

**Review Article**

**VALIDATING THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF NEGOTIATION STYLE BETWEEN PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES AND COMMUNICATION STYLE ON MARITAL SATISFACTION AMONG NIGERIAN**

Fasasi Lukman<sup>1,2</sup>, Aqeel Khan<sup>1</sup>, Adibah Abdul Latif<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities, Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia (UTM), Skudai, Johor , Malaysia.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Educational Psychology, FCE (Tech), Asaba-Nigeria.

Received: 05.02.2020

Revised: 12.03.2020

Accepted: 14.04.2020

**Abstract**

This study validating the mediating effect of negotiation style between problem solving strategies and Communication style on Marital Satisfaction among Nigerian. To achieve the purpose a cross-sectional survey design was adopted with a sample of 385 married couples in Kwara state Nigeria. The instruments used tagged 'Problem-Solving Strategies, Communication and Negotiation styles on Marital Satisfaction Scales' contained 80 items spread among the 16 sub-constructs, 4 Likert's type was adopted throughout the scale. The data collected were entered into Microsoft Excel 2016 and SPSS 20 for data cleaning and were filtered to the SmartPLS 3. The data was check for normality using two indicators of Skewness and Kurtosis. The data analysis was conducted using Partial least square structural equation modeling approaches with SmartPLS 3 software. The measurement construct was evaluated by items loading, composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE). The results revealed that the measurement construct assessed in this study showed acceptability with validity and reliability test results presented in the preceding sections. The indicator reliability, convergent validity examined through the factor loadings. Thus with the effect of all the measurement requirements, it can be concluded that the mediating effect of negotiation style between Problem-Solving Strategies and Communication style on Marital Satisfaction can be used to the resolved marital problem among the couples as an alternative option for marital counselor ministry of social welfare and the religious leaders.

**Key words:** Validating the Mediating Effect, Negotiation Styles, Marital Satisfaction.

© 2019 by Advance Scientific Research. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.06.50>

**INTRODUCTION**

The word "marriage" is a common term in every society. Marriage is the sub-institution of society and from which family evolves. Marriage has been in existent since the creation of heaven and the earth Lukman F et al (2019). It unanimously believed in different religious practices all over the world that humankind is the children of Adams and Eve (who believed to be the first set of creations). Their interaction as partners made them husband and wife; thus, the existence of their progeny. Etymologically, the term "marriage" is deducted from the similar word "matrimony," which is believed to have evolved from the old French word "matrimonies" in the year 1300 CE. The word "matrimonies" was also argued to have evolved from the Latin word "matrimonium" which a combination of the words "mater" (which means mother) and "monium" (which means state, condition or action) (Sweet land , 2018). This means that marriage is a state or condition of moving from the state of singlehood to motherhood.

There is no universal definition of marriage. The definition and its practices vary from country to country and from culture to culture. Hence, the definitions of marriage may be influenced by the culture, norms, values, and practices of those who are defining it (Bernardo et al 2016, 2014). Given this, marriage experts, writers, authors, marriage constitution, and laws have put several definitions forward. According to Water (2012) defined marriage as the coming together of a man and a woman, as husband and wife, with a legal agreement to live together. In a similar view, Ndolo (2006) described marriage as a union between a man and a woman to become one. This is a narrow view of marriage. The authors only look at the interaction aspect of marriage for couples to continue with the relationship as long as they wish to keep it alive.

From the societal perspective, Dube et al (2017) defined marriage as an institution of society, which can have different implications in different cultures. It is a social status, which defines the rights and obligations of persons of the opposite

sex living in a more or less permanent union. Oniye (2016) defined marriage as a complex and unique relationship between two "strange" human beings, joined together by that complex phenomenon called "love." Oniye (2016) stated further that marriage is a joint institution to all human societies and supported by significant religions of today, such as Christianity, Islam, and African Traditional Religion. These definitions suggest that marriage is a joint institution upon which the existence of a society lies. It is an accepted and cherished entity in many religious and cultural contexts.

From a legal perspective, marriage is viewed as the joining of a male and female in matrimony by someone qualified by law to perform the ceremony (a minister, priest, judge, or clergyman), having obtained a valid marriage license (Hill and Hill, 2005). Buston (2007) described it as a contract made in due form of law, by which a free man and woman mutually agree to live together as husband and wife. According to Boston (2017), the term freeman or freewoman in this definition does not only mean that they are not slaves, but also that they are clear from all bars to a lawful marriage. Therefore, David (1979) it is a mutual, legal, and conjugal relationship between a husband and a wife. Marriage is thus an institution supported and regulated by the authority or government of a state or nation. In this regard, the consummation and dissolution of marriage may oversee by the state.

Some other definitions of marriage pointed at the responsibilities, functions, duties, and purposes of the so-called couples or in which marriage is to serve. Given this, Undiyaundeye and Ugal (2006) described marriage as an institution by adults who engage in socially approved intimacy to have children, engaging in economic co-operation, and sharing a typical residence. Haviland et al. (2011) refer to marriage as a ritually or socially recognized union or legal contract between partners that stipulates the rights and responsibilities between them and their children as well as

their in-laws. It is the conjugal union of husband and wife, which serves the good of children, the good of spouses, and the common goods of the society (George, Girgis, Sherif and Anderson, 2015).

In all and the African context, marriage could, therefore, be described as a mutual relationship between adult heterosexual individuals (a matured man and woman) to live together as husband and wife, after fulfilling, perhaps, the cultural, religious, social, and legal rights. It means that a “boyfriend” and “girlfriend” relationship or cohabitation cannot be regarded as marriage because the above-stated conditions have not been fulfilled, and it is against the societal moral norms. However, modernization has changed people's perspective of marriage, mainly, in the advanced countries; hence, various views have upheld what constitutes marriage.

Therefore, in whatever perspective marriage being viewed, the fact remains that partners have different roles to play to keep the relationship going. This is because every marriage usually contracted amidst joy, happiness, and merry-making for couples, family members, and friends without having the tools to control all sorts of waves that would want to blow-off the blissful peace (Khan et al 2020; Tahir et al., 2014).

Marriage can be sustained only when it enjoys relative peace and stability, which can be made possible by the partners involved. This implies that as couples are enjoying their marriage, they should be prepared in devising means of handling conflict when it occurs in the relationship. Lukman et al (2019) stated that marriage is more meaningful when it is dynamic and evolving rather than fixed and final. A marriage, for sure, will experience the period of joy and excitement followed by times of struggle, pain, and distance. Therefore, individuals in the relationship must invest in the union through love, total commitment, understanding, tolerance, and full knowledge of what is involved. Thomas (2002) corroborated this when he stated that marriage is more than physical attraction, biological union, and social integration. It involves total commitment, self-donation to one another, and taking responsibilities that lead to mutual well-being.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Several marriages in Nigeria have broken up due to the inadequate negotiation style and communication style of couples. For example, a civil servant in Nigeria divorced his wife due to some questions over the paternity of the two children out of his three children (Song, 2015). The Daily Post (2017) reported a case of a woman who pleaded with an Agege Customary Court, Lagos, to dissolve her nine-year-old marriage because her husband was irresponsible and in the habit of threatening her life with charms. Another report was a woman (of three children) who filed a divorce suit (for 19 years of marriage) over alleged battering by her husband for her refusal to have more children.

Though there are infinite explanations for conflicts, they mostly surround the fundamental wants of all human beings, which includes emotional, physical, intellectual, social, and spiritual (Townsend, 2010). Besides, financial issues, the barrenness of the couple, and the problems of relatives may generate acrimony and misunderstanding within the family. It may not be far from the truth that many of the crises that rock most families were caused by the inability of couples to manage conflicts successfully. Therefore, the most reliable channels for resolving conflicts are communication and negotiation styles because communication is a step towards effective negotiation and problem-solving strategies in a marriage relationship.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study is descriptive research with a structured data collection and analysis using a cross-sectional survey design to validate the developed Measurement of problem solving strategies, negotiation style and communication style on Marital Satisfaction. The goal is that the fully developed and validated scale was used to assess the mediating effect of

negotiation style between problem solving strategies and communication style on Marital Satisfaction among couples in Nigeria. The instrument tagged ‘Negotiation style, problem solving strategies, Communication style and Marital Satisfaction Scales’ were developed by the researchers following the established procedures in the literature. The scale contained 60 items spread among the sixteen (16) sub-constructs (4 in Negotiation Styles, 4 in problem solving strategies 4 in Communication style and 4 in Marital Satisfaction). Four points (4) Likert’s type was adopted throughout the scale. i.e. SD= Strongly Disagree 1; D= Disagree 2; A= Agree 3; SA= Strongly Agree 4.

The participants were the 385 married couple drawn from mostly secondary school teachers as defined in the study’s population in Kwara state Nigeria. The distribution of the participants includes males and females. The consent of the respondents was sort by providing them the informed consent form designed. After obtaining the consent of the respondents, the scale was administer to the selected sample, using purposive sampling techniques by the researchers; the participants’ responses were oblique, score and analyzed.

**OBJECTIVE**

To investigate the mediating role of negotiation styles on the effect of problem-solving strategies and communication styles on marital satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Nigerian.

**HYPOTHESES**

H a: Negotiation styles will significantly mediate the relationship between problem-solving strategies and marital satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Kwara State, Nigeria

H b: Negotiation styles will significantly mediate the relationship between communication styles and marital satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

**RESULTS**

**1. Indicator reliability**

The indicator reliability was measured using item loadings. Items loading of at least 0.7 showed satisfactory indicator reliability for the measurement model. The indicator reliability of the four (4) constructs represented through 16 sub-constructs.

According to an analysis of second-order constructs’ reliability, all the sub-constructs in the measurement model showed loading exceeding 0.7. This is an indication that all the sub-constructs showed exhibited acceptable loadings. The loadings as indicator reliability are shown in Table 1.

Indicator reliability (Cross loadings)						
	Constructs		Loadings			
			PS	MC	NS	MS
1	Compromise	Strategies	0.92			
		(CS)				
2	Avoidance	Strategies (AS)	0.93			
3	Domination	Strategies	0.88			
		(DS)				
4	Submission	Strategies (SS)	0.91			
5	Mutual	Avoidance Styles		0.93		
		(MAS)				
6	Mutual	Discussion Styles		0.86		
		(MDS)				
7	Mutual	Expression Styles		0.90		
		(MES)				
8	Mutual	Blame Styles		0.80		
		(MBS)				
9	Normative	Negotiation			0.81	
		Styles (NNS)				
10	Intuitive	Negotiation			0.77	
		Styles (INS)				
11	Analytic	Negotiation Styles			0.86	

(ANS)		
12 Factual Negotiation Styles (FNS)	0.85	
13 Financial Satisfaction (FS)	0.76	
14 Emotional Satisfaction (ES)	0.84	
15 Companionship Satisfaction (CSE)	0.81	
16 Sexual Satisfaction (SSE)	0.75	

**2. Construct Reliability**

The composite reliability (CR) is used to assess whether the model has satisfactory construct reliability. The CR of each construct presented in this study is more significant than 0.7. As presented in Table 2, all the CRs are above the recommended value of 0.7 to above. Based on these results, the items in the study are a good representative of the constructs with adequate consistent and internal reliability.

Construct Reliability (Composite Reliability)			
Constructs		Loadings	
		PS	MC NS MS
1 Compromise Strategies (CS)	0.96		
2 Avoidance Strategies (AS)	0.95		
3 Domination Strategies (DS)	0.95		
4 Submission Strategies (SS)	0.96		
5 Mutual Avoidance Styles (MAS)		0.95	

6 Mutual Discussion Styles (MDS)	0.93	
7 Mutual Expression Styles (MES)	0.92	
8 Mutual Blame Styles (MBS)	0.90	
9 Normative Negotiation Styles (NNS)	0.89	
10 Intuitive Negotiation Styles (INS)	0.86	
11 Analytic Negotiation Styles (ANS)	0.92	
12 Factual Negotiation Styles (FNS)	0.88	
13 Financial Satisfaction (FS)		0.84
14 Emotional Satisfaction (ES)		0.91
15 Companionship Satisfaction (CSE)		0.88
16 Sexual Satisfaction (SSE)		0.84

**3. Convergent Validity**

To evaluate the convergent validity in PLS, average variance extracted (AVE) were examined, its value is considered the measure of convergent validity and AVE value of 0.5 or higher accepted as the satisfactory convergent validity index in a construct's assessment. The convergent validity index is presented in Table 3 for all the 16 sub-constructs. It is an indication that the proposed model has adequate and acceptable convergent validity.

Convergent Validity (AVE)				
	Second-order Constructs	Loadings		
		PS	MC	NS MS
1	Compromise Strategies (CS)	0.85		
2	Avoidance Strategies (AS)	0.86		
3	Domination Strategies (DS)	0.78		
4	Submission Strategies (SS)	0.83		
5	Mutual Avoidance Styles (MAS)		0.86	
6	Mutual Discussion Styles (MDS)		0.74	
7	Mutual Expression Styles (MES)		0.82	
8	Mutual Blame Styles (MBS)		0.65	
9	Normative Negotiation Styles (NNS)			0.67
10	Intuitive Negotiation Styles (INS)			0.61
11	Analytic Negotiation Styles (ANS)			0.74
12	Factual Negotiation Styles (FNS)			0.72
13	Financial Satisfaction (FS)			0.58
14	Emotional Satisfaction (ES)			0.71
15	Companionship Satisfaction (CSE)			0.66
16	Sexual Satisfaction (SSE)			0.56

**4. Discriminant Validity**

In this study, the evaluation of the discriminant validity of the measurement construct was performed according to the Fornell and Lacker's (1981) principle. A proposed measurement construct is considered to have discriminant validity if the AVE's square root is more than the correlations existing between the considered measure and all other measures. The assessment was performed on the discriminant validity of each construct. The results showed

that all roots of AVE were more than the off-diagonal elements within their corresponding column and row. The bold values in Table 4 indicate the AVE's square roots and other values denote the intercorrelation value existing between the constructs. It indicates that Fornell and Lacker's criterion was met.

Discriminant Validity (Fornell and Lacker's Criterion)																
Sub-Constructs	AN															
	S	AS	CS	CSE	DS	ES	FNS	FS	INS	MA	MB	MD	ME	NN	SS	SSE
Analytic Negotiation Styles (ANS)	<b>0.8</b>															
Avoidance Strategies (AS)	0.6	<b>0.9</b>														
Compromise Strategies (CS)	0.6	0.6	<b>0.9</b>													
Companionship	0.6	0.6	0.5	<b>0.8</b>												
ip	7	6	9	1												

Satisfaction (CSE)																															
Domination Strategies (DS)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	<b>0.8</b>	6	4	8	3	<b>8</b>																					
Emotional Satisfaction (ES)	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	<b>0.8</b>	3	9	2	4	3	<b>4</b>																			
Factual Negotiation Styles (FNS)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	<b>0.8</b>	4	2	6	3	9	0	<b>5</b>																	
Financial Satisfaction (FS)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	<b>0.7</b>	1	1	1	9	8	8	1	<b>6</b>															
Intuitive Negotiation Styles (INS)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.7	<b>0.7</b>	0	6	5	1	0	8	1	4	<b>8</b>													
Mutual Avoidance Styles (MAS)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	<b>0.9</b>	5	4	6	1	4	5	7	5	7	<b>3</b>											
Mutual Blame Styles (MBS)	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.3	<b>0.8</b>	6	5	7	2	6	1	9	0	3	8	<b>0</b>									
Mutual Discussion Styles (MDS)	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	<b>0.8</b>	3	8	2	3	1	1	3	7	7	9	0	<b>6</b>								
Mutual Expression Styles (MES)	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.6	<b>0.9</b>	5	4	7	4	5	4	0	6	6	1	2	6	<b>0</b>				
Normative Negotiation Style (NNS)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	<b>0.8</b>	4	7	0	5	7	4	8	4	4	7	4	6	8	<b>2</b>			
Submission Strategies (SS)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7	<b>0.9</b>	3	7	1	9	6	7	7	7	9	5	3	9	5	0	<b>1</b>	
Sexual Satisfaction (SSE)	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.7	<b>0.7</b>	2	9	4	6	6	9	8	2	8	4	6	9	4	2	5	<b>5</b>

Generally, the measurement assessed in this study showed acceptability with validity and reliability test results presented in the preceding sections. All validity and reliability tests confirmed the entire construct. It indicates that a valid and appropriate construct is presented in this study, and the estimation of parameters within the structural construct is valid. The VAF is evaluated for the mediation of NS and the proportion of mediation referred to as:

**5. Mediation estimates (hypotheses testing a and b)**

The VAF was evaluated for the mediation of NS and NS. The proportion of mediation referred to as:

$$VAF = \frac{\text{Indirect Effect}}{\text{Indirect Effect} + \text{Direct Effect}} = \frac{0.978 \times 0.527}{(0.978 \times 0.527) + 0.217} = 0.743$$

$$VAF = \frac{0.934 \times 0.673}{(0.934 \times 0.673) + 0.217} = 0.703$$

Hypotheses Statement	Beta	p-value	Results
H <sub>4</sub> PSS – NS – MS	0.743	***	Supported
H <sub>5</sub> CS – NS – MS	0.703	***	Supported

Notes: Critical t-values. \*1.96 (P < 0.05); \*\*2.58 (P < 0.01).

**DISCUSSION**

The study examines the validating sixteen constructs and sub-constructs through the psychometric properties of reliability and validity. Indicator, construct reliability was evaluated and convergent validity and discriminant validity were also evaluated for standard and confirmed the entire constructs. The VAF index value of 0.743 reveals that the NS provided 74% of the total effect of PSS on MS, indirectly. Also, the second on the mediation of CS on MS shows clearly VAF value of 0.703; this is an indication that about 70% of the total effect CS on MS was indirectly provided by NS. Based on this analysis, all the two hypotheses on the median have been being accepted Hair 2014, De Vries 2009).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the analysis revealed, all the indices evaluated were entirely accepted and were used to determine the effect of mediating of NS between PSS and CS on MS. Based on the results NS was recommended for Nigeria couples mostly married secondary school teachers to adopt NS as intervening option to resolve their grievances Lukman (2020). The marital counselor should employ NS as a mediating option to help the couples to resolve their problem the same as religious leaders to leave together in peace, not in pieces.

**REFERENCES**

- Bernardo, A. B. I., Salanga, M. G. C., Tjipto, S., Hutapea, B., Yeung, S. S., & Khan, A. (2016). Contrasting lay theories of polyculturalism and multiculturalism: Associations with essentialist beliefs of race in six Asian cultural groups. *Cross Cultural Research*, 50 (3), 231–250.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., Salanga, M. G. C., Khan, A., & Yeung, S. S. (2016). Internal and external loci-of-hope predict use of individual and collaborative learning strategies: Evidence from university learners in four Asian cities. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25 (3), 367-376.
- Boston Globe (2017). The study identifies communication patterns beneficial for couples affected by Alzheimer's. Retrieved from <http://www.bridgesbyepoch.com/>
- David H. Knox (1979). *Exploring Marriage and the Family* (Pennsylvania: Foresman Scott, 1979), p.5
- Daily Post (2017). *My husband threatens my life with charms: Woman tells the court*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailypost.com>
- DeVries, T.J. (2009). *Measuring communication styles*. Retrieved on 06/09/2017 from Child Teodora-Academia.edu.

7. Dube, N., Nkomo, T. S., and Khosa, P. (2017). Condom usage negotiation among customarily married women in Katlehong, Johannesburg. *Sage Journal*, Retrieved from <http://www.journalsage.pub.com/>.
8. <http://www.journalsage.pub.com/>.
9. George, R., Girgis, S., and Anderson, R. T. (2015). *What is marriage?* Retrieved from <http://www.catholiceducation.org/en/controversy/marriage/what-is-marriage.html>.
10. Hair Jr, J. F; Hult, G. T. M, Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS M)*. Sage Publications
11. Haviland, W. A., Herald, p. E. L., Bunny, M., and Dana, A. (2011). *Cultural anthropology: The human challenge* (13<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Cengage Learning.
12. Hill, G. N., and Hill, K. T. (2005). *Marriage*. Retrieved from <http://www.hillmarriage.com>.
13. Khan, A., et al. (2020). Mediating Effect of Positive Psychological Strength and Study Skills on Examination Anxiety among Nigerian College Students. *Sustainability*, 12, 1479.
14. Lukman F, Khan A, Latif AB, Salleh Rosman A, Kosnin AM, Mokhtar M, Ayodeji A Determinants of Marital Adjustment among Married Persons in Ogbomosho Metropolis. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*.2019; 10(4):1354-8.
15. Lukman, F., Khan, A, Latif A. Abdul, Bichi, A. A, (2019). Validating the Measurement Model of Problem Solving Strategies and Communication Style among Secondary School Teachers in Kwara State. *India Public Health Research and Development*, Volume: 10, Issue: 9, 1927-1932.
16. Lukman, F., Khan, A, & Ayodeji, A. A. (2019). Factors Influence Career Progression of Working-Class Married Women in Oyo. *India Public Health Research and Development*. Volume: 10, Issue: 4 , 1365-1370.
17. Ndolo, I. S. (2006). *Interpersonal communication: Selected readings in relationships*. Enugu, Nigeria: Grace Publisher
18. Song, W. (2015). *Conflict-solving orientation and goal management: Effectiveness of opening messages in interpersonal conflict*. A published Ph.D. thesis, Graduate School of the Ohio State University
19. Sweet land, R. (2018) Conflict Resolution, Problem Solving, and mediation. Retrieve on 12/11/ 2018.From <http://www.homeofbob.com/cma/nintrvatasiconflictindex.html>.
20. Tahir, L., Mohd Said, M.N.H., Daud, K., Vazhathodi, S.H., & Khan, A. (2014). The Benefits of Headship Mentoring: An Analysis of Malaysian Novice Head teachers' Perceptions. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44, 420-450.
21. Thomas, K. (2011). *How does non-verbal communication affect relationships?* Retrieved 16 December 2014 from <http://www.counsellingonlinesite.com/2012/04/how-does-non-verbal-communication-affect-relationship/>.
22. Townsend, M. (2010). *Starved Stuff: Feeding the 7 basic needs of healthy relationships*. New York: Townsend Relationship Center.
23. Undiyaundeye, F., and Ugal, O.S. (2006). The effect of conflict management skills on marital stability among literate couples in Odudu Local Government Area of Cross River State. *The Counsellor*, 22, 91- 99.
24. Walter, A. G. (2012). *What does a happy marriage make? Men and women tell a different story*. Retrieved on 26/11/2018 from <http://www.forbes.com>