punishments in response to the crime they committed, then this refers to retributive justice (Wenzel & Okimoto, 2016). Retributive justice aims to balance the scale which was disrupted by the offender's unfair gains through the tool of punishment. *Punishment* can be defined as any negative outcomes which are enforced on the responsible party as a result of the transgression (Brooks, 2012).

It is essential to distinguish self-inflicted punishment from the punishment imposed on the offender. Self-inflicted punishment is not considered as part of retributive justice. It is rather regarded as part of restorative justice because there is the compensatory motivation of the perpetrator behind it. For a punishment to be retributive, it has to be imposed on the perpetrator by the victim or a third party (such as judges). Since wrongdoing is different from a mistake, effortless compensation by the offender would not be enough to serve justice (Tyler &

Smith, 1998). Thus, the perpetrators need to be responded with proportionate sanctions.

The link between vengeance and retributive justice is also an important issue to be clarified. Although one of the synonyms of retribution is vengeance (Merriam-Webster, n.d.), there are slight differences within justice literature. Indeed, vengeance is a type of punishment, but it usually involves a stronger emotional motive, and most of the time, proportionality between punishment and offense is ignored (Nozick, 1981). Even though both share a retroactive approach, aim to communicate the harm to the offender, and intend to regain social acceptance within the group, vengeance can go beyond punishment which might cause additional harm to the offender and eventually starts a vicious cycle of revenge.

Psychological studies regarding retribution in intimate relationships mainly focus on partners' revenge (e.g., Boon et al., 2009; Yoshimura, 2002, 2004). For instance, Boon et al. (2009) studied the main provocative reasons for revenge behavior with 85 undergraduate students. The researchers applied three major categories of provocations that caused a revenge response towards an intimate partner. These categories were violating the relationship rules (e.g., norm of exclusivity-infidelity-, failures to be responsive, exploitation), threat to self (e.g., partner's control, hurtful messages, and social exclusion), and affronts to the relationship (e.g., partner suspending the relationship, showing off with a potential partner, decrease in the romantic interest in the partner). The results showed that violation of the relationship rules was the most reported cause for the revenge response followed by affronts to the relationship and threats to self. In the same study, the motives for revenge were also examined. The findings indicated that the main motive behind the revenge response was the hope to cause a desired change in the partner (e.g., empathy, regret, correction, and jealousy), followed by the motive to redress the avenger's negative experiences due to the provocation and then the motives regarding the justice concerns (such as restoring the justice scale and reciprocating the harm).

In another study conducted by Clemente and Espinosa (2021) the relationship between revenge and Dark Triad was examined in the context of intimate heterosexual relationships. The results showed that psychopathy was the best predictor for revenge response among the three personality traits, while narcissism did not predict revenge after controlling psychopathy and Machiavellianism.

Based on these findings, one can conclude that people consider punishment or revenge as one of the ways to serve justice in their romantic relationships. Therefore, retributive justice can be considered as one of the important forms of justice that plays a role in close relationship dynamics.

1.2.5 Restorative Justice

Restorative justice is a relatively new form of justice that is considered an alternative to the retributive approach. Instead of prioritizing punishment, the main objective of restorative justice is to reestablish the relations between victim, offender and the community harmed as a result of the crime (Cohen, 2016).

Maintaining restorative justice happens through certain social practices, which mostly comprise face-to-face interactions of the parties. These social practices are carried out with certain rituals in which victims, offenders, and if necessary, the community share their personal experiences with memory-based narratives to create a common understanding of what happened and why (Cohen, 2016). They discuss who was harmed and how, and they try to find a resolution on how the offender would repair the harm or how the conflict would be resolved for now and in the future. In restorative justice approach, victims are given an active role so that their feelings of anxiety and weakness is reduced (Sherman & Strang, 2007; Webber, 2009).

Restorative justice processes can be implemented at the interpersonal level as well as the intergroup (or international) level. At the interpersonal level, victim-offender dialogue or family group conferencing (which are preferred in juvenile cases) takes place in the presence of trained facilitators (Armour & Umbreit,

2006). Even wider within-group processes occur as restorative conferences. At the international level, peacemaking committees are examples of the restorative processes such as The South Africa Truth and Reconciliation Commission which aimed at healing the harms done due to the violations of human rights during the apartheid.

Forgiving the offender(s) has been one of the major focus of restorative justice which is also critical in intimate relationships. Studies have shown that forgiveness is important for both physical and mental health (Harris & Thoresen, 2005). Moreover, in marital relationships, the ability to ask for forgiveness and to forgive was associated with higher relationship satisfaction and longevity of marriage (Fennel, 1993). In addition to this, forgiveness has been treated as an important part of the healing process after both severe transgressions and daily heartbreaks (e.g., Fincham et al., 2004; Gordon et al., 2005).

Forgiveness is considered as a process instead of a single act (Fincham, 2000) and assumed to involve a change (McCullough et al., 2003) where a transformation occurs over time (Fincham et al., 2006). To forgive someone, the victim needs to deliberately decides to forgive (Enright, 1996). Gordon et al. (2000) proposed a three-stage model about forgiveness in marriage. According to this model the transformation begins with handling the effects of the transgression, then finding a reason for the offence and proceeding with new relationship beliefs.

The retributive and restorative forms of justice are concerned with the correction of the harm or regaining the degraded value in the society. Thus, both forms are related to the processes after an offence occurs. However, the other forms of justice, such as distributive, procedural or interactional justice, focus on how to create and then maintain justice in different areas of the relationship. In other words, these three forms lay the foundation in order to prevent any harms or offences to occur. When people are asked to talk about the level of fairness in their relationships, it is expected that participants would tend to focus on the justice rules and practices that happen usually in their marriage instead of focusing on managing the specific offences. Thus, while developing a new measure, it is

expected that, instead of retributive and restorative justice, giving precedence to procedural, distributive and interactional justice concepts would contribute more to the development of a stable and generic measure.

1.3 Justice in Marriage

When justice in marriage is mentioned, one can understand many different concepts ranging from gender equality in marriage to legal procedures such as divorce, custody and property rights. Therefore, it is important to set the boundaries of the area of study beforehand.

In the psychological literature regarding justice in intimate relationships, scholars (e.g., Davidson, 1984; Desmarais & Lerner, 1989; Hatfield & Traupman, 1981) have centered their attention on the exchange of resources between partners due to the reciprocal and interdependent structure of the close relationships. Therefore, the dominant perspectives in the area are founded within the framework of the Social Exchange Theory. Homans (1961) defined social exchange as “an exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons” (p.13). Although there are different social exchange theories (e.g., Blau, 1964; Homans, 1958; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), there are four common assumptions that these different theories are built on. As stated by Sabatelli and Shehan (1993) these assumptions can be summarized as follows:

- 1- Individuals tend to look for rewards and avoid punishments.
- 2- Individuals try to maximize their profits while minimizing their costs.
- 3- As rational beings, individuals calculate the rewards and costs within the limits of the information that they have before engaging.
- 4- How individuals evaluate the rewards and costs may change over time and from person to person.

According to social exchange theory people make the cost and benefit analysis in many kinds of relationships such as friendships, professional relations and romantic relationships and if the perceived costs exceed the rewards then this might cause the termination of the relationship (Emerson, 1976). Regarding the close relationships, two major theories which are based on the principles of the social exchange theory were employed the most while examining the dynamics of the exchange relations among the partners. These theories are the Interdependence Theory (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) – Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980, 1983) and the Equity Theory (Hatfield et al., 1985; Walster et al., 1978).

Both interdependence theory and investment model try to bring explanations to why and how relationships are continued. Interdependence theory posits that there are three main variables that affect people's interaction. These are outcomes, comparison level and comparison level for alternatives (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The outcome variable is determined by the evaluation of rewards and costs that are present in the relationship. If the rewards exceed the costs, then the outcomes would be positive and if the costs exceed the rewards then the outcomes would be negative. However, while determining the satisfaction from a relationship Thibaut and Kelley (1959) proposed that besides evaluations of outcomes, individuals make comparisons of the outcomes with their own expectations of what one deserves (comparison level) and possible outcomes that they can obtain in alternative relationships (comparison level of alternatives). Through these comparisons, the satisfaction level is determined, and people decide to leave or continue the relationship accordingly.

Investment model (Rusbult, 1980, 1983) which is based on the principles of the interdependence theory expands it by including a new variable to the equation. As suggested by the name, the model posits that besides satisfaction, the personal investments in the relationship also influences the commitment decisions. Investments are defined as the “direct and indirect resources one gives to the relationship that cannot be retrieved if the relationship were to end” (Sprecher & Schwartz, 1994, p.18). Although the two above mentioned theories seem to focus

on maintenance of the relationship, the variables included in the evaluation processes, such as outcomes, investments and comparison levels, can give an important insight into what people might consider when assessing fairness in their relationships.

Apart from these theories and concepts, one can say that equity has been the primary measure of justice in the area of psychology, and Equity Theory has been the fundamental theoretical perspective that many scholars have adopted. The widely used version of Equity Theory employed in close relationship studies is the version developed by Hatfield and her colleagues (e.g., Hatfield et al., 1979; Hatfield & Traupman, 1981). According to Hatfield and Traupmann (1981) “an equitable relationship exists when the person evaluating the relationship- who could be Participant A, Participant B, or an outside observer- concludes that all participants are receiving equal relative gains from the relationship.” (p.166). So, in equity-theoretical perspective, partners compare their relative gains from the relationship with each other (called relational comparisons) or with similar others (referential comparisons) (vanYperenk & Buunk, 1994) and decide whether they are running either an equitable or inequitable relationship. There are two types of inequity experience which are: over benefiting inequity and under benefiting equity where both are expected to cause distress but in different ways. Over benefiting partners are expected to feel emotions like guilt while under benefiting partners are expected to feel emotions such as anger, frustration and also depression (Sprecher, 1986, 1992).

Although the equity-theoretical perspective suits the close relationship and marriage context very well, it is still just one of the norms of distributive justice as depicted in the previous sections. Therefore, measuring only equity will cover merely a portion of the justice concept in marriage and will be inadequate to reveal a comprehensive evaluation of justice in the relationship. When spouses evaluate justice in their marriage, they might seek distributive justice and other forms of justice, such as procedural and interactional, depending on the area of the relationship. For instance, considering the opinions of both partners while making

a joint decision on marriage indicates the pursuit of procedural justice, while the division of household chores between spouses is related to the distributive justice. In these circumstances, the perception of justice in marriage should actually be accepted as a multi-faceted concept that covers different forms of justice. Moreover, the norms of distributive justice also vary, and these norms should be also taken into consideration while measuring the distributive justice in marriage. As mentioned before, equality is another norm of distributive justice besides equity and many gender advocates fight for equality between men and women. However, there are times when maintaining equality does not guarantee that justice is served. For this reason, while measuring the perceived justice in this study, not only equity or equality has been acted upon, but also the different forms of justice have been considered. Thereby a more comprehensive justice measurement was intended.

In fact, measuring perceived justice in heterosexual marriage is different from measuring justice in any other relationship since, as many scholars have indicated in previous studies, marriage does not provide an equal and equitable relationship experience for men and women (e.g., Davidson, 1984; vanYperen & Buunk, 1990). Usually, men benefit more from marriage when compared to women (e.g., Wanic & Kulik, 2011) and generally, women become the subject of socially accepted injustice in the marriage. Therefore, when the context is heterosexual marriage, the researcher measures the justice perceptions in an already unfair relationship structure. Therefore, not only the individual variations regarding justice dispositions should be considered for justice research but also the effect of gender difference and socially embedded attitudes towards gender and gender roles should also be investigated as possible antecedents that might affect perceived marital justice.

In the dissertation, how married people define marital justice and the factors that might influence the justice perception is the main focus. Firstly, a perceived justice in marriage scale is developed, and then the effects of dispositional justice concerns (justice sensitivity), gender attitudes (ambivalent sexism), and gender on

the perceived marital justice is explored. Therefore, in the following sections, the psychological concept of justice sensitivity is conveyed first and then the theory of ambivalent sexism is presented as a measure of attitudes towards gender. Finally, the previous findings regarding the effect of gender difference and perceived marital justice are presented.

1.4 Justice Sensitivity and Perceived Justice

According to Deutsch (2006), when people are insensitive to injustice, they will be less aware of it. Hence, one can expect that justice-insensitive people would not experience or perceive unjust events as frequently and strongly as the justice-sensitive ones. Therefore, the level of awareness of injustices can be considered a potential determinant of justice perceptions in general. Regarding heterosexual marriages, because of the gender-based unfair structure of the relationship, the effects of dispositional justice factors on perceived marital justice is expected to be regulated by the gender difference.

In the quantitative study of this dissertation research the psychological concept of justice sensitivity (JS) which was elaborated by Schmitt et al. (1995) was used as an indicator of the awareness of injustices. According to the definition of the concept, a person's justice sensitivity indicates how frequently a person experiences injustice; the intensity of anger after the injustice experience; the level of disturbance of the thoughts due to the unjust event; and the level of retaliation towards the offender (Schmitt et al., 1995).

The initial conceptualization of justice sensitivity focused only on the victim perspective. However, studies revealed that people vary in their justice sensitivities depending on the role that they act in the unjust event (e.g., Mikula, 1994). In light of these findings Schmitt et al. (2005, 2010) advanced the justice sensitivity concept by integrating three more perspectives based on the idea that people are not only different in their experiences of injustice as victims, but they also vary in their reactions and perceptions of injustice as perpetrators, observers and beneficiaries in unjust events. Hence, the final Justice Sensitivity Scale

entailed four perspectives as subscales. The perpetrator, observer and beneficiary roles differentiate from each other in certain ways. The observer sensitivity refers to the awareness and reactions to injustice when the actor is neither victim nor perpetrator and does not gain any benefit from the unjust situation but only witnesses to the injustice. On the other hand beneficiary sensitivity indicates how people perceive and respond to the injustices that they do not intentionally perpetrate but gain advantage from the unjust situation such as the privileged groups in a society while the perpetrator justice sensitivity refers to the awareness of the injustices when a person victimizes another person purposefully (Schmitt et al., 2010).

Concerning the focus of this dissertation study, two of these perspectives were found to be appropriate to measure justice awareness in marital relationships, which are the victim (JS_{VIC}) and beneficiary (JS_{BENF}) perspectives. First, due to the dyadic organization of marriage, if there is a marital injustice, one of the spouses needs to be the victim for sure while the other spouse is either the perpetrator or the beneficiary. Hence, both spouses have to become involved in marital injustices. Therefore, measuring the observer perspective is not applicable in the marital context since it is not possible to create an injustice between two persons without any perpetrators or beneficiaries. Secondly, most of the marriages are consensual contracts that partners abide by voluntarily. Therefore, it is expected that the majority of the conflicts and transgressions in ongoing healthy marriages are not caused by intentional offenses or maltreatment of the spouse but mostly due to the structure of the marital relationship or clash between individual differences. In addition to this, some of the traditional gender norms are designed in such a way that culturally what might be “fair” is actually victimizing, but there are no specific intended perpetrators. Thus, the already unfair social structure of the marriage creates victims (women) along with beneficiaries (men) who do not perpetrates the injustice intentionally, but the system does that for them.

Moreover, if there is an injustice in marriage, one of the partners should be at least the beneficiary if not the perpetrator of the injustice due to the dyadic nature of the

relationship. Considering all of this, employing the beneficiary perspective can be applied to the general context of marital relationships and provide a distinctive justice disposition from victim sensitivity. Finally, the victim perspective was measured because without a victim, injustice does not exist. Thus, measuring victim sensitivity is a must for measuring awareness towards injustices.

Studies revealed that justice sensitivity is a critical measure to understand how people prioritize justice concerns for self and others and should be treated as a dispositional factor which is assumed to stay stable over time (Schmitt et al., 2005). According to the study by Schmitt et al. (2005) observer and beneficiary sensitivity scales were positively correlated with role taking, empathy and social responsibility whereas the victim sensitivity was related to traits such as Machiavellianism, jealousy, distrust and vengeance. Moreover, Gollwitzer et al. (2005) found that beneficiary sensitivity was positively associated with prosocial behaviors such as solidarity, existential guilt and compassion towards the disadvantaged groups while high victim sensitivity predicted ignorance of the disadvantaged groups, refusing the responsibility for them and even the probability of committing immoral actions towards these groups. There were also research findings showing that beneficiary and observer sensitive people were making cooperative decision in social dilemma games whereas high victim sensitivity predicted self-centered decisions (Fetchenhauer & Huang 2004; Gollwitzer & Rothmund, 2009). Hence, some researchers have merged the observer and beneficiary scales under single measure while examining the primary justice concerns for others whereas the victim sensitivity was used as the measure of justice concerns for the self (e.g., Lotz et al., 2011; Saklar, 2015).

Regarding the relationship between gender and justice sensitivity, there are studies indicating a difference in sensitivity to justice between males and females. For instance in their scale development study Schmitt et al. (2010) found that females had significantly higher scores of JS than man but with a very low explained variance (1%). Moreover, in a study conducted by Dulebohn et al. (2016) they examined patterns of brain activation after manipulations of distributive and

procedural justice with fMRI. The results showed that females had significantly higher neural activity than males while processing manipulations about both distributive and procedural justice.

Integrating the above mentioned findings and explanations about justice sensitivity in to heterosexual marital context it is expected that in a heterosexual marital relationship where frequency of experiencing interpersonal transgressions and conflicts between spouses increases due to cohabitation and increased sharings in addition to socially constructed inequalities based on gender roles, people with high victim justice sensitivity would evaluate their marital relationship less just since their awareness would be higher for the injustices. In addition to this, gender is expected to significantly moderate the effect of justice sensitivity on perceived justice in marriage especially for males. The main rationale for this premise is grounded on the nature of marriage. Since marriage is underbenefitting women and overbenefitting men (e.g., Schafer & Keith, 1981) males who have higher beneficiary sensitivity would have an increased awareness towards the disadvantaged group and would perceive less overall justice when compared to male fellows who have lower beneficiary sensitivity towards injustices. These premises are investigated by using appropriate statistical analyses that are presented in Chapter 3.

1.5 Sexism in Marriage

Sexism, in general, refers to discriminatory or prejudiced attitudes and behaviors based on one's gender or sex (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Sexist beliefs often include the idea that one gender is superior to another which then gives rise to a hierarchical mindset. This hierarchical thinking most of the time imposes what men and women can/should and cannot/should not do, therefore helps preserving socially accepted and expected gender roles (Burgess & Borgida, 1999).

Although sexism can affect all men and women, social science scholars (e.g., Lorber, 2011; Wortman et al., 1999) emphasized that women and girls are largely the main subjects of sexism. The main motivation of sexism towards woman is to

maintain male domination through oppressive practices (Cudd & Jones, 2005). Although most of the time sexism has been associated with oppressive and antagonistic attitudes and behaviors towards women, in their Ambivalent Sexism Theory, Glick and Fiske (1996) posited that not only hostile but also benevolent attitudes and behaviors cause discrimination against women. Through caring and protective attitudes toward women, females are patronized and denigrated which then endorses the hierarchy between men and women. According to the theory, there are three main components that ambivalent sexism stands on which are paternalism, gender differentiation and heterosexuality (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Each component has both a hostile and a benevolent side and they comprises beliefs which are inherently degrading women against men.

Ambivalent sexism has been studied in many different contexts and with many different variables such as rape myth acceptance (e.g., Chapleau et al., 2007; Yamawaki, 2007), intimate partner violence against women (e.g., Glick et al., 2002), beauty ideals (e.g., Forbes et al., 2007; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007), attitudes in organizational settings (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 2007), and religiosity (e.g., Gaunt, 2012; Taşdemir & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2010). Regarding the current study, research findings about ambivalent sexism specifically in marriage were carefully examined and presented in the following paragraphs.

According to Chen et al. (2009) ambivalent sexism manifests itself in marriage in two ways: 1) at the start of a marriage male dominance and female submission are established by the mate selection criteria; and 2) during the marriage, endorsement of power-related gender role norms sustain the male dominance. The study results showed that, hostile sexism in both male and female participants was positively correlated with endorsed traditional imbalanced gender role norms in marriage (i.e. male dominance in family decisions, more female responsibility in housework and child rearing). In addition to this, as many other studies have shown, both male and female participants who had higher hostile sexism scores showed higher agreement on domestic violence toward women (e.g., Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003).

In another study conducted by Duran et al. (2011) with a Spanish sample, the results revealed that as the benevolent and hostile sexism scores increased, participants considered sexual intercourse in marriage more as a marital right for a husband and a marital duty for a wife. Moreover, as the benevolent sexism scores of participants increased the rate of considering forced sexual intercourse in marriage as rape also decreased and participants' perceptions of marital rights and duties regarding sexual intercourse mediated the relationship between these two variables.

Casad and his colleagues (2015) showed that women who endorsed marriage myths in pre-marital period had more positive marriage experiences due to the match between expectations and real life experiences while high benevolent sexism scores were related to more negative marriage experiences. Women with low endorsement of marriage myths, but with high benevolent sexist attitudes reported negative experiences such as low marital satisfaction and higher depression.

Sexism is also related to the attitudes towards the traditional gender roles in the society (Lee et al., 2010). In many cultures, especially patriarchal cultures such as Turkey, men are expected to be the breadwinners (Türkoğlu, 2013) and women are expected to be devoted, the supporter of the husband's career and be the caregivers (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2021). Although life conditions are changing and the number of double-earner families or female breadwinners are increasing, still how people perceive female breadwinners and male caregivers in families are somehow related to the sexist attitudes that they hold. In a study focusing on the relationship between sexism and gender roles, Gaunt (2013) found that the higher hostile sexist attitudes that participants had, the more negative perceptions they hold towards female breadwinners and the higher benevolent sexism scores predicted more positive evaluations of female caregivers. Furthermore, ambivalence toward men also affected how people perceived male caregivers. Participants with higher hostile attitudes toward men perceived nontraditional male caregivers more positively while higher benevolent attitudes towards men

predicted more negative reactions toward male caregivers. This shows that sexism is one of the barriers in front of balancing the roles or responsibilities that are embedded in the society.

1.6 Demographics and Perceived Justice in Marriage

Most of the studies examining the effects of demographics in perceived justice in marriage owned an equity-theoretical perspective. In these studies, participants were asked to compare their own inputs and outcomes with those of their partner (Walster et al., 1978). Several of these studies have shown that women reported feelings of deprivation and being under benefited more often than men did and more men reported receiving greater support from their wives than women did (e.g., Davidson, 1984; Traupmann et al., 1981; vanYperen & Buunk, 1994).

The duration of the relationship was also considered to be a predictor of the degree of perceived equity in close relationships however there are very few and contradictory findings regarding the effect of duration on perceived equity in marriage. In a study designed by Schafer and Keith (1981) perceived equity levels in marriage of two independent groups were compared with each other. The results of this cross-sectional study showed that in the later stages of family life cycle, where the children have already left the home, couples reported higher degree of perceived equity than the couples who were at earlier stages of family life cycle and still raising children. On the other hand, longitudinal studies provided no evidence indicating that marriage becomes more equitable as the duration of the relationship increases (e.g., Hatfield, 1985; VanYperen & Buunk, 1990).

Consequently, the previous findings revealed that perceived equity has been affected by some demographic variables such as gender and years of marriage. Therefore, while investigating the potential antecedents of the perceived marital justice, examining the affects of socio-demographic variables along with justice sensitivity and sexism would enhance the understanding about how justice perceptions are shaped in the marital context.

1.7 Overview of the Dissertation

Although many scholars have focused on the effects of perceived justice in marriage to the relationship quality and maintenance (e.g., Akcaboza, 2017; Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999; Canary & Stafford, 1992,) there are not many research analyzing the possible factors which might influence the justice perception in marriage itself. Therefore, the main aim of this dissertation is to examine whether certain social psychological variables, which are justice sensitivity and ambivalent sexism, have an effect on perceived justice in marriage. Moreover, as mentioned in the previous sections, most of the social psychological studies have focused on the measures of relational equity while justice is a more comprehensive concept. Thus, a new measurement tool was needed to determine the level of perceived justice in marriage which covers not only the equity rule but other norms (such as equality and need) in the areas of marriage where Turkish couples seek justice the most.

For this reason, this dissertation was designed as a sequential qual → QUAN mixed method research wherein a qualitative study was followed by a quantitative field analysis.

In the first study (see Chapter 2), a thematic analysis was conducted in order to determine how Turkish people define justice in marriage, the main areas that married people seek justice in their relationships, and the norms that they use while assessing justice.

Accordingly, the research questions of the first study are as follows:

1. How do married people define marital justice?
2. On what issues do women and men think they are experiencing injustice?
Is there gender-based injustice in marriage?

In the quantitative study (Study 2, see Chapter 3), through an online survey battery, statistical data was collected from married couples including their demographic information, hostile/benevolent sexism and justice sensitivity levels together with the item pool of the perceived justice in marriage scale prepared within the framework of the data obtained from the qualitative study. Thus, the effect of justice sensitivity, sexism and gender variables on the level of justice perceived by people in their marriage is investigated.

The main research questions of the second study are as follows:

1. Is there a relation between justice sensitivity and perceived justice in marriage? If there is a significant relationship, how does victim sensitivity and beneficiary sensitivity affect justice perceptions in marriage?
2. Is there a relation between overall sexism and perceived justice in marriage? If there is a significant relationship, how does hostile and benevolent sexism affect justice perceptions?
3. What are the certain demographic variables that have an effect on perceived justice in marriage?
4. Does gender moderate the effect of justice sensitivity and sexism on perceived justice in marriage?

CHAPTER 2

STUDY 1: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOW JUSTICE IS PERCEIVED IN MARRIAGE

2.1 Introduction

The first step of this dissertation research, the qualitative study, was designed for two purposes. First, to elaborate on the areas people care about and search for justice and how they make justice evaluations in their marriages. Second, to provide rich qualitative information that was needed to enhance the new scale's validity which was developed in the following study. In this chapter, first, the method of this study is presented. Then the results of the qualitative analysis are given, and finally, these findings are discussed in light of the justice and gender literature.

2.2 Method

2.2.1 Participants

A total of 14 participants volunteered for the study. 7 male and 7 female participants were interviewed. One of the male participants declared himself married at the beginning of the interview; however, later, he revealed that he was divorced but had been cohabitating with another partner for the last 9 years. He assumed his current status as 'married' practically but not legally. After carefully considering the situation and the research questions at hand, his data was kept and included in the thematic analysis. Moreover, participant's initial marriage experience also provided support for this data to be kept.

The mean age of the participants was 41 (SD= 10.5) ranging from 28 to 60. Two of the participants were graduated from middle school (14%), 7 participants had bachelor's degree (50%), and 5 participants held graduate degrees (36 %). 12 participants were employed (86%) and 2 were retired (14%) at the time of the interview. 6 participants (43%) described their economic status as upper-medium, 7 participants as medium (50%) and one participant as low (7%).

Regarding the matrimonial information, the average duration of the marriages was 14 years (SD= 10) ranging from 2 to 33 years. 11 out of 14 participants (79 %) had children and the maximum number of children was 2. The socio-demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Socio-Demographic Information about the Participants

Variable	<i>f</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Gender					
Female	7	50			
Male	7	50			
Age			41	10.5	28-60
Education Level					
Middle School	2	14			
Undergraduate Degree	7	50			
Graduate Degree	5	36			
Doctorate Degree	-	-			
Employment Status					
Employed	12	86			
Retired	2	14			
Monthly Income Level					
Low	1	7			
Medium	7	50			
Upper Medium	6	43			
High	-	-			
Duration of marriage (years)			14	10	2-33
Having Children	11	79			
Number of Children			1.5	0.5	1-2

2.2.2 Sampling Procedure

In congruence with the aim and design of this qualitative study, purposeful (also known as purposive, judgement, selective, or subjective) sampling strategy was employed wherein the participants were chosen according to the judgement of the researcher along with the inclusion criteria. In purposeful sampling, while selecting participants, researcher pays attention to the richness of information that a potential participant can share (Patton, 2002), whether s/he is available and willing for participation and how well s/he can express and reflect the experiences and thoughts (Bernard 2002; Spradley 1979). Therefore, purposeful sampling can provide wealth of information in shorter time period and with smaller budget.

There are different types of purposeful sampling strategies. For instance, selecting extreme cases of a certain phenomenon, or creating a highly homogenous group with the aim of describing certain group characteristics or facilitating group interviews (Palinkas et al., 2015). In this research, maximum variation was intended so that the overarching themes about perceptions and reactions to injustices in marriage can be reached regardless of the gender, age and socioeconomic status (SES) of the participants and the duration of their marriage. Therefore, equal number of female and male participants, with different marriage duration, ages and SES were selected to reach maximum variation.

Although maximum variation was sought for the sampling procedure, there were two inclusion criteria for participation. The first criterion was being between the ages of 18-65 due to the legal capacity. The second criterion was to have been married for at least two years by the time of the interview since the tolerance and positive attitudes during the honeymoon stage (usually the first two years of the marriage) might distort the actual perceptions of injustices and reactions in the long run.

According to this sampling frame, the research was announced through phone calls and informal chats with friends, family members, coworkers, etc. At the end of the

announcement period 14 volunteers, who fulfilled the inclusion criteria and researcher's subjective selection decisions, participated in the study.

2.2.3 Interview Process

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews, which had previously been planned face to face were conducted over the internet. Zoom Video Communications Inc.'s online meeting tool was utilized in order to conduct interviews. Participation was on a voluntary basis and interviewees did not receive any kind of rewards for their participation except profound gratitude of the researcher.

The semi-structured interviews were consisted of 11 open-ended questions which were designed in a non-directive manner with the intention of discovering thoughts, feelings and reactions about justice in marriage (e.g., "In your relationship with your spouse, do you experience unfair situations where you are treated unfairly or there is no equality? Can you share an example?") (Appendix A). When the ice breakers and vote of thanks were excluded, the gist of the interviews lasted 25 minutes on average, ranging from 13 to 45 minutes.

The study received ethical approval from Middle East Technical University (METU) Human Subjects Ethics Committee (see Appendix I). Before starting the interviews, participants were informed about the purpose and structure of the study, and consent for both participation and audio-video recording was taken verbally. These verbal consents were also video recorded. Each participant was clearly explained that they could skip any of the questions if they do not feel like answering or they could leave the interview or withdraw from the study at any time they want. While transcribing and citing quotations from these interviews, in order to protect the confidentiality, pseudonyms were used instead of real names.

2.2.4 Data Analysis

After the interviews were completed, a verbatim transcription was done for each interview. During the analysis process a computer software program was used (MAXQDA 2021) to facilitate coding and analysis of the data (Verbi Software, 2021).

Thematic data analysis was conducted in six phases, as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). After the transcription was completed, the researcher did active readings of the entire data set repeatedly to become familiar with the data and take notes of the initial ideas. After familiarization, the coding phase began. The inductive coding approach was mainly adopted throughout the coding phase since this thematic analysis was intended for more of an exploratory purpose and was not constructed based on any specific theoretical framework.

After all of the data set was coded, and codes were examined thoroughly and refined, these codes were sorted into potential themes (both overarching and sub-themes). Relevant data extracts were also collated for these themes. In phase four, the initial themes were reviewed and refined. The candidate themes which were not highly supported by the data and not relevant to the research topic were discarded. In addition to this, to achieve internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity (Pattons, 1990), themes were organized in a way that the scope of the themes did not overlap and the selected data extracts (coded segments) were coherent inside each theme. In the fifth phase, the final versions of the themes were decided. The definitions and names of these themes were refined, and the data were analyzed within these themes. At the final stage, the most relevant and richest data extracts were selected, and a report was produced, which is presented in the following section.

2.3 Results

According to the results of the thematic analysis, five overarching themes were identified. These superordinate themes were 1) general perception of justice in marriage, 2) experiences of gender-based injustices in marriage, 3) reactions after perceived injustices, 4) ways of dealing with injustice, 5) prominent factors affecting gender-based injustice experiences in marriage. Each superordinate theme was composed of subordinate themes, which represented more focused and niche aspects of the overarching theme (see Table 2). While presenting these themes, specific quotations from the participant accounts were used and reported in Turkish (the original language).

Table 2

List of Superordinate and Subordinate Themes

Superordinate Themes	Subordinate Themes
1. General perception of justice in marriage	a. Equivalent share of responsibilities which are aligned with personal skills and desires b. Reciprocal exchange of intangible goods (i.e. respect, support) c. Maintaining justice is possible, it just needs effort d. Justice is essential for a sustainable marriage
2. Experiences of gender-based injustices	a. Male participants not perceiving gender-based injustices b. Experiences that female participants perceived themselves advantaged c. Experiences that female participants perceived themselves disadvantaged
3. Reactions to perceived injustices	a. Initial vs. subsequent reactions b. Negative emotions c. Reactions being different in marriage than in other social domains d. Moderating effect of time on reactions

Table 2 (continued)

4. Dealing with the injustice in marriage	a. Searching for solutions b. Avoiding the injustice experiences c. The search for empathy d. Raising awareness about gender-based injustices
5. Factors linked to gender-based injustice experiences in marriage	a. Family b. Rearing children

2.3.1 General Perception of Justice in Marriage

Before asking the main questions about justice in marriage, participants were first asked what comes to their minds when only justice was mentioned. Most of the participants talked about three main things which were 1) the definition of justice as equality and equal rights, 2) the variability of the justice concept, and 3) the difficulty of maintaining justice in general. After this initial question, their thoughts about justice in marriage were asked. The answers showed that how participants defined and perceived justice in marriage was built on their universal definition of justice, but with more specific and detailed thoughts.

The first subordinated theme that emerged was the equivalent share of responsibilities which are aligned with personal skills and desires instead of equality. Instead of equality, participants mentioned equivalent and *appropriate* division of labor and household responsibilities more often while defining a just marriage. Some participants also explained what was meant by ‘appropriate’ as couples taking up responsibilities and household chores in line with their desires and skills, regardless of gender roles. Deniz, a 34 years old working mom, defined a fair marriage as having equal opportunities but equivalent responsibilities.

Evlilikte adalette, yani karşı partnerimizin, hem eşim, hem kendi adıma aslında az önce bahsettiğim fırsatların eşit olması, ne bileyim biraz şey cinsiyet ayrımı olmaksızın kadındı, erkekti, bu etiketlenmiş işlerden bağımsız, herkesin her şeye koştuğu, ne bileyim genel olarak böyle Erдің işte şeyse, yemek yapmayı

seviyorsa onu yapsın, ben tamiratla uğraşıyorsam onu yapayım;
böyle etiketlerden, cinsiyetten, cinsiyetçi yaklaşımlardan uzak,
herkesin eşit görev paylaşımları olan, eşit görev derken herkesin
kendi şeyine uygun diyeyim, kaleminde olduğu bir şey, kurum.

The second subordinate theme was the reciprocal exchange of intangible goods. While defining justice in marriage, due to the nature of the social exchange in marital relationships and the emotional involvement of the partners, the existence of reciprocal respect, trust, tolerance, attention and support were mentioned frequently. Thus, it was concluded that the reciprocity principle was sought for justice in marriages, especially for intangible resources that partners can provide to each other. When a partner failed to reciprocate any of those previously received intangible gains, then feelings of deprivation emerged. Engin, a 42-year-old father of two explained his thoughts as follows:

Eşlerin birbirine olan sevgisini, birbirlerine daha çok yansıtması
gibi geliyor bana adalet. Ne bileyim yani birbirlerine doğruyu
söylemeleri başta adalet yani.

The following subordinate theme was named as ‘maintaining justice is possible but it needs effort’. Participants pointed out that the world is not a just place, and neither is marriage. Most of the participants talked about the high frequency of injustice that they experience in their marriage. They revealed that justice is hard to maintain, especially due to the selfish nature of human beings and variability (or relativity) of justice perception among people. However, according to the participant accounts maintaining justice is not impossible either, it just needs effort- an effort to keep the balance. Merve, who was 54 years old and a mother of two, shared her desperation about maintaining justice in marriage, but in her following accounts she left a door open which indicated a slight possibility even for her.

Evlilikte adaletin olduğuna inanmıyorum. Bu dengenin bir türlü
sağlanamadığını, insanların adil olmadığını, adil olmak
istemediğini de aynı zamanda düşünüyorum....

Evlilikte adalet sağlanırsa, evlilikte adalet nasıl sağlanır? Yine empatiyle sağlanır Zeynep’ciğim.

While talking about justice most of the participants referred to the image of double-pan balance scale. Participants mentioned that they always sought to maintain balance between these two pans, where each pan represented the assets (or liabilities) of the couples. This finding was also supported with the high frequency of expressions such as ‘trying to be just’ or ‘putting effort to maintain the balance’. Melis, who was 27 years old and had been married for 2 years, expressed how important was justice in her relationships.

Onun dışında genel olarak eşit olmaya çalışıyoruz. Buna çok dikkat ediyorum, benim için çok hassas bir konu çünkü! İşte dediğim gibi, hayatta çok ince ve hassas gördüğüm için o teraziyi hep toplamaya çalışıyorum; ama hâlâ öğrenme aşamasında olduğum bir konu diyebilirim.

Therefore, one can conclude that marriages are not fair by their nature but justice can be achieved through effort. Moreover, the in-depth analysis provided that while measuring justice, couples did not weigh apples with apples most of the time but instead they made overall evaluations. For instance, if a person was asked to evaluate justice in his/her marriage, each partner’s total inputs (or liabilities) were weighed in the scale, not the inputs related to specific items (e.g. cleaning, shopping, or childcare etc.).

The last subordinate theme was indicating that justice is essential for a sustainable marriage. The following sub-ordinate theme refers to the perceived importance of justice for a sustainable marriage. Most of the participants considered justice as one of the cornerstones for a fulfilling marriage along with respect and love. Even some participants positioned justice in the center as a foundation or a frame that would also regulate love and respect. Meliha, a 50-year-old mother of two explained the importance of justice in her marriage as follows:

Aslında adalet çok merkezde bence, yani şöyle açayım: Mesela sevgide de, diyelim ki en başa sevgiyi koyduk, sevgide de bir adalet

yakalanamazsa bir zaman sonra beslemediğin zaman azalır. Saygı diyelim onun yanında, sevgi ile saygı yan yana düşünerek söylüyorum; saygıyı da aynı zamanda beslemezse adalet duygusu, yani benim sana gösterdiğim saygıyı sende bana göstermezsen bu bir yere kadar gider gider, bir yerden sonra durur.

Although importance of justice was the common opinion, there was a minority who perceived justice and happiness in marriage somehow mutually exclusive. Even one of the participants mentioned that if couples start to seek for maintaining justice then there would be a fight for rightfulness and since justice perception varies from person to person, the fight would turn into a vicious cycle. This finding also provided secondary support for the previous sub-ordinate theme which implies the difficulty of maintaining justice. Talip:

Benim felsefemde, benim düşüncemde haklılık mı, mutluluk mu üzerine bir ilişkiyi kurmak gerekir. Eğer mutlu olmayı seçerseniz birçok şeyi daha kolay çözersiniz, problemleri daha kolay çözersiniz; ben değil, biz odaklı olmak lâzım ilişkilerde.

2.3.2 Experiences of Gender Based Injustices

Before talking about gender-based injustice experiences, participants were asked what kind of common injustices (without making any reference to gender) they face in their marriage. There were 3 frequent answers which were 1) false accusations made by the spouses, 2) efforts remaining unnoticed and unappreciated, and 3) failure in the reciprocity principle such as not receiving reciprocal respect, and attention etc. Although this question was intended for priming reasons another result came out which was worth to mention. Almost in all participant accounts, the relationship with the in-laws was seen as a very important point in evaluating justice in marriage. Especially comparison of the frequency and the duration of the family visits made to one's own family and spouse's family, as well as the attitudes towards the parents in laws were two of the main assessment units of evaluating overall justice in ongoing marriages, regardless of the gender. Melis, who had been married for two years, explained the situation in her own words:

Çünkü evlilikte çok şey oluyor ya, hepimizin işi var, yoğunluklarımız var, kendimizle kalmak istiyoruz. Bu adaleti sağlamak önemli! Bir de tabii diğer konu olarak kendi ailelerimize ne kadar ayırıyoruz, bu da bizim için önemli konulardan bir tanesi... Mesela, Harun kendi ailesine belli bir miktar zaman ayırıyor, ama benim aileme ne kadar ayırıyor; çünkü onların da belli beklentileri oluyor ya da onun ailesinin de beklentileri oluyor, “Melis de bize zaman ayırsın” şeklinde. Bizim en çok adalette uğraştığımız nokta bu oluyor; ebeveynlerimizi tatmin etmek diyebilirim.

After inciting the justice concept in marriage in participants’ minds, gender-based injustice experiences were asked. The interview questions were designed to inquire both types of experiences in which participants were either disadvantaged or advantaged. Subsequently, the thematic analysis revealed three sub-ordinate themes related to gender-based injustice experiences in marriage: 1) male participants not perceiving gender-based injustices. 2) experiences that female participants perceived themselves advantaged, and 3) experiences that female participants perceived themselves disadvantaged.

The first subordinate theme was named as: male participants not perceiving gender-based injustices. Firstly, when male participants were asked if they had ever been in a disadvantaged or an advantaged position in their marriage because of their gender, the common answer was ‘no’. So, although male participants mentioned that they had experienced injustices in their marriage, they indicated that these were not related to their gender, manhood or masculine characteristics. 56 years old Kadir, who had been married for 33 years shared his thoughts as follows:

Bence erkeklikle, erkek olmayla alakası yok. İnsanlar erkek de olsa, kadın da olsa bence eşit olmalı yani, eşit, ben eşit düşünüyorum.

It was worth mentioning that most of the male participants gave very short answers to this question and did not deliberate any responses despite the extra questions. Only two participants later mentioned the difficulty of being the breadwinner of

the family. However, although the breadwinning role was associated with manhood by these participants, it was not perceived as an injustice but instead as a mission or responsibility which is fair and normal in its nature. Orkun, who was married for 10 years, father of one and whose wife was also working, stated his thoughts as:

Yani, benim erkek olarak görevim; evin kirasını ödeyebilecek kadar kazanabilmek, işte onlara iyi bir hayat sürdürebilecek kadar iyi kazanabilmek mesela onlara iyi bir hayat sürdürebilmek.

The second subordinate theme was the experiences that female participants perceived themselves advantaged. Unlike male participants, female participants shared very clear examples and experiences of injustices that they thought were a result of the gender difference. To begin with, when female participants were asked if they had ever benefitted from any unjust situations in their marriage because of their gender, it took some time for them to answer the question. However, except for one, all of them provided at least one incidence or unjust situation that they benefitted from, although most of them thought they were at a disadvantage from the very beginning. (i.e. Meliha: “Kadın olduğum için, ben zaten hayatımda kadın olarak doğduğum için dezavantajlı olduğumu çok sık hissettim.”)

These mentioned cases in which women felt advantaged were: not carrying the main responsibility of earning the living, household chores that need physical strength such as carrying water carboys, repairment and renovation related to house, and lastly driving and car maintenance. Melis expressed her advantaged situation in driving case very frankly.

Araba mesela ortak, ikimizin kullandığı bir araba; ama bakımı ya da tamiri gerektiğinde, hani ben hem konuyu çok iyi bilmediğim, hem çok ilgilenmediğim için böyle Harun’a attığım konulardan diğeridir. Bu konuda da adil olmadığımızı düşünüyorum; çünkü ben daha çok arabanın keyfini çıkaran, sürmüyorum ama işte “şuraya gidelim” dediğimde temizliğini, işte arabayı yıkamaya götüren Harun’dur ve burada mesela makineler yok sen kendin yıkıyorsun genel olarak arabayı.

Experiences that female participants perceived themselves disadvantaged was the third subordinate theme related to the perceived gender based injustices in marriage. Related to this theme three main subjects emerged: 1) experiencing power related injustices 2) being held responsible for the household chores and 3) facing the public (and family) pressure.

Power related injustice experiences were consisted of injustices related to economic, therefore authority related and physical power inequalities wherein women perceived themselves at disadvantage. To begin with the economic power inequality, most of the female participants drew attention to the systematic pay gap between men and women and expressed its effects in their marriage. Participants indicated that even if they worked as much as their husbands, they earned less. Meliha was a nurse and her husband worked as a physician in the same hospital and she mentioned how unjust was the difference between the input/output ratios when compared to her husband.

Evliliğimde mesela nerede hissettim? Hiçbir zaman eşim kadar maaş alamadım, para kazanamadım. O kadar yoruldum, ama o kadar para kazanamadım. Evde para harcamak, para işte ekonomik olarak daha fazla söz sahibi eşim oldu. Çok daha fazla para kazandığı için.

Another female participant mentioned the effect of economic gap in marriage as ‘whoever holds the economic power will pull the strings’. Therefore, the economic power would bring decision making authority along.

Regarding power related injustices, although physical power inequality was not mentioned by majority of the female participants, it was the researcher’s decision to include in the results section due to its relevance to the subject and its complementary input to the subordinate theme. In one of the accounts, a female participant mentioned that the only reason that a male can exert physical violence to his wife is because she is a female. As simple as it is. If the partner was a male than it was expected that physical abuse would not be possible, and maybe this would be a fight rather than an abuse where the conditions are more equal.

Besides power inequalities, household chores being perceived as the default responsibility of women was another major issue expressed by the female participants. Because the household chores were seen as women's responsibility, males were reluctant to take on or share these responsibilities and instead they were just 'helping' their wives. Hence, this was very tiring and frustrating for women because they expected to share these responsibilities with their partners not help from them. Women just wanted to know that their husbands would take responsibility, and get the chore done without needing any directions or support from their wives as it was the case of Ilgın, who had been married for 10 years.

Çünkü, “ben sana yardım edeyim” dedi, “ben yardım istemiyorum, iş bölümü olsun, bileyim ki o iş senin, ben o işi düşünmeyeyim artık” dedim ve dolayısıyla artık öyle bir işbölümü yaptık.

Another finding related to helping behavior was the male privilege to choose what and when to help. When all participant accounts were analyzed thoroughly, it was seen that when men participated in household chores, most of them picked the chores according to their wishes and 'helped' their wives accordingly (i.e. shopping, running errands). For instance, cooking is a household chore as well as cleaning. However, if husband liked cooking, he picked cooking the dishes instead of cleaning, but what about the wife? What if she did not like cleaning either? The analysis showed that most of the female participants were not aware of this privileged act or they ignored the situation. Thus, when they evaluate justice in their marriage, they tried to make overall comparisons between them and their husbands instead of comparing particular chores or responsibilities. Deniz expressed her discontent as follows:

Şey olabilir; mesela Erдің çok güzel yemek yapar, yemekleri yapar, o yapar, ama mesela ev toplama konusunda şey yapmaz, hiç dokunmaz yani toplama, düzen. Hani, en çok yani hani, “sen de yapma” falan diyor gerçi, böyle çok mağdurları çok oynayamıyorum ama en rahatsız olduğum o geliyor aklıma.

Moreover, female participants also complained about being the manager /planner of the house. They mentioned that even if their husbands were helping with the

household chores, the planning was still under their responsibility, which was very exhausting. Keeping track of the requirements of the house (e.g., kitchen, sanitary needs, bills), planning the schedules of the family and the kids, deciding on when to do the laundry or ironing, etc., all needed energy and effort. Not only planning but also controlling and making sure that the job was done was also under female responsibility. This exhaustion was mentioned explicitly in Ilgın's account:

Birçok buna ilişkin yazılar yazılmış ve sadece ev işi yapmak değil, planlamak ciddi bir sıkıntı aslında. Onu düşündüm, hakikaten beynimin bir kısmı ona gidiyormuş benim. Yani, “şunu şöyle yapacağım, bunu böyle yapacağım” filan diye. O kısmı hâlâ pas edemedim, o kısmı bende! Ama onda da kendimi daha düzenli hale getirmeye çalışıyorum; ajandayla falan çalışmak gibi, işleri belirli günlere ayırmak gibi, “şu gün çamaşır yıkanıyor, bugün şu yapılıyor” filan gibi! 1 haftalık yemeği planlayıp yapmak gibi! Yani, bir günde iki ayrı tencere, üç ayrı tencere yemek yapıp mesela onu iki-üç gün yemek!

The very last subject of injustice experience that females felt disadvantaged was facing the public and family pressure. Participants mentioned that after they got married, society had some expectations from them such as cohabitation of the spouses, having children, and becoming economically independent as a couple etc. Female participants stated that although these expectations were set for both of them as a couple, the society put more pressure on women than men. For instance, newly married couples are usually expected to have babies. However, questions about their family planning, whether they are expecting a baby or not, and even if they do not plan to have children the responsibility of giving an explanation of this decision mostly lies on the shoulders of women. Gülin, who was frustrated about this pressure expressed her thoughts as follows:

Açayım; mesela çocuk baskısı sadece bana yapılıyor, kimse arayıp “sen ne zaman baba olmayı düşünüyorsun” demiyor. Çünkü bir erkeğe bunu söylemek çok zor; daha kırılabilir, şey yapılabilir gibi düşünülüyor. Hem onun ailesi, hem benim ailem bu konuda bana daha çok söylüyor.

Not only female participants but also some male participants mentioned that females were disadvantaged regarding facing the socially set expectations and pressure about marriage. Zafer, who had been married for 2.5 years, talked about how their families took different attitudes towards him and his wife while expressing their expectations from or complaints about them. Moreover, he pointed out to the gender difference as the reason for this ambivalence.

Yani, uzakta yaşadığımız için daha yakına taşınmamızı istiyorlar ya da şu an yeni evli olduğumuz için bizden bir çocuk beklentisi var gibi ya da işte sosyal-ekonomik olarak borçlandığımızda işte bunun daha dikkatli olunması gerektiği gibi! Yani, bize verdikleri tavsiyeleri biz daha çok Demet üzerinden yürütüyorlar, yani bana çok paylaşıyorlar gibi geliyor...

Ya, kesinlikle cinsiyet temelli bir durum! Benimle bu durumu paylaştıklarında gururumun kırılacağını düşünüyor olabilirler, benim sert tepki vereceğimi düşünüyor olabilirler, benimle o kadar samimi olamadıklarını düşünüyor olabilirler. Yani, bunun genelde hep benim cinsiyetle ilgili olduğunu düşünüyorum.

Regarding the social factors, females mentioned that they felt the pressure to be compatible with the demands and expectations of the society more when compared to their husbands. The concept to ‘be a good bride’ emerged in which the criteria was already defined by the society (such as being respectful to in-laws, taking good care of the husband, being a good cook etc.). Since the criteria of being a good bride was socially accepted then judging the brides became easier. Therefore, females felt that they had to think about the consequences of their actions regarding marriage a lot more than their husbands. Ela shared her experience as follows:

Mesela küçük bir şey örnek vereyim, yaşanmış bir şey; bir şey olur mesela ben “işte bunun ailesi işte gelin gelmedi der, bilmem ne şöyle böyle der” diye ben mesela her halükârda gitmek isterim. Hani, onlara şey tavırda olmamak için, ama eşim “ya gitmesen daha iyi olur” der bazen. Ondan sonra giderim, gittiğime pişman olurum, “niye gittim ki, bunun böyle olacağı belli, ben hep aynı hataya tekrar tekrar düşüyorum” falan diye olmuştur bu tür şeyler hep.

2.3.3 Reactions to Experienced Injustices in Marriage

When participants were asked how they would react to injustice in their marriage, some of them talked about their usual reactions to injustice rather than the reactions that they experience in marriage. However, the commonalities were examined through additional questions and the results were reported accordingly.

The first subordinate theme referred to the difference between initial vs. subsequent reactions. The findings showed that reactions towards injustices in marriage could be categorized in two groups which were 1) initial and 2) subsequent reactions. Initial reactions indicated the responses given right after the experience of perceived injustice and these reactions ranged from silence and ignorance to verbal and physical abuse. However, when the perceived injustices persisted in the relationship, then different reactions occurred such as crying jags, outburst of anger as well as quail and despair. What is more, persistent and unresolved feelings of injustice could create health problems. Therefore, these findings showed that persisting injustices can lead to cumulative negative effects.

Merve, who was a physician, had to live with the unresolved problems and injustices in her marriage for a long time. Although she tried to communicate or restore the balance her spouse was ignorant about the situation. As a result, she developed psychopathological symptoms and suffered from compulsive cleaning behavior.

Beni dibe vurdurdu, çok mutsuz hissettim kendimi, bayağı bir süre sürdü bu! Bu defa temizlik hastalığına yakalandım; sürekli olarak dolapları temizliyordum, her temizlediğimde yeni bir başlangıç yapacağımı zannediyordum. Bir ara her akşam temizlik yapmaya başladım, mutfak dolaplarını her akşam indirip sonra yerine yerleştiriyordum. Sonra bir anda fark ettim, ben tabii hekim olarak da bunun daha çabuk farkına varıyorsun, sonra “ben herhalde hastalandım” dedim, “bunun için, bundan sonra bunu yapmamaya çalışacağım” dedim. Haftada bir yapmaya başladım, sonra 15 günde bir yapmaya başladım, dolapların önünden geçerken düşünmemeye çalışıyordum. Sonra da bıraktım bunu, ama zaman zaman hâlâ da temizlik yapma ihtiyacı duyuyorum; çünkü temizlik yaparken kafam sanki rahatlıyor, başka bir şeyler mi düşünüyorum

ya da arınıyor muyum ya da bir şey mi yakalamaya çalışıyorum onu bilmiyorum. Ama eskisi kadar temizlik yapmıyorum.

The second subordinate theme was related to negative emotions. The most frequent feelings experienced after injustice was anger and rage. No matter whether injustice was experienced in marriage or in other social domains, participants stated clear expressions of feelings of anger.

However, when reactions to gender-based injustices were asked, female participants pointed out that they would feel worthless, unimportant, weak and as if they did not exist in their marriage. Moreover, if there was experiences of physical abuse then the feelings of humiliation ensued. Deniz expressed the feelings of unworthiness in the following sentences:

İşte önemsiz olduğumu, değersiz hissedirim herhalde büyük ihtimal ve değersiz hissettiğim bir yerde de yani, hani o adalet aslında şey; yani, yok sayılmak gibi gelir. Yani, adaletsizlik olunca hani şey gibi, ya evlilikteki o sevgi, saygı ve o varlığım yok gibi hissedirim ben.

Reactions being different in marriage than in other social domains was another subordinate theme that emerged from the analysis. Regarding the reactions to injustices, participant accounts revealed a significant difference between the reactions in marriage, and in other social domains (i.e. work, school, friends etc.). Participants tended to be more sensitive to injustices that they experience in their marriages when compared to other social domains because they could ignore or distance themselves from friends or colleagues in cases of unresolved conflicts but in a structured marriage ignorance of the spouse was not as feasible. Moreover, factors such as emotional involvement, long lasting commitment and being well acquainted with the spouse created an expectation that one's spouse would not engage in unjust behaviors easily. Due to these reasons if there was an injustice experience in marriage, participants indicated that they would be more direct, uncontrolled (i.e. overreacting, high volume) and hence sincere while showing their reactions. On the other hand, because of the high stakes (especially in the

workplace), participants stated that they would be a lot more controlled, indirect and less frank while expressing their discontent.

This finding underlines the importance of justice concept especially in marriage which people pay more attention and sets higher expectations of fairness and Zafer was one of them.

Evet, yani o konuda bir rahatsızlığım varsa hemen onu çözmeye ve o rahatsızlığımı dile getirmeye çalışıyorum; çünkü dışarıdaki insanlara karşı bu kadar duyarlı değilim. Yani, dışarıdaki insanların çok daha kaba davranışlarına, çok daha haksızlıklarına göğüs gerebildiğimi düşünüyorum, bu konuda görmezden geldiğimi de düşünüyorum. Ama evlilik içinde öyle bir adaletsizlik durumunda ya da birbirimize yaptığımız yanlış konusunda daha hassas olduğumu düşünüyorum.

The thematic analysis showed that time had a moderating effect on the reactions towards the injustices. Almost all participants commented that their reactions became more lenient as they got older. This moderating change in the reactions were explained by the increase in life experiences (thus changes in justice perceptions and increase in self-control), and people becoming more acquainted with their spouses and therefore becoming more tolerant towards them. Talip, who was a 60 years old retired man, talked about his own moderation as follows:

Yani, 25 ile 40 yaş arasında yaşadığınız bir olayı, 40 ile 55 arasında yaşadığınız aynı olaya tepkiniz veya adalet görüşünüz veya haksızlık görüşünüz değişebiliyor... Ağırlaşıyorsunuz, duygularınız olgunlaşıyor, bakışlarınız değişiyor, hayata bakışınız değişiyor.

Therefore, according to the participant accounts, the reactions to injustices in marriage became less destructive as time passed by. However less destructive should not always indicate being ‘more constructive’ since some participants mentioned an increase in the withdrawal behavior and leaving the conflicts unresolved. Engin stated that he preferred not to overreact or fight for the injustices in his marriage anymore and instead chose to stay silent.

Ama eski, gençlikte daha hemen volkan gibi patlayıp, bağırıp çağırıp olur olmadık şeyler söyleyip insanları kırabiliyorduk. Ama şimdi kırmamak için de işte uzaklaşmayı tercih ediyoruz herhalde. Tercih ediyorum diye düşünüyorum. Suskunluk daha iyi geliyor.

2.3.4 Dealing with Injustices in Marriage

While participants talked about how they dealt with the unfair situations that they experience in their marriage, two conflicting intentions emerged. Participants preferred either searching for a solution or avoiding the unjust situation and letting the problem turn into a deadlock.

The first subordinate theme related to dealing (or handling) injustices in marriage was the search for solutions. When the participants intended to resolve the unjust problems, most of the participants tried to communicate with their spouses and express their thoughts, feelings and look for possible solutions. However, majority of the participants mentioned that because of the arousal of negative emotions, they needed a calming period in which they let go off their anger and took time to think deliberately about the situation before communicating with their partners. As many other solution seekers, Orkun talked about the need for a period to calm down before he spoke to his wife and how he used this time to handle the situation.

Düşünüyorum, “ben neyi yanlış yapmış olabilirim”, yani olayı değerlendiriyorsun. Ben neyi yanlış yaptım, o neyi yanlış yaptı, nerede haklıyım, nerede haksızım? Ve zaten soğumaya başlayınca da ben de “şurada haksız olabilirim” demeye başlıyor zaten, yavaş yavaş şey yapıyorsun veya onun bakış açısıyla bakmaya başlayınca ya da sadece bekliyorsun. Çok uzaması istenmiyor çoğu zaman.

From the participant accounts, the need for a calm-down period can be interpreted as the importance given to and care for the spouse and/or the relationship, so that no damages or hurt feelings were caused by the initial reactions.

Although participants talked about their search for a solution, how they restored justice, if they ever did so, was not mentioned. Whether they compromised, collaborated or competed with their spouses varied but the analysis showed that

communicating the feelings of frustration, discussing the situation and being heard was crucial in resolution process.

Another subordinate theme was ignoring the experienced injustices in the marriage. Unfortunately, there were those who intended to leave the unfair situations unsolved as well as those who sought for the solutions. Some participants preferred repressing their feelings and thoughts about the perceived injustices although they were aware of the negative outcomes of leaving the problems unresolved. Engin explained how he dealt with the injustices in his marriage and also justified his avoidance with difficult living conditions.

Daha sonra, soğuduktan sonra da çözülecekse çözülsün, çözülmeyecekse de benim içimde kalsın. Daha çok içimde, yani kendi içimde herhalde şey yapıyorum... Empati yapılıp çözülmesi lâzım aslında, o bizde onu kendi yerimize koyup düşünmemiz lâzımken, bazen işte yaşam şartları da tabii ki muhtemelen bizi çok yoruyor

The search for empathy was the final subordinate theme referring to how spouses deal with injustice in their marriage. Empathy was considered as the key to restoring the balance in marriage. According to the participant accounts being able to see, feel and think from others' perspective will ease the restoration process and also prevent future injustices. Merve, who acclaimed many experiences of injustice, mentioned that although she thought justice is almost impossible to maintain, this could only be reached through empathy.

Belki empatiyle sağlayabiliriz. Böyle bir yola çıkıp denenebilir. Empati duygusu geliştirilirse olabilir. Adalet, eşit olmuş olsa, herkes aynı olmuş olsa ya böyle bir şey mümkün değil. O yüzden hayal dünyasında gezmek lâzım, ama empati kurulabilir "bu bir insan, bunun duyguları var, o da benim gibi, onun da bir anası, babası var, bu bir kız çocuğu, bu bir oğlan çocuğu..."

Raising awareness about gender-based injustices was the last subordinate theme related to the dealing with the injustices in marriage superordinate theme. This subordinate theme was formed mostly based on female participant accounts.

While female participants were talking about how they dealt with gender-based injustice experiences in their marriages, most of them talked about a cumulative process in which they raised both self and others' awareness about how gender-based injustices appear and how they should be handled. According to the participants' explanations this 'enlightenment' happened through education and social contact with people who study/work about gender related issues or live in a way beyond socially accepted gender roles. For instance, Meliha stated that she started to think about gender issues along with her daughter's education in psychology department. Academic discussions between mother and daughter about gender and feminism paved the way for this participant to read and learn more about the subject. In Meliha's account, it was mentioned that after many years of reading and participating in seminars/activities about gender equality and feminism she was able to make changes and draw a line to the disadvantaged position in her marriage.

Fakat zaman içinde, benim aydınlanmamın esas noktası; aslında Selin'in bu kadın konusundaki özel çalışmaları ve hassasiyetiyle başladı. Yani, bu benim için çok dönüm noktasıdır. Birçok şeyi çok okudum, çok her şeyi; kişisel gelişimden de okudum, bilimsel kitaplardan da okudum, sordum da, yani araştırdım da, kurslara da gittim, kongrelere de gittim, fakat yine de ne olursa olsun insanın tamamlanması için bir süreç gerekiyor anladığım kadarıyla, bir de bir katkı gerekiyor, belki de bir olgunluk düzeyi gerekiyor.

Another female participant, Gülin, talked about how her marriage caused vicarious learning for her own mother. This participant was mostly satisfied with her marriage regarding her experience of justice.

Annem aslında kendini "feminist" olarak tanımlayan bir kadın olmasına 46 yaşına bana şu şekilde cümleler kuruyordu: "Evlenince erkekler değişir, istesen de istemesen de ev işlerini, temizliği yapan, yemeği yapan sen olacaksın, cicim ayları bittikten sonra kendini buna hazırla", hani buna benzer cümleler kuruluyordu evliliğimin ilk başında.... Ama bunun tersinin mümkün olabileceğini, aslında hem benim evliliğimde, hem kardeşimin evliliğinde görmüş oldu. Çünkü; hem kardeşimin eşi, hem Zafer hayata öyle bakan insanlar değil.

2.3.5 Factors Linked to Gender Based Injustice Experiences in Marriage

The first subordinate theme was family. The qualitative analysis revealed that family had a crucial role in shaping the idea of justice between men and women. As a part of the relationship between mother and father children observe the roles and responsibilities that their parents share, watch how they communicate, and in cases of injustice experience how they restore or react to injustices all have an impact on shaping the child's view of what justice is and how it should be handled. Therefore, participants emphasized the impact of previous family experiences on creating the schemas, which passed on to their marriage. For instance Meliha mentioned that, how much her husband can/should expect from her as responsibility was actually determined by her own family background, wherein the schemas of roles and responsibilities of wife and husband were first created.

Gerçekten bütün kabahatte evliliğimdeki partnerimde değil. Bu biraz da benim geçmişten getirdiğim yüklerle alakalı, benim izin verdiğim kadar yüklenebildi bana eşim bu anlamda.

Another participant, Kadir, revealed that in the past he abused his wife physically during reacting to the injustices he experienced. While explaining his behavior, he pointed out to his father's reactions and abuse of his mother and tried to justify his own behavior as a consequence of his family background.

Tabii, gençliğimde yani 20'li, 25'li, 20'li, 35 yaşlar arası diyeyim yani eşime zarar verdiğim anlar oldu, olmadı değil. Darp oldu, fakat bunlar tabii çok büyük şeyler değil, çok büyük değil. Kendisine böyle belirgin şeyler verecek derecede değil, ama tabii oldu olmadı değil. O da gençliğimizden, yaşadığımız sıkıntılardan, aile yapısından, babamızdan, annemizden gördüklerimizden etkilenerек yapmış olduğumuz şeyler.

Although the formerly shaped justice schemas pass on to the child's own grown up life, these schemas might also work oppositely. Some of the participants mentioned that, they were not willing to accept and sustain the justice format that they were born into in their families. These participants used their past experiences as some kind of a warning and tried to shape their current marriage according to

these lessons. For instance Melis shared how she took lessons from what she saw in her own family experience.

Hence, family is not only effective in passing on socially accepted norms, and creating schemas in child's mind related to justice and how to handle injustice but also in providing lessons for future experiences.

Another subordinate theme related to the factors that are linked to gender-based injustices was having and rearing children. According to participant accounts, having children had huge impact on marriage and especially on the roles and responsibilities of the partners.

Including male participant accounts, the analysis showed that with the birth of the first child, women experience significant changes and most of the time made compromises such as quitting their jobs or leaving on absence in order to provide care for their child. For instance, Deniz had been living apart from her husband, in a different city, before she got pregnant. However, before giving birth to her child, she had to move in, therefore she had to change jobs and cities, and make a compromise which was actually a sacrifice. Her expressions were indicating that she was still questioning her decision about changing the city and job and even if this was a good decision at all.

Zaten biliyorsun biz aslında zorunda kaldık biraz da! Şöyle, Dilara doğmasaydı ben gelmiyordum Bursa'ya... Dilara için bir araya geldik aslında. Ben biraz neye uğradığımı şaşırdım, çünkü ben aslında evliydim, ama evli değildim. Yani bildiğimiz anlamda, öyle dışarıdaki insanların baskı yaptığı gibi ben bir anda, aynı anda evlendim belki o evlilik tanımı, aynı anda evlendim, aynı anda çocuğum oldu, aynı anda iş değiştirdim; ben Bursa'ya geldiğimde her şeyim değişti.

Not only the socially expected roles of women as mothers and primary care givers but also the biological necessities of the child (i.e. breastfeeding) and child care causes a great change in the justice scale in marriage. Whether or not the biological differences between males and females are the real cause of this injustice in

marriage (or society in general) is a hot topic in today's feminism and gender literature however in this current study some of the participants intended to explain (or justify) the injustice experience due to child rearing through biological factors which they assumed as the nature of motherhood. Ilgın talked about how she realized the biological background of motherhood and injustices it caused in her life.

Doğanın verdiği haksızlığa ve eşitsizliğe biraz kızgınım. Ama hani bunun da şöyle aşılabileceğini düşünüyorum, hani çabayla; ama birkaç yıl hakikaten böyle bir durum ne yazık ki söz konusu. İşte böyle, iş hayatında kadınlar hep şeyde ya; kadınlar evlenir, çocuk yapar, işi bırakıp ya da birkaç yıl işe gelmez, “o yüzden terfi vermeyelim, parasını yükseltmeyelim, şunu yapmayalım, daha hafif işler verelim” vesaire şeyinin aslında biyolojik bir kökeni olduğunu görmek beni yıktı.

Interestingly, one of the female participants, Melis, who had been married for 2 years and had no children also talked about the effect of having children on the justice relationship between wife and husband. She said that she was very surprised when she heard that after the child was born most of the couples separate the beds where mothers got to sleep with the newborn child and father slept somewhere else (most probably in the living room). This participant indicated that separation of beds due to childcare was unjust for both and especially for the husband.

Mesela, evlendikten sonra ilk kez dikkatimi çeken konulardan birisi çocuk doğduktan sonra insanların ilişkileri nasıl ilerliyor diye okumalar yapmaya başlamıştım. İşte mesela şeyi duydum, ilk o zaman duyduğumda çok şaşırmıştım; kadınlar doğum yaptıktan sonra anne ile bebek yatakta yatıyor, eş salonda yatıyor. Ve bunu ilk duyduğumda şey dedim, “tamam çocuk için çok güzel bir şey, tabii ki seviyorsun, kolluyorsun, ama o eş nasıl hissediyor?”, yani seninle evlendi.

2.4 Discussion

The main objective of this qualitative study was to find answers to how participants from a Turkish sample define justice in marriage, and what are the areas that they seek justice the most in marital relationships. The results of the thematic analysis provided wealth of information regarding these questions along with additional findings which were not expected at the beginning of the study. The interpretations and discussions related to the study findings are conveyed in the following paragraphs.

To begin with, the majority of the participants mentioned that justice was important and essential for a sustainable and fulfilling marital relationship. Most of the participants emphasized the importance of justice not only in marital or romantic relationships but in any kinds of interpersonal relationships. In fact, these verbal explanations of the participants can be accepted as a confirmation of the previous quantitative study findings which show that perceived justice (or equity) predicts relationship satisfaction, commitment to the relationship, and maintenance behavior (e.g., Baxter & Dindia, 1990; Berger & Janoff-Bulman, 2006; Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999; Canary & Stafford, 1992) which are all indicators of a fulfilling and/or a long lasting marital relationship.

In addition to this, when defining justice in marriage, most of the participants referred to two subordinate themes. First one was the equivalent share of responsibilities that are aligned with personal skills and desires and the second one was the reciprocity of intangible goods such as love, attention, support and honesty in marital relationship. Regarding the first subordinate theme there were two important points to be noticed. First, instead of equal share of responsibilities, equivalent share was mentioned. It was observed that couples tended to share marital responsibilities item by item instead of sharing the responsibility of a single item together. For instance, if one of the spouses cooks the meals then it was expected that the other spouse would do the dishes instead of cooking and washing the dishes together as a couple. Thus, justice was assessed by comparing the total responsibilities that partners take on.

Moreover, if these responsibilities are shared in accordance with the personal skills and desires of both partners then this was assumed to be the most preferred case. This finding indicates the importance of ‘how’ the distribution of the household chores were done. Do partners take on the responsibilities of the household chores voluntarily or do they end up doing it compulsorily otherwise the family or the quality of life at home will be negatively affected.

When the share of the household chores was discussed, most of the female participants talked about how they divided the housework with their husbands. The results revealed that although some husbands were sharing household responsibilities, they were choosing the chores that they wanted to do, whereas women did not even consider choosing among these responsibilities. Moreover, the main difference in freedom that husbands and wives hold regarding the responsibilities of the housework can be explained through the patriarchal structure of the Turkish culture (see Kandiyoti, 1995) which favors men and reassures the social hierarchy between the two genders. Consequently, relatively younger participants indicated that when they have a chance to choose the household responsibilities that they take on or they have to take on, perceived justice in the relationship increases.

Considering the second subordinate theme about description of justice in marriage, the reciprocity of intangible goods such as love, respect, support and attention was critical. This can be explained through the perspective of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1958; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). As mentioned by the theory, people exchange tangible goods along with intangible ones and if this exchange is not perceived equitable then the relationship will not maintain (as posited by the Equity Theory) (Emerson, 1976). So, findings showing that reciprocity of intangible goods as a reference to justice in marriage was not unexpected as the equity and social exchange theory have predicted. Therefore, measuring the equity or reciprocity in intangible assets is important to develop a comprehensive scale of perceived justice in marriage.

Related to the reciprocity in intangible goods, the results also provided an unexpected finding. When spouses were evaluating justice in their marriage, spouse's relationship with the in-laws was a critical factor in determining the perceived marital justice. If they were not spending enough time with one's own family, make family visits regularly or if there is an imbalance between the attention and respect that spouses show to their in-laws, then this caused perceived injustice in marriage.

In a study examining how differently a person build ties with the family of origin and the in-laws, Jorgenson (1994) found that the family of origin is considered *sacred*, where the relationship with one's own parents were so strong that it even prevented building kinship with the in-laws (e.g. calling mom or dad to in-laws). In addition to this, attachment and dependency on one's own parents was found to be effective in quality of marital relationship (such as stability of the relationship) (e.g., Komarovsky, 1950; Wallin, 1954). When the importance given to the parents and the interwoven boundaries built between the child and own parents in Turkish culture is considered one might assume that family is one of the elements of the extended self for many in Turkish population. According to Belk (1988, 2016), if components of the extended self (such as body, physical possessions, or family) are lost or injured this would be felt as a damage to the self. When the close family bonds between child and parents in Turkish culture is considered, people might interpret their spouse's attitudes toward their own parents as an attitude toward themselves. Thus, these results show that while measuring justice perceptions, the relationships with family in laws should be taken into account.

Regarding the gender difference in perceived marital justice, the qualitative study results showed that there was a clear difference between men and women in perceiving injustice in marriage. When male participants were asked whether they experienced any injustices that they were underbenefitting or disadvantaged in their marriage, majority of them answered 'no', or it took them a long time to come up with an example, while female participants had very concise and relevant experiences and thoughts to share. This finding was in line with the previous study

results which posited that women perceive more unfavorable inequity in marriage (e.g., Davidson, 1984; Schafer & Keith, 1981). However, when females were asked to share any injustice that they benefit from, they were aware of these situations and shared examples right away such as not holding the responsibility of breadwinning or the responsibility of technical or mechanical things such as car care, or repair. On the other hand, male participants did not see this as an injustice, instead they defined these responsibilities as part of their masculine character. The current findings were in line with previous quantitative studies conducted with Turkish samples (e.g., Sakallı et al., 2021; Türkoğlu, 2013) where the stereotypes of married men were related to traditional gender roles such as breadwinners, fathers and householders. Thus, one can interpret this finding as an indication of traditional gender roles reinforcing an unjust situation but this time for men.

Secondly, while there were female participants who talked about injustice in distribution of the household chores, there were certain issues that participants from both genders mentioned that was not fair. Most of these issues were referring to the concepts such as not being respected or heard. Thus, one can conclude that in marriage not only equality and distributive justice is sought for, but also interpersonal injustice was of concern for the couples.

Lastly, Duration of marriage and having children were found to be possible demographic factors which were affecting justice experience in marriage. As the years of marriage increased participants tended to become more quiet, avoidant, silenced and hopeless about the injustices that they experience. Moreover, some of the participants with children mentioned how life has changed after children and how certain responsibilities shifted directly to women and even as a must for women. In a study conducted by Schafer and Keith (1981), the results revealed that as the marriage stages progress, the perceived equity in the family roles increase for both husbands and wives however in all stages wives perceive significantly unfavorable inequity in housekeeping throughout the marriage. In the same study, it was found that the perceived equity increased after the kids left home. Thus, the qualitative findings from this study are providing support

for the previous quantitative findings regarding the effect of marriage duration and having children.

All in all, the findings from this qualitative study has provided valuable insights for the justice perceptions in marital relationships which will pave the way for further studies.



CHAPTER 3

STUDY 2: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF JUSTICE SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON PERCEPTION OF JUSTICE IN HETEROSEXUAL MARRIAGE

3.1 Introduction

Based on the findings from the initial qualitative study and relevant literature in the fields of justice and gender psychology, a quantitative study was planned with the intention of investigating effects of justice sensitivity, ambivalent sexism and gender on perceived justice in marriage. As a dispositional variable (Schmitt et al., 2010) justice sensitivity is expected to affect the frequency and strength of the injustice experiences in marriage. For highly victim justice sensitive people it is expected that the perceived marital justice will be lower since even the small interactional disputes or transgressions in marriage would be perceived as great injustices from their self-centered perspectives. Thus, it is expected that high scores of victim sensitivity would predict a decrease in the perceived level of marital justice. Secondly, the beneficiary sensitivity, which refers to the awareness of injustices that the person unintentionally benefits from someone else's victimization, is expected to be moderated by gender difference. Beneficiary justice sensitivity has been used as an indicator for an orientation for primary justice concerns for others (e.g., Fetchenhauer & Huang 2004; Gollwitzer & Rothmund, 2009) and positively associated with the empathy towards the disadvantaged groups and existential guilt (Gollwitzer et al., 2005). Since women are generally disadvantaged in marriages in patriarchal societies, such as the one in Turkey (see Kandiyoti, 1995), it is expected that males with higher beneficiary sensitivity would perceive less justice in their marriage when compared to men

with lower beneficiary sensitivity because their justice awareness for the disadvantaged group, women in this case, would be higher than beneficiary insensitive males. In her historical exploration of the gender inequality and family systems, Carmichael (2016) has underlined the disadvantaged place of women in marriage in many different societies (e.g., English, Arabic or Indian cultures) for many generations. Thus, being able to notice the unequal and unfair experiences of women in marriage might influence the perceived marital justice for men especially for issues regarding the distributive justice in household chores. In previous studies, the division of household responsibilities between men and women have been examined the most in marital justice and equality research, and the results have found that women were significantly taking more household responsibilities than man (e.g., Hasta, 1996; Schafer & Keith, 1981).

In addition to justice sensitivity, sexist attitudes are expected to influence the marital justice perceptions of participants. Due to the nature of marriage that puts women in a disadvantageous position, it is expected that the sexist attitudes toward women, which sustain the patriarchal order in the society, will affect the perceived justice in the relationship. Since sexism have been found to be related to the endorsement of traditional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 2001), both men and women who have high ambivalent sexist attitudes are expected to report higher perceived justice in marriage when compared to both males and females who have lower sexist attitudes. The theory of Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) integrates not only the hostile sexist attitudes but also the benevolent attitudes which cause the permanence of the patriarchal system by denigrating women. In this current study, it is hypothesized that benevolent and hostile sexism would predict the level of perceived justice in marriage since both sexism types supports the gender differentiation and the traditional gender roles in family and marriage. In a study conducted by Brown (2013), while examining the mediation role of perceived fairness on the association between benevolent sexism and marital satisfaction, the results showed that benevolent sexism was a significant and a negative predictor of perceived overall fairness for women where the mediation analysis was also significant. This analysis was taken one step further

and the moderated mediation was tested where the gender was the hypothesized moderator. The results again revealed a significant moderated mediation output where the mediation of perceived fairness of marriage between benevolent sexism and marital satisfaction was significant only for women. In another study, Casad et al. (2015) showed that women who endorsed higher benevolent sexist attitudes were more depressed and disappointed in their marriage experiences. This might be related to the gendered and unfair structure of marital institution where females' expectations of benevolence are not actually fulfilled in real-life marriages. Thus, it is expected that for males both higher benevolent and hostile sexism would predict higher perceived justice in marriage while increase in benevolent sexism score would predict decrease in perceived marital justice for women.

Finally, as mentioned before, the studies have shown that women are underbenefitting from marriage in many ways such as health (Wanic & Kulik, 2011), and economics (Carmichael, 2016). So, it is assumed that gender would cause a difference between perceived marital justice of men and women where women would significantly report lower levels of perceived justice in marriage.

In accordance with testing these assumptions, first a new scale was developed in order to measure perceived justice in marriage. Then, the effects of justice sensitivity, ambivalent sexism and gender were statistically analyzed by using this new scale. Lastly, the effect of demographic variables were statistically analyzed in the subsequent section. However before presenting the study hypotheses and results, the literature regarding assessment of perceived justice in marriage is given to provide a background information regarding the newly developed PJM scale.

3.1.1 Assessment of Perceived Justice in Marriage

As mentioned in the first chapter, there are different norms that people refer to when making fairness (or justice) judgements (Forsyth, 2014). Equality, equity and need can be named as the three most frequently used norms while assessing justice in a situation. In psychology literature, the equity measure has been the

major tool for assessing justice in close relationships. According to Sprecher and Schwartz (1994) there are two measures of equity: global and detailed. Global measures of equity asks participants to consider everything that is exchanged in the relationship. For instance the Hatfield's (1978) global measure asks participants to compare their gains with their partner's (e.g., "I am getting a much better deal than my partner."). Also the Relational Equity Scale (RES) (Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985) is a global measure focusing on the overall gains and losses and consists 10 items with a 5-point Likert type scale. RES measures the participants' evaluations of the ratio of the outcomes that they derive to the investments that they make in their marriages. On the other hand, the detailed equity measures ask questions about predetermined areas relevant to close relationships such as personal, emotional, day to day concerns and opportunities gained or lost that take place in Traupmann-Utne-Hatfield equity Scale (Traupmann et al., 1981). Foa and Foa (1974) measured equity in areas such as money, love, status, and information.

Considering the measurement tools focusing I on justice in marriage, there is not much diversity. A new scale was developed in 2013 with a Persian sample which is called the Marital Justice Scale (Ghaffari et al., 2013). This 20-item, 5-point Likert type scale focuses mainly on the dyadic aspect of the marriage. Development of this scale was principally based on the organizational research literature and items included in this scale resembled to the ones in Colquitt's (2001) Organizational Justice Scale. The final scale is composed of two factors; in the first factor procedural and interactional justice items are gathered and in the second factor distributive justice items are assembled. Sample items for the first factor are: "My spouse gives sufficient reasons for his/her plans and decision in marital life", "My spouse has an open, transparent and honest relationship with me". The sample items of the second factor are: "Through various ways, congruent with my efforts in marital life, my spouse rewards me" and "My responsibilities are fair in marital life".

Although the Marital Justice Scale (MJS) comprehends the three forms of justice, almost all of the items indicate the perception of the fairness in the partner's behavior but not the overall perception of justice in the marriage. In other words, in MJS justice (or injustice) is caused by the spouse but the possibility of the injustices caused by the situation or norms are ignored. Only three out of twenty items make general evaluations of justice in marriage which are: "The pressure and burden on me is fair in marital life.", "In general, my share in marital life is congruent with my efforts." And "My responsibilities are fair in marital life.". Except these three items, all of them refer to how fairly the spouse would treat the participant. However, there might be cases when people cause or benefit from the injustice in marriage. In the first study of this dissertation research interviewees not only talked about injustices that they were victims but also the injustices that they commit, or they benefit from. Thus, MJS would not be able to measure these situations since it mainly focuses on partner's fairness in distributive and procedural justice. In addition to this. The results of the first study revealed that there is more to the marital justice and the questions should be extended accordingly. For instance, the interviewees mentioned about the justice in sexual intercourse, the injustice in distribution of liability for familial and community pressures and exchange of intangible goods. In fact, the authors of the MJS (Ghaffari et al., 2013) also mentioned that the scale included adapted items from Colquitt's (2001) scale, and they did not conduct any interviews beforehand. Hence, MJS might miss some critical questions regarding marital justice.

Therefore, a new marital justice scale was developed within the scope of this study. Before item development, the in-depth interviews of the first study was examined carefully and certain areas which partners sought justice was determined. These topics were: housework, childcare, breadwinning, mechanical works required for the house and family, sexuality, issues in economic, physical and political (decision making) power, reciprocity of intangible goods (love, respect etc.) and facing family and community oppression. Some of these areas were relevant for distributive form of justice and some were related to procedural and interactional justice. The preferred norms for justice decisions for these areas were decided

based on the interview data. For instance, when participants perceive equality in economic power as just, they seek equity in appraisals. Consequently, a new perceived marital justice scale was developed through a detailed review of the justice literature, previous scales and the qualitative data gained from the in-depth interviews in the first study. Then the hypothesis regarding the effects of justice sensitivity, ambivalent sexism and gender on perceived justice in marriage were tested by using this newly developed PJM scale.

3.1.2 Research Hypotheses

In light of the psychology literature and findings of the previous studies including the qualitative study in this thesis, the following hypotheses were tested.

H1: There is a significant relationship between gender and perceived justice in marriage. When compared to men, women perceive significantly less overall marital justice including all four components of PJM (communicative, distributive, interpersonal and procedural justice).

H2: The victim justice sensitivity is expected to predict perceived marital justice in a negative direction where an increase in victim sensitivity would cause a significant decrease in PJM including all four components.

H3: The relationship between beneficiary justice sensitivity and perceived justice in marriage is moderated by gender. As the male scores of beneficiary sensitivity increases they tend to perceive less justice in their marriage, but this type of a significant relationship is not expected for females.

H4: Both hostile and benevolent sexism are significant predictors of perceived justice in marriage where the relationship is moderated by gender.

H4a: As the hostile sexism score increases, perceived justice in marriage for men also increases while no significant relationship is expected for women.

H4b: As the benevolent sexism score increases, perceived justice in marriage is effected differently for men and women, while perceived marital justice for women decreases, for men PJM increases.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Participants

The initial sample consisted of 364 participants, where all of the participants answered the item pool of newly developed PJM scale fully. There was one participant who did not answer the rest of the question battery and 11 participants were excluded due to the assumption checks for the multivariate analysis. The final sample was composed of 352 participants including 218 females (62%) and 134 males (38%). The mean age of the sample was 44.5 ($SD = 11.6$), ranging from 22 to 70. As a result of the participation requirement, all of the participants were married, and the mean duration of their current marriage was 16 years ($SD = 12.6$) ranging from less than a year (6%) to 55 years (one participant which accounted for .3%). Thirty participants (8.6%) reported that the current marriage was not their first marriage. Regarding the way of marriage, 329 participants reported that they got married by acquaintance and getting to know each other (93.5%), 18 participants described their marriage as arranged marriage (5%) and 5 participants described their marriage type as 'other' (1%). 258 participants had children (73.5%) and among them, 144 participants had 1 child (41%), 102 participants had 2 children (29%), 11 participants had 3 children (3%) and 1 participant had 4 children (.3%). The socio-demographic information of the sample is presented in Table 3.

Table 3*Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=352)*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	M	SD	Range
Age			44.5	11.6	22-70
Gender					
Female	218	62			
Male	134	38			
Duration of marriage (years)			16	12.6	0-55
Previous marriage					
Yes	30	8.5			
No	320	90.9			
Type of marriage					
Mutual love/agreement	329	93.5			
Arranged marriage	18	5.1			
Other	5	1.4			
Children					
Have	258	73.5			
Don't have	93	26.4			
Number of Children					
1	144	40.9			
2	102	29.0			
3	11	3.1			
4	1	.3			
Degree of Education					
Primary	7	2			
High school	18	5.1			
College	20	5.7			
University	152	43.2			
Graduate	84	23.9			
Doctorate	70	19.9			
Occupational Information					
Employed	270	76.7			
Retired	71	20.2			
Unemployed	11	3.1			
Monthly income level					
Low	3	.9			
Low-Middle	16	4.5			
Middle	127	36.1			
Middle-High	173	49.1			
High	32	9.1			

3.2.2 Instruments

3.2.2.1 Perceived Justice in Marriage Scale

Perceived Justice in Marriage (PJM) scale was developed within the scope of this dissertation research to measure the level of perceived justice that a person experiences in his/her marriage. First, the researcher generated the initial items based on the qualitative findings of the first study, the review of the relevant literature and the previous justice measures in marital context, such as Marital Justice Scale by Ghaffari et al. (2013), and in organizational context, such as Organizational Justice Scale by Colquitt (2001). The initial items were developed by considering how different types of justice apply to marital contexts. Thus, the initial items were categorized under three forms of justice which were distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. At the end of this process, the initial scale had 55 items. Then three social psychology professors and two nonprofessional volunteers reviewed the items. Based on their feedbacks, the initial item pool was revised based on quality, ease of understanding, redundancy, and relevance. After the revisions were made, the item pool was composed of 45 items where 10 of them were reverse (see Appendix C). After the factor analysis was conducted, the final scale had 25 items and a four-factor structure. The findings regarding the scale development study and relevant reliability and validity measures are presented in the results section of this chapter (see section 3.3.1).

The PJM was designed as a 6-point Likert-type measure where the neutral answers were discarded. Participants were asked to rate their degree of agreement with the statements (1 = *totally disagree*, 6 = *totally agree*), where the higher scores indicated higher perceived justice in marriage.

3.2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Scale

The Ambivalent Sexism Scale (ASI) was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and translated and adapted into Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). ASI was used to measure sexist attitudes of the participants. ASI had two subscales which

assessed hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS). Hostile sexism scale measured the level of overtly negative antagonistic sexist attitudes (e.g., “Women exaggerate the problems that they have at work.”; $\alpha = .87$) whereas benevolent sexism scale measured sexist attitudes which seem positive but in fact discriminatory toward women (e.g., “Women should be cherished and protected by men.”; $\alpha = .78$). Each subscale consisted of 11 items with a 6-point Likert type measure (1 = *totally disagree* to 6 = *totally agree*) (see Appendix D). In both subscales the higher scores indicate higher levels of sexist attitudes. The previous studies conducted with Turkish samples showed that the scale has a good fit with the Turkish culture (e.g., Glick et al. 2016; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Glick, 2003). In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for hostile and benevolent sexism scales were .89 and .86.

3.2.2.3 Justice Sensitivity Scale

Developed by Schmitt et al. (2005) the Justice Sensitivity Scale (JS) consists of four subscales which refers to the different perspectives in unjust situations: victim, perpetrator, observer and beneficiary perspectives. Regarding the current study two subscales of justice sensitivity measure were used. These were victim sensitivity (JS_{VIC}) and beneficiary sensitivity (JS_{BENF}) scales. As in all unjust events and situations, there is always at least one victim who suffers from the unfair situation, but injustice does not always require an intended perpetrator who purposefully victimize others. Instead of a specific perpetrator, there are times when the system itself creates and fosters injustices. In these cases, while the victims continue to experience their grievances, instead of purposeful perpetrators the system creates beneficiaries who gains advantage from injustice without being the main offender. The JS_{VIC} referred to how a person is susceptible to injustices directed to self as a victim (e.g., “It bothers me when others receive something that ought to be mine.”) and the JS_{BENF} scale measured how a person is responsive to injustices that s/he benefits from other people’s unjust treatment or exploitation (e.g., “It bothers me when things come easily to me that others have to work hard for.”). Each sensitivity scale consisted 10 items and measured with a 6-point Likert

type scale (1 = *totally disagree* to 6 = *totally agree*) (see Appendix E). Final scores of each dimension were obtained by taking the arithmetic means of 10 items under each subscale. As the mean score increase, the justice sensitivity increase. All four scales were translated and adapted into Turkish by Saklar (2015) for the master's thesis study. Except the perpetrator scale the three dimensions measuring victim, beneficiary and observer sensitivity demonstrated good reliability measures. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for the three subscales ranged from .85 to .89 (Saklar, 2015). For this study, the internal consistency values (Cronbach's alpha) for JS_{VIC} and JS_{BENF} were .84 and .86.

3.2.2.4 Relational Equity Scale

With the intention of testing the *convergent validity* of the PJM scale, Relational Equity Scale (RES) was used since the theoretical background of the scale was similar to PJM. Developed by Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985), RES aim to measure whether the outcomes that people derive from their relationship were well-balanced to their investments. The RES was composed of 10 questions (e.g., "All things considered, my partner and I contribute equally to our relationship.") and had a single factor structure (see Appendix F). In order to be consistent with the other scale measures used in this study, RES was assessed with a 6-point Likert type scale (1= *totally disagree* to 6= *totally agree*) where higher scores indicated higher relational equity. Therefore, the items 1,3,4,6,8 and 10 were reverse coded. RES was translated and adapted to Turkish by Akçabozan (2017) and single factor structure was supported with the results of confirmatory factor analysis along with indicators of adequate internal consistency measure ($\alpha = .87$). In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was also .87.

3.2.2.5 Relationship Assessment Scale

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, perceived equity was found to be significantly related to the relationship satisfaction (e.g., Berger & Janoff-Bulman, 2006). Therefore, to test the *predictive validity* of PJM scale the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was used in this study. RAS was developed by Hendrick

(1988) to determine the level of satisfaction in close relationships. The initial scale was developed just for married couples (Hendrick, 1981) but then the items were modified by the author in a following study in order to address close relationships in general. The final scale consisted 7 items (e.g., “How often does your partner meet your needs?”) and had a single factor structure (see Appendix G). The items 4 and 7 were reverse coded. In the original scale, the measurement was done with a 5-point Likert type scale but in the current study, for consistency purposes, a 6-point Likert type scale (1= *totally disagree*, 6 = *totally agree*) was used. The total score of the single factor scale indicated the level of relationship satisfaction where the higher scores signified more relationship satisfaction experienced by the participant. The scale was translated and adapted to Turkish by Curun (2001) and reported that the Turkish version also holds a single factor structure with 7 items. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were found to be .86 in in the adaptation study respectively. In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .92.

3.2.2.6 Demographic Measures

Participants were asked to give information about their gender, age, duration of their current marriage, whether they had been married before (and if yes, how many times?), the way of marriage (e.g., *tanışarak/anlaşarak*, *görücü usulü*, *beşik kertmesi*, *başlık parası karşılığı*, *diğer*), number of children, employment status, occupation, education level and monthly income level. In addition to the personal data, participants were also asked to give information about their spouse’s education level, employment status, and monthly income. For the last two questions participants were asked to compare their education level and monthly income level with their spouses (see Appendix H).

3.2.3 Procedure

Before distributing the survey, permission from Middle East Technical University (METU) Human Subjects Ethics Committee was taken (see Appendix I). The question battery, which consisted all survey instruments, were transferred into digital form and delivered through the online survey program Qualtrics. The

announcement of the study was done through face to face communication. Participants reached the survey via the Qualtrics link which was provided through e-mails and electronic messages. The average duration for answering the survey was 20 minutes. No personal identification was required, therefore there were no issues of privacy. Participants did not receive any monetary rewards for participation however it was announced that for every fully completed survey 5TL will be donated to TEMA (Türkiye Erozyonla Mücadele, Ağaçlandırma ve Doğal Varlıkları Koruma Vakfı). Data collection was completed in one week during the summer of 2021 mainly from Ankara district but there were also participants from different parts of Turkey since the data was collected online. The statistical analysis were conducted by a computer software program which is SPSS Statistics 28.0 (IBM Corp.).

3.3 Results

3.3.1 Scale Development

3.3.1.1 Factor Structure

Before conducting an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), factorability of the 45 items were analyzed based on four criteria. First one was the sample size. Comrey and Lee (1992) described the the degree of factorability of the samples sizes as: 100- poor, 200-fair, 300-good, 500-very good and 1000 or more excellent where the current sample size lies between good and very good markers. Secondly the inspection of the diagonal of anti-image correlation matrix revealed that the coefficient scores were greater than .5. Finally the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity revealed that based on the criteria of Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) the data met the factorability criteria ($KMO = .94$, $\chi^2(990) = 10475.6$, $p < .001$). All the items had a missing value less than %5. Therefore, a listwise exclusion was preferred.

Principal components analysis (PCA) with an oblique rotation (promax rotation with $\kappa = 4$) was used as the factor extraction method. The maximum iteration for

convergence was set to 50. While determining the factor structure, multiple decision rules were considered which were: Kaiser's criterion (eigen value > 1.0), Catell's Scree plot test, parallel analysis (SPSS syntax provided by O'Connor (2000)) and interpretability of the factors. The initial analysis revealed 9 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. These 9 factors explained 65.53% of the total variance. However, the parallel analysis and scree plot test indicated a four-factor structure. Therefore, PCA with oblique rotation was fixed to four factors and the analysis was run again. While examining the factor structure, items with factor loadings lower than .40 (see Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988), communality values lower than .20 (see Child, 2006), cross-loading items and close high correlations in structure matrix were deleted. As a result, 20 items were deleted. The final scale constituted 25 items with four factors explaining 64.21% of the total variance. Considering the item contents, the factors were named as *communicative justice* (factor 1), *interpersonal justice* (factor 2), and *procedural justice* (factor 3), and *distributive justice* (factor 4). The proportion of the explained total variance by the factors were 44.8%, 7.5 %, 6.3 %, 5.6 % respectively.

The communicative justice subscale was consisted of 7 items focusing on being able to fairly communicate oneself to the partner and vice versa (e.g., "When I have a problem regarding the relationship, I would have no reservations about telling it to my partner"). The interpersonal justice subscale included 9 items referring to mainly reciprocity in respect, dignity, support and attention (e.g., "I think that both parties in our marriage show the same level of respect for each other"). The following third factor which is procedural justice scale contained 5 items related to fair procedures in marriage such as making decisions, and benefiting from common sources (e.g., "In our marriage, we make important decisions jointly with my husband/wife."). The final factor, distributive justice subscale, was composed of 4 items about distribution of daily and livelihood responsibilities (e.g., "I share the daily responsibilities, such as cooking, washing the dishes, laundry or ironing, with my husband/wife fairly").

Regarding the item-total correlations, the range for the first factor was between .66 and .88, for the second factor .66 and .78, for the third factor .53 and .78, and for the final factor .42 and .74. The overall item total correlations ranged between .56 and .71 and met the criteria of .30 or above. (see Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007).

Reliability of the subscales were measured with Chronbach's alpha coefficient. The coefficients were .90 for the first factor, .77 for the second factor, .92 for the third factor and .89 for the last factor. Since these findings meet the criteria of minimum .70, one can conclude that the subscales were reliable measures for the four component of justice perception in marriage.

Regarding the relation between four subscales, arithmetic means for each subscale was calculated as the indicator of the final score for each component. As provided in Table 5 Pearson correlation results showed that all four subscales were significantly correlated with each other. The correlation coefficients ranged between .44 and .72 ($p < .01$). The factor structure, factor loadings of the items, item-total correlations, eigenvalues, the explained variance, and information regarding reliability of the subscales are presented in Table 4.

3.3.1.2 Validity

After the factor structure of PJM was established, validity of the scale was tested based on the correlations between the factors and two criterion measures which were RES and RAS. All four subscales were significantly and positively correlated with both criterion variables RES and RAS. The statistical results are provided in Table 3.3. To begin with, regarding the test of convergent validity, all of the four subscales were significantly and positively correlated with RES score where correlation coefficients ranged from .43 to .75. The perceived interpersonal justice had the highest correlation with RES while distributive justice had the lowest correlation.

Table 4*Final Factor Structure of the PJM*

Factors (<i>n</i> =4) and Items (<i>N</i> =5)		Factor Loadings				
		Corrected Item-Total Corr.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Factor 1: Communicative Justice						
1.	İlişkiyle ilgili bir sorunun olduğunda bunu eşime aktarmakla ilgili bir çekincem olmaz.	.88		.91		
2.	Eşlerin birbirini rahatça eleştirebildiği bir evliliğim var.	.89		.87		
3.	Evliliğimizde yaşanan bir çatışma sonrasında birbirimize kendimizi açıklamama fırsatı sunarız.	.73		.84		
4.	Evliliğimizde iki taraf da kendini ifade ederken aynı düzeyde rahat ve samimimidir.	.73		.77		
5.	İlişkimizde bir sorun yaşandığı zaman konuyla ilgili kendimi ifade etme şansını bulurum.	.66		.73		
6.	Evliliğimizde bir sorun yaşandığında birbirimizi anlamak için karşılıklı çaba sarf ederiz.	.70		.64		
7.	Evlilikle ilgili şikayetlerimi eşime anlattığım zaman eşim bunları dikkate alır.	.69		.59		
Factor 2: Interpersonal Justice						
8.	Birbirimizin ailesiyle olan ilişkileri yürütmek için ikimiz de benzer düzeyde çaba sarf ederiz.	.66			.95	
9.	Birbirimizin ailesine karşı ikimiz de aynı özen ve hassasiyete sahibiz.	.65			.95	

Table 4 (continued)

10. Eşimin bana hak ettiğim ilgiyi gösterdiğini düşünürüm.	.78	.74
11. Evlilikte yaptıklarımın yeteri kadar kıymetinin bilinmediğini düşünürüm.*	.75	.70
12. Evlilik içerisinde harcadığım çabanın görmezden gelindiğini düşünürüm.*	.76	.69
13. Bir konuda eşimin desteğine ihtiyaç duyduğum zaman eşim beni genelde yalnız bırakır.*	.67	.66
14. İki tarafın birbirine gösterdiği ilginin karşılıklı ve yeterli olduğunu düşünürüm.	.76	.63
15. Evliliğimizde birbirimize gösterdiğimiz desteğin karşılıklı ve yeterli olduğunu düşünürüm.	.72	.59
16. Evliliğimizde iki tarafın da birbirine aynı düzeyde saygı gösterdiğini düşünürüm.	.74	.57
Factor 3: Procedural Justice		
17. Evliliğimizde önemli kararları eşimle ortak bir şekilde alırız.	.78	.77
18. Evliliğimizde etkisi olabilecek bireysel kararlar almadan önce ikimiz de birbirimizin fikrini sorarız.	.63	.77
19. Ortak yaşantımıza dair önemli kararlarda ikimizin de düşüncesi aynı derecede etkilidir.	.64	.71
20. Ortak kararlar alırken ikimiz de birbirimizin fikrine saygılıyız.	.70	.66
21. Ortak kararlarda söz hakkının yendiğini düşünürüm.*	.53	.66
Factor 4: Distributive Justice		
22. Yemek, alışveriş, çamaşır ve ütü yapmak gibi gündelik ev işlerinin sorumluluğunu eşimle adil bir şekilde paylaşıyoruz.	.66	.89
23. Eşimle gündelik ev işlerinin planlamasını adil bir şekilde yürütürüz.	.71	.88

Table 4 (continued)

24. Gündelik ev işleriyle ilgili sorumluluk paylaşırken ikimiz de kendi tercihlerimiz doğrultusunda işler üstleniriz.	.56					.73
25. Ortak yaşamımızı sürdürülebilmek için üstlendiğimiz sorumlulukların ikimizin de istek ve becerileriyle uyumlu olduğunu düşünürüm.	.58					.65
<i>Eigenvalue</i>		11.21	1.88	1.57		1.40
<i>Explained variance</i>		44.82	7.50	6.28		5.61
<i>Internal consistency (α)</i>		.90	.92	.84		.81

Note: For the factor analysis N=364 and listwise deletion method was used for missing values.

Items 11, 12, 13, and 21 are reverse items.

Secondly, the predictive criterion was the relationship satisfaction which was measured with RAS. All four subscales were significantly and positively correlated with RAS score where the perceived distributive justice variable had the lowest correlation coefficient ($r = .45$) while perceived interpersonal justice had the highest correlation coefficient ($r = .75$) (see Table 5).

Table 5

Correlations between PJM Subscales and RAS

	RES	RAS	F1	F2	F3	F4
Relationship Equity	-					
Relationship Assessment	.78**	-				
Communicative Justice (PJM _{COM})	.68**	.63**	-			
Interpersonal Justice (PJM _{INT})	.75**	.75**	.70**	-		
Procedural Justice (PJM _{PRD})	.63**	.55**	.56**	.64**	-	
Distributive Justice (PJM _{DIST})	.43**	.45**	.40**	.51**	.38**	-

Note. RES = Relational Equity Scale, RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Moreover, the regression analysis which was tested to support predictive validity of the scales showed that the overall scores of the PJM scale significantly predicted relationship satisfaction ($F(1, 351) = 410.3, p < .001, R^2 = .54$) where an increase in the overall perceived justice in marriage would predict a significant increase in relationship satisfaction ($B = 5.58, SE = .28, p < .001$). However when each subscale was tested for predictive validity, while PJM_{COM} ($B = 4.08, SE = .27, p < .001$) and PJM_{INT} ($B = 3.14, SE = .55, p < .001$) predicted RES significantly, PJM_{PRD} ($B = .58, SE = .35, p = .10$) and PJM_{DIST} ($B = .35, SE = .21, p = .09$) did not significantly predicted RAS. Although two subscales were not predicting RAS score significantly, the significant positive correlations of these two subscales with

RAS were accepted as an indicator of validity since the previous findings of the significant relationship between RAS and justice was measured with equity scales

(e.g., Akcaboza Kayabol, 2017) which might cause a difference. Thus, the overall evaluation of the validity tests revealed that the PJM scale and its subscales can be considered as valid measures.

3.3.2 Hypothesis Testing

Before conducting the relevant statistical analyses for the hypothesis testing the data set was screened for the assumptions of multivariate analysis (outliers, normality, linearity and multicollinearity). The missing value ratio for any of the variables did not exceed 5% and no significant pattern was noticed. In order to manage the missing values, listwise deletion method was preferred throughout the analysis. However, one participant did not fill in any of the justice sensitivity subscales. Therefore, this participant was excluded from the analysis. After the univariate and multivariate outliers were detected, 11 participants were excluded from the analysis. Thus, the final data sample included 352 participants. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality results indicated that except the benevolent sexism scale all of the variables failed to meet the assumption. However, based on the criterion which assumes the data is normal if z-scores of skewness and kurtosis smaller than 1.96 (Field, 2009), JS_{VIC}, JS_{BENF}, and hostile sexism variables had less than 2 standard deviations for skewness score, therefore no intervention was made for these variables. Regarding PJM subscales, as expected, there was an accumulation of positive scores in all four subscales indicating a negatively skewed distribution and all of the z-scores of skewness were higher than 3.29 which was the criterion for larger sample sizes (Kim, 2013). Hence a logarithmic transformation ($\log_{10}$) was done for PJM_{INT} and PJM_{PRD}, and square root transformation was done for PJM_{DIST} and PJM_{COM}. Although the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was still not meeting the nonlinearity assumption after the transformations, the absolute value of skewness and kurtosis values were far less than 1 and also each skewness measure was less than two standard deviations. Therefore, the transformed variables were used in the statistical analysis.

In the following sections, first the descriptive statistics of the study variables are presented. Following this, the correlations among the major variables are

examined. After this overview, the results of the variance and regression analysis regarding the research hypotheses are presented.

3.3.2.1 Descriptive Statistics on Study Variables

In PJM scale the results revealed that procedural justice has the highest mean score ($M = 5.19$, $SD = .71$), followed by interpersonal justice ($M = 4.85$, $SD = .93$), communicative justice ($M = 4.83$, $SD = .82$) and distributive justice ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.05$). In relation to this sample, one can conclude that participants perceived justice the most in their decision making and other procedural areas whereas they perceived least justice in the distribution of daily responsibilities. However, when the subscales are considered all together, it is understood that the participants perceived moderate to high level of justice in their marriages. The descriptive statistics of the study variables are presented in Table 6.

Considering the ASI scale, benevolent sexism had a higher mean score ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.00$) than hostile sexism ($M = 2.99$, $SD = .99$). These results indicated that participants tended to endorse benevolent sexist attitudes more than the hostile sexist attitudes but there is a small difference in the mean scores. Since the scaling was between 1 to 6, in which sexism increases as the scores increase, the mean scores around 3 indicated that the participants did not exhibit strong sexist attitudes.

Regarding the JS subscales, JS_{BENF} variable had a higher mean score ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .80$) than the JS_{VIC} variable ($M = 4.34$, $SD = .80$) with small difference. These results implied that participants were moderately sensitive to injustices from both beneficiary and victim perspectives.

Table 6*Descriptive Statistics of the Major Study Variables*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
PJM			
Communicative Justice	4.83	.82	2.29-6
Interpersonal Justice	4.85	.93	1.56-6
Procedural Justice	5.19	.71	2-6
Distributive Justice	4.52	1.05	1.25-6
ASI			
Hostile Sexism	2.99	.99	1-5.55
Benevolent Sexism	3.20	1.00	1-5.64
JS			
Victim sensitivity	4.34	.80	2-6
Beneficiary sensitivity	4.52	.80	2-6

Note. *N*= 352. PJM = Perceived Justice in Marriage; ASI = Ambivalent Sexism Inventory; JS = Justice Sensitivity

3.3.2.2 Correlations among Study Variables

Pearson's correlations with significance at two-tailed were calculated in order to reveal any bivariate associations between the variables. The correlations are presented in two parts. In the first part the relationships between the psychological variables are presented while in the second part the correlations between major study variables and sociodemographic variables are conveyed.

First, the correlation between the subscales of PJM were examined. The results showed that all of the subscales were positively and significantly correlated to each other (ranging from .38 to .70, at $p < .01$). As expected communicative, procedural and interpersonal justice measures were highly correlated to each other since these variables are conceptually related. On the other hand, the relatively low correlation of distributive justice with other three variables indicated the distinctiveness of the measure.

The two measures of JS - victim sensitivity and beneficiary sensitivity - were positively and significantly correlated with each other ($r = .27, p < .01$). Regarding the relationship between subscale of PJM and JS, beneficiary sensitivity (JS_{BENF}) was positively and significantly correlated with perceived communicative justice ($r = .11, p < .05$), interpersonal justice ($r = .18, p < .01$) and procedural justice ($r = .17, p < .01$). As the participants' beneficiary sensitivity towards injustices increased the perceived communicative, interpersonal and procedural justice in marriage increased. However, there were no significant correlation between perceived distributive justice and beneficiary sensitivity. The second perspective which is the victim sensitivity (JS_{VIC}) was not associated with any of the PJM subscales. The only significant correlation that victim sensitivity had was with hostile sexism ($r = .15, p < .01$) which was in positive direction.

The subscales of ASI, which are hostile and benevolent sexism measures, were positively and significantly correlated with each other ($r = .58, p < .01$). When the relationship between ASI and PJM was considered hostile sexism was negatively and significantly correlated only with procedural justice ($r = -.18, p < .01$). This indicated that participants with lower hostile sexist attitudes tended to perceive higher procedural justice in their marriage. In addition to hostile sexism, benevolent sexism was also negatively and significantly correlated with procedural justice ($r = -.14, p < .01$). Participants who had lower scores on benevolent sexism tended to have higher scores on perceived procedural justice in their marriage. The relevant statistics are provided in Table 7.

When the correlation between sociodemographic variables and main study variables were examined there were some significant correlations. To begin with, gender was significantly associated with distributive justice ($r = .20, p < .01$) and both hostile ($r = .35, p < .01$) and benevolent sexism. ($r = .37, p < .01$). Age was negatively and significantly correlated with communicative ($r = -.18, p < .01$) and procedural justice ($r = -.13, p < .01$), whereas positively correlated with hostile ($r = .20, p < .01$) and benevolent sexism ($r = .29, p < .01$).

Table 7*Correlations among Study Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PJM								
1. Communicative Justice	-							
2. Interpersonal Justice	.70**	-						
3. Procedural Justice	.56**	.64**	-					
4. Distributive Justice	.40**	.51**	.38**	-				
JS								
5. Victim Sensitivity	-.08	-.10	-.03	-.03	-			
6. Beneficiary Sensitivity	-.11*	.18*	.17**	-.06	.27**	-		
ASI								
7. Hostile Sexism	-.09	-.10	-.18**	-.02	.15**	.06	-	
8. Benevolent Sexism	-.09	-.08	-.14**	.02	.08	.08	.58**	-

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Age was also positively correlated with beneficiary sensitivity ($r = .14, p < .01$). Education level was associated negatively and significantly with hostile sexism ($r = -.16, p < .01$) and benevolent sexism ($r = -.24, p < .01$). Moreover, there was a negative and significant correlation between education and beneficiary sensitivity ($r = -.14, p < .01$). The duration of marriage was negatively associated with two components of perceived justice in marriage which were communicative justice ($r = -.21, p < .01$), and procedural justice ($r = -.16, p < .01$).

The type of marriage was also measured in this study and the results showed that it was significantly associated with all four compounds of perceived justice in marriage. The association between type of marriage with procedural justice was the highest ($r = -.26, p < .01$) and followed by communicative justice ($r = -.21, p < .01$), interpersonal justice ($r = -.14, p < .01$) and distributive justice ($r = -.13, p < .01$). Type of marriage was also correlated with positively and significantly with both hostile ($r = .18, p < .01$) and benevolent sexism ($r = .18, p < .01$).

Besides the type of marriage, whether or not participants had kids was also correlated significantly with all four justice perceptions (ranging from .15 to .24). In addition to this, having kids was also correlated with hostile sexism ($r = -.17, p < .01$) and benevolent sexism ($r = -.20, p < .01$). Employment status and monthly incomes of the participants were not related to the perceived justice measures.

The information about spouse's sociodemographic variables revealed that spouse's education level was significantly and positively correlated with perceived procedural justice ($r = .16, p < .01$), distributive justice ($r = .16, p < .01$), communicative justice ($r = .15, p < .01$) and interpersonal justice ($r = .11, p < .05$) which indicates that participants whose spouses have higher levels of education tend to have higher PJM scores. All of the correlation coefficients between study variables and socio-demographic variables are provided in Table 8.

3.3.2.3 Testing the Effect of Gender on Perceived Justice in Marriage, Sexism and Justice Sensitivity

In order to test the effect of gender on the study variables, independent samples t-test was conducted for communicative, distributive, interpersonal and procedural justice first. The results showed that the gender difference was significant only for distributive justice amongst four justice components. Female participants ($M = 4.35, SD = 1.15$) had significantly lower scores in perceived distributive justice when compared to the male participants ($M = 4.78, SD = .79$), $t = -3.78, p < .001$. Moreover when the overall score of the PJM scale was compared between the two genders, the results indicated that again women ($M = 4.78, SD = .75$) perceived significantly less overall marital justice when compared to men ($M = 4.96, SD = .62$), $t = -2.32, p = .05$. According to these results the first hypothesis (H1) was partially supported where females perceived less overall justice and distributive justice in their marriages when compared to males. However, there were no significant difference in PJM_{INT}, PJM_{PRD}, and PJM_{COM} based on the gender difference.

Table 8*Correlations among Study Variables and Socio-demographic Variables*

Variables	GEN	Age	EDU	YoM	TYPM	Kids	EMPL	MINC	S- EDU	S- EMPL	S- MINC	S-P EDU
PJM												
1. Communicative Justice	.04	-.18**	-.01	-.21**	-.21**	.24**	-.04	-.01	.15**	-.08	.01	-
2. Interpersonal Justice	.08	-.07	-.04	-.09	-.14**	.21**	-.03	.07	.11*	-.02	.04	.16** -.12*
3. Procedural Justice	.05	-.13*	-.05	-.16**	-.26**	.18**	-.04	.05	.16**	-.01	-.02	-.12*
4. Distributive Justice	.20**	.00	-.01	-.05	-.13**	.15**	-.03	.02	.16**	.03	.03	-.10
JS												
5. Victim Sensitivity	-.09	-.03	-.03	-.02	.01	-.01	.07	-.14**	-.01	-.08	.02	.02
6. Beneficiary Sensitivity	-.01	.14**	-.14**	.17**	-.01	-.07	.08	-.04	-.09	.06	.02	-.08
ASI												
7. Hostile Sexism	.36**	.18**	-.17**	.19**	.19**	-.16**	.03	-.06	-.13*	.19**	-.19**	.01
8. Benevolent Sexism	.37**	.29**	-.24**	.32**	.16**	-.20**	.16**	-.05	-.24**	.24**	-.19**	-.07

Note. GEN = gender; EDU = Education level; YoM = Years of marriage; EMPL = Employment status; MINC = Monthly income; S-EDU = Spouse's education level; S-EMPL = Spouse's employment status; S-MINC = Spouse's monthly income; S-P EDU = Education level comparison.

In addition to PJM, gender difference was also significant for the sexism scores. Male participants ($M = 3, SD = .77$), had significantly higher hostile sexist attitudes than female participants ($M = 2.71, SD = .93$), $t = -7.06, p < .001$. The pattern was same for the benevolent sexism. Male participants ($M = 3.67, SD = .99$) held significantly stronger benevolent sexist attitudes than females ($M = 2.90, SD = .90$), $t = -7.45, p < .001$. Regarding the relationship between gender and justice sensitivity, there were no significant differences between males and females for both victim sensitivity $t = 1.65, p = .09$ and beneficiary sensitivity $t = .12, p = .91$.

3.3.2.4 Regression Analyses for the Main Study Variables

Testing the hypotheses which postulated the relationships between perceived justice in marriage measures, sexism and justice sensitivity required regression analysis. In order to test whether justice sensitivity predicted perceived justice in marriage, five multiple regression analyses were conducted where the predictors were victim sensitivity and beneficiary sensitivity. The first multiple regression analysis showed that both victim sensitivity ($B = .04, SE = .02, p = .05$) and beneficiary sensitivity ($B = -.05, SE = .02, p < .01$) significantly predicted perceived communicative justice however the significant model explained very low variance in PJM_{COM} ($F(2,351) = 4.48, p = .01, R^2 = .03$). The second regression analysis revealed that perception of distributive justice was not significantly predicted by neither victim sensitivity ($B = .02, SE = .02, p = .40$) nor beneficiary sensitivity ($B = -.03, SE = .02, p = .15$). On the contrary, the following regression analysis indicated that both victim sensitivity ($B = .03, SE = .01, p < .01$) and beneficiary sensitivity ($B = -.05, SE = .01, p < .01$) predicted perceived interpersonal justice with a significant regression model but with a low explained variance ($F(2,351) = 9.76, p < .01, R^2 = .05$). For the final component of perceived justice in marriage, which is the perceived procedural justice, the multiple regression analysis revealed a significant model ($F(2,351) = 6.35, p < .01, R^2 = .04$) in which only the beneficiary sensitivity ($B = -.04, SE = .01, p < .01$) was a significant predictor while victim sensitivity ($B = .01, SE = .01, p = .23$) was not.

When the relationship between justice sensitivity and overall perceived justice in marriage was tested, both victim sensitivity ($B = -.11, SE = .05, p = .02$) and beneficiary sensitivity ($B = .17, SE = .05, p < .01$) significantly predicted overall perceived justice in marriage with a significant model ($F(2,351) = 7.12, p < .01, R^2 = .04$). In light of these findings, victim sensitivity predicted perceived interpersonal justice, communicative justice and overall justice significantly whereas beneficiary sensitivity predicted all of the PJM components except perceived distributive justice. Thus, the second hypothesis (H2) was partially supported but, the significant findings were indicating a very low association with the PJM variables.

The following analyses were conducted between perceived justice components and sexism measures. Five multiple regression analyses were designed for perceived justice in marriage where each justice measure was the predicted variable and the hostile and benevolent sexism variables were the predictors. The first multiple regression analysis showed that perceived communicative justice was not significantly predicted by neither hostile sexism ($B = .02, SE = .02, p = .34$) nor benevolent sexism ($B = .02, SE = .02, p = .42$). The second analysis revealed similar results as the first one, where perceived distributive justice was not significantly predicted by neither hostile sexism ($B = .03, SE = .02, p = .20$) nor benevolent sexism ($B = -.02, SE = .02, p = .25$). The results of the third regression analysis also showed that both hostile ($B = .02, SE = .01, p = .12$) and benevolent sexism ($B = .002, SE = .01, p = .85$) did not predict perceived interpersonal justice in marriage significantly. On the contrary, the following multiple regression analysis reported a significant model ($F(2,351) = 6.72, p < .01, R^2 = .04$) in which perceived procedural justice was significantly predicted by hostile sexism ($B = .03, SE = .01, p = .02$), while benevolent sexism was not a significant predictor ($B = .01, SE = .01, p = .40$). Finally, the last analysis showed that the overall justice perception in marriage was not predicted by neither hostile ($B = -.08, SE = .05, p = .10$) nor benevolent ($B = -.01, SE = .05, p = .82$) sexism. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis (H4) was partially supported where hostile sexism was found to be a

significant predictor only for perceived procedural justice, whereas benevolent sexism was not a significant predictor for any of the perceived justice compounds.

Finally, the relationship between sexism and justice sensitivity was measured. Two separate multiple regression analyses were conducted where hostile sexism and benevolent sexism were predicted variables and beneficiary and victim sensitivity were the predictor variables. According to the results of the first analysis, the model was significant ($F(2,349) = 4.17, p = .01, R^2 = .02$) where victim sensitivity ($B = .19, SE = .07, p < .01$) was found to be a significant predictor of hostile sexism while beneficiary sensitivity was not ($B = .01, SE = .07, p = .87$). In the second analysis, neither victim sensitivity ($B = .09, SE = .07, p = .22$) nor beneficiary sensitivity ($B = .09, SE = .07, p = .22$) significantly predicted benevolent sexism.

In order to test the moderation hypotheses, PROCESS macro (Version 4.0) which was developed by Hayes (2017) was used in SPSS. The findings regarding the moderation of gender between beneficiary sensitivity and PJM revealed that gender did not moderate any of the relationships between beneficiary sensitivity and all compounds of PJM (the p values ranged from .10 to .99). Thus the third hypothesis (H3), which posited a significant difference between males and females in the strength of the relationship between beneficiary sensitivity and PJM, was not supported.

Regarding the moderation analysis of gender for the relationship between ambivalent sexism and PJM, the results showed that gender was not a significant moderator for the relationship between hostile sexism and PJM variables including all of the four compounds (the p values ranged from .06 to .75). However, it is worth to mention that for perceived communicative (PJM_{COM}) and procedural justice (PJM_{PRD}) the significance level for the moderation analysis was close to .05. All in all, due to lack of significant evidence, H4a and H4b were not supported.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The overarching objective of this dissertation was to amplify knowledge about the justice concept in marital relationships. Therefore, a two-step mixed-model design was employed in order to gather data from both qualitative and quantitative sources. In the first study, the main research questions focused on how people define justice in marriage, and the domains where they seek for justice the most. The qualitative findings and their discussions are presented in Chapter 2. Based on the findings from the first study, a new scale was developed and tested in order to measure participants' perceived justice in their own marriage. The purpose of developing a new scale was to create a more comprehensive justice measure that extended the scope of the traditional measure of equity. After obtaining a valid and reliable justice measure, certain social psychological factors were examined to see whether they had an impact on the level of perceived justice in marriage. Therefore, this quantitative study was designed in order to examine the effect of sexism, justice sensitivity, and gender on the level of perceived justice in marriage, including communicative, distributive, interpersonal, and procedural justice. In the previous chapter (see Chapter 3) the results of the qualitative study were provided in detail, but their implications need further evaluation. Therefore, this chapter was dedicated to the discussion of the results from the quantitative study.

In the following sections, first, the results of the scale development study were discussed. Then, the effects of gender on study variables were examined. Following this, the results of the linear relationship tests between predictors and PJM were deliberated. While doing so, the non-significance of the hypothesized moderation relationships was also examined. After these discussions, the contributions of the study to the psychology literature and its implications were

presented. Then, suggestions for future research and certain limitations of the study were conveyed. Finally, the discussion chapter is closed with concluding remarks.

4.1 The PJM Scale

Through the first analysis a valid and reliable PJM scale was developed with the purpose of measuring the perceived justice of married people in their marital relationships. The results of the exploratory factor analysis showed that the final scale, which consisted 25 items, had a good factor structure which was valid and reliable.

The factor structure had four compounds which were named as communicative, distributive, interpersonal and procedural justice. Although the last three compounds were expected to emerge from the factor analysis, the communicative compound was not anticipated. These items were expected to be placed under either procedural justice (items 3, 5 and 7) or interactional justice (items 1, 2, 4 and 6), however, the results of the factor analysis showed that communicative justice compound had significantly different latent concept than these two. In fact, obtaining two different factors from interactional justice items would not be surprising since Greenberg (1990) divided the interactional justice concept into two: informational and interpersonal justice. Based on his division interpersonal justice refers to whether people treat each other with respect, dignity, and politeness during the procedures and informational justice refers to whether people are provided with adequate explanation about why the decisions or procedures were executed in a certain way (Colquitt et al., 2001). However, the analysis results showed that the communicative justice had items from both interactional and procedural justice. Besides, in addition to be a separate factor, it was also the factor that explained the highest variance in PJM. Thus, facing a new justice compound related to the perceived marital justice was informative and showed that couples give importance to be able to express their thoughts and feelings without any resentment and being heard and understood by their partners.

In procedural justice subscale the items mostly referred to the “how” question. For instance, how the common decisions were made, how the common resources were shared etc. The focal point here was the fairness of the procedure. In the interpersonal justice subscale, the items mostly referred to the reciprocity of intangible goods such as respect, support etc. However, in the communicative justice scale the items denoted whether a person was able to express herself/himself to the partner clearly and securely without having doubts or reservations and whether the partner (or spouse) was listening to him/her attentively and considerately. In fact, these items were generated based on the qualitative data which was analyzed in the first study. During the interviews some of the participants mentioned that when they could not freely convey their thoughts to their spouses or when their partners did not listen to them, they felt like they did not exist, or they felt trapped. According to their statements this situation was a cause for feeling of injustice. So, this component was carrying a distinct latent concept than what procedural and interpersonal justice components did. Therefore, a new dimension to the perceived justice measure was included. Thus, one can conclude that PJM scale was not only a reliable and valid scale, but it was a comprehensive measure which was tailored not only with previous findings in the literature but also with the current data embedded in marital experiences of Turkish participants.

Regarding the Turkish culture, there was one important finding about the newly developed scale. Two of the items, which were generated based on the in-depth interviews, were about the relationships with the in laws (item no 8 and 9 in the final scale) that loaded to perceived interpersonal justice factor. Riley (1994) emphasized that the role of family members in the relationship with the spouse is observed mostly in societies where the household lives and practices with parents are interwoven. Also, Beşpınar and Beşpınar (2017) conveyed the importance of the family influence on the relationship with the spouse in Turkish culture. According to their evaluations, based on the data of TAYA (Türkiye Aile Yapısı Araştırması) from years 2006 and 2011 and TÜİK (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu) years between 2002 and 2016, families are playing an important role in many

marital areas such as deciding whom to marry, being the one to consult when having problems with the spouse, and even one third of the participants reported that intrusiveness of the spouse's family is a reason for divorce. When families are highly involved and also very influential in marital relationships, seeing them as a factor affecting justice perception in marriage should not be a surprise. Most probably, the interwoven relationships with the parents cause them to be treated as a part of the extended self which refers to the idea that "certain possessions and certain other people are seen to be a part of us" (Belk, 2016, p. 50). Thus, the expectation of the norm of reciprocity in dignity and respect between spouses is extended to the reciprocity in respect and dignity towards the spouse's family. This finding is also unique and draws attention to the importance of defining and examining justice concept carefully and deliberately based on the context that it is measured for.

Lastly, when compared to the latest Marital Justice Scale developed by Ghaffari et al. (2013), the new PJM scale was able to distinguish procedural and interactional justice which was combined as a single factor in MJS (named as Procedural/Interactional Justice). Moreover, due to the qualitative findings integrated in the scale development process in this dissertation, the new PJM scale was more inclusive regarding the variations in justice evaluations as can be seen from the communicative justice compound.

4.2 The Effect of Gender

Regarding the effect of gender, it was hypothesized that women would perceive significantly less justice in their marital relationship. The current study findings were partially in line with this premise where women perceived significantly less distributive and overall justice in their marriage when compared to men. However, there was not any statistical evidence for a significant gender difference for PJM_{COM} , PJM_{INT} , and PJM_{PRD} . The significant gender difference for overall and distributive justice has been supported by previous findings in the literature. For instance, regarding the overall justice evaluation in marriage the findings of Davidson's (1984) study sample indicated that there were significantly more

women than men who perceived themselves as underbenefitting in their marital relationship. In addition to this, study by Schafer and Keith (1981) showed that higher proportion of women perceived unfavorable overall inequity in family roles (cooking, housekeeping and parenting) while higher percentage of men perceived favorable inequity in their marriage which indicate that both men and women agree on who is underbenefitting and overbenefitting in the relationship. This finding was also supported by Hasta (1995) in a study conducted with a Turkish sample where both male and female participants reported that females do significantly more housework than men in marriage and women who perceive more equity in housework responsibilities were doing less housework than women who perceived the housework distribution inequitable. Thus, one can say that the current findings about the significant gender difference on perceived distributive justice was not a coincidence. Nonetheless, the nonsignificant gender effect on the other three PJM compounds needs explanation.

In fact, it was expected that women would perceive significantly less procedural justice. Previous findings have shown that religiosity (Lundquist Denton, 2004) along with patriarchal social structure affects the decision-making power of women (Ferdoos & Zahra, 2016). For instance, Connel and Connel (2005) states that in a patriarchal society men enjoy many benefits such as higher income, authority, higher social status and control over important decisions which is also valid in the family context. Considering these previous findings and also the patriarchal structure of Turkish culture (see Kandiyoti, 1995) it was expected that women would perceive less procedural justice in their marital relationship. However, the results were not indicating any significant difference for perceived procedural justice between men and women. One of the reasons might be the education level of the participants since education level is associated with higher egalitarian attitudes (e.g., Auletto et al., 2007; Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004). Around 87% of participants had at least an undergraduate degree, which corresponds to 86% of female participants and almost 89% of male participants. In addition to the education level, the employment status and economic power that women hold might also be influential in procedural justice in marital decisions.

Almost 77% of female participants were employed, and around 88% reported monthly income level as middle or middle-high, but still 46% of them reported that their monthly income was lower than their husband whereas 55% of male participants reported that their monthly income was higher than their wife. So, although the majority of the female participants were earning relatively less than their husbands still making economic contributions and holding an economic freedom might affect how the decisions are made between spouses. However, as mentioned earlier, the education and economic status were not adequate to change the perceived distributive justice in marital relationships.

Unfortunately, there has not been many studies examining the interpersonal or communicative justice in marital context since the former is mainly a concept of the organizational justice and the latter is a fairly new concept. Thus, in order to find an explanation to the nonsignificant difference, first the subscale items were examined thoroughly. Although the expectations were in a way that women would perceive less interpersonal and communicative justice, during the interviews in the first study, besides the female participants there were many male interviewees who mentioned that their efforts -as a father or a husband- were not appreciated by their wives (interpersonal justice) or they preferred to remain silent rather than expressing themselves to their wives when they have complaints about their marriage (communicative justice). Thus, one can say that the results of the quantitative study had already been pointed out by the findings from the qualitative study.

The variations among the perceptions of different forms of justice has an important implication for the psychology research since it underlines how conceptualization can make difference in measuring perceived justice in marital relationships. Thus, while using the measures, it is important to conceptualize how justice is defined and measured since just measuring equity or equality in certain domains might not represent the overall perceived justice in the relationship.

4.3 Linear Relationship Between Study Variables

The regression analyses testing revealed some significant model results, but the variance explained by the predictor variables required careful consideration due to the low R^2 values. To begin with, when the predictive powers of hostile and benevolent sexism were tested, the results showed that hostile sexism was a significant predictor only for perceived procedural justice whereas benevolent sexism did not predict any of the PJM compounds significantly. However, when the statistics were examined, it showed that even the significant model where hostile sexism predicted procedural justice had very low R^2 value (.04) indicating that the explained variance by hostile sexism in perceived procedural justice was only 4%. Thus, when all the results regarding sexism and PJM were considered it would be fair to say that sexism (neither hostile nor benevolent) was not a strong predictor for the perceived justice in marriage.

These findings did not overlap with the initial expectations where a significant relationship between sexism and perceived procedural justice was hypothesized. It was expected that in patriarchal cultures a positive linear relationship would occur between sexism and perceived justice in marriage for males while an opposite relationship between benevolent sexism and PJM was expected for women. However, the current results revealed that sexism was a very weak predictor for PJM in the Turkish sample. It was expected that certain stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes (such as sexism) would influence decision making processes (such as justice assessments in the marriage). However, the findings indicated that sexism and justice sensitivity were not able to explain the changes in PJM. When this finding was compared with the significant results provided by Brown (2013) certain differences were noticed. In her study, the perceived fairness was measured only for household chores (cooking, cleaning, household management, yard work and childcare) and the measure was indicating the direction of injustice whether the participant was under or overbenefitting from the unfair situation. Thus, this is a great difference from the current study and points out to an important measurement issue for future studies, because in the

current study, most of the items did not indicate any direction, rather, referring to an overall justice for each area without determining the over or underbenefitting party. This was intentionally planned for creating a measure that specifically focuses on the perceived justice (considering the positions of both self and other) in marital relationships. However, this might be also a weakness for the new measurement, since, the PJM scale determines the perception of marital justice in communication, distribution, interpersonal and procedural justice forms but does not directly imply who is under or overbenefitting. In addition to this, based on the findings from the nonsignificant (or weak) association between sexism and PJM, this new scale might be not be a proper tool to measure for gender based perceived injustices in marital relationships. The positive and egalitarian tone of the items might not reflect the negative experiences based on the gender differences. So for researchers who tend to use this scale or who would like to develop new scales related to marital justice perceptions, these outcomes regarding the current PJM scale development process should be taken into consideration and the wording, the tone and also the focus of the items should be tailored accordingly.

Regarding the relationship between justice sensitivity and PJM, similar results were obtained. Victim sensitivity predicted perceived communicative, interpersonal and overall justice and the explained variance for the multiple linear models were 3%, 5%, and 4% respectively. In addition to this, beneficiary sensitivity predicted perceived interpersonal, communicative, procedural and overall justice significantly but again the highest R^2 value was .05. Thus, these findings were not providing strong evidence for the predictive power of justice sensitivity for PJM variables.

So, based on these findings and interpretations, one can conclude that neither justice sensitivity nor sexism can be assumed as robust predictors for the perceived justice in marriage and require further investigation for more statistical evidence. Thus, in light of these findings two possible causes were speculated.

First, justice perception might be the preliminary psychological process itself without any initial or latent variables or processes affecting it. In other words, there

might not be psychological predictors or antecedents of the justice perception where individual differences do not cause any changes in the evaluation process. While making justice assessments one might use external cues and references (such as social norms) which are more solid and stable. Unfortunately, the literature review does not provide adequate information about this issue. When the organizational justice literature was examined it was seen that while the antecedents of perceived justice were researched, most of the tested variables were based on external and situational factors such as organizational regulations, raters' behavior during performance evaluations (e.g., Erdogan, 2002), empowerment and communication (Haiyan Zheng, 2006), process and decision control (Phillips, 2002). So almost no psychological variables or procedures were examined as the antecedents or predictors of the justice perceptions at work environment. In close relationships literature there is even less research about possible predictors of the justice perceptions. Among these few variables were gender and marriage duration (e.g., Schafer & Keith, 1981) which were basically demographic variables. Two psychological concepts had been tested in this scope but not as predictors but as mediators between equity and relationship satisfaction. These two variables were exchange orientation (e.g., Sprecher, 1992) and communal orientation (e.g., Clark et al., 1987). However, their possible effects on justice perception were not examined. In conclusion, there is a gap in the current literature regarding the possible psychological factors that might affect justice perception in marriage.

The second speculation about the current results was related to measurement issue of the perceived justice in marriage. This study was done with married people where they were asked to rate how just they perceive their marriage. Since the literature has already established the relationship between equity and maintenance behavior (e.g., Akçaboza Kayabol, 2017), most participants would report higher scores in PJM otherwise it would be expected for them to quit the relationship and thus not to be included in the sample. Therefore, it might be difficult to find people with very low or moderate scores of PJM. So, in the current study the variance in the data might not be adequate to infer clear statistical interpretations. As reported

in the previous chapter, all of the four PJM variables needed transformation due to the negative skewness in the data.

4.5 Contributions of the Study

First, the qualitative study and its findings were unique and made evident contributions to the psychology literature regarding justice perception of Turkish men and women in marriage. How people define justice, where they need justice the most, whether they experience any injustice based on their gender were examined through in-depth interviews.

Second, a new valid and reliable scale was developed with the aim of measuring the degree of perceived justice in marriage. This scale was a detailed and a comprehensive scale which measured different forms of justice. Most of the detailed equity scales group their findings based on resource categories such as money, material goods, and information where the investments and the outcomes are compared with the partner's. However, in PJM scale, not only distributive justice was measured but also communicative, procedural and interpersonal justice were measured. Thus, regarding the norms and forms of justice included in the scale, this measure can be described as a more comprehensive justice measure for marital context which is also compatible with Turkish culture.

Third, the findings from the quantitative study created important insights to understand justice assessment process. Although the findings were supporting the hypotheses partially, the outcomes of the study provided new directions for future research. As mentioned before, there were not enough studies examining the possible psychological factors underlying the perception of justice in marriage. Thus, these findings might be a starting point for the ones who might want to dig into the subject and search for other possible factors or these findings might be a warning for some researchers and would lead them to put their efforts to create better measures of perceived justice instead of searching for the psychological antecedents of it. In both ways, the findings of the quantitative study made a unique contribution to the field.

4.5 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

First, there were certain limitations of the factor analysis. As the main limitation of the scale development study, the analysis of divergent validity was missing and needs to be conducted in future studies in order to enhance the validity of the scale. Secondly, although each subscale demonstrated very high reliability coefficients, the test-retest reliability was not measured, and this should be taken into account especially before employing the scale for longitudinal studies. Third, the scale development and the hypothesis testing were done on the same sample data. Thus, a CFA could not be conducted for the validity of the factor structure.

As well as validity, there was an issue to be noted for future studies about the factor analysis. During factor extraction process, in the first step where no numbers of factors were fixed, item 3 (“My wife/husband and I take the responsibility for household mechanical and repair work fairly.”) and item 7 (“We share the responsibility for living expenses such as house rent, bills, food expenses, fairly with my spouse.”) demonstrated good communality (.50 and .65 respectively). In this analysis these two items loaded into a single factor together. However, when the factors were fixed to 4, the communalities of item 3 and item 7 decreased remarkably (.27 and .26 respectively) and due to relatively low loadings in pattern and structure matrices these items were excluded from the distributive justice subscale. This might be an important notice for future studies since these two items might be a part of another factor or compound which was not measured sufficiently in the current study. In addition to this, the final distributive justice scale consists of items related mainly to daily household chores which might be salient for females regarding justice concerns while item 3 and 7 might be a concern for male participants. Therefore, in the future studies while developing detailed measures of equity or justice a separate compound based on gender difference might be planned for measuring justice in the distribution of household chores and livelihood.

In addition to the distributive justice, the unanticipated subscale, which measures the perceived communicative justice, needs special attention for future studies.

The perceived communicative justice seems to be very important for the participants (due to the high variance explained among the four compounds in PJM), and therefore, it should be investigated thoroughly in order to clearly define the meaning of the concept and demonstrate its distinctiveness from procedural and interactional justice.

Regarding the second study, there are two suggestions for future research. First one is testing the gender role attitudes as a predictor for perceived justice in marriage. Although sexism holds certain gender role stereotypes, directly measuring gender role attitudes would bring more evident results. Secondly, a dyadic study would make significant contribution to the understanding of the possible factors that influence the justice perceptions for the same marriage. Through this method, certain psychological variables can be detected more easily since some variance would be controlled.

Also, another limitation for this study was the sample structure since it was highly educated when compared to the average education level in Turkish society. Based on the data provided by TÜİK (Turkish Statistical Institute) in 2020 the proportion of graduates from college or a higher degree in the total Turkish population was 16% while this proportion was 87% in the current study sample. Thus, when interpreting the results, this should be taken into consideration and in order to generate more valid findings, these variables should be tested in a more representative sample.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academy Press.
- Akçabozan Kayabol, N. B. (2017). *Relationship maintenance behaviors and marital satisfaction: The mediator roles of relational equity and appreciation*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.
- Akçabozan, N. B., & Hatipoğlu Sümer, Z. (2017). İlişkisel Eşitlik Ölçeği'nin Türkçe uyarlaması ve psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. 26. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Tam Metin Bildiri Kitabında Yayımlanan Tam Metin*, 355-362.
- Armour, M. P., & Umbreit, M. S. (2006). Victim forgiveness in restorative justice dialogue. *Victims and Offenders*, 1, 123-140.
- Auletto, A., Taeyeon, K., & Marias, R. (2017). Educational attainment and egalitarian attitudes toward women in the MENA region: Insights from the Arab barometer. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 20(1), 45-67.
- Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 629-643.
- Baxter, L. A., & Dindia, K. (1990). Marital partners' perceptions of marital maintenance strategies. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 7(2), 187-208. doi: 10.1177/0265407590072003
- Belk, R. (2016). Extended self and the digital world. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 20, 50-54.

- Berger, A. R., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (2006). Costs and satisfaction in close relationships: The role of loss-gain framing. *Personal Relationships*, 13(1), 53-68.
- Beşpınar, F. U., & Beşpınar, L. Z. (2017). Türkiyede hane halkı yapıları ve evlilik pratiklerinde ikili resim: Geleneklerin yanı sıra değişimin yansımaları. *Nüfusbilim Dergisi*, 39, 109-149.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria for fairness. In B. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). JAI.
- Blader, T. R., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 445-464.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Bobocel, D. R., & Holmvall, C. M. (2001). Are interactional justice and procedural justice different? Framing the debate. In S. W. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (Vol. 1, pp. 85-108). Information Age Publishing.
- Bolzendahl, C. I., & Myers, D. J. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974-1998. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 759-790.
- Boon, D. S., Deveau, V. L., & Alibhai, A. M. (2009). Payback: The parameters of revenge in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26(6-7), 747-768.
- Brooks, T. (2012). *Punishment*. Routledge.
- Buunk, B. P. & Mutsaers, W. (1999). Equity perceptions and marital satisfaction in former and current marriage: A study among the remarried. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16(1), 123-132.

- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and perspective gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 5(3), 665-692. doi: 10.1037//1076-8971.5.3.665
- Canary, D. J., & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage. *Communication Monographs*, 59(3), 243-267.
- Carmichael, S. G. (2016). *Marriage, family and gender inequality: An historical exploration of the relationship between family systems, the position of women and development*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Utrecht University.
- Casad, B., Salazar, M., & Macina, V. (2015). The real versus the ideal: Predicting relationship satisfaction and well-being from endorsement of marriage myths and benevolent sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 39(1), 119-129.
- Chapleau, K., Oswald, D., & Russell, B. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 57(1/2), 131-136.
- Chen, Z., Fiske, S., & Lee, T. (2009). Ambivalent sexism and power-related gender-role ideology in marriage. *Sex Roles*, 60(11-12), 765-778.
- Child, D. (2006). *The essentials of factor analysis* (3rd ed.). Continuum.
- Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2021). Revenge in couple relationships and their relation to the Dark Triad. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(14), <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18147653>
- Cohen, R. (2016). Restorative justice. In C. Sabbagh & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Justice Theory and Research* (pp. 257-272). Springer Science+Business Media.
- Collins, B. J., & Mossholder, K. W. (2017). Fairness means more to some than others; Interactional fairness, job embeddedness, and discretionary work behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 43(2), 293-318.

- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Connell, R. W., & Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities. Toward a Critical Sociology of Men and Masculinities*. University of California Press.
- Cook, K. S., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (1983). Distributive justice, equity, and equality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 217-241.
- Cudd, A. E., & Jones, L. E. (2005). Sexism. In R. G. Frey & C. H. Wellman (Eds.), *A companion to applied ethics* (pp. 102-117). Blackwell.
- Curun, F. (2001). *The effects of sexism and sex role orientation on romantic relationship satisfaction* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Davidson, B. (1984). A test of equity theory for marital adjustment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 36-42.
- Desmarais, S., & Lerner, M. J. (1989). A new look at equity and outcomes as determinants of satisfaction in close personal relationships. *Social Justice Research*, 3, 105-119.
- Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive Justice: A social psychological perspective*. Yale University Press.
- Dulebohn, J., Davison, R., & Lee, S. A. (2016). Gender differences in justice evaluations: Evidence from fMRI. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(2), 151-170.
- Duran, M., Moya, M., & Megias, J. (2011). It's his right, it's her duty: Benevolent sexism and the justification of traditional sexual roles. *Journal of Sex Research*, 48(5), 470-478.

- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(4), 555-578.
- Fennel, D. (1993). Characteristics of long-term first marriages. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 15, 446-460.
- Ferdoos, A., & Zahra, S. (2016). Patriarchy and decision making power of women. *Journal of Gender and Social Issues*, 15(2), 55-67.
- Fetchenhauer, D., & Huang, X. (2004). Justice sensitivity and distributive decisions in experimental games. *Personality and Individual Difference*, 36, 1015-1029.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd edition). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fincham, F. D. (2000). The kiss of the porcupines: From attributing responsibility to forgiving. *Personal Relationships*, 7(1), 1-23.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2006). Relationship satisfaction. In D. Perlman & A. Vangelisti (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 579-594). Cambridge University Press.
- Fincham, F. D., Beach, S. R. H., & Davila, J (2004). Forgiveness and conflict resolution in marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(1), 72-81.
- Fincham, F. D., Hall, J., & Beach, S. R. H. (2006). Forgiveness in marriage: Current status and future directions. *Family Relations*, 55, 415-427.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.
- Forbes, G., Collinsworth, L., Jobe, R., Braun, K., & Wise, L. (2007). Sexism, hostility toward women, and endorsement of beauty ideals and practices: Are beauty ideals associated with oppressive beliefs? *Sex Roles*, 56(5/6), 265 – 273.

- Forsyth, D. R. (2014). *Group Dynamics* (6th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning, California.
- Gaunt, R. (2012). "Blessed is he who has not made me a woman": Ambivalent sexism and Jewish religiosity. *Sex Roles*, 67, 477-487.
- Gaunt, R. (2013). Ambivalent sexism and perceptions of men and women who violate gendered family roles. *Community, Work and Family*, 16(4), 401-416.
- Ghaffari, M., Fatehizadea, M., Ahmedia, S. A., Ghasemia, V., & Baghbana, I. (2013). Construction and validation of the marital justice scale: Adaptation of social justice theory in marriage. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 9(4), 737-743.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, T. S. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2007). Sex discrimination: The psychological approach. In F. J. Crosby, M. S. Stockdale, & S. A. Ropp (Eds.), *Sex discrimination in the workplace*. Blackwell.
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Akbaş, G., Orta, I. M., & Ceylan, S. (2016). Why do women endorse honor beliefs? Ambivalent sexism and religiosity as predictors. *Sex Roles*, 75, 543-554.
- Glick, P., Sakallı, N., Ferreira, M. C., & de Souza, M. A. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 291-296.
- Gollwitzer, M., Schmitt, M., Schalke, R., Maes, J., & Baer, A. (2005). Asymmetrical effects of justice sensitivity perspectives on prosocial and antisocial behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 18, 183-201.
- Gollwitzer, M., & Rothmund, T. (2009). When the need to trust results in unethical behavior: The sensitivity to mean intentions (SeMI) model. In D. De Cramer (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on ethical behavior and decision making* (pp. 135-152). Information Age.

- Gordon, K. C., Baucom, D. H., & Snyder, D. K. (2000). The use of forgiveness in marital therapy. In M. McCullough, K. Pargament, & C. Thoresen (Eds.), *Forgiveness: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 203-227). Guilford Press.
- Gordon, K. C., Baucom, D. H., & Snyder, D. K. (2005). Forgiveness in couples: Divorce, infidelity, and couples therapy. In E. L. Worthington (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 407-422). Routledge.
- Greenberg, J. (1990) Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(2), 265-275.
- Hagan, J., Ferrales, G., & Jasso, G. (2007). How law rules: Torture, terror, and the normative judgments of Iraqi judges. *Law & Society Review*, 42, 605-644.
- Haiyan Zheng, B. E. (2006). *Antecedents and consequences of organizational justice: An investigation in China*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. McMaster University.
- Harris, A. H. S., & Thoresen, C. E. (2005). Forgiveness, unforgiveness, health and disease. In E. L. Worthington (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 321-334). Routledge.
- Hasta, D. (1996). *Ev işi paylaşımı ve ev işi paylaşımında hakkaniyet algısı ile evlilik doyumu ilişkisi*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Hatfield, E., & Traupmann, J. (1981). Intimate relationships: A perspective from Equity Theory. In S. Duck, & R. Gilmour (Eds.), *Personal relationships: Studying personal relationships* (pp. 165-178). London: Academic Press.
- Hatfield, E., Traupmann, J., Sprecher, S., Utne, M., & Hay, J. (1985). Equity and intimate relations: Recent research. In D. W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships* (pp. 91-117). New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., & Traupmann, J. (1979). Equity theory and intimate relationships. In R. L. Burgess, & T. L. Huston (Eds.), *Social exchange in developing relationships* (pp. 91-117). New York: Academic Press.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1150-1159.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93-98.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606.
- IBM Corp. (2021). SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. IBM Corp.
- Jackson, D. (2010). *Equity, maintenance behaviors, and relational satisfaction in distressed partners*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Arizona State University.
- Jasso, G., Törnblom, K. Y., & Sabbagh, C. (2016). Distributive justice. In C. Sabbagh & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice theory and research* (pp. 201-218). Springer.
- Johnston, D. (2011). *A brief history of justice*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1995). Patterns of patriarchy: Notes for an analysis of male dominance in Turkish society. In S. Tekeli (Ed.), *Women in modern Turkish society*. Zed Books.
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. Wiley.
- Kim, H. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution using skewness and kurtosis. *Open lecture on statistics (NA)*, 52-54. <https://dx.doi.org/10.539 5/rde.2013.38.1.52>

- Kluwer, E. S., Tumewu, M., & Van Den Bos, K. (2009). Men's and women's reactions to fair and unfair treatment in relationship conflict. *Personal Relationships*, 16, 455-474.
- Lerner, M. J. (1977). The justice motive: Some hypothesis as to its origins and forms. *Journal of Personality*, 45(1), 1-52.
- Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent sexism in close relationships: (Hostile) Power and (benevolent) romance shape relationships ideals. *Sex Roles*, 62, 583-601.
- Lorber, J. (2011). *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics* (5th edition). Oxford University Press.
- Lotz, S., Baumert, A., Schlösser, T., Gresser, F., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2011). Individual differences in third-party interventions: How justice sensitivity shapes altruistic punishment. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 4(4), 297-313.
- Lundquist Denton, M. (2004). Gender and marital decision making: Negotiating religious ideology and practice. *Social Forces*, 82(3), 1151-1180.
- Maiese, M. (2003a, June). *Distributive justice*. Beyond intractability. Retrieved May 2, 2021 from https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/types_of_justice
- Maiese, M. (2003b, July). *Types of justice*. Beyond intractability. Retrieved May 2, 2021 from https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/types_of_justice
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
- McCullough, M. E., Fincham, F. D., & Tsang, J. (2003). Forgiveness, forbearance, and time: The temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 540-557.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Justice. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June 20, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/justice>

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Marriage. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June 20, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/marriage>

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Retribution. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June 25, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/retribution>

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Sexism. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June 25, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sexism>

Michales, J. W., Edwards, J. N., & Acock, A. C. (1984). Satisfaction in intimate relationships as a function of inequality and outcomes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 347-357.

Mikula, G. (1994). Perspective-related differences in interpretations of injustice by victims and victimizers: A test with close relationships. In M. J. Lerner & G. Mikula (Eds.), *Entitlement and the Affectional Bond*, (pp. 175-203). Plenum Press.

Mill, J. S. (2017). *Faydacılık*. (S. Aktuyun, Çev.). Alfa Yayıncılık. (1863)

Nelson, N., Peleg-Koriat, I., & Ben-Ari, R. (2018). Perceived procedural justice and conflict management in intimate relationships: The moderating effects of anxious attachment and personal power. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 7(1), 34-46.

Nozick, R. (1981). *Philosophical explanations*. Harvard University Press.

- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instrumentation, and Computers*, 32, 396-402.
- Peleg-Koriat, I., Nelson, N., & Ben-Ari, R. (2017). The effects of perceived procedural justice on conflict management between spouses, and the mediating role of dyadic adjustment. *Negotiation Journal*, 33, 129-152.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgement of the child*. Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner. (Original work published 1932)
- Phillips, J. M. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of procedural justice perceptions in hierarchical decision-making teams. *Small Group Research*, 33(1), 32-64.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (2004). *The social contract*. Penguin Books. (1762)
- Rudman, L., & Fairchild, K. (2007). The F word: Is feminism incompatible with beauty and romance? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(2), 125-136.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(2), 172-186. doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(80)90007-4
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101-117. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.45.1.101
- Sabbagh, C., & Schmitt, M. (1998). Exploring the structure of positive and negative justice judgments. *Social Justice Research*, 11(4), 381-395.
- Sabatelli, R. M., & Cecil-Pigo, E. F. (1985). Relational interdependence and commitment in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 931-937.
- Sabatelli, R. M., & Shehan, C. L. (1993). Exchange and resource theories. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz

(Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 385–417). Plenum Press.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 47-58.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Glick, P. (2003). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 296-302.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Ulu, S. (2003). Evlilikte kadına yönelik şiddete ilişkin tutumlar: Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, yaş, eğitim ve gelir düzeyinin etkileri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 6(11-12), 53-65.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Türkoğlu, B., & Kuzlak, A. (2021). Stereotypes of single and married women and men in Turkish culture. *Current Psychology*, 40(1), 213-225.

Saklar, Z. (2015). *Investigating the role of justice sensitivity on volunteering*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University.

Schafer, R. B., & Keith, P. M. (1981). Equity in marital roles across the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 43(2), 359-367.

Schmitt, M., Baumert, A., Gollwitzer, M., & Maes, J. (2010). The justice sensitivity inventory: Factorial validity, location in the personality facet space, demographic pattern, and normative data. *Social Justice Research*, 23, 211-238. doi: 10.1007/s11211-010-0115-2

Schmitt, M., Gollwitzer, M., Maes, J., & Arbach, D. (2005). Justice sensitivity: Assessment and location in the personality space. *European Journal of Psychology Assessment*, 21, 202-211. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.21.3.202

Schmitt, M., Maes, J., & Schmal, A. (1995). *Gerechtigkeit als innerdeutsches problem. Einstellungen zu verteilungsprinzipien, ungerechtigkeitssensibilität und glaube an eine gerechte welt als kovariate* [Justice as an inner German problem. Attitudes to principles of distributive justice, justice sensitivity and just world belief as covariates] (Unpublished working paper). University of Trier.

- Schwartz, S. H. (1975). The justice need and activation of humanitarian norms. *Journal of Social Issues, 31*, 111-136.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influence on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 221-279.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Simon, B., & Strümer, S. (2003). Respect for group members: Intragroup determinants of collective identification and group-serving behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 183-193.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434-443.
- Sprecher, S. (1986). The relation between inequity and emotions in close relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 49*(4), 309-321. doi: 10.2307/2786770
- Sprecher, S. (1992). Social exchange perspectives on the dissolution of close relationships. In T. L. Orbuch (Ed.), *Close relationship loss* (pp. 47-66). Springer New York. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4613-9186-9_3
- Sprecher, S., & Schwartz, P. (1994). Equity and balance in the exchange of contributions in close relationships. In M. J. Lerner & G. Mikula (Eds.), *Entitlement and the affectional bond: Justice in close relationships* (pp. 11-41). Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Steil, J. M., & Turetsky, B. A. (1987). Is equal better? In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Family processes and problems: Social psychological aspects* (pp. 73-91). Sage.
- Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Worker's evaluation of the "ends" and the "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55*, 23-40.

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Taşdemir, N., & Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2009). The relationships between ambivalent sexism and religiosity among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles*, 62, 420-426.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. Wiley.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1978). A theory of procedure. *California Law Review*, 66, 541-566.
- Traupmann, J., Peterson, R., Utne, M., & Hatfield, E. (1981). Measuring equity in intimate relationships. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 5, 467-480.
- Türkoğlu, B. (2013). *Violence as a way of reconstructing manhood: The role of threatened manhood and masculine ideology on violence against women*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 349-361.
- Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1998). Social justice and social movements. In D. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Van Erp, K. J. P. M., Giebels, E., Van der Zee, K. I., & Van duijn, M. A. J. (2011). Expatriate adjustment: The role of justice and conflict in intimate relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 18, 58-78.
- VanYperen, N. W., & Buunk, B. P. (1990). A longitudinal study of the equity and satisfaction in intimate relationships. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 287-309.
- Walster, E., Berscheid, E., Walster, G. W. (1973). New directions in equity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 151-176.

- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research* (1st ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wanic, R., & Kulik, J. (2011). Toward an understanding of gender differences in the impact of marital conflict on health. *Sex Roles*, 65, 297-312.
- Wenzel, M., & Okimoto, T. G. (2016). Retributive justice. In C. Sabbagh & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice theory and research* (pp. 237-256). Springer.
- Wortman, C. B., Loftus, E. F., & Weaver, C. A. (1999). *Psychology* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(4), 406-423.
- Yoshimura, S. M. (2002). *An evolutionary approach to communicating vengeance in romantic relationships*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Arizona State University.
- Yoshimura, S. M. (2004). Fifteen types of revenge activities enacted against current and past romantic partners. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association for Relationship Research. Madison, Wisconsin, July.

APPENDICES

A. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (STUDY 1)

1. Kendinizi kısaca anlatır mısınız? İsminiz, yaşıınız, ne kadardır evli olduğunuzu paylaşır mısınız?
2. Adalet denince aklınıza ne geliyor?
3. Evlilikte adalet kavramı hakkında neler söylemek istersiniz?
 - a. Örn. İlişkide adil olmak mümkün mü? Evlilikte adalet aranmalı
4. Eşinizle olan ilişkinizde hakkınızın yendiğini ya da eşitliğin olmadığını düşündüğünüz adaletsiz durumlar yaşıyor musunuz? Bir örnek paylaşabilir misiniz?
5. İlişkinizde adaletsizlik yaşadığınızda neler hissediyorsunuz? Nasıl tepki veriyorsunuz? Eşiniz tepkilerinizi nasıl karşılıyor?
6. Evliliğinizde kadın olduğunuz /erkek olduğunuz için hakkınızın yendiği ya da dezavantajlı konuma düştüğünüz durumlar yaşıyor musunuz? Bu durumda deneyimlediğiniz hislerinizi ve tepkilerinizi anlatır mısınız?
7. Bir de tam tersini düşünelim, kadın/erkek olduğunuz için ilişki içerisinde avantajlı pozisyonda olduğunuz bir olay/durum yaşıyor musunuz? Avantajlı olmak size nasıl hissettiriyor? Böyle bir durumun içerisindeyken nasıl tepki veriyorsunuz?
8. Evliliğinizde size adaletsiz görünen bir durumun eşiniz tarafından adil görülmesi ya da bu adaletsizliğin farkına varmaması mümkün mü? Bir örnek paylaşabilir misiniz? Bu farklılık neden kaynaklanıyor olabilir?
9. Evliliğinizde yaşadığınız adaletsizliklere karşı hassasiyetiniz, verdiğiniz tepkiler çevrenizde yaşanan adaletsizliklere verdiğiniz tepkilerle ne derece örtüşüyor?
10. Evlilikteki hangi faktörler bu farklılığa/benzerliğe yol açıyor olabilir?
11. Evlilikte yaşanan adaletsizlikleri gidermek sizce mümkün mü? Nasıl?
12. Konu hakkında paylaşmak istediğiniz başka bir şey var mı?

B. INFORMED CONSENT (STUDY 2)

ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü Doktora Programı kapsamında yürütülen bu çalışmada **evlilikte adalet algısını** etkileyen faktörler incelenmektedir.

Bu doğrultuda anket kapsamında size bir takım sorular yöneltilecektir. Soruları cevaplamak için yaklaşık **20 dakika** ayırmanız yeterlidir.

Anketi tamamlayan her katılımcı için **TEMA Vakfına** 5 TL bağışta bulunulacaktır.

Bu sayede hem doğanın hem de bilimin ilerlemesine ortak bir katkı sağlamış olacaksınız.

Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, ve sadece bilimsel araştırma amacıyla kullanılacaktır.

Anket içerisinde kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi sorulmamaktadır.

Katılım sırasında kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz istediğiniz zaman çalışmadan ayrılabilirsiniz. Soruları **samimi** ve **dürüst** bir şekilde cevaplamanız araştırma için büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Yukarıdaki bilgiler doğrultusunda lütfen aşağıda size uygun olan seçeneği işaretleyiniz:

- ☐ Evet, araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum. (1)
- ☐ Hayır, araştırmaya katılmak istemiyorum. (2)

C. PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE SCALE ITEM POOL

Evliliğe ilişkin aşağıda yer alan ifadeleri lütfen dikkatle okuyunuz. Bu ifadeleri **kendi evliliğinizi** göz önünde bulundurarak değerlendiriniz ve ifadelere ne kadar katıldığınızı altında yer alan seçeneklerden bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Hiç Katılmıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Tamamen Katılıyorum
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

1. Yemek, alışveriş, çamaşır ve ütü yapmak gibi gündelik ev işlerinin sorumluluğunu eşimle adil bir şekilde paylaşıyoruz.
2. Eşimle gündelik ev işlerinin **planlamasını** adil bir şekilde yürütürüz.
3. Evle ilgili mekanik ve tamirat işlerinin sorumluluğunu eşimle adil bir şekilde üstleniriz.
4. Çift ya da aile olarak gerçekleştirdiğimiz arkadaş buluşmaları, gezi veya tatil gibi sosyal aktiviteleri **planlama** işlerini eşimle birlikte adaletli bir şekilde yürütürüz.
5. Ailelerimizle ve ortak arkadaşlarımızla olan sosyal ilişkileri yürütmek için ortak çaba harcarız.
6. Ev kirası, faturalar, gıda masrafları gibi geçimle ilgili giderlerin yükümlülüğünü eşimle adil bir şekilde paylaşıyoruz.
7. Eşimle benim aramda maddi anlamda bir adaletsizlik söz konusudur. *
8. Eşim ve ben sahip olduğumuz ortak maddi imkânlardan adil bir şekilde faydalanırız.
9. Toplumun ve yakın çevrenin evliliğimize dair yönelttiği baskı ve eleştirilere eşlerden birinin daha çok maruz kaldığını düşünürüm. *
10. Evlilik hayatına dair çevrenin bize yönelttiği baskıları adil bir şekilde üstlendiğimizi düşünürüm.
11. Gündelik ev işleriyle ilgili sorumluluk paylaşıırken ikimiz de kendi tercihlerimiz doğrultusunda işler üstleniriz.
12. Ortak yaşantımızı sürdürebilmek için üstlendiğimiz sorumlulukların ikimizin de istek ve becerileriyle uyumlu olduğunu düşünürüm.
13. Ortak yaşantımıza dair önemli kararlarda ikimizin de düşüncesi aynı derecede etkilidir.

14. Ortak kararlarda söz hakkımın yendiğini düşünürüm.*
15. Evliliğimizi ya da ailemizi ilgilendiren bir karar alınacağı zaman fikirlerimin eşim tarafından dikkate alınmadığını düşünürüm.*
16. Evliliğimize etkisi olabilecek **bireysel kararlar** almadan önce ikimiz de birbirimizin fikrini sorarız.
17. Ortak kararlar alırken ikimiz de birbirimizin fikrine saygılıyız.
18. Evliliğimizde önemli kararları eşimle ortak bir şekilde alırız.
19. İlişkimizde bir sorun yaşandığı zaman konuyla ilgili kendimi ifade etme şansı bulurum.
20. Evliliğimizde yaşanan bir çatışma sonrasında birbirimize kendimizi açıklama fırsatı sunarız.
21. İlişkimizle ilgili herhangi bir sorunu çözmeye çalışırken genelde bir taraf diğerinden daha fazla çaba sarf eder. *
22. Evliliğimizde bir sorun yaşandığında birbirimizi anlamak için karşılıklı çaba sarf ederiz.
23. Evliliğimizde herkes kendini aynı derecede özgür ve rahat hisseder.
24. Güven duygusunun evliliğimizde karşılıklı olduğuna inanırım.
25. Evliliğimde kendimi kısıtlanmış hissedirim. *
26. Birbirimizin ailesine karşı ikimiz de aynı özen ve hassasiyete sahibiz.
27. Birbirimizin ailesiyle olan ilişkileri yürütmek için ikimiz de benzer düzeyde çaba sarf ederiz.
28. Evliliğimizde iki tarafın da birbirine aynı düzeyde saygı gösterdiğini düşünürüm.
29. İlişkimizde sevginin karşılıklı olduğuna inanırım.
30. Eşimin bana hak ettiğim ilgiyi gösterdiğini düşünürüm.
31. İki tarafın birbirine gösterdiği ilginin karşılıklı ve yeterli olduğunu düşünürüm.
32. Bir konuda eşimin desteğine ihtiyaç duyduğum zaman eşim beni genelde yalnız bırakır. *
33. Evliliğimizde birbirimize gösterdiğimiz desteğin karşılıklı ve yeterli olduğunu düşünürüm.
34. İhtiyaç duyduğumuz anlarda ikimiz de birbirimize karşılıklı maddi ve manevi destek sağlarız.
35. Evlilik içerisinde harcadığım çabanın görmezden gelindiğini düşünürüm. *
36. Evlilikte yaptıklarımın yeteri kadar kıymetinin bilinmediğini düşünürüm. *
37. Birbirimizin emeğini her daim karşılıklı takdir ederiz.

38. Cinsellikle ilgili duygu, düşünce ve isteklerimin dikkate alındığı bir evliliğim var.

39. Cinsel anlamda zaman zaman istemediğim şeylere zorlandığım bir ilişki yürütüyorum. *

40. Evlilikle ilgili şikayetlerimi eşime anlattığım zaman eşim bunları dikkate alır.

41. İlişkiyle ilgili bir sorunum olduğunda bunu eşime aktarmakla ilgili bir çekincem olmaz.

42. Evliliğimizde iki taraf da kendini ifade ederken aynı düzeyde rahat ve samimidir.

43. Eşlerin birbirini rahatça eleştirebildiği bir evliliğim var.

44. Evliliğe etkisi olabilecek **bireysel kararlar** alacağımız zaman ikimiz de birbirimizi açık ve dürüst bir şekilde bilgilendiririz.

45. Evliliğimizde iki tarafın da birbirine karşı aynı oranda dürüst ve açık olduğuna inanırım.

* Ters kodlanmış maddeleri ifade eder (Madde 7,9,14,15,21,25,32,35,36,39).

* Faktör analizi sonucunda ölçeğin son halini oluştururken 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 45 nolu maddeler silinmişti.

D. AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

Aşağıda size uyan ya da uymayan pek çok ifade yer almaktadır. Bu ifadelerden her birinin sizin için ne kadar uygun olduğunu ilgili rakamı işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Hiç Katımıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Tamamen Katılıyorum
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

1. Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.
2. Gerçekte birçok kadın “eşitlik” arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar
3. Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.
4. Birçok kadın, masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.
5. Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.
6. Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.
7. Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.
8. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.
9. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.
10. Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.
11. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindeler.
12. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.
13. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler
14. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar
15. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.
16. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırırlar.

17. İyi bir kadın erkeęi tarafından yüceltilmelidir
18. Erkeklerle cinsel yönden yaklaşılabilir olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.
19. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.
20. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.
21. Feministler erkeklerle makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.
22. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.



E. JUSTICE SENSITIVITY SCALES

Victim Sensitivity Scale

Aşağıda yer alan ilk kısımda **sizin zararınıza ancak başkalarının faydasına** olan durumlarda verilebilecek tepkilere dair ifadeler yer almaktadır. Bu ifadelerden her birine ne kadar katıldığınızı ilgili rakamı işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Hiç Katılmıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Tamamen Katılıyorum
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

1. Aslında benim hakkım olan bir şeyi başkalarının elde etmesi beni rahatsız eder.
2. Benim hak ettiğim övgüyü/takdiri başkalarının alması beni sinirlendirir.
3. Başkalarının benden tek taraflı faydalanmasına kolay kolay katlanamam.
4. Başkalarının ihmallerini telafi etmek zorunda kaldığımda bunu uzun süre unutamam.
5. Becerilerimi geliştirmek için diğerlerine göre daha az olanağımın olması beni üzer.
6. Başkalarının hak etmediği halde benden daha iyi durumda olması beni öfkelenendirir.
7. Başkalarının kolayca elde ettiği şeyler için çok çalışmam gerektiğinde bu durum beni rahatsız eder.
8. Başkalarına nedensiz yere benden daha iyi davranılması uzun süre aklımı kurcalar.
9. Başkaları için görmezden gelinen konularda benim eleştirilmem canımı sıkar.
10. Başkalarına göre bana daha kötü davranılması beni sinirlendirir.

Beneficiary Sensitivity Scale

Bu bölümde, **sizin menfaatinize ancak başkalarının zararına** olan adaletsiz durumlarda verilebilecek tepkilere dair ifadeler yer almaktadır.

Yine bu ifadelerin sizin tepkilerinizle ne derece uyduğuna ilgili rakamı işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Hiç Katılmıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Tamamen Katılıyorum
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

1. Gerçekte başkasının hakkı olan bir şeye sahip olmam beni rahatsız eder.
2. Başkasının hak ettiği övgüyü/takdiri ben aldığım zaman vicdanen rahatsızlık duyarım.
3. Tek taraflı olarak başkalarından çıkar sağlamayı kolay kolay kabullenemem.
4. Başkalarının, benim ihmallerimi telafi etmek zorunda kalmasını uzun süre aklımdan çıkartamam.
5. Becerilerimi geliştirmek için bana başkalarından daha fazla imkan sunulması beni huzursuz eder.
6. Haksız yere başkalarına göre daha iyi durumda olduğumda suçluluk duyarım.
7. Başkalarının çok çalışarak elde ettikleri şeylere kolayca sahip olmam beni huzursuz eder.
8. Bana, nedensiz yere başkalarından daha iyi davranılması beni uzun süre düşündürür.
9. Başkalarında eleştirilen konuların bende hoş görülmesinden rahatsızlık duyarım.
10. Bana başkalarından daha iyi davranıldığında suçluluk hissederim.

F. RELATIONAL EQUITY SCALE

Lütfen aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı ilgili rakamlardan bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Hiç Katılmıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Tamamen Katılıyorum
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

1. Genellikle ilişkimize verdiklerimin aldıklarımın daha fazla olduğunu hissedirim.
2. Eşimle eşit derecede birbirimize bağlı olduğumuzu söyleyebilirim.
3. Genellikle eşim tarafından kullanıldığımı hissedirim.
4. Eşimin ilişkimize olan ilgisi, benim ilişkimize olan ilgimden daha az gibidir.
5. Eşim ve ben ilişkimizde gücü eşit olarak paylarız.
6. Genellikle eşimin beni kendi çıkarları için kullandığını hissedirim.
7. Her şey göz önüne alındığında eşim ve ben ilişkimize eşit derecede katkıda bulunuruz.
8. İlişkide kandırıldığımı hissettiğim zamanlar olmuştur.
9. Eşim ve ben kararlar hakkında tartıştığımızda genellikle adil bir çözüme ulaşırız.
10. İlişkide eşimden daha güçsüz olduğumu hissedirim.

G. RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Lütfen her bir ifadenin size uygunluğunu altında yer alan seçeneklerden bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1. Eşiniz ihtiyaçlarınızı ne kadar iyi karşılıyor?
 - 1-Hiç karşılamıyor
 - 2-Çok az karşılıyor
 - 3-Az karşılıyor
 - 4-Orta düzeyde karşılıyor
 - 5-Oldukça karşılıyor
 - 6-Çok iyi karşılıyor
2. Genel olarak evliliğinizden ne kadar memnunsunuz?
 - 1-Hiç memnun değilim
 - 2- Çok az memnunum
 - 3- Az memnunum
 - 4-Orta düzeyde memnunum
 - 5-Oldukça memnunum
 - 6-Çok memnunum
3. Diğerlerine kıyasla evliliğiniz ne kadar iyi?
 - 1-Çok daha kötü
 - 2- Kötü
 - 3- Biraz kötü
 - 4-Biraz iyi
 - 5-İyi
 - 6-Çok daha iyi
4. Ne sıklıkla bu evliliği hiç yapmamış olmayı düşünürsünüz?
 - 1-Hiçbir zaman
 - 2-Nadiren
 - 3-Ara sıra
 - 4-Sık sık
 - 5-Çok sık
 - 6-Her zaman

5. Evliliğiniz başlangıçtaki beklentinizi ne ölçüde karşıladı?

- 1-Hiç karşılamadı
- 2-Çok az karşıladı
- 3-Biraz karşıladı
- 4-Orta düzeyde karşıladı
- 5-Oldukça karşıladı
- 6-Tamamen karşıladı

6. Eşinizi ne kadar seviyorsunuz?

- 1-Hiç sevmiyorum
- 2-Çok az seviyorum
- 3-Az seviyorum
- 4-Seviyorum
- 5-Oldukça seviyorum
- 6-Çok seviyorum

7. Evliliğinizde ne kadar sorun var?

- 1-Hiç sorun yok
- 2-Çok az sorun var
- 3-Az sorun var
- 4-Orta düzeyde sorun var
- 5-Oldukça sorun var
- 6-Çok fazla sorun var

H. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Cinsiyet: ☐ Kadın ☐ Erkek
2. Yaş: _____
3. Evlilik süreniz: yıl
4. Daha önce başka bir evlilik deneyiminiz oldu mu?: ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır
5. Eşinizle evlenme şeklinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?
☐ Tanışarak/Anlaşarak ☐ Görücü usulü ☐ Beşik kurtmesi
☐ Başlık parası karşılığı ☐ Diğer
6. Çocuğunuz var mı? : ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır
7. Çocuğunuz varsa kaç tane?:
8. Mesleki durumunuz:
☐ Öğrenci ☐ Çalışan ☐ Emekli ☐ İş arıyorum
9. Eğitim Düzeyiniz: Eğer öğrenci iseniz halihazırda devam ettiğiniz, eğer mezunsanız en son mezun olduğunuz eğitim düzeyini belirtiniz:
☐ İlköğretim ☐ Lise. ☐ Yüksek Okul ☐ Üniversite –Lisans ☐ Y. Lisans.
☐ Doktora
10. Mesleğinizi aşağıdaki boşlukta belirtiniz:.....
11. Aylık kişisel gelir düzeyinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?
☐ Düşük ☐ Düşük-Orta ☐ Orta ☐ Orta-Yüksek ☐ Yüksek
12. Eşiniz çalışıyor mu?: ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır
13. Eşinizin aylık gelir düzeyini nasıl tanımlarsınız?
☐ Düşük ☐ Düşük-Orta ☐ Orta ☐ Orta-Yüksek ☐ Yüksek
14. Eşinizin eğitim düzeyini belirtiniz.
☐ İlköğretim ☐ Lise. ☐ Yüksek Okul ☐ Üniversite –Lisans ☐ Y. Lisans.
☐ Doktora

15. Eşinizle sizin aylık gelirinizi karşılaştırdığınızda aşağıdaki ifadelerden uygun olanı seçiniz.

☐ Eşimin aylık geliri benimkinden fazladır.

☐ İkimizin aylık geliri birbirine yakındır.

☐ Benim aylık gelirim eşiminkinden fazladır.

16. Eşinizle sizin eğitim düzeyinizi karşılaştırdığınızda aşağıdaki ifadelerden uygun olanı seçiniz.

☐ Eşimin eğitim seviyesi benimkinden yüksektir.

☐ İkimizin eğitim seviyesi birbirine yakındır.

☐ Benim eğitim seviyem eşiminkinden yüksektir.



I. HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 /

21 ARALIK 2020

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof.Dr. Nuray SAKALLI

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Zeynep ŞAKLAR ŞAHİN'in "*Romantik İlişkilerde Cinsiyet Temelli Adaletsizliklerin Algılanışı ve Adaletsizliğe Verilen Tepkilerin İncelenmesi*" başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **380-ODTU-2020** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.


Prof.Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY
İAEK Başkanı

J. CURRICULUM VITAE

Zeynep ŞAKLAR

EDUCATION

- 2015-2021 **Ph.D.** in Social Psychology
Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara,
Turkey
Department of Psychology
CGPA: 3.92 / 4.00
- 2012-2015 **MSc** in Social Psychology
Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara,
Turkey
Department of Psychology
CGPA: 3.78 / 4.00
- 2011-2012 Scientific Preparation Program for MSc in Psychology
Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara,
Turkey
Department of Psychology
- 2005-2009 **BSc** in Business Administration
Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey
Faculty of Business Administration
CGPA: 3.50 /4.00

SCHOLARSHIPS

- 2015-2021 National Graduate Scholarships, The Scientific and
Technological Research Council of Turkey
(TÜBİTAK)
- 2008 Erasmus Exchange Program Full Grant
- 2006-2007 High Academic Performance Scholarship by Bilkent
University

LANGUAGE

<i>Native</i>	Turkish
<i>Advanced</i>	English
<i>Intermediate</i>	Spanish
<i>Beginner</i>	German

WORK EXPERIENCE

2018-present	Research Assistant Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University Department of Psychology
2015-2018	Research Assistant Middle East Technical University (METU) Department of Psychology
2014-2015	Research Assistant Gazi University Department of Psychology
2011-2012	Program Assistant Ministry of Interior Republic of Turkey International Relations Department Turkish Political Criteria Programme 2

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Prosocial behavior and altruism; psychology of justice; group processes, and conflict management; attitude and attitude change; research methodology in psychology.

DISSERTATIONS

Saklar, Z. (2021). *Perceived justice in marriage: The effects of justice sensitivity, ambivalent sexism and gender*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University

Saklar, Z. (2015). *Investigating the role of justice sensitivity on volunteering*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University.

PRESENTATIONS

Saklar, Z. (2016, September). *The role of justice sensitivity on volunteering*. Oral presentation at 19th National Congress of Psychology, İzmir, Turkey.

Saklar, Z. (2016, July). *The role of justice sensitivity on volunteering*. Poster presented at 39th Annual Conference of International Society of Political Psychology, Warsaw, Poland.



K. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

Evlilikte adalet bařta grmezden gelinse de zamanla iliřkinin kalitesini etkileyen temel bir faktrdr. Mevcut yazın, algılanan adaletin (veya eřitlięin) iliřki doyumunu, iliřkinin devamlılıęı, baęlılık ve mutluluk gibi deęiřkenler zerindeki etkisini inceleyen birok alıřma olduęunu ortaya koymuřtur (rn., Baxter ve Dindia, 1990; Buunk ve Mutsaers, 1999). Ancak aynı yazın, hangi deęiřkenlerin algılanan adaleti yordadıęına odaklanan arařtırmalardan yoksun kalmıřtır. Bu nedenle, bu tez alıřmasında, evlilikte algılanan adaletin olası yordayıcıları olarak adalet duyarlılıęı ve eliřik duygulu cinsiyetilik ele alınmıřtır.

Evlilikte iki farklı karakter birbirleriyle etkileřime girmekte ve adalet deęerlendirmelerinde miza farklılıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Evlilik baęlamında kiři eřinin maęduriyetini algılamazken, aynı durumu kendisi iin byk bir haksızlık olarak algılayabilir. Bu nedenle, bu tezde eřlerin kiřisel adalet duyarlılıklarının evlilikte algılanan adalet dzeyini etkilemesi beklenmektedir.

Heteroseksel evlilikler, evliliklerin ikili yapısının yanı sıra iki cinsiyetin etkileřimini de beraberinde getirmektedir. Dolayısıyla heteroseksel evlilięin cinsiyetilięi yansıtan ataerkil toplumlarda erkeęin avantajlı konumu ve kadının dezavantajlı konumu nedeniyle sadece kiřiler arası sreleri deęil, gruplar arası sreleri de ierdięi sylenebilir. Dolayısıyla eřlerin kendilerinin ve partnerlerinin cinsiyetine ynelik cinsiyeti tutumları adalet deęerlendirmelerinde etkili olabilir. Tm bu hususlar gz nnde bulundurularak bu alıřmanın amacı, evlilikte adalet algısını etkiledięi dřnlen adalet duyarlılıęı, cinsiyetilik ve cinsiyet gibi sosyal-psikolojik deęiřkenler arasındaki iliřkiyi incelemektir.

Bu amalar doęrultusunda biri nitel dięeri nicel olmak zere iki arařtırma yapılmıřtır. Daha nce Trk rnekleminde hi gerekleřtirilmemiř olan nitel alıřmada, evlilikte adaletin arandıęı alanlar grřmeler ıřıęında arařtırılmıřtır. Nicel alıřmada birinci alıřmadan elde edilen temalar erevesinde Likert tipi bir

ölçek geliştirilmiştir. Bu yeni ölçeğin amacı evlilikte algılanan adalet düzeyini ölçmektir. Daha sonra bu ölçek kullanılarak evlilikte algılanan adaletin cinsiyetten, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilikten ve adalet duyarlılığından etkilenip etkilenmediği istatistiksel olarak incelenmiştir.

1.1 Adaletin Tanımlanması

Resmi tanıma göre adalet, “adil olanın muhafazası veya idaresi” anlamına gelir (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Adaletin tanımı net olmakla birlikte, 'adil' olarak kabul edilen şey yoruma açıktır. Adaletin uygulanmasına yönelik yaklaşımlar da çeşitlilik göstermiştir. Dolayısıyla neyin “adil” olduğunun ve adaletin nasıl uygulanması gerektiğinin belirlenmesi, adaletin basit bir şekilde tanımlanmasını zorlaştırmaktadır. Bu nedenle, adaletin kapsamlı ve kesin bir tanımının peşinden gitmek yerine, farklı adalet biçim ve normlarını ortaya koymak bu tez için daha fazla amaca hizmet edecektir. Bu sebeple öncelikle adaletin temel biçimleri ve ilgili normlar kısaca sunulacaktır. Daha sonra evlilikte adalet ile ilgili literatür bu bağlamda aktarılacaktır.

1.2 Adalet Biçimleri

Dört ana biçimin dağıtımsal (dağıtım ya da dağıtıcı), prosedürel, cezalandırıcı ve onarıcı adalet olarak sıralanabileceği birçok farklı adalet türü ve teorisi vardır (Maiese, 2003). Bununla birlikte, son yıllarda örgütsel adalet üzerine yapılan çalışmalar, prosedürel adalet araştırmasının bulgularını detaylandırmış ve Bies ve Moag (1986) tarafından etkileşimsel adalet olarak adlandırılan yeni bir adalet kavramı geliştirilmiştir. Bazı araştırmacılar (örn. Skarlicki ve Folger, 1997) etkileşimsel adalet ile prosedürel adaleti birbirinin yerine kullanılabilen kavramlar olarak ele alsalar da araştırma bulguları farklı sonuçlara neden olduklarını kanıtlamıştır (Masterson ve ark., 2000). Bu nedenle bu tez kapsamında adaletin bu beş formu temel alınarak konular ele alınacaktır.

1.2.1 Dağıtım Adaleti

Dağıtım adaleti kaynakların bir grubun üyeleri arasında ya da gruplar arasında adil dağılımı olarak tanımlanabilir. Aslında, dağıtım adaleti yalnızca kaynakların veya

ödüllerin dağıtımındaki adaletle değil, aynı zamanda grup üyeleri arasında maliyetlerin ve olumsuz sonuçların dağılımıyla da ilgilidir (örn., Hagan ve ark., 2008).

Forsyth (2014), eşitlik, hakkaniyet, ihtiyaç, güç ve sorumluluk olmak üzere beş dağıtımcı adalet ilkesini tanımlamıştır ve ilk üçü (yani eşitlik, hakkaniyet ve ihtiyaç) birçok kültürde baskın olanlarıdır (örn., Deutsch, 1985).

Yakın ilişkilerle ilgili olarak, Deutsch (1985) ve Steil ve Turetsky (1987) gibi bilim adamları, eşitlik ilkesinin, girdilerinden bağımsız olarak her iki ortağın da aynı derecede sonuçları aldığı yakın ilişkiler kurmada en faydalı ve işlevsel norm olduğunu öne sürerler. Öte yandan, psikolojik araştırmalarda daha çok hakkaniyet normuna odaklanılmıştır. Eşitlik ve hakkaniyet iki farklı norm olmasına rağmen, bilim adamları her iki normun da önemli ölçüde birbirine karşılık geldiğini (örn., Michaels ve ark., 1984) ve birbirlerinin yerine kullanılabileceğini öne sürmektedirler (Sprecher ve Schwartz, 1994).

1.2.2 Prosedürel Adalet

Prosedürel adalet, yetkililer tarafından yürütülen karar verme süreçlerine dair algılanan adaleti ifade eder. Prosedürel adalet, çoğunlukla yasal işlemlerde, örgütsel ortamda ve eğitim ortamlarında aranır. Dağıtım adaletinde, sonuçların (haklar ve kaynaklar) dağılımının adilliği dikkate alınırken, prosedür adaletinde bu tahsis kararının nasıl verildiğinin adaleti söz konusudur. Yetkililer tarafından tarafların ifadelerinin dinlenmesi, saygı duyulma ve dikkate alınma, tarafsız ve güvenilir karar vericiler ve şeffaf bir karar verme süreci, prosedür adaletinin ana unsurlarını oluşturur (Thibaut ve Walker, 1978).

Yakın ilişkilerle ilgili olarak, algılanan prosedür adaleti, çatışma durumlarında (örn., Van Erp ve ark., 2011) ve karşılıklı karar verme süreçlerinde (örn., Kluwer ve ark., 2009) incelenmiştir. Tyler ve Blader (2003) tarafından, ortaklar arasındaki işbirliği düzeylerini belirlemede algılanan prosedürel adaletin algılanan dağıtım adaletinden daha etkili olduğunu ortaya koymasıyla birlikte yakın ilişkilerde prosedürel adaletin rolüne yönelik ilgi başlatılmıştır. Peleg-Koriat ve arkadaşları

(2017) ayrıca, katılımcıların eşlerini prosedürel olarak adil algıladıklarında, işbirliğine daha yatkın olduklarını ve kaçınmaya daha az eğilimli olduklarını göstermişlerdir.

Sonuç olarak, algılanan prosedür adaleti, kişinin yakın ilişkideki öneminin ve aidiyetinin kritik bir göstergesidir (Tyler ve Blader, 2003). Bu nedenle evlilikte algılanan adalete yönelik ölçümler geliştirilirken, dağıtım adaletinden farklı bir alanı ifade etmesi nedeniyle prosedür adaletinin gücü dikkate alınmalıdır.

1.2.3 Etkileşimsel Adalet

Prosedürel adalet üzerine yapılan geniş çaplı araştırmalar, etkileşimsel adalet olarak adlandırılan yeni bir form ortaya çıkardı. Etkileşim adaleti çoğunlukla örgütsel ortamlarda aranır ve esas olarak iletişimdeki adil dinamiklere atıfta bulunur (Bies ve Moag, 1986). Kavramın geliştirilmesinden sonra Greenberg (1990) kavramı ikiye ayırmıştır; kişilerarası ve bilgilendirmeye dair adalet. Etkileşimsel adalet, onurlu ve saygılı bir şekilde muamele görmenin (kişilerarası adalet) yanı sıra, kararların neden belirli bir şekilde alındığına ilişkin olarak insanlara yeterli bilginin sağlanıp sağlanmadığına da (bilgi adaleti) atıfta bulunur (Collins ve Mossholder, 2017).

Yapılan araştırmalar, prosedürel adalet ve kişilerarası saygının kişilerarası ilişkilerin kalitesini belirlemede etkili olduğunu ve insanların bu adalet ipuçlarına dayalı olarak kendi gruplarıyla ne kadar iyi özdeşleşeceklerini etkilediğini göstermiştir (Blader ve Tyler, 2009; Simon ve Strümer, 2003). Bu nedenle algılanan etkileşim adaletinin, aidiyet, katılım ve evlilik ilişkisi ile özdeşleşme duygularını etkilemesi beklenir. Dolayısıyla, yakın ilişkilerde ve evlilikte etkileşimsel adaleti ölçmek, bir kişinin ilişkisindeki genel adalet deneyimine dair daha kapsamlı bir anlayış sağlayabilir.

1.2.4 Cezalandırıcı Adalet

Normların, kuralların veya yasaların ihlal edildiği algılandığında cezalandırıcı adalet devreye girer. Eğer bozulmuş adalet, faillerin işledikleri suça karşılık olarak

uygun (veya orantılı) bir şekilde cezalandırılması yoluyla sağlanıyorsa, buna cezalandırıcı adalet denir (Wenzel ve Okimoto, 2016).

Yakın ilişkilerde misillemeyle ilgili psikolojik araştırmalar, esas olarak eşlerin intikamına odaklanır (örn., Boon ve ark., 2009; Yoshimura, 2002, 2004). Örneğin, Boon ve arkadaşları (2009), 85 lisans öğrencisiyle intikam davranışının temel kışkırtıcı nedenlerini araştırmıştır. Araştırmacılar, intikam tepkisine neden olan üç ana kışkırtma kategorisi belirlemişler. Bu kategoriler, ilişki kurallarını ihlal etme (örn., aldatma, tepki vermeme, sömürü), kendine yönelik tehdit (örn., eşin kontrolü, incitici mesajlar ve sosyal dışlanma) ve ilişkiye hakaret (örn., partnerin ilişkiyi askıya alması, potansiyel bir partnerle gösteriş yapması, partnere olan romantik ilginin azalması). Sonuçlar, intikam tepkisinin en çok rapor edilen nedeninin ilişki kurallarının ihlali olduğunu, bunu ilişkiye yönelik hakaretler ve kendine yönelik tehditlerin izlediğini göstermiştir. Aynı çalışmada intikam alma güdülerini de incelenmiştir. Bulgular, intikam tepkisinin arkasındaki ana güdünün, partnerde arzu edilen bir değişikliğe (örn., empati, pişmanlık, düzeltme ve kıskançlık) neden olma arzusunun, ardından intikamcının provokasyon nedeniyle olumsuz deneyimlerini düzeltme güdüsünün ve sonrasında ise adalet kaygılarıyla ilgili nedenlerin (adalet terazisini eski haline getirmek ve zarara karşılık vermek gibi) yer aldığını göstermiştir.

1.2.5 Onarıcı Adalet

Onarıcı adalet, cezalandırıcı yaklaşıma alternatif olarak kabul edilen bir adalet biçimidir. Onarıcı adaletin temel amacı cezayı önceliklendirmek yerine mağdur, fail ve suçtan zarar gören toplum arasındaki ilişkileri yeniden kurmaktır (Cohen, 2016).

Suçluyu/failleri affetmek, yakın ilişkilerde de kritik olan onarıcı adaletin ana odak noktalarından biri olmuştur. Araştırmalar affetmenin hem fiziksel hem de zihinsel sağlık için önemli olduğunu göstermiştir (Harris ve Thoresen, 2005). Ayrıca evlilik ilişkilerinde affetme ve affetme yeteneği, daha yüksek ilişki doyumu ve evliliğin uzun ömürlülüğü ile ilişkilendirilmiştir (Fennel, 1993). Buna ek olarak,

affetme, hem ciddi ihlallerden hem de günlük kalp kırıklıklarından sonra iyileşme sürecinin önemli bir parçası olarak ele alınmıştır (örn., Fincham ve ark., 2004).

1.3 Evlilikte Adalet

Psikoloji literatüründe, yakın ilişkilerin karşılıklı ve birbirine bağımlı yapısı göz önüne alındığında, bilim adamları dikkatlerini eşler arasındaki kaynak alışverişine odaklamışlardır. Bu nedenle alana hâkim bakış açıları Sosyal Mübadele Kuramı çerçevesinde kurulmuştur. Kuramın kurucusu olan Homans (1961), sosyal mübadeleyi “en az iki kişi arasında, somut veya soyut, az çok ödüllendirici veya maliyetli bir faaliyet alışverişi” olarak tanımlamıştır (s.13).

Yakın ilişkilerle ilgili olarak, ortaklar arasındaki mübadele ilişkilerinin dinamikleri incelenirken en çok sosyal mübadele kuramının ilkelerine dayanan iki ana teori kullanılmıştır. Bu teoriler, Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Kuramı (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978) - Yatırım Modeli (Rusbult, 1980, 1983) ve Hakkaniyet Kuramıdır (Hatfield ve ark., 1985; Walster ve ark., 1978).

Hakkaniyetin psikoloji alanında adaletin ana ölçüsü olduğu ve hatta literatürde eşitlik ve hakkaniyet terimlerinin birbirlerinin yerine kullanıldığı söylenebilir. Yakın ilişkiler alanında yaygın olarak kullanılan Hakkaniyet Kuramı, Hatfield ve meslektaşları tarafından geliştirilen versiyondur (örn., Hatfield ve ark., 1979; Hatfield ve Traupman, 1981). Hakkaniyet perspektifinde, eşler kendi aralarında (ilişkisel karşılaştırmalar) veya benzer diğerleriyle (referans karşılaştırmaları) göreceli kazançlarını karşılaştırırlar ve ilişkinin adil mi yoksa adaletsiz mi olduklarına karar verirler (vanYperenk ve Buunk, 1994). İki tür adaletsizlik deneyimi vardır ve bu iki deneyimin de kişide rahatsızlık hissine sebep olması beklenir. Bu iki durum aşırı fayda sağlama durumu ve tam tersi yetersiz fayda sağlama ya da zararda olma durumudur. Aşırı fayda sağlayan eşlerin suçluluk gibi duygular hissetmeleri beklenirken, fayda sağlamayıp zararda olduğunu düşünen eşlerin ise öfke, hayal kırıklığı ve depresyon gibi duyguları hissetmeleri beklenir (Sprecher, 1986, 1992).

Hakkaniyet bakış açısı, yakın ilişki ve evlilik bağlamına çok iyi uysa da yine de dağıtımçı adalet normlarından biridir. Dolayısıyla sadece hakkaniyeti ölçmek, evlilikte adalet kavramının sadece bir kısmını kapsayacak ve ilişkide adaletin genel bir değerlendirmesini ortaya koymada yetersiz kalacaktır. Evlilikte adalet değerlendirilirken sadece dağıtımçı değil, aynı zamanda prosedürel ve etkileşimsel gibi diğer adalet biçimleri de evlilikle ilgili farklı alanlarda aranabilir.

Evlilik erkekler ve kadınlar için eşit ve adil bir ilişki deneyimi sağlamaz (örneğin, Davidson, 1984; vanYperen ve Buunk, 1990). Genellikle erkekler kadınlara göre evlilikten daha fazla yararlanır (örn., Wanic ve Kulik, 2011) ve genel olarak kadınlar evlilikte toplumsal olarak kabul edilen adaletsizliğin öznesi haline gelmektedir. Dolayısıyla bağlam heteroseksüel evlilik olduğunda, araştırmacı zaten adaletsiz bir ilişki yapısında adalet algılarını ölçer. Buna dayanarak, sadece adalet eğilimlerine ilişkin bireysel farklılıklar değil, aynı zamanda cinsiyete ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumlar ile cinsiyet farklılığı da algılanan evlilik adaletini etkileyebilecek olası öncüller olarak düşünülmelidir.

1.4 Adalet Duyarlılık ve Adalet Algısı

Deutsch'a (2006) göre, insanlar adaletsizliğe karşı duyarsız olduklarında, bunun daha az farkında olacaklardır. Dolayısıyla adalet karşı duyarsız insanların adalet karşı duyarlı olanlar kadar sık ve güçlü bir şekilde adaletsizlikleri yaşaması ve algılaması beklenmemelidir. Haliyle kişilerin adalet karşı duyarlılıklarının adaletsizlikleri algılamalarında önemli bir mizaç faktörü olması beklenir. Bağlam heteroseksüel evliliklerle olduğunda ise, ilişkinin cinsiyete dayalı adaletsiz yapısı nedeniyle, bu duyarlılığın algılanan evlilik adaleti üzerindeki etkilerinin cinsiyet farklılığı tarafından düzenlenmesi beklenmektedir.

Bu tez araştırmasının nicel çalışmasında, Schmitt ve arkadaşları (1995) tarafından geliştirilen adalet duyarlılığı kavramı adaletsizliklerin farkındalığının bir göstergesi olarak kullanılmıştır. Adalet duyarlılık kavramı, bir kişinin adaletsizliği ne sıklıkla deneyimlediği; adaletsizlik deneyiminden sonra öfkesinin yoğunluğunu; haksız olay nedeniyle aklını kurcalayan düşüncelerin rahatsızlık

düzeyi; ve suçluya yönelik öç alma isteğinin düzeyini ifade eder (Schmitt ve ark., 1995).

Schmitt ve arkadaşları (2005, 2010), insanların haksız durumlarda sadece mağdur olarak adaletsizlik deneyimlerinde farklılaşmadıklarını, aynı zamanda fail, gözlemci ve faydalanıcı olarak da adaletsizlik algılarının ve tepkilerinin kişiden kişiye değişebileceği görüşünü dikkate almışlardır. Bu doğrultuda Adalet Duyarlılık Ölçeğinin en güncel hali dört bakış açısını içermektedir.

Gözlemci duyarlılığı, aktörün ne mağdur ne de fail olduğu ve adaletsiz durumdan herhangi bir fayda sağlamadığı, sadece adaletsizliğe tanık olduğu durumlarda farkındalığı ve tepkileri ifade eder. Faydalanıcı (ya da yararlanıcı) duyarlılığı ise bir kişilerin kasıtlı olarak yapmadıkları ancak doğrudan ya da dolaylı fayda sağladıkları adaletsizlikleri nasıl algıladıklarını ve bunlara nasıl tepki verdiklerini ifade ederken, fail adalet duyarlılığı ise kişinin başka bir kişiyi kasıtlı olarak mağdur etmesi sonucunda bunu ne derece adaletsizlik olarak algıladığını belirtmektedir (Schmitt ve ark., 2010). Bu tez çalışmasının odak noktası ile ilgili olarak, evlilik ilişkilerinde adalet farkındalığını ölçmek için bu bakış açılarından ikisi, mağdur ve yararlanıcı perspektifleri uygun bulunmuştur.

Toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine dayalı eşitsizliklerin yanı sıra birlikte yaşama ve paylaşımların artması nedeniyle kişilerarası ihlallerin ve eşler arasında çatışmaların yaşanma sıklığının arttığı heteroseksüel bir evlilik ilişkisinde, mağdur adaleti duyarlılığı yüksek kişilerin evlilik ilişkilerini daha az adil değerlendirmeleri beklenir; çünkü haksızlıklara karşı farkındalıkları daha yüksek olacaktır. Buna ek olarak cinsiyetin özellikle erkekler için evlilikte adalet duyarlılığının algılanan adalet üzerindeki etkisini önemli ölçüde düzenlemesi beklenmektedir. Bu önermenin temel mantığı evliliğin doğasına dayanmaktadır. Evlilik, yapısı itibarıyla kadınlara daha az, erkeklere ise kadınlardan daha fazla fayda sağlamaktadır (örn., Schafer ve Keith, 1981). Bu durumda yararlanıcı duyarlılığı daha yüksek olan erkekler, dezavantajlı gruba karşı daha fazla farkındalığa sahip olacağı için adaletsizliklere karşı daha az yararlanıcı duyarlılığı olan erkeklere kıyasla, evliliği daha az adil algılaması beklenmektedir.

1.5. Evlilikte Cinsiyetçilik

Cinsiyetçilik, genel olarak, kişinin cinsiyetine dayalı ayrımcı veya önyargılı tutum ve davranışları ifade eder (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Cinsiyetçi inançlar genellikle bir cinsiyetin diğerinden üstün olduğu fikrini içerir ve bu da hiyerarşik bir zihniyete yol açar. Bu hiyerarşik düşünce çoğu zaman kadın ve erkeğin neleri yapıp neleri yapamayacaklarının sınırlarını çizer ve bunları toplumdaki bireylere dayatır. Dolayısıyla toplumsal olarak kabul edilen ve beklenen cinsiyet rollerinin sürdürülmesine sağlar.

Cinsiyetçilik çoğu zaman kadınlara yönelik baskıcı ve düşmanca tutum ve davranışlarla ilişkilendirilse de Glick ve Fiske (1996) Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Kuramında kadınlara karşı ayrımcılığa neden olan sadece düşmanca değil, korumacı tutum ve davranışların da olduğunu öne sürmüşlerdir. Kadınlara karşı şefkatli ve koruyucu tutumlar yoluyla, kadınlara patronluk taslanır ve aşağılanır, bu da erkekler ve kadınlar arasındaki hiyerarşiyi onaylar.

Chen ve arkadaşları (2009) hem erkek hem de kadın katılımcılardaki düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin, evlilikte onaylanmış geleneksel cinsiyet rolü normlarıyla (yani aile kararlarında erkek egemenliği, ev işlerinde ve çocuk yetiştirmede daha fazla kadın sorumluluğu) pozitif olarak ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir.

Duran ve arkadaşları (2011) korumacı ve düşmanca cinsiyetçilik puanları arttıkça katılımcıların evlilikte cinsel ilişkiyi daha çok bir koca için evlilik hakkı ve eş için evlilik görevi olarak gördüklerini ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca katılımcıların korumacı cinsiyetçilik puanları arttıkça evlilikte zorla cinsel ilişkiyi tecavüz olarak görme oranı da azalmış ve katılımcıların cinsel ilişkiye dair medeni hak ve ödev algıları bu iki değişken arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık etmiştir.

Casad ve arkadaşları (2015) ise yüksek korumacı cinsiyetçilik puanlarının kadınlar için daha olumsuz evlilik deneyimleri ile ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Evlilik mitlerini fazla benimsememiş, ancak korumacı cinsiyetçi tutumları yüksek olan kadınlar ise düşük evlilik doyumu ve daha yüksek depresyon gibi olumsuz deneyimler bildirmişlerdir.

Cinsiyetçiliğin evlilik kurumunda kadın ve erkek arasındaki hiyerarşiyi besleyen yapısı sebebiyle eşlerin evlilikteki adalet algısına etki etmesi beklenmektedir. Ayrıca bu durumun katılımcıların cinsiyetlerine göre farklılık göstermesi beklenmektedir.

1.6 Demografik Değişkenler ve Evlilikte Adalet Algısı

Araştırmaların birçoğunda, kadınlar erkeklere kıyasla daha sık dezavantajlı konumda olduklarını ve yoksunluk yaşadıklarını bildirirken daha fazla erkek, kadınlara nazaran, eşlerinden daha fazla destek aldığını bildirmiştir (örn., Davidson, 1984; Traupmann ve ark., 1981; vanYperen ve Buunk, 1994).

İlişkinin süresi de yakın ilişkilerde algılanan eşitlik derecesinin bir yordayıcısı olarak düşünülmektedir, ancak sürenin evlilikte algılanan adalet üzerindeki etkisine ilişkin çok az ve aynı zamanda çelişkili bulgular vardır.

Schafer ve Keith (1981), iki bağımsız grubun evliliklerinde algılanan eşitlik düzeylerini karşılaştırmıştır. Bu kesitsel çalışmanın sonuçları, çocukların zaten evi terk ettiği aile yaşam döngüsünün sonraki aşamalarında olan çiftlerin, aile yaşam döngüsünün erken aşamalarında olan ve hala çocuk yetiştirmeye devam eden çiftlere göre daha yüksek derecede hakkaniyet algısı bildirdiklerini göstermiştir. Öte yandan, boylamsal araştırmalar, ilişkinin süresi arttıkça evliliğin daha hakkaniyetli hale geldiğini gösteren hiçbir kanıt sunmamıştır (örn., Hatfield, 1985; VanYperen ve Buunk, 1990).

1.7 Araştırmaya Genel Bakış

Bu tezin temel amacı, adalet duyarlılığı ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve cinsiyet farkının evlilikte algılanan adalet üzerinde bir etkisinin olup olmadığını incelemektir.

Bu doğrultuda çalışma nitel bir çalışmanın ardından nicel alan analizinin yapıldığı sıralı, nitel → NİCEL karma yöntem araştırması olarak tasarlanmıştır.

Birinci çalışmada (bkz. Bölüm 2) Türk insanının evlilikte adaleti nasıl tanımladığını, evlilerin ilişkilerinde adalet aradığı temel alanları ve adaleti değerlendirirken kullandıkları normları belirlemek amacıyla tema analizi yapılmıştır. Buna göre birinci çalışmanın araştırma soruları şu şekildedir:

1. Evli insanlar evlilikte adaleti nasıl tanımlar?
2. Kadınlar ve erkekler hangi konularda haksızlığa uğradıklarını düşünüyorlar? Evlilikte cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik söz konusu mu?

Nicel çalışmada (bkz. Bölüm 3) ise aşağıda yer alan sorulara ölçek yoluyla elde edilen verilerin ışığında cevap aranmıştır. İkinci çalışmanın ana araştırma soruları aşağıdaki gibidir:

1. Evlilikte adalet duyarlılığı ile algılanan adalet arasında bir ilişki var mıdır? Mağdur duyarlılığı ve yararlanıcı duyarlılığı evlilikte adalet algılarını nasıl etkiler?
2. Genel cinsiyetçilik ile evlilikte algılanan adalet arasında bir ilişki var mı? Düşmanca ve korumacı cinsiyetçilik adalet algılarını nasıl etkiler?
3. Evlilikte algılanan adalet üzerinde etkisi olan belirli demografik değişkenler nelerdir? Cinsiyet, adalet duyarlılığının ve cinsiyetçiliğin evlilikte algılanan adalet üzerindeki etkisini düzenler mi?

2. Nitel Çalışma

Bu tez araştırmasının ilk adımı olan nitel araştırma iki amaç için tasarlanmıştır. Öncelikle insanların evliliklerinde hangi alanlarda adalet aradığı ve evliliklerinde adalet değerlendirmelerini nasıl yaptıklarına dair kapsamlı bir bilgiye ulaşmaktır. İkincisi ise, bir sonraki çalışmada geliştirilen yeni ölçeğin geçerliliğini artırmak için ihtiyaç duyulan zengin nitel bilgi zeminini sağlamaktır.

2.1 Yöntem

2.1.1 Katılımcılar

Araştırmaya toplam 14 kişi gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. 7 erkek ve 7 kadın katılımcı ile görüşülmüştür. Katılımcıların yaş ortalaması 41'dir ($SD= 10,5$). Katılımcıların ikisi ortaokul (%14), 7'si lisans (%50) ve 5'i yüksek lisans mezunudur (%36). Görüşme sırasında 12 katılımcı (%86) çalışırken 2 katılımcı (%14) emekli olmuştur. 6 katılımcı (%43) ekonomik durumunu üst-orta, 7 katılımcı orta (%50) ve bir katılımcı ise düşük (%7) olarak tanımlamıştır (bkz. Tablo 2.2)

2.1.2 Örneklem İşlemi

Bu nitel araştırmanın amacına ve tasarımına uygun olarak, amaçlı (seçici veya öznal olarak da bilinir) örneklem stratejisi kullanılmış ve katılımcılar dâhil etme kriterlerinin yanı sıra araştırmacının kararları doğrultusunda seçilmiştir.

Katılımcıların çalışmaya dahil olabilmeleri için iki kriter mevcuttur. Bunlardan ilki hukuki ehliyet nedeniyle 18-65 yaş arasında olmaktır. İkincisi ise görüşmenin yapıldığı tarihte en az iki yıldır evli olmaktır. Bu kriterin amacı genellikle evliliğin ilk iki yılı hoşgörü ve olumlu tutumların baskın olması nedeniyle ilişkideki adaletsizliklerin algılanmasında bir yanlılık olma ihtimaline karşı önlem almaktır.

Araştırma duyurusu, telefon görüşmeleri ve arkadaşlar, aile üyeleri, vb. ile yapılan resmi olmayan sohbetler aracılığıyla yapılmıştır. Duyuru döneminin sonunda 14 gönüllü çalışmaya katılmayı kabul etmiştir.

2.1.3 Mülakat Süreci

COVID-19 salgını nedeniyle daha önce yüz yüze planlanan görüşmeler internet üzerinden gerçekleştirilmiştir. Görüşmelerin gerçekleştirilebilmesi için Zoom Video Communications Inc.'in online toplantı aracından yararlanılmıştır. Katılım gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır.

Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler evlilikte adaletle ilgili düşünce, duygu ve tepkileri keşfetmeye yönelik yönlendirici olmayan 11 açık uçlu sorudan oluşmuştur (ör.

Evliliğinizde haksızlığa uğradığınızı düşündüğünüz durumlar oldu mu? Örnek paylaşır mısınız?) (Ek A). Görüşmelerin analize dahil edilen kısımlarının süresi 13 ila 45 dakika arasında değişmiş ve ortalama 25 dakika sürmüştür. Çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi (ODTÜ) İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulundan (İAEK) etik onay almıştır (bkz. Ek G).

2.1.4 Veri Analizi

Görüşmeler tamamlandıktan sonra her görüşmelerin deşifresi yapılmıştır. Analiz sürecinde verilerin kodlanması ve analizini kolaylaştırmak için bir bilgisayar yazılım programı (MAXQDA 2021) kullanılmıştır (Verbi Software, 2021). Tema analizi, Braun ve Clarke (2006) tarafından önerildiği gibi altı aşamada gerçekleştirilmiştir.

2.2 Sonuçlar

Tema analizinin sonuçlarına göre, beş kapsayıcı tema belirlenmiştir. Bu üst temalar, 1) evlilikte genel adalet algısı, 2) evlilikte cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik deneyimleri, 3) algılanan adaletsizlikler sonrası tepkiler, 4) adaletsizlikle başa çıkma yolları, 5) toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik deneyimlerini etkileyen önde gelen faktörlerdir. evlilik. Her bir üst tema, kapsayıcı temanın daha odaklı ve niş yönlerini temsil eden alt temaları barındırmaktadır (bkz. Tablo 2.2).

2.2.1 Evlilikte Genel Adalet Algısı

Evlilikte adaletle ilgili temel sorular sorulmadan önce, katılımcılara sadece adalet denilince akıllarına ne geldiği sorulmuştur. Katılımcıların çoğu, 1) adaletin eşitlik ve eşit haklar olarak tanımlanması, 2) adalet kavramının değişkenliği ve 3) genel olarak adaleti sağlamanın zorluğu olmak üzere üç ana konudan bahsetmiştir. Bunun dışında evlilikte genel adalet algısına yönelik dört alt tema aşağıdaki şekilde sınıflandırılmıştır.

Eşitlik yerine kişisel beceri ve arzularla uyumlu eşit sorumluluk paylaşımı. Katılımcılar adil bir evliliği tanımlarken eşitlik yerine eşdeğer ve *uygun* işbölümü ve ev içi sorumluluklardan sıkça söz etmişlerdir. Bazı katılımcılar 'uygun' ile

kastettikleri şeyin cinsiyet rollerinden bağımsız olarak eşlerin istekleri ve becerileri doğrultusunda sorumluluk ve ev işlerini üstlenmeleri olduğunu açıkça ifade etmiştir.

Maddi olmayan malların karşılıklı değişimi. Evlilikte adalet tanımlanırken evlilik ilişkilerinde sosyal alışverişin doğası ve eşlerin duygusal katılımı nedeniyle karşılıklı saygı, güven, hoşgörü, ilgi ve desteğin varlığından sıkça söz edilmiştir. Böylece evliliklerde adalet için, özellikle eşlerin birbirlerine sağlayabileceği maddi olmayan kaynaklar için, karşılıklılık ilkesinin arandığı sonucuna varılmıştır.

Adaleti sağlamak mümkündür ancak çaba gerektirir. Katılımcılar, dünyanın adil bir yer olmadığı gibi evliliğin de adil olmadığına dikkat çekmiştir. Katılımcıların çoğu evliliklerinde yaşadıkları adaletsizliğin sıklığından bahsetmiştir. Özellikle insanların bencil doğası ve insanlar arasındaki adalet algısının değişkenliği (veya göreliliği) nedeniyle adaletin sağlanmasının ne kadar güç olduğunu ifade etmişlerdir. Ancak katılımcı beyanlarına göre adaleti sağlamak imkânsız da değildir, dengeyi sağlamanın çaba gerektirdiği sıkça belirtilmiştir.

Sürdürülebilir bir evlilik için adalet şart. Aşağıdaki alt tema, sürdürülebilir bir evlilik için adaletin algılanan önemine atıfta bulunmaktadır. Katılımcıların çoğu, adaleti saygı ve sevgi ile birlikte tatmin edici bir evliliğin temel taşlarından biri olarak görmüştür. Hatta bazı katılımcılar adaleti sevgi ve saygıyı da düzenleyecek bir temel veya çerçeve olarak merkeze yerleştirmiştir.

2.2.2 Toplumsal Cinsiyete Dayalı Adaletsizlik Deneyimleri

Cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik deneyimlerinden bahsetmeden önce, katılımcılara evliliklerinde ne tür yaygın adaletsizliklerle (cinsiyete atıfta bulunmadan) karşılaştıkları sorulmuştur. 1) eşler tarafından yapılan yanlış suçlamalar, 2) çabaların fark edilmemesi ve takdir görmemesi ve 3) karşılıklı saygı ve ilgi görmeme gibi karşılıklılık ilkesinin ihlali vb. nedenler, bahsetmeye değer başka bir sonuç olarak ortaya çıkmıştır.

Erkek katılımcıların cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlikleri algılamaması. İlk olarak, erkek katılımcılara cinsiyetlerinden dolayı evliliklerinde daha önce dezavantajlı ya da avantajlı bir konumda bulunup bulunmadıkları sorulduğunda ortak yanıt “hayır” olmuştur. Dolayısıyla erkek katılımcılar evliliklerinde haksızlıklar yaşadıklarını belirtse de bunların cinsiyet ya da erkeklik özellikleriyle ilgili olmadığını belirtmişlerdir.

Kadın katılımcıların kendilerini avantajlı gördükleri deneyimler. Erkek katılımcılardan farklı olarak, kadın katılımcılar cinsiyet farklılığından kaynaklandığını düşündükleri adaletsizliklerin çok açık örneklerini ve deneyimlerini paylaşmışlardır. Öncelikle kadın katılımcılara evliliklerinde cinsiyetleri nedeniyle herhangi bir haksız durumdan yararlanıp yararlanmadıkları sorulduğunda, soruyu cevaplamaları biraz zaman almıştır. Ancak biri hariç hepsi en az bir olayı örnek olarak paylaşmışlardır; ancak çoğu daha baştan dezavantajlı olduğunu düşünmüştür. Kadın katılımcıların çoğu kendilerinin avantaj sağladığı birkaç noktayı ekonomik geçim kaygısını üstlenmemek ve mekanik ve tamirat işlerinin sorumluluğunu almamak gibi iki durumla örneklendirmiştir.

Kadın katılımcıların kendilerini dezavantajlı olarak algıladıkları deneyimler. Bu temayla ilgili olarak üç ana konu ortaya çıkmıştır: 1) iktidara bağlı adaletsizlikler yaşamak 2) ev işlerinden sorumlu tutulmak ve 3) çevrenin (ve ailenin) baskısı ile karşı karşıya kalmak.

Güç kaynaklı adaletsizlik deneyimleri, ekonomik, dolayısıyla otorite kaynaklı adaletsizlikler ve kadınların kendilerini dezavantajlı olarak algıladıkları fiziksel güç eşitsizliklerinden oluşuyordu.

Güç eşitsizliklerinin yanı sıra ev işlerinin kadınların varsayılan sorumluluğu olarak algılanması da kadın katılımcılar tarafından dile getirilen bir diğer önemli adaletsizlik durumu olmuştur. Ev işleri kadınların sorumluluğu olarak görüldüğünden, erkeklerin bu sorumlulukları üstlenmek veya paylaşmak konusunda isteksiz olmaları ve bunun yerine sadece eşlerine 'yardım etmeleri' kadınlar tarafından cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik olarak yorumlanmıştır. Kadın katılımcılar bu durumu çok yorucu ve sinir bozucu olarak nitelendirmiş ve bu

sorumlulukları yerine getirirken eşlerinden yardım almak değil, onlarla bu sorumlulukları paylaşmanın asil adil olan olduğu konusunu birçok kez dile getirmiştir.

Yardım etme davranışıyla ilgili bir diğer bulgu da erkeklerin neye ve ne zaman yardım edeceğini seçme ayrıcalığıydı. Tüm görüşmeler detaylı bir şekilde incelendiğinde, erkeklerin ev işlerine katıldıkları zaman, çoğunluğunun ev işlerine kendi isteklerine göre seçtikleri ve buna göre eşlerine “yardım” ettikleri (alışveriş, getir götür işleri gibi) görülmüştür. Örneğin yemek yapmak temizlik kadar ev işidir. Ancak, erkek yemek yapmayı seviyorsa, bulaşıkları yıkamak yerine yemek pişirmeyi seçtiğinde kadın ne yapıyor? Sevmese de bulaşıkları yıkamayı adil bir iş bölümü olarak niteleyebiliyor. Analiz, kadın katılımcıların çoğunun bu ayrıcalıklı eylemin farkında olmadığını veya durumu görmezden geldiklerini göstermiştir.

Ayrıca kadın katılımcılar evin yöneticisi/planlayıcısı olmaktan da şikâyet etmişlerdir. Kocaları ev işlerine yardım etseler bile planlamanın yine onların sorumluluğunda olduğunu ve bunun çok yorucu olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Evin ihtiyaçlarını (örneğin mutfak, tuvalet ihtiyaçları, faturalar) takip etmek, ailenin ve çocukların programlarını planlamak, çamaşır ve ütüyü ne zaman yapacağınıza karar vermek, vb. gerekli tüm enerji ve çabanın kadınlardan beklendiğini ve bunun da kişinin kendi iyilik halinden tutun ilişkiden aldığı doyumunu etkilediğine dair birçok farklı ifadeye rastlanmıştır.

Kadınların kendilerini dezavantajlı hissettikleri en son adaletsizlik deneyimi ise çevre ve aile baskısı ile karşı karşıya kalması olmuştur. Katılımcılar, evlendikten sonra toplumun kendilerinden eşlerin fiziksel olarak bir arada yaşaması, çocuk sahibi olması, bir çift olarak ekonomik bağımsızlığa kavuşması vb. gibi bazı beklentilerinin olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Bu beklentilerin ise büyük çoğunlukla kadınlara yansıtıldığı, erkeklere yöneltilen baskıların da yine kadın aracılığıyla yapıldığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Haliyle bu durum da cinsiyet temelli bir adaletsizliğe yol açmaktadır.

2.2.3 Evlilikte Yaşanan Adaletsizliklere Tepkiler

Katılımcılara evliliklerinde adaletsizliğe nasıl tepki verdikleri sorulduğunda, bazıları evlilikte yaşadıkları tepkilerden çok adaletsizliğe karşı olağan tepkilerinden bahsetmiştir. Ancak ortak noktalar ek sorularla incelenmiş ve sonuçlar buna göre rapor edilmiştir.

İlk ve sonraki reaksiyonlar. Bulgular, evlilikte adaletsizliklere yönelik tepkilerin 1) ilk ve 2) sonradan gelen tepkiler olmak üzere iki grupta sınıflandırılabilirliğini göstermiştir. İlk tepkiler, algılanan adaletsizlik deneyiminden hemen sonra verilen tepkileri gösteriyordu ve bu tepkiler sessizlik ve bilgisizlikten sözlü ve fiziksel tacize kadar uzanıyordu. Ancak ilişkide algılanan haksızlıklar devam edince ağlama, öfke patlamaları ve umutsuzluk gibi farklı tepkiler ortaya çıkmıştır.

Olumsuz duygular. Haksızlıktan sonra en sık yaşanan duygu öfke ve hiddet olmuştur. Evlilikte ya da diğer sosyal alanlarda yaşanan adaletsizliklerde katılımcılar öfke duygularını açık bir şekilde ifade etmişlerdir.

Ancak cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizliklere tepkiler sorulduğunda kadın katılımcılar kendilerini değersiz, önemsiz, zayıf ve evliliklerinde yokmuş gibi hissettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca, fiziksel istismar deneyimleri varsa, aşağılanma duyguları ortaya çıkmıştır.

Evlilikte tepkilerin diğer sosyal alanlardan farklı olması. Haksızlıklara verilen tepkilere bakıldığında ise evlilikte ve diğer sosyal alanlardaki (iş, okul, arkadaşlar vb.) tepkiler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar, evliliklerinde yaşadıkları adaletsizliklere diğer sosyal alanlara göre daha duyarlı olma eğilimindedir; çünkü çözülmemiş çatışmalarda arkadaşlarını veya meslektaşlarını görmezden gelebildiklerini veya onlardan uzaklaşabildiklerini, ancak evlilikte eşi görmezden gelmenin ya da uzaklaştırmanın mümkün olmadığını ifade etmişlerdir. Ayrıca duygusal ve uzun süreli bağlılık ve eşi iyi tanımak gibi faktörler, kişinin eşinin kolayca haksız davranışlarda bulunmayacağı yönünde bir beklenti oluşturmuştur.

Zamanın tepkiler üzerindeki düzenleyici etkisi. Hemen hemen tüm katılımcılar, yaşlandıkça tepkilerinin daha yumuşak hale geldiğini belirtmiştir. Tepkilerdeki bu ılımlı değişim, yaşam deneyimlerinin artması (böylece adalet algılarının değişmesi ve öz denetimin artması) ve kişilerin eşlerini daha yakından tanımaları ve dolayısıyla onlara karşı daha hoşgörülü olmaları ile açıklanmaktadır.

2.2.4 Evlilikte Adaletsizliklerle Başa Çıkmak

Katılımcılar evliliklerinde yaşadıkları haksız durumlarla nasıl başa çıktıklarını anlatırken, birbiriyle çelişen iki durum ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar ya çözüm aramayı ya da haksız durumdan kaçınarak sorunun çıkmaza girmesine izin vermeyi tercih etmişlerdir.

Çözüm arayışı. Katılımcılar haksız sorunları çözmeyi amaçladığında, katılımcıların çoğu eşleri ile iletişim kurmaya, düşüncelerini ve duygularını ifade etmeye ve olası çözüm yollarını aramaya çalışmışlardır. Ancak katılımcıların çoğu, olumsuz duyguların uyarılması nedeniyle, partnerleriyle iletişim kurmadan önce öfkelerini attıkları ve durum hakkında bilinçli olarak düşünmeye zaman ayırdıkları sakinleşmek adına bir süreye ihtiyaç duyduklarını belirtmişlerdir.

Yaşanan haksızlıkları görmezden gelmek. Maalesef çözüm arayanlar kadar haksız durumları çözümsüz bırakmak isteyenler de katılımcılar arasında yer almıştır. Bazı katılımcılar, sorunları çözümsüz bırakmanın olumsuz sonuçlarının farkında olmalarına rağmen, algılanan adaletsizliklerle ilgili duygu ve düşüncelerini bastırmayı tercih etmişlerdir.

Empati arayışı. Empati, evlilikteki dengeyi yeniden kurmanın anahtarı olarak görülmüştür. Katılımcı ifadelerine göre başkalarının bakış açısıyla görebilmek, hissedebilmek ve düşünebilmek onarma sürecini kolaylaştıracağı gibi ileride yaşanabilecek adaletsizliklerin de önüne geçecektir.

Cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlikler hakkında farkındalık yaratmak. Bu alt tema daha çok kadın katılımcı ifadelerinden hareketle oluşturulmuştur. Kadın katılımcılar, evliliklerinde toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı adaletsizlik deneyimleriyle nasıl başa çıktıklarından bahsederken çoğu, bu adaletsizliklerin nasıl ortaya çıktığı ve ele

alınması gerektiği konusunda hem kendisinin hem de başkalarının farkındalıklarının arttığı bir süreçten bahsetmiştir. Katılımcıların açıklamalarına göre bu 'aydınlanma', toplumsal cinsiyetle ilgili konularda okuyarak, eğitim alarak veya toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine dair farkındalığı yüksek kişilerle sosyal temas yoluyla gerçekleşmiştir.

2.2.5 Evlilikte Cinsiyete Dayalı Adaletsizlik Deneyimleriyle Bağlantılı Faktörler

Aile. Nitel analiz, ailenin kadın ve erkek arasındaki adalet fikrini şekillendirmede çok önemli bir rolü olduğunu ortaya koydu. Anne ve baba arasındaki ilişkinin bir parçası olarak çocuklar, ebeveynlerinin paylaştığı rol ve sorumlulukları gözlemler, nasıl iletişim kurduklarını izler ve adaletsizlik durumlarında adaletsizlikleri nasıl düzelttiklerini veya bunlara nasıl tepki verdiklerini deneyimler. Dolayısıyla bunların hepsinin çocuğun evlilikte adaletle bakış açısını şekillendirmede etkili olduğu görülmüştür. Bu nedenle katılımcılar, evliliklerine geçen şemaların oluşturulmasında önceki aile deneyimlerinin etkisine vurgu yapmışlardır.

Çocuk sahibi olmak ve çocuk yetiştirmek. Katılımcılara göre çocuk sahibi olmanın evlilik üzerinde ve özellikle eşlerin rol ve sorumlulukları üzerinde büyük etkisi olmuştur. Erkek katılımcıları da kapsayan analiz sonuçları, ilk çocuğun doğumuyla birlikte kadınların önemli değişiklikler yaşadığını ve çoğu zaman çocuklarına bakmak için işten ayrılma veya devamsızlık gibi tavizler verdiğini göstermiştir.

2.3 Tartışma

Katılımcıların çoğunluğu, sürdürülebilir ve tatmin edici bir evlilik ilişkisi için adaletin önemli ve gerekli olduğunu belirtmiştir. Katılımcıların çoğu, adaletin sadece evlilik ya da romantik ilişkilerde değil, her türlü kişilerarası ilişkilerde önemini vurgulamıştır. Bu bulgular, algılanan adaletin (veya eşitliğin) ilişki doyumunu, ilişkiye bağlılığı ve sürdürme davranışını yordadığını gösteren önceki nicel araştırma bulgularının bir teyidi olarak kabul edilebilir (örn., Baxter ve

Dindia, 1990; Berger ve Janoff-Bulman, 2006; Buunk ve Mutsaers, 1999; Canary ve Stafford, 1992).

Sonuçlar, bazı erkeklerin ev sorumluluklarını paylaşmasına rağmen, yapmak istedikleri işleri seçtiklerini, kadınların ise bu sorumluluklar arasında seçim yapmayı düşünmediklerini ortaya koydu. Karı kocaların ev işlerinin sorumluluklarına ilişkin özgürlüklerindeki temel farklılık, Türk kültürünün erkekleri kayıran ve iki cinsiyet arasındaki sosyal hiyerarşiyi güvence altına alan ataerkil yapısıyla açıklanabilir (bkz. Kandiyoti, 1995).

Algılanan evlilik adaletindeki cinsiyet farklılığına ilişkin nitel araştırmanın sonuçları, evlilikte adaletsizliği algılamada kadın ve erkek arasında açık bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bulgu, kadınların evlilikte daha olumsuz bir eşitsizlik algıladıklarını öne süren önceki çalışma sonuçlarıyla uyumludur (örn., Davidson, 1984; Schafer ve Keith, 1981).

Ev işlerinin dağılımında adaletsizlikten bahseden kadın katılımcılar bulunurken, her iki cinsiyetten katılımcıların adil olmadığını belirttiği bazı hususlar olmuştur. Bu sorunların çoğu, saygı duyulmamak, takdir edilmemek gibi kavramlara atıfta bulunuyordu. Dolayısıyla evlilikte sadece dağıtım adaleti aranmadığı, aynı zamanda çiftler için kişilerarası adaletsizliğin de söz konusu olduğu sonucuna varılabilir.

Sonuçlar karşılıklılık ilkesi ile ilgili beklenmedik bir bulgu sunmuştur. Eşler evliliklerinde adaleti değerlendirirken eşlerin kayınlarıyla olan ilişkisi algılanan evlilik adaletinin belirlenmesinde kritik bir faktör olmuştur. Kişi endi ailesiyle yeterince vakit geçirmiyorsa, düzenli olarak aile ziyaretleri yapmıyorsa ya da eşlerin birbirlerinin ailelerine gösterdikleri ilgi ve saygı arasında bir dengesizlik varsa, bu durum evlilikte adaletsizlik algısı oluşmasına neden olmuştur.

Evlilik süresi ve çocuk sahibi olma, evlilikte adalet deneyimini etkileyen olası demografik faktörler olarak bulunmuştur. Evlilik süresi arttıkça katılımcılar yaşadıkları adaletsizliklere karşı daha sessiz, çekingen, ve umutsuz olma eğilimindedir. Ayrıca, çocuklu katılımcıların bir kısmı, çocuklardan sonra hayatın

nasıl deęiřtięini ve bazı sorumlulukların doęrudan kadınlara ve hatta kadınlar için bir zorunluluk olarak nasıl deęiřtięini dile getirmiřtir. Schafer ve Keith (1981) tarafından yapılan bir alıřmada, evlilik evreleri ilerledike hem karı hem koca için aile rollerinde algılanan adaletin arttıęını, ancak hem kadınların hem de erkeklerin tüm evrelerde ev iřlerinde önemli ölçüde olumsuz eřitsizlik algıladıklarını ortaya koymuřtur. Aynı alıřmada, ocuklar evden ayrıldıktan sonra algılanan hakkaniyetin arttıęı bulunmuřtur. Bahsi geen gemiř sonularla mevcut alıřmanın sonuları kısmen örtüřmüř ve ocukla ilgili bulgular birbirini desteklemiřtir.

3. Nicel alıřma

İlk ařamada yürütölen nitel arařtırma ve gemiřteki bulgulara dayanarak, adalet duyarlılıęı, eliřik duygulu cinsiyetilik ve cinsiyetin evlilikte algılanan adalet üzerindeki etkilerini arařtırmak amacıyla nicel bir alıřma planlanmıřtır. Bu arařtırma doęrultusunda ilk bölümde yer alan arařtırma soruları istatistiksel analizle cevaplanmaya alıřılmıřtır.

3.1. Yöntem

3.1.1 Katılımcılar

İlk örneklem, tüm katılımcıların yeni geliřtirilen evlilikte algılanan adalet ölçęinin madde havuzunu tam olarak yanıtladıęı 364 katılımcıdan oluřmuřtur. Soru bataryasının geri kalanını cevaplamayan bir katılımcı ve ok deęiřkenli analiz için varsayımları karřılamadıęı için 11 katılımcı toplamda 12 katılımcı örneklemden ıkarılmıřtır. Nihai örneklem 218'i kadın (%62) ve 134'ü erkek (%38) olmak üzere 352 katılımcıdan oluřmuřtur. Örneklemin yař ortalaması 44,5 ($SS = 11,6$). Katılım řartının bir sonucu olarak, katılımcıların tamamı evlidir ve mevcut evliliklerinin ortalama süresi 16 yıldır ($SS = 12,6$).

3.1.2 Veri Toplama Araçları

3.1.2.1 Evlilikte Algılanan Adalet Ölçeği

Evlilikte Algılanan Adalet (EAA) ölçeği, bu tez araştırması kapsamında kişinin evliliğinde algıladığı adalet düzeyini ölçmek amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. İlk olarak, araştırmacı, ilk çalışmanın nitel bulgularına, ilgili literatürün gözden geçirilmesine ve Ghaffari ve arkadaşları (2013) tarafından hazırlanan Evlilik Adaleti Ölçeği ve Colquitt (2001) tarafından hazırlanan Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeği gibi önceki adalet ölçütlerine dayalı olarak ilk maddeleri oluşturmuştur. Düzeltmeler yapıldıktan sonra madde havuzu 10'u ters olmak üzere 45 maddeden meydana gelmiştir (bkz. Ek C). Faktör analizi yapıldıktan sonra nihai ölçek 25 madde ve dört faktörden oluşan bir yapıya sahiptir. Ölçek geliştirme çalışmasına ilişkin bulgular ve ilgili güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik önlemleri bu bölümün sonuçlar bölümünde sunulmaktadır (bkz. Bölüm 3.3.1).

Evlilikte Algılanan Adalet Ölçeği 6 puanlı Likert tipi bir ölçek olarak tasarlanmıştır. Katılımcılardan ifadeler katılma derecelerini (1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 6 = kesinlikle katılıyorum) belirtmeleri istenmiştir; burada daha yüksek puanlar evlilikte daha yüksek algılanan adaletle işaret eder.

3.1.2.2 Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği

Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği, Glick ve Fiske (1996) tarafından geliştirilmiş ve Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) tarafından Türkçe'ye çevrilerek uyarlanmıştır. Bu ölçek katılımcıların cinsiyetçi tutumlarını ölçmek için kullanılmıştır. Düşmanca cinsiyetçiliği ve korumacı cinsiyetçiliği değerlendiren iki alt ölçeği vardır. Düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ölçeği, açıkça olumsuz ve düşmanca cinsiyetçi tutumların seviyesini ölçerken, korumacı cinsiyetçilik ölçeği, olumlu görünen ama aslında kadınlara karşı ayrımcı olan cinsiyetçi tutumları ölçmektedir. Her bir alt ölçek, 6'lı Likert tipi (1=hiç katılmıyorum, 6=tamamen katılıyorum) ölçeğidir ve 11 maddeden oluşmaktadır (bkz. Ek D). Artan puanlar daha güçlü cinsiyetçi tutumlara işaret eder.

3.1.2.3 Adalet Duyarlılık Ölçeği

Schmitt ve arkadaşları (2005) tarafından geliştirilen ölçek adaletsiz durumlarda farklı bakış açılarına atıfta bulunan dört alt ölçekten oluşmaktadır. Bu dört perspektif şunlardır: mağdur, fail, gözlemci ve yararlanıcı. Mevcut çalışma ile ilgili olarak adalet duyarlılığı ölçeğinin mağdur duyarlılığı ve yararlanıcı duyarlılığı ölçekleri kullanılmıştır. Her biri 10 maddeden oluşur ve 6'lı Likert tipi ölçüme sahiptir (1= hiç katılmıyorum, 6= tamamen katılıyorum) (bkz. Ek E). Her bir alt ölçeğin aritmetik ortalaması alınarak her boyutun nihai puanları elde edilmiştir. Ortalama puan arttıkça adalet duyarlılığı artmaktadır.

3.1.2.4 İlişkisel Eşitlik Ölçeği

Tez kapsamında geliştirilen EAA ölçeğinin yakınsak geçerliliğini test etmek amacıyla, ölçeğin teorik altyapısı EAA'ya benzer olduğu için İlişkisel Eşitlik Ölçeği (İEO) kullanılmıştır. Sabatelli ve Cecil-Pigo (1985) tarafından geliştirilen İEO, insanların ilişkilerinden elde ettikleri kazanımlarla ilişkiye yatırımlarının dengeli olup olmadığını ölçmeyi amaçlar. 10 sorudan oluşur ve tek faktörlü bir yapıya sahiptir (bkz. Ek F). İEO daha yüksek puanların daha yüksek ilişkisel adaleti gösterdiği 6'lı Likert tipi bir ölçekle (1= hiç katılmıyorum - 6= tamamen katılıyorum) değerlendirilmiştir.

3.1.2.5 İlişki Değerlendirme Ölçeği

Yakın ilişkilerde algılanan hakkaniyet, ilişki doyumu ile önemli ölçüde ilişkili bulunmuştur (örn., Berger ve Janoff-Bulman, 2006). Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada EAA ölçeğinin yordayıcı geçerliğini test etmek için İlişki Değerlendirme Ölçeği (İAO) kullanılmıştır. İAO, yakın ilişkilerde doyum düzeyini belirlemek için Hendrick (1988) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Nihai ölçek 7 maddeden oluşmaktadır ve tek faktörlü bir yapıya sahiptir (bkz. Ek G). 4. ve 7. maddeler ters kodlanmıştır. Orijinal ölçekte ölçüm 5'li Likert tipi bir ölçekle yapılırken, mevcut çalışmada tutarlılık amacıyla 6'lı Likert tipi (1=hiç katılmıyorum, 6=tamamen katılıyorum) ölçek kullanılmıştır. Tek faktörlü ölçeğin toplam puanı hesaplanır ve yüksek puanların katılımcının deneyimlediği daha fazla ilişki doyumunu ifade eder.

3.1.2.6 Sosyo-demografik Sorular

Katılımcılardan cinsiyetleri, yaşları, şu anki evliliklerinin süresi, daha önce evlenip evlenmedikleri (ve evet ise kaç kez?), evlilik şekli (örn., tanışarak/anlaşarak, görücü usulü, beşik kertmesi) çocuk sayısı, çalışma durumu, mesleği, eğitim düzeyi ve aylık gelir düzeyi hakkında bilgi vermeleri istenmiştir. Katılımcılardan kişisel verilere ek olarak eşlerinin eğitim durumu, çalışma durumu ve aylık geliri hakkındaki bilgileri de sorulmuştur. Son iki soruda ise katılımcılardan eğitim düzeylerini ve aylık gelir düzeylerini eşleriyle karşılaştırmaları istenmiştir (bkz. Ek H).

3.1.3 İşlem

Anket dağıtılmadan önce ODTÜ İAEK'den izin alınmıştır (bkz. Ek G). Tüm anket araçlarından oluşan soru bataryası dijital forma aktarılarak Qualtrics çevrimiçi anket programı üzerinden katılımcılara ulaştırılmıştır. Anketi cevaplama süresi ortalama 20 dakikadır. İstatistiksel analiz, SPSS Statistics 28.0 (IBM Corp.) bilgisayar yazılım programı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir.

3.2 Bulgular

3.2.1 Ölçek Geliştirme

3.2.1.1 Faktör Analizi

Açımlayıcı faktör analizi (AFA) yapılmadan önce, 45 maddenin faktör analizine uygun olduğu dört kriter üzerinden kontrol edilmiş ve sonuçta data faktör analizi için uygun bulunmuştur. Faktör çıkarma yöntemi olarak eğik rotasyonlu ($\kappa = 4$ ile promax rotasyonu) temel bileşenler analizi kullanılmıştır. Yakınsama için maksimum yineleme 50 olarak ayarlanmıştır.

İlk analiz, öz değerleri 1.0'dan büyük olan 9 faktör sunmuştur. Bu 9 faktör toplam varyansın %65.53'ünü açıklamaktadır. Ancak paralel analiz ve dağılıma grafiği testi dört faktörlü bir yapı göstermiştir. Bu nedenle temel bileşenler analiz dört faktöre zorlanarak analiz tekrar çalıştırılmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, nihai ölçek toplam varyansın %64.21'ini açıklayan dört faktörlü 25 maddeden oluşan bir yapıya kavuşmuştur. Madde içerikleri dikkate alınarak faktörler iletişim adaleti (faktör 1), kişilerarası adalet (faktör 2), prosedür adaleti (faktör 3) ve dağıtım adaleti (faktör 4) olarak adlandırılmıştır. Faktörler tarafından açıklanan toplam varyansın oranı sırasıyla %44.8 , %7.5, %6.3, %5.6'dır. Alt ölçeklerin Chronbach alfa değerleri sırası ile .90, .92, .84 ve .81 olarak tespit edilmiştir. Geçerlilik testi için dört alt ölçek de İEÖ ve İAÖ ile pozitif ve anlamlı şekilde ilişkili çıkmıştır. Korelasyon katsayıları İEÖ için .43 ile .75 arasında değişirken İAÖ için .45 ile .75 arasında yer almıştır. Yordayıcı geçerlilik içinse EAA genel ölçeğinin İAÖ'yü anlamlı şekilde yordadığı sonucuna varılmıştır ($F(1, 351) = 410.3, p < .001, R^2 = .54$), ancak alt ölçeklere bakıldığında prosedürel ve dağıtımsal adaletin İAÖ'yü anlamlı olarak yordamadığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

3.2.2 Hipotez Testleri

Yapılan bağımsız t-testi sonucunda cinsiyet farkının dört adalet bileşeni arasında sadece dağıtım adaleti için anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir. Kadın katılımcılar ($Ort. = 4.35, SS = 1.15$), algılanan dağıtım adaletinde erkek katılımcılara göre ($Ort. = 4.78, SS = .79$), anlamlı olarak daha düşük puanlara sahiptir $t = -3.78, p < .001$. Ayrıca, EAA ölçeğinin toplam puanı iki cinsiyet arasında karşılaştırıldığında, sonuçlar yine kadınların ($Ort. = 4.78, SS = .75$) erkeklere kıyasla ($Ort. = 4.96, SS = .62$) genel olarak evliliklerinde algıladıkları adaletin daha düşük olduğunu ortaya koymuştur, $t = -2.32, p = .05$.

Çoklu doğrusal analizler yapılmadan önce, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normallik testi sonuçları, korumacı cinsiyetçilik ölçeği dışında hiçbir değişkenlerin varsayımı karşılamadığını göstermiştir. Bu nedenle, kişilerarası ve prosedürel adalet için logaritmik dönüşüm ($\log_{10}$) yapılırken dağıtım ve iletişim adaleti alt ölçekleri için karekök dönüşümü yapılmıştır.

Adaletsizliklere karşı mağdur ve faydalanıcı duyarlılıkları ile EAA bileşenleri çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi ile incelendiğinde sonuçlar hem mağdur duyarlılığının hem de faydalanıcı duyarlılığının iletişimdeki adaleti anlamlı olarak yordadığını göstermiştir ($F(2,351) = 4.48, p = .01, R^2 = .03$). Dağıtımcı adalet

algısının ne mağdur duyarlılığı ne de yararlanıcı duyarlılığı tarafından anlamlı bir şekilde yordamadığı anlaşılmıştır. Aksine, hem mağdur duyarlılığının hem de yararlanıcı duyarlılığının kişilerarası adalet algısını anlamlı olarak yordadığı belirlenmiştir ($F(2,351) = 9.76, p < .01, R^2 = .05$). Algılanan prosedürel adaletinse yalnızca faydalanıcı duyarlılığı tarafından anlamlı şekilde yordandığı ancak mağdur duyarlılığının anlamlı bir yordayıcı olmadığı anlaşılmıştır. Adalet duyarlılığı ile evlilikte genel olarak algılanan adalet arasındaki ilişki test edildiğinde hem mağdur duyarlılığı (hem de yararlanıcı duyarlılığı anlamlı bir modelle evlilikte genel algılanan adaleti önemli ölçüde yordamıştır ($F(2,351) = 7.12, p < .01, R^2 = .04$). Ancak anlamlı çıkan modellerin hiçbirisi %5'ten fazla varyans açıklamamaktadır.

Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik bileşenleri ile EAA bileşenleri arasındaki ilişki incelendiğinde ise algılanan iletişimsel, dağıtımsal ve kişilerarası adaletin ne düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ne de korumacı cinsiyetçilik tarafından anlamlı olarak yordanmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak, algılanan prosedürel adaletin düşmanca cinsiyetçilik tarafından anlamlı olarak yordandığı fakat korumacı cinsiyetin yine anlamlı bir ilişki göstermediği anlaşılmıştır ($F(2,351) = 6.72, p < .01, R^2 = .04$). Son olarak, düşmanca ve korumacı cinsiyetçiliğin evlilikte genel adalet algısını yine anlamlı olarak yordamadığı saptanmıştır.

Cinsiyetin düzenleyici etkisine dair hipotezleri test etmek için SPSS'de Hayes (2017) tarafından geliştirilen PROCESS makrosu (Sürüm 4.0) kullanılmıştır. Yararlanıcı duyarlılığı ile EAA arasındaki ilişki için cinsiyetin EAA'nın hiçbir alt ölçeği ile ilişkisinde düzenleyici etkisinin olmadığı anlaşılmıştır. Dolayısıyla, yararlanıcı duyarlılığı ile PJM arasındaki ilişkinin gücünde erkekler ve kadınlar arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu öne süren hipotez (H3) desteklenmemiştir.

Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve EAA arasındaki ilişkide cinsiyetin düzenleyici rolü ile ilgili olarak, sonuçlar cinsiyetin düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ile dört bileşiğin tümünü içeren PJM değişkenleri arasındaki ilişki için anlamlı bir moderatör olmadığını gösterdi (p değerleri .06 ile .06 arasındaydı. 75). Ancak, algılanan iletişimsel ve prosedürel adalet için moderasyon analizi için anlamlılık seviyesinin

.05'e yakın olduğunu belirtmekte fayda var. Sonuç olarak, önemli kanıt olmaması nedeniyle H4a ve H4b desteklenmedi.

4. Tartışma

Bu nicel çalışma, temelde çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, adalet duyarlılığı ve cinsiyetin iletişimsel, dağıtımıcı, kişilerarası ve prosedürel adalet dahil olmak üzere evlilikteki adalet algısına etkisini araştırmak için tasarlanmıştır.

Cinsiyetin etkisi ile ilgili olarak, kadınların evlilik ilişkilerinde önemli ölçüde daha az adalet algılayacakları ön görülmüştür. Mevcut çalışma bulguları, kadınların erkeklere kıyasla evliliklerinde önemli ölçüde daha az dağıtımıcı ve genel adalet algıladıklarını göstermiş; ancak, iletişimsel, kişilerarası ve prosedürel adalet için kadınlarla erkekler arasında anlamlı bir fark tespit edilmemiştir. Genel ve dağıtımıcı adalet algısında var olan anlamlı cinsiyet farkı, Davidson (1984), Schafer ve Keith (1981) ve Hasta'nın (1995) çalışmalarındaki bulguları tekrarlamıştır. Çoklu regresyon analizleri bazı anlamlı model sonuçlarını ortaya çıkarmış olsa da bu modellerin açıkladıkları düşük varyans sebebiyle dikkatli bir şekilde değerlendirilmeleri gerekmektedir.

Düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin yalnızca algılanan prosedür adaleti için önemli bir yordayıcı olduğu, oysa korumacı cinsiyetçiliğin EAA bileşenlerinin hiçbirini anlamlı olarak yordamadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak istatistikler incelendiğinde, düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin algılanan prosedürel adaleti yordadığı anlamlı modelin bile çok düşük R^2 değerine (.04) sahip olması, aslında bu ilişkinin etki büyüklüğünün fazla olmadığına işaret etmektedir. Cinsiyetin düzenleyici etkisi test edildiğinde ise hiçbir anlamlı sonuca ulaşılmamıştır.

Bu bulgular, cinsiyetçilik ile algılanan adalet arasında anlamlı bir ilişkinin varsayıldığı ilk beklentilerle örtüşmemektedir. Ataerkil kültürlerde erkekler için cinsiyetçilik ile evlilikte adalet algısı arasında pozitif bir doğrusal ilişki olması beklenirken, kadınlar için korumacı cinsiyetçilik ile EAA arasında zıt bir ilişki olması beklenirdi. Ancak mevcut sonuçlar, bu örneklemde cinsiyetçiliğin EAA için çok zayıf bir yordayıcı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Adalet duyarlılığı ile EAA arasındaki ilişkide de benzer sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Mağdur duyarlılığı algılanan iletişimsel, kişilerarası ve genel adaleti anlamlı olarak yordarken, yararlanıcı duyarlılığı algılanan kişilerarası, iletişimsel, prosedürel ve genel adaleti anlamlı olarak yordamaktadır; ancak yine en yüksek R^2 değerinin .05 olması bu ilişkilerin etki büyüklüğünün fazla güçlü olmadığına işaret etmektedir.

Birincisi, adalet algısı, onu etkileyen herhangi bir öncül değişken ya da süreç olmaksızın, ilk psikolojik sürecin kendisi olabilir. Başka bir deyişle, bireysel farklılıkların değerlendirme sürecinde herhangi bir değişikliğe yol açmadığını, adalet algısının bireysel değişkenlerden etkilenmeyecek şekilde stabil ve hatta toplumsal olarak belirlendiği fikrini tartışmaya sunabiliriz.

Mevcut sonuçlarla ilgili ikinci spekülasyon ise evlilikte algılanan adaletin ölçülmesi konusuyula ilişkilidir. Ölçüm beklendiği üzere olumlu cevapların yığılma yaptığı haliyle normal dağılımdan uzak bir veri dağılımı sunmuştur. Her ne kadar veriler dönüştürülse de altta yatan ölçümle ilgili durum ölçümle ilgili bir takım sorunlara işaret ediyor olabilir. Bir diğer konu da ölçekte yer alan maddelerin kimin mağdur kimin faydalanıcı olduğu yönünde çok fazla ifade içermeyip çoğunlukla evliliğin geneliyle ilgili değerlendirmelere odaklanmış olmasıdır. Haliyle kişilerin evliliklerini ne derece adil bulduklarını ölçerken bu ilişkide ne zaman mağdur ne zaman faydalanıcı olduklarına yönelik bir bilgi sağlamamaktadır. Bundan sonraki çalışmalarda EAA ölçeği kullanılacağı zaman bu hususlar dikkate alınmalı ve ileride evlilikte ya da yakın ilişkilerde cinsiyet temelli adaletsizlikleri ya da adaletsizliğin yönünü ölçen araçlar geliştirilirken ölçüm maddelerinin içeriği bu hususa uygun olarak geliştirilmelidir.

L. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences** ☐
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences** ☒
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics** ☐
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics** ☐
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences** ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : ŞAKLAR
Adı / Name : ZEYNEP
Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji / Psychology

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN MARRIAGE: THE EFFECTS OF JUSTICE SENSITIVITY, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND GENDER

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** ☐ **Doktora / PhD** ☒

- 1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.** ☒
- 2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. *** ☐
- 3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. *** ☐

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature **Tarih / Date**

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.