

AUTHENTICITY IN RELATIONSHIPS SCALE (AIRS): TURKISH ADAPTATION AND VALIDATION STUDY

İLİŞKİDE OTANTİKLİK ÖLÇEĞİ: TÜRK KÜLTÜRÜNE UYARLAMA VE GEÇERLİK ÇALIŞMASI

Reyhan ARSLAN-BABAL¹, Ferah ÇEKİCİ², Zeynep AYDIN-SÜN BÜL³, Asude MALKOÇ⁴, Meltem ASLAN-GÖRDES Lİ⁵

ÖZ: Bu çalışmanın amacı, Lopez ve Rice (2006) tarafından geliştirilen İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin Türk örneklemindeki psikometrik özelliklerini incelemektir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu, 263 lisans öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin yapı geçerliğini değerlendirmek amacıyla doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Bulgular, uyum iyiliği indekslerinin yeterli düzeyde olduğunu ve ölçeğin iki faktörlü yapısının doğrulandığını göstermiştir ($\chi^2 / df = 1.8$; GFI= 0.88; CFI= 0.90; TLI= .88; RMSEA= 0.05). Ölçeğin Cronbach Alfa iç tutarlılık katsayısı .80 bulunmuştur. Ölçeğin yakınsak geçerliğini saptamak amacıyla, Otantiklik Ölçeği ve İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Buna göre, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği ile Otantiklik Ölçeği ve İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Yanı sıra, ölçme değişmezliği analizinin sonuçları, kadınların ve erkeklerin ölçek maddelerine verdikleri yanıtların benzer bir örüntüde olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu nedenle, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin cinsiyet faktörü açısından ölçme değişmezliğine sahip olduğu söylenebilir. Sonuç olarak, mevcut çalışmanın bulguları, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin Türk kültüründe geçerli ve güvenilir bir ölçek olarak kullanılabileceğini göstermektedir.

ABSTRACT: The aim of the current study is to investigate the psychometric properties of Authenticity in Relationships Scale (AIRS) developed by Lopez and Rice (2006) in Turkish sample. The study carried out with 263 undergraduate students that were included with purposive sampling method. To examine the construct validity of AIRS, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. The results showed that goodness of fit indices meet the model fit requirements for the two-factor structure of the scale ($\chi^2 / df = 1.8$; GFI= 0.88; CFI= 0.90; TLI= .88; RMSEA= 0.05). The internal consistency coefficient was found .80. As an evidence for the convergent validity, Authenticity in Relationships Scale was found to have significantly positive correlations with the Authenticity Scale and Relationship Assessment Scale. Moreover, the results of measurement invariance analysis showed that scale has the same measurement body of items in females and males and the answer patterns are similar in both genders indicating a sound metric variance for AIRS. In conclusion, it can be concluded that AIRS is a reliable and valid measure of relationship authenticity in Turkish culture.

Keywords: Relationship authenticity, honesty, validity, reliability, measurement invariance

Anahtar sözcükler: İlişkide otantiklik, dürüstlük, geçerlik, güvenilirlik, ölçme değişmezliği

Bu makaleye atf vermek için:

Arslan-Babal, R., Çekici, F., Aydın-Sünbül, Z., Malkoç, A., & Aslan-Gördesli, M. (2021). İlişkide otantiklik ölçeği: Türk kültürüne uyarlama ve geçerlik çalışması. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(1), 439-449.

Cite this article as:

Arslan-Babal, R., Çekici, F., Aydın-Sünbül, Z., Malkoç, A., & Aslan-Gördesli, M. (2021). Authenticity in relationships scale (AIRS): Turkish adaptation and validation study. *Trakya Journal of Education*, 11(1), 439-449.

¹ Arş.Gör., İstanbul Medipol University, İstanbul/Türkiye, reyhanarslan@medipol.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-0359-9322

² Doç.Dr., İstanbul Medipol University, İstanbul/Türkiye, fcekici@medipol.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-4672-2116

³ Dr.Öğr.Üye., Kocaeli University, Kocaeli/Türkiye, zeynep.aydinsunbul@kocaeli.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-8084-2344

⁴ Dr.Öğr.Üye., İstanbul Medipol University, İstanbul/Türkiye, amalkoc@medipol.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9073-2752

⁵ Dr.Öğr.Üye., İstanbul Medipol University, İstanbul/Türkiye, mgordesli@medipol.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9989-9516

UZUN ÖZET

Giriş

Kişinin kendini açık ve dürüst bir şekilde ortaya koyması -diğer bir deyişle, otantik bir biçimde- insanlık tarihi boyunca önemsenmiş (Harbus, 2002) ve birçok teorisyen tarafından da sağlıklı ilişkinin önemli bir parçası olarak kabul edilmiştir. Buna karşın, otantik davranış ile ilgili yapılan araştırmalar çok sınırlı sayıdadır; mevcut çalışma bulguları ise birbiriyle tutarlı değildir (Harter, 2002). Bu nedenle, literatürdeki otantiklik kavramı halen tartışmalı olmakla birlikte oldukça merak uyandırıcıdır (Lopez ve Rice, 2006). Otantiklik üzerine yapılan araştırmaların az sayıda olmasının nedenlerinden birinin literatürde otantiklik kavramına ilişkin ortak bir görüşe varılamaması ile ilgili olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bazı araştırmacılar, otantikliği bireysel farklılık değişkeni olarak değerlendirirken; bazıları bunu ilişkişel bir kavram olarak ele almaktadır. Benlik yapısının kritik özelliklerine odaklanan insan merkezli bakış açısına göre, ebeveyn isteklerini karşılama ve/veya reddedilmekten kaçınma temelinde bir benlik imajı geliştirmeye yol açabilecek benlik deneyimleri, kişilerarası ilişkilerdeki davranış biçiminin de benzer şekilde ortaya çıkmasına neden olur (Winnicott, 1960). Bu açıdan bakıldığında, otantiklik, bazı araştırmacılar tarafından bir kişilik özelliği olarak kabul edilmektedir. Öte yandan, bazı araştırmacılar otantikliği; partneriyle karşılıklı dürüstlük ve şeffaflığa dayalı bir romantik ilişkiyi, kişisel sıkıntı, onaylanmama veya reddedilme riskine yeğleyen ilişkişel bir şema olarak değerlendirmektedir (Kernis, 2003; Lopez ve Rice, 2006). Buna göre, otantiklik, ilişkinin dinamiklerine bağlı ilişkişel bir yapı olarak ele alınmaktadır. Kendini açma kavramı ile ilgili araştırmalar, kişinin başkalarına kendisi hakkında bilgi vermesinin birçok riski olabileceğini göstermektedir (Kelly ve McKillop, 1996). Bununla birlikte, yapılan çalışmalar, ilişkilerinde dürüst olmayan bireylerin partnerine karşı daha az yakınlık duyduğunu ve kendini olduğu gibi ortaya koyabilen bireylere göre ilişkilerinde daha az samimiyet hissettiklerini bildirmektedir (Cole, 2001). Dahası, otantik olmayan davranışlar, kişilerarası ilişkide güveni tehdit eder ve ilişkilerde yakınlık kurmayı engelleyebilir (Bok, 1978). Buna göre, yakın ilişkilerdeki otantik olmayan davranışlar, kendini dürüstçe ortaya koymanın ilişkinin devamlılığını tehdit ettiği durumlarda, partnerin onayını sürdürme ve çatışmayı önleme konusundaki aşırı kaygının bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkabilmektedir (Lopez ve Rice, 2006). Çocuklarda otantik davranış ile ilgili oldukça geniş bir literatür olmasına karşın; yetişkinlerle yapılan çalışmalar çok sınırlıdır (Bussey, 1992; Peterson, 1991). Türkiye'de bilindiği kadarıyla ilişkide otantikliği araştıran bir çalışma yoktur ve bu yapıyı incelemeye olanak tanıyan bir ölçek de bulunmamaktadır. Bu açıdan, ilişkide otantikliği değerlendirmek için yapılacak bir ölçek uyarlaması Türk kültüründe ilgili literatürün genişletilmesine katkıda bulunabilir. Mevcut araştırmada, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye adaptasyonu, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik analizleri yapılmıştır.

Yöntem

Çalışmanın örnekleme, amaçlı örnekleme yöntemi kullanılarak seçilen, İstanbul'daki farklı üniversitelere devam eden 263 üniversite öğrencisinden (214 kadın, 49 erkek) oluşmaktadır. Katılımcıların yaş ortalaması 21.54 (SS= .27) olarak bulunmuştur. Bu araştırma kapsamında İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği, Otantiklik Ölçeği ve İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmayı yürütebilmek için İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Etik Kurulu'ndan etik izin aldıktan sonra, (1) maddelerin hedef dile çevrilmesi, (2) maddelerin özgün form ve uyarlanmış form arasındaki eşdeğerliğinin değerlendirilmesi ve (3) uyarlanan formun geçerlik ve güvenilirliği incelenmiştir (Hambleton ve Bollwark, 1991). Ölçeğin Türkçe versiyonunun faktör yapısı incelenmeden önce SPSS 20 istatistik paket programı ile veri tarama işlemleri gerçekleştirilmiştir (IBM, 2011). Doğrulayıcı faktör analizi sonuçları ise AMOS 18 programı ile elde edilmiştir (Byrne, 2001).

Bulgular

Ölçeğin yapı geçerliğini test etmek amacıyla doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Bulgular, uyum iyiliği indekslerinin, ölçeğin iki faktörlü yapısını doğruladığını göstermektedir ($\chi^2 / df = 1.8$; GFI= 0.88; CFI= 0.90; TLI= .88; RMSEA= 0.05). Ölçek maddeleri için standardize edilmiş faktör yükleri .32 ile .73 arasındadır. Tüm ölçek için Cronbach Alpha iç tutarlılık katsayısı .80'dir. Ölçeğin yakınsak

geçerliğini test etmek amacıyla Otantiklik Ölçeği ve İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Pearson korelasyon analizinin sonuçlarına göre, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği ve Otantiklik Ölçeği arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki saptanmıştır ($r = .44$, $p < .000$). Benzer şekilde, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği ve İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği anlamlı düzeyde ve pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur ($r = .45$, $p < .000$). Ölçeğin psikometrik özelliklerinin cinsiyete göre değişmezliğini test etmek amacıyla yapılan ölçme değişmezliği analizi sonucunda, kadınların ve erkeklerin ölçek maddelerine verdikleri yanıtların benzer örüntüde olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin kadın ve erkeklerde aynı yapıyı ölçtüğü söylenebilir.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Bu araştırmada, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin Türk kültürüne uyarlaması, geçerlik ve güvenilirliğinin sınanması amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmanın bulguları, İlişkide Otantiklik Ölçeği'nin romantik ilişkilerde otantikliği değerlendirmede geçerli ve güvenilir bir araç olarak kullanılabileceğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu ölçüm aracının Türkçeye kazandırılmasının, Türkiye'de ilişkide otantiklik konusunda daha fazla çalışma yapılmasına katkıda bulunabileceği düşünülmektedir. Öte yandan, çalışmanın bazı sınırlılıkları vardır. İlk olarak, öz bildirime dayalı bir ölçümün doğası gereği katılımcıların ölçek maddelerine sosyal olarak arzu edilen yanıtları vermiş olabileceği; bu nedenle araştırma sonuçlarının güvenilirliğinin olumsuz yönde etkilenmiş olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Çalışmanın bir diğer kısıtlılığı kadın ve erkek katılımcıların eşit sayıda olmamasıdır. Cinsiyet dağılımındaki dengesizliğin, sonuçların genellenebilirliği açısından bir sınırlama oluşturabileceği düşünülmektedir. Son olarak, araştırma örnekleminin yalnızca üniversite öğrencilerinden oluşuyor olması, sonuçların genellenebilirliğini olumsuz yönde etkilemiş olabilir. Bu nedenle, gelecek araştırmalarda çalışma sonuçlarının çeşitli yaş gruplarıyla test edilmesi önerilmektedir.

INTRODUCTION

Even though revealing yourself openly and honestly to other people -that is, authentically- has been valued throughout the history (Harbus, 2002) and agreed to have an important role in healthy relationship functioning in many theories, literature on authentic behavior is very limited and the findings of the studies are inconsistent (Harter, 2002). Thus, the concept of authenticity in the psychological literature is still controversial but also intriguing (Lopez and Rice, 2006).

Empirical research on authentic behavior is scarce, that might be partly because of the ambiguous conceptualization of the authenticity in the literature. Some researchers claim that authenticity is an individual-difference variable. That is, they emphasize a stable internal structure that reflects the real self). Others claim that it is a relational construct. These researchers claim that it is a unique experience of self with an "other" person). Furthermore, the ambiguity of the description elicits the absence of appropriate measurement tools for the construct, hence further hindering to reach a coherent body of literature (Lopez and Rice, 2006).

According to the person-centered theorists that calls attention to the critical features of the self-formation, actual self-experiences that may lead to develop a self-image based on meeting parental wishes or avoiding disapproval affect the interpersonal relationship style in a similar way (Winnicott, 1960). Similarly, Rogers (1951) asserted that early experiences with caregivers are critical for identity formation. That is, childhood experiences of "conditions of self-worth" lead to the development of a negative, inauthentic, and incongruent self. Thus, from this point of view, authenticity is accepted as a stable personality characteristic by some researchers. On the other side, some self-theorists point out a temporal view claiming that the self is the subjective organization of meanings that the person builds over time and it includes affective states and cognitive processes the person experience, rather than the view that a stable, core self exists (Gergen, 1991; Mitchell, 1992).

Recently, Kernis (2003) indicates that authenticity involves a process of revealing information about yourself to other person (i.e., self-disclosure) and mutual trust and intimacy in a relationship. In other words, authenticity in the relationship implies being ‘real’ in someone’s relationships with others. Likewise, Lopez and Rice (2006) defines *authenticity in relationships* as:

“a relational schema that favors the benefits of mutual and truthful exchanges of real self-experiences with one’s intimate partner over the potential risks of personal discomfort, partner disapproval or rejection, and relationship instability.”

Thus, authenticity is evaluated as a relational construct that depends on the dynamics of the unique relationship by other researchers.

Research examining self-disclosure shows that revealing information to others involves many risks (Kelly and McKillop, 1996). Deceptively appeasing a partner might enable couples to avoid conflict (Buller & Burgoon, 1998) and enhance harmony in relationship (Saxe, 1991). Researches showed that individuals who have anxious attachment style have a tendency to assure their romantic partner through conciliation and manipulation and also build a false image of themselves. However, studies report that individuals who use deception feel less intimacy and closeness in their relationships (Cole, 2001).

Authenticity was shown to be associated with some variables in the literature. Theran (2011) found that authenticity with parents predicts depressive symptomatology in adolescents. Adolescents that reported higher level of authentic behavior also reported higher level of unconditional positive regard and support from their parents and peers. Also, they have higher self-esteem and more positive affect in comparison with their peers who are less authentic (Harter et al., 1996). Moreover, authenticity level strongly predicts well-being, self-esteem, life satisfaction, and healthy psychological functioning in an adult sample (Goldman and Kernis, 2002; Neff and Harter, 2002a; Sheldon et al., 1997). Furthermore, research asserts that adolescents’ level of authenticity in their relationships with parents and peers may be different from each other (Harter et al., 1998), that also supports the view that authenticity is a relational schema.

Actually, Neff and Harter (2002a, 2002b) showed that people who are worried about sustaining relationship with their partners and solving conflicts by meeting their partners’ desires and needs were most likely to report their relationship as inauthentic. Moreover, researchers that investigate deception in close relationships showed that participants deliberately deceive their partner to avoid conflict and disapproval or rejection (Cole, 2001; DePaulo and Kashy, 1998; Metts, 1989; Peterson, 1996). Thus, these findings underline the importance of evaluating authenticity as a relational concept implying a cost–benefit appraisal of the advantages and risks of honest sharing of self-experiences with your partner. Relatedly, Lopez and Rice (2006) found that even when the variables of gender, self-esteem, attachment styles, and commitment level were controlled, relationship authenticity significantly predicts the relationship satisfaction.

These findings indicate that inauthentic behavior in romantic relationships reflects an over anxiety about maintaining approval from partner and avoiding conflict when truthful exchanges may risk the relationship. In other words, people can behave authentically in some relationships and not in others and the perceptions of threat to relationship breakdown or expectations towards a possibility of partner disapproval might predict inauthentic behavior (Lopez and Rice, 2006). Thus, using deception in relationships is not uncommon in social relationships (Knox, Schacht, Holt, and Turner, 1993). Moreover, it threatens interpersonal trust and may hinder building intimacy in relationships (Bok, 1978).

Although there is a wide literature on the use of deception in children; similar studies investigating adults are scarce (Bussey, 1992; Peterson, 1991). Moreover, most of the studies have concentrated on deception towards strangers rather than intimates (Lindskold and Walters, 1983;

Lindskold and Han, 1986). Also, the results of adult studies are inconsistent. Although there are some studies examining the relationship of authenticity with different variables such as social self-efficacy (Satici, Kayis, and Akin, 2013a), psychological vulnerability (Satici, Kayis, and Akin, 2013b), and hope (Akin and Akin, 2014) in Turkish university students, as far as is known, there is no study investigating the authenticity in relationship in Turkey, as well as there is no scale to measure this construct. Furthermore, the ambiguity of the description elicits the absence of appropriate measurement tools for the construct, hence further hindering to reach a coherent body of literature. From this point of view, adapting and validating a measure to assess authenticity in relationship may contribute to extend the related literature in Turkey. In the present study, the validity, reliability and psychometric properties of Authenticity in Relationships Scale (AIRS) were examined in Turkish university students.

METHOD

Participants

The sample of the study consists of 263 undergraduate students (214 women, 49 men) attending to the different universities in Istanbul. The mean of the participants' age was 21.54 ($SD= 2.27$). The purposive sampling method was used (Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun, 2011). Only participants having a current romantic relationship were included in the study. 87.8% of the participants are in a relationship, 6.1% of the participants are in engagement, and 6.1% of them are married.

Instruments

Authenticity in Relationships Scale (AIRS), Authenticity Scale (AS), and the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) were used within the scope of this study.

Authenticity in Relationships Scale (Lopez and Rice, 2006) was developed to examine self-experiences in romantic relationships. It is a 9-point Likert-type scale, 1 referring to "not at all" and 9 referring to "very". The initial form of the scale consists of 37 items that was applied to two independent group of university students who report having a current romantic relationship. As a result of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses conducted with two independent samples, 24 items that are grouped under the two factors were determined: Unacceptability of Deception (UOD) and Intimate Risk Taking (IRT). UOD scores imply person-centered desires for self-disclosure and truthful relational exchanges; however, IRT scores represents more relationship-centered evaluations of reliance on a specific partner and mutual trust. The UOD consists of reverse scoring items and the scores of UOD and IRT can be summed to obtain a composite score for AIRS. The subscale of Intimate Risk Taking includes such items as "I share my deepest thoughts with my partner even if there's a chance that he/she won't understand them". The sample item from Unacceptability of Deception subscale is "To avoid conflict in our relationship, I will sometimes tell my partner what I think he or she wants to hear even if it's not true".

Initially, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for 26-items to load on two factors based on the findings of exploratory factor analysis. Model fit indices revealed a good fit for the sample of the study ($CFI= .93$, $SRMR= .072$, and $RMSEA= .058$; 90% confidence interval $[CI]= .050-.066$). Nevertheless, factor loadings suggested some further elimination of items to a better model fit. One of the items that was loaded on the UOD factor was found to have a coefficient value of .24 (coefficients of remaining items were between .54 and .80). Internal consistency reliability analysis pointed out that if that item eliminates from the scale, the reliability coefficient will improve. Likewise, one of the items which was loaded on the IRT factor was found to have a coefficient of .35, which is also relatively low (the remaining coefficients were between .47 and .78). Reliability analysis also showed that dropping that item would improve reliability; however, omitting even one of the other items would decrease the reliability coefficient. After these two items were omitted, another CFA was conducted. Model fit indices was similar to the values found before missing out the additional two items ($CFI= .94$; $SRMR=$

.071; RMSEA= .06; 90% [CI]= .051–.068). For the UOD factor, pattern coefficients were between .53 and .80 and for the IRT factor, these were between .46 and .75. The correlation coefficient between UOD and IRT was found .59.

Internal consistency reliability of the scale was .88 for the UOD factor and .85 for the IRT factor. Test-retest reliability analysis revealed that test–retest correlation coefficient was .70 for UOD and .76 for IRT. Validity analyses yielded significant support for AIRS. The scores on each AIRS subscale was found to be modestly correlated with self-esteem, self-concealment, splitting, and attachment styles. Also, when gender, self-esteem, commitment level, and attachment styles were controlled, AIRS significantly predicted relationship satisfaction. Thus, the AIRS is a reliable and valid assessment tool to measure relational authenticity.

Authenticity Scale (Wood et al., 2008) consists of 12 items including three subscales which are self-alienation, accepting external influence, and authentic living. The researchers confirmed that these three dimensions obtained in both explanatory and confirmatory factor analyzes combined in the upper level in the second level analysis. Internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were between .69 and .78. Test–retest reliability coefficients ranged from .78 to .91. Validity studies of the scale showed that authenticity scale was also positively correlated with the variables of self-esteem, subjective well-being, and psychological well-being. The scale was also found to be correlated with the Big Five personality dimensions. Accordingly, authentic people were shown to be less neurotic and more extraverted, agreeable, conscientious, and open. These findings support the conceptualization of authenticity as an indication of healthy emotional and social functioning. Thus, the scale is a valid and reliable tool for measuring authenticity.

Ilhan and Ozdemir (2013) made Turkish adaptation study of the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis yielded good fit indices (CFI= 0.95; IFI= 0.95; GFI= 0.92; RMSEA= .055). The internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were in the range of .62 to .79. In this study, internal consistency coefficient of the scale was .68.

Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) consists of 7 items designed to measure the individual's satisfaction with his/her relationship. Factor analyses supported a single factor structure, with the internal reliability coefficient of .86. The scale had significant correlations with the variables of love, self-disclosure, commitment, and investment in a relationship. Thus, it is a brief, reliable and valid measure of relationship satisfaction. Curun (2001) made the Turkish adaptation study of the scale. The internal consistency coefficient was .86. In this study, internal consistency coefficient was also .86.

Procedure

Before carrying out the study, ethical permission was taken from Istanbul Medipol University Social Sciences Ethics Committee. After that, scale adaptation stages were followed. Firstly, items of the scale were translated to the target language. Secondly, equivalence of the items in the original form and the adapted version of the scale were assessed. Lastly, the psychometric properties of the adapted version were investigated (Hambleton and Bollwark, 1991).

At the beginning, AIRS was translated to Turkish by five experts from the department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling who are both competent and fluent in both languages. The experts then reviewed these five separate translations and agreed upon the most suitable form in terms of comprehensibility. Secondly, two experts (one from Guidance and Psychological Counseling department and one from English Language Teaching department) re-translated the Turkish form to English to ensure linguistic equivalence. After that, the final version of the Turkish form was decided. At the final stage, the scale was applied to 263 university students and the psychometric properties were examined.

Data was obtained from undergraduate students attending at various universities in Istanbul. At the beginning of the study, an informed consent form was given to the participants in order to inform them about the study and assured of confidentiality was given. No incentive was given to the participants of the study. Participants who were voluntary to participate filled out the scales in a paper-pencil format at about 15 minutes.

Data Analysis

Before examining the factor structure of the Turkish version of the scale, data screening procedures were carried out with SPSS 20 statistical package program (IBM, 2011). At first, data entry was checked to avoid error of fact. After that, participants who did not answer more than 5% of each scale were removed from the data. When there was a missing value of less than 5% for any participants, the mean value of the relevant items was assigned by using series mean method. Z scores were checked for each continuous variable to detect the outliers. The participants exceeding the z score of ± 3.29 were excluded from the data. Thus, 41 participants were excluded from the sample.

The analyses for checking whether data meet the assumptions (normality and linearity) of confirmatory factor analysis showed that the data distributed normally and linearly (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2006). The results of confirmatory factor analysis were also obtained by AMOS 18 program (Byrne, 2001).

RESULTS

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to test the factor structure of Authenticity in Relationships Scale (Lopez and Rice, 2006).

Model Fit Indices and Standardized Parameter Estimates for AIRS

After obtaining satisfactory findings for the assumptions of CFA, a Maximum Likelihood Estimation Method was applied to validate the two-factor structure of AIRS. At first, the model fit indicators were examined. The criterion indices to determine the goodness of fit of AIRS are chi square value, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and goodness of fit index (GFI) (Kline, 2011). The relevant findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Model fit indices from measurement models of AIRS

Goodness of Fit Indexes	Measurement Model of MSCS	Criterion Ranges
χ^2/df	1.8	$\chi^2/df < 3$
CFI	.90	CFI $>.90$ or close to 1
TLI	.88	TLI $>.90$ or close to 1
RMSEA	.05	$.08 > RMSEA > .05$
GFI	.88	GFI $>.90$

Note: CFI=Comparative Fit Index; TLI=Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA=Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; GFI= Goodness of Fit Index”

As shown in Table 1, the normed chi square indicator of 1.8 is satisfactory because it is lower than criterion value of 3 (Kline, 2011). Similarly, CFI (.90) value is within the acceptable ranges of .90-1.00 (Bentler, 1990; Tucker & Lewis, 1973). Also, the RMSEA indicator of .05 refers a satisfactory value since it remains between the range of .05-.08. Lastly, the GFI (.88) and TLI (.88) indicators are not within the acceptable ranges but very close to the criterion value of .90 (Kline, 2011). Thus, the findings indicated that almost all of the goodness of fit indices meet the model fit requirements for the two-factor structure of AIRS.

In the second step, standardized and unstandardized estimates for each item of two-factor AIRS were investigated. The relevant findings are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Unstandardized and standardized parameter estimates for AIRS

Construct	Item	Unstandardized Factor Loadings	Standardized Factor Loadings	SE	T	R ²
IntimateRisk Taking	AIRS_1	.78	.61	.08	10.16	.37
	AIRS_2	1.30	.71	.11	12.28	.50
	AIRS_3	.92	.59	.10	9.61	.35
	AIRS_4	1.29	.64	.12	10.64	.41
	AIRS_5	.69	.41	.11	6.35	.16
	AIRS_6	.74	.49	.10	7.74	.24
	AIRS_7	1.16	.73	.09	12.87	.54
	AIRS_9	1.16	.56	.13	9.15	.31
	AIRS_16	1.04	.40	.17	6.20	.16
	AIRS_19	1.27	.67	.11	11.24	.45
	AIRS_23	.70	.45	.10	7.19	.21
Unacceptability of Deception	AIRS_8	1.33	.53	.16	8.23	.28
	AIRS_10	1.10	.44	.17	6.65	.19
	AIRS_11	.86	.36	.16	5.34	.13
	AIRS_12	.74	.32	.16	4.68	.10
	AIRS_13	.84	.44	.13	6.71	.20
	AIRS_14	.56	.49	.08	7.47	.24
	AIRS_15	.79	.58	.09	9.12	.34
	AIRS_17	1.32	.63	.13	10.09	.40
	AIRS_18	.82	.35	.16	5.21	.12
	AIRS_20	.86	.37	.16	5.54	.14
	AIRS_21	.83	.34	.17	4.97	.12
	AIRS_22	1.21	.60	.13	9.50	.36
	AIRS_24	1.51	.60	.16	9.55	.36

Note 1. All t values were significant, $p < .001$

Note 2. Some correlated errors were included: between items 10-13, 11-12, 11-15, 12-21, 14-15, and 21-22 on Unacceptability of Deception; between 2-4, 6-7, 3-19, and 16-19 on Intimate Risk Taking.

The parameters presented in Table 2 revealed that the standardized factor loadings of the items vary between .32 and .73. So, factor loadings of the items were greater than .30 which is the minimum value to be acceptable (Brown, 2006). The explained variance of the items was in the range of .10 to .54. So, all of them are statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Measurement Invariance Across Gender

Metric invariance and configural invariance were examined so as to check whether AIRS is invariant across gender. Metric invariance was checked through a chi-square difference test. The difference test yielded an insignificant chi-square value ($\Delta\chi^2 = 92.6$, $\Delta df = 24$, $p > .05$) showing that the scale has the same measurement body of items in females and males and the answer patterns are similar in both genders pointing to a sound metric variance for AIRS. The configural invariance was also assessed through crosschecking the model fit indices for the baseline model and for all other subsequent determined invariance models. The model fit indices emerged were all adequate to conclude that AIRS has a sufficient configural invariance across gender ($\chi^2 / df = 862.27/482$, $p < .001$; GFI= .89; CFI= .91; TLI= .88; RMSEA= .06). (Horn and McArdle, 1992).

Reliability

The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was .80 for the overall scale, providing satisfactory evidence for the reliability of AIRS. The internal consistency coefficients were .74 for UOD, and .81 for IRT.

Convergent Validity

To test the convergent validity of the AIRS, Pearson Correlation Coefficients with Authenticity Scale (AS) and Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was calculated. The results showed that there is a significantly positive relationship between AIRS and AS ($r=.44$, $p<.000$). The relationship of AIRS with RAS was also found significantly positive ($r=.45$, $p<.000$). In addition, simple linear regression analysis showed that AIRS has a positively significant predictive role on relationship assessment ($R^2=.38$, $F(2,55)=5.56$, $p<.01$). and also authenticity ($R^2=.38$, $F(2,55)=5.56$, $p<.01$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, the adaptation of Authenticity in Relationships Scale in Turkish sample and its psychometric properties were investigated. The findings provide psychometric support for AIRS and contribute to understand the nature of the relationship authenticity. To determine the construct validity of AIRS, confirmatory factor analysis was carried out. The results yielded acceptable goodness of fit values for two factor structure of the 24-item scale (Bentler, 1990; Byrne, 2011; Schumacker and Lomax, 2004). Factor loadings of the items were between .32 and .73. According to Brown (2006), factor loadings of each item should be .30 and above. Thus, factor loadings of all items in the scale meet this criterion, so the original two-factor structure with 24 items was supported in Turkish sample.

Reliability analysis showed that the internal consistency coefficient of .80 for the overall scale is adequate. Also, the internal consistency values for the subscales were satisfactory. To test the convergent validity of the scale, the relationships of AIRS with AS and RAS were investigated. Results showed that both AS and RAS were moderately and positively correlated with AIRS. These findings are in line with the literature. Lopez and Rice (2006) revealed that even gender, self-esteem, commitment level, and attachment style were controlled, relationship authenticity significantly predicts the relationship satisfaction. This means that feeling free and comfortable with sharing of accurate and undistorted self-experiences and engaging in spontaneous self-disclosure with intimate partner is significantly related to the relationship satisfaction.

Moderate correlation with authenticity is thought to be associated with the relational aspect of AIRS. While authenticity scale includes statements evaluating authentic behavior in a more general sense, AIRS focuses on self-experiences that emerges in romantic relationship. In other words, authenticity scale evaluates the authentic behaviors as a personality trait; on the other hand, AIRS evaluates authenticity as a relational construct that depends on the dynamics of the unique relationship.

Furthermore, metric invariance and configural invariance were examined to see whether AIRS is invariant across genders. The results showed that scale has the same measurement body of items in females and males and the answer patterns are similar in both genders indicating a sound metric variance for AIRS. So, the measurement obtained from the scale are stable across the gender. Thus, the AIRS can be used for both gender group.

Taken together, Authenticity in Relationships Scale (AIRS) is a valid and reliable measure for assessing authenticity in romantic relationship into Turkish culture. Adapting and validating this measurement tool may enable to make more study in relational authenticity, so extend the related literature in Turkey. On the other hand, the study has some limitations. Firstly, reliance on self-report measures may cause the participants to respond in a socially desirable way. In other words, participants may not have answered the questions honestly, that may have affected the reliability of the results in a negative manner. Another limitation is the unequal number of male and female participants. In this

study, female participants outnumbered the male participants, so the inequality of the gender distribution in the sample may be a limitation in terms of the generalizability of the results. Lastly, sample of the study was consisted of university students, that may be another limitation for generalizability of the findings. So, the results of this study may be tested with various age-groups. Thus, our findings provide psychometric support for the AIRS and give insight into the nature of relationship authenticity. Yet, future studies with diverse and more representative groups are needed to validate the Authenticity in Relationships Scale into Turkish culture.

REFERENCES

- Akin, A. & Akin, U. (2014). Authenticity as a predictor on hope in Turkish university students. *Education Science and Psychology*, 2(28), 64-70.
- Bentler, M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral choices in public and private life*. New York: Pantheon.
- Brown, A. T. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (1st ed). New York: Guilford Press.
- Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1998). Emotional expression in the deception process. In P. A. Anderson and L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion* (pp. 381-402). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bussey, K. (1992). Lying and truthfulness: Children's definitions, standards, and evaluative reactions. *Child Development*, 63, 129-137.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: basic concepts, applications, and programming*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cole, T. (2001). Lying to the one you love: The use of deception in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 107-129.
- Curun, F. (2001). *The Effects of Sexism and Sex Role Orientation on Romantic Relationship Satisfaction*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Kashy, D. A. (1998). Everyday lies in close and casual relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 63-79.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N. & Hyun, H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). US: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldman, B. M., & Kernis, M. H. (2002). The role of authenticity in healthy psychological functioning and subjective well-being. *Annals of the American Psychotherapy Association*, 5, 18-20.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Bollwark, J. (1991) Adapting tests for use in different cultures: Technical issues and methods. *Bulletin of the International Test Commission*, 18, 3-32.
- Harbus, A. (2002). The medieval concept of the self in Anglo-Saxon England. *Self and Identity*, 1, 67-76.
- Harter, S. (2002). *Authenticity*. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382-394). London: Oxford University Press.
- Harter, S., Marold, D. B., Whitesell, N. R., & Cobbs, G. (1996). A model of the effects of parent and peer support on adolescent false self behavior. *Child Development*, 67, 360-374.
- Harter, S., Waters, P., & Whitesell, N. R. (1997). False self behavior and lack of voice among adolescent males and females. *Educational Psychology*, 32, 153-173.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50(1), 93-98.
- Horn, J. L. & McArdle, J. J. (1992). A practical and theoretical guide to measurement equivalence in aging research. *Experimental Aging Research*, 18, 117-144.
- IBM Corp. (2011). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows. Version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Ilhan, T., & Ozdemir, Y. (2013). Otantiklik Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5(40), 142-153.
- Kelly, A. E., & McKillop, K. J. (1996). Consequences of revealing personal secrets. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(3), 450-465.
- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1-26.
- Kline, B. R. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Knox, D., Schacht, C., Holt, J., & Turner, J. (1993). Sexual lies among university students. *College Student Journal*, 27, 269-272.
- Lindskold, S., & Han, G. (1986). Intent and the judgment of lies. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126(1), 129-130.
- Lindskold, S., & Waters, P.S. (1983). Categories of acceptability of lies. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 120(1), 129-136.

- Lopez, F. G., & Rice, K. G. (2006). Preliminary development and validation of a measure of relationship authenticity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(3), 362-371.
- Metts, S. (1989). An exploratory investigation of deception in close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6*, 159-179.
- Mitchell, S. A. (1992). True selves, false selves, and the ambiguity of authenticity. In N. J. Skolnick & S. C. Warshaw (Eds.), *Relational perspectives in psychoanalysis* (pp. 1-20). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Neff, K. D., & Harter, S. (2002a). The authenticity of conflict resolutions among adult couples: Does women's other-oriented behavior affect their true selves? *Sex Roles, 47*, 298-307.
- Neff, K. D., & Harter, S. (2002b). The role of power and authenticity in relationship styles emphasizing autonomy, connectedness, or mutuality among adult couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*, 835-857.
- Peterson, C. (1996). Deception in intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology, 31*, 279-288.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory*. Oxford, England: Houghton Mifflin.
- Satici, S. A., Kayis, A. R., & Akin, A. (2013a). Investigating the predictive role of social self-efficacy on authenticity in Turkish university students. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 9*(3), 572-580.
- Satici, S. A., Kayis, A. R., & Akin, A. (2013b). Predictive role of authenticity on psychological vulnerability in Turkish university students. *Psychological Reports, 112*(2), 519-528.
- Saxe, L. (1991). Lying: Thoughts of an applied social psychologist. *American Psychologist, 46*, 251-258.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Rawsthorne, L. J., & Ilardi, B. (1997). Trait self and true self: Cross-role variation in the Big-Five personality traits and its relations with psychological authenticity and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1380-1393.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2006). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Theran, S. A. (2011). Authenticity in relationships and depressive symptoms: A gender analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*, 423-428.
- Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). The reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 38*, 1-10.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1960). Ego distortion in terms of true and false self. In D. W. Winnicott (Ed.), *The maturational process and the facilitating environment* (pp. 140-152). New York: International Universities Press.
- Wood, A., Linley, P., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M. & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the authenticity scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*, 385-399.