

## THE SAVORING BELIEFS INVENTORY: AN ADAPTATION STUDY OF THE SBI IN THE TURKISH CULTURAL CONTEXT

IREM METIN-ORTA  
ATILIM UNIVERSITY

---

Savoring is an individual propensity to focus on and enjoy past, current, and future positive events. It emerges as an important construct in promoting and boosting the intensity of positive affect. This study aims to examine the psychometric properties of the Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI) in a sample of Turkish university students. A total of 456 participants were administered measures of savoring beliefs, self-esteem, life satisfaction, perceived stress, positive and negative affectivity. The results showed that the SBI presents one-factor structure rather than the three-factor structure found in the past research. The scale yields good internal consistency. In addition, savoring beliefs are positively correlated with self-esteem, life satisfaction, and positive affectivity, while negatively correlating with perceived stress and negative affectivity. The present findings show that the SBI is a reliable and valid measure of individuals' beliefs about their capacity to savor positive experiences for a Turkish sample.

Key words: Savoring beliefs; Positive psychology; Subjective well-being; The Savoring Beliefs Inventory; Turkish validation of the Savoring Beliefs Inventory.

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Irem Metin-Orta, Department of Psychology, Atılım University, Kızılcaşar Mah., Incek, Golbasi 06836, Ankara, Turkey. Email: irem.metin@atilim.edu.tr*

---

The renewed interest in positive psychology research proposes that rather than addressing the processes of how individuals cope with negative experiences or survive under stress and adversity, it is more important to deal with how they achieve and express positive features (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The study of positive experience is essential in various disciplines as it has been related to the psychological well-being of individuals. Growing evidence suggests that experiencing and maintaining positive emotions contribute to both individual and organizational desirable outcomes including better physical and mental health (Wood, Heimpel, & Michela, 2003), happiness, optimism, creative thinking, efficient problem-solving processes (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2000), effective coping styles in stressful situations, academic achievement and cooperation (Seligman, 2002; Wood et al., 2003). Despite the vast amount of research in regulating and coping with negative experiences, little research has been devoted to positive affect and its regulation (Diener, 1984; Wood et al., 2003). Such a need has driven scholars to direct their efforts toward several constructs that aid in sustaining and enhancing positive emotions and exploring individual characteristics, subjective experiences, and possible mechanisms which optimize the well-functioning of human beings in promoting positive affects (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

In line with this evidence of interest, Bryant (1989, 2003) designated the term “savouring,” originating from the Latin word “sapere” meaning “to taste” or “to have good taste” (Bryant & Veroff, 2007, p.3). Researchers, in general, use this concept in referring to the process by

which individuals cultivate the experience of positive feelings. The main underlying assumption is that individuals have “the capacity to attend, appreciate and enhance the experience of positive emotions” (Bryant & Veroff, 2007, p. 2). Savoring, at the conceptual level, has been regarded as a new model of positive emotional experience that affects the relationship between positive events and the individual’s positive emotional reactions to these events (Jose, Tim, & Bryant, 2012). Based upon positive psychology, it has been defined as an individual propensity to focus on and enjoy past, current, and future positive events (Bryant, 1989, 2003).

In order to fully understand the concept of “savoring,” it is important to distinguish it from other constructs. Savoring is related to pleasure yet it is different from it to some extent (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). The experience of pleasure does not necessarily involve savoring. Nevertheless, it involves mindful awareness of enjoyment and conscious attention to the experience of pleasure. Different from coping with negative outcomes, it acts as a type of perceived control over positive emotions where one prolongs the enjoyment of positive events (Bryant, 1989). Bryant (2003) notes that individuals make their own evaluations of their capacities to avoid and cope with negative outcomes and to savor positive outcomes. However, coping with negative outcomes does not guarantee positive subjective well-being. Accordingly, his research demonstrates that a large majority of individuals is capable of coping but not savoring. It is also argued that experiencing positive events does not necessarily imply that an individual is capable of savoring those events. More specifically, the management of positive emotions requires regulation, manipulation, and sustainment of emotions. Therefore, a detailed comprehension of individual differences in savoring capabilities may contribute to our understanding of signaling the positive functioning of those individuals.

#### PRIOR RESEARCH IN ASSESSING SAVORING

Scholars have developed several instruments to measure individuals’ beliefs about their savoring capacity. The earlier measure of savoring beliefs, the unidimensional Perceived Ability to Savor Positive Outcomes scale (PASPO; Bryant, 1989), included five items (i.e., “When good things have happened in your life, how much do you feel you have typically been able to appreciate or enjoy them?”) that assess experience of positive emotions in general. A more commonly used instrument, the Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI; Bryant, 2003), consists of 24 items that assess the savoring beliefs of individuals with three temporal components: *savoring through anticipation* refers to individuals’ tendency to look forward to future events in ways that generate positive feelings before an upcoming good event actually occurs; *savoring the moment* refers to individuals’ tendency to intensify or prolong their positive feelings through specific thoughts and behaviors during a positive event; and *savoring through reminiscence* refers to individuals’ tendency to look back on ways that prolong or rekindle positive feelings after a good event is over. According to Bryant (2003), measuring individuals’ beliefs about savoring with three temporal components strengthens such beliefs. The SBI provides both a total global score for people’s overall beliefs about savoring and three separate scores for past-, present-, and future-focused forms of savoring. In past studies, it was revealed that the SBI total score and the three subscale scores correlated strongly with those from PASPO scale (Bryant, 2003). The instrument has also

been adapted for children (e.g., Children's Savoring Beliefs Inventory, CSBI; Cafasso, 1994; Cafasso, Bryant, & Jose, 1994, as cited in Bryant & Veroff, 2007).

In the USA, several studies have been conducted to explore the psychometric properties of the SBI among adolescents and adults. In these studies, the SBI was found to be a measure with good psychometric qualities. In particular, the confirmatory factor analyses using a sample of 415 college students (Bryant, 2003) revealed that the three temporal factors and two method factors with positively and negatively worded items provided an adequate fit to the data. Bryant also revealed high internal consistency, test-retest reliability, good convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity for this scale. In particular, he showed that the SBI scores were positively correlated with affect intensity, extraversion, optimism, internal locus of control, reported self-control behaviors, value fulfilment, life satisfaction, self-esteem, happiness; negatively correlated with hopelessness, neuroticism, guilt, anhedonia, depression, unhappy and neutral affect, but not correlated with socially desirable responding. Furthermore, earlier savoring belief scores predicted college students' behaviors and affects in looking forward to, enjoying the actual experience of, and looking back on a positive experience (i.e., Christmas vacation). More importantly, each temporal subscale predicted students' behaviors and affects in the relevant time frame, indicating prospective validity of the scale.

Furthermore, SBI has been used in a number of studies in relating the savoring concept to several outcomes (Bryant & Yarnold, 2014; Ford, Klibert, Tarantino, & Lamis, 2017; Gentzler, Palmer, & Ramsey, 2016; Hurley & Kwon, 2013; Lin, Chen, & Wang, 2011; Metin Camgoz, 2014; Smith & Bryant, 2015, 2016a, 2016b; Smith & Hollinger-Smith, 2015). In one of these studies, researchers explored the differences between Type A and Type B individuals in terms of their abilities to savor positive experiences, and revealed that Type A individuals had greater reminiscence, anticipation, and savoring the moment scores than Type B individuals (Bryant & Yarnold, 2014). In other studies, the impact of savoring was examined on work-family conflict among Turkish dual-earner employees (Metin Camgoz, 2014) and on perceived job performance among Taiwanese insurance salespeople (Lin et al., 2011). The results of Lin et al. revealed that people with higher scores in savoring beliefs experience higher perceived job performance. Furthermore, in Metin Camgoz's (2014) study, only present-focused (but not past- and future-focused) savoring beliefs were found to be correlated with levels of work-family conflict, indicating that people who appreciate enjoyable life events, when they are occurring, were more likely to buffer from the negative impact of work-family conflict.

In another study conducted on momentary savoring responses (i.e., amplifying and dampening responses), researchers examined how savoring influences the relationship between daily positive events and daily happiness (Jose et al., 2012). They found that people who savor daily positive events experience a greater boost in happiness, and higher levels of savoring enhance positive mood more than lower levels of savoring when pleasant daily events are rare. Similarly, three behavioral savoring responses (i.e., natural savoring, intentional savoring, and dampening responses) are positively associated with the value of happiness (Gentzler et al., 2016), and reminiscing about pleasant memories increases levels of happiness (Bryant, Smart, & King, 2005).

Further, researches revealed that people with a higher savoring capacity experience greater happiness, life satisfaction, and lower depression among older adults (Smith & Bryant, 2015, 2016a, 2016b; Smith & Hollinger-Smith, 2015). In specific terms, the relationship between

savoring and psychological well-being is stronger among those with lower resilience (Smith & Hollinger-Smith, 2015). In a related vein, people with lower scores in savoring the moment subscale and fewer daily positive events (uplifts) experience the lowest levels of positive affect and life satisfaction (Hurley & Kwon, 2013). These findings indicate that savoring enhances the impact of positive events most when such events are rare (Hurley & Kwon, 2013; Jose et al., 2012).

Recent studies also indicate the protective role of savoring beliefs on depression (Ford et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2017; Hurley & Kwon, 2012; Smith & Hanni, 2017). For instance, the relationship between negative life events and depression is less strong when savoring is higher (Ford et al., 2017). Furthermore, savoring moderates the relationship between the physical symptoms and depression among patients diagnosed with cancer (Hou et al., 2017). Therefore, interventions that strengthen their ability to savor positive emotions might be beneficial in decreasing distress and depression. Consistent with this notion, researchers revealed that people who undergo savoring-the-moment intervention experience decrease in depressive symptoms and negative affect as compared to those who do not receive such intervention (Hurley & Kwon, 2012). In particular, a one-week savoring intervention enhances older adults' resilience and psychological well-being through decreased levels of depressive symptoms and increased levels of happiness (Smith & Hanni, 2017).

#### THE AIM OF THE CURRENT STUDY

Even though the perceived ability of savoring, its correlates, and consequences have been examined in several studies, only a handful of work has been devoted to investigating the psychometric qualities of the SBI in a non-English speaking country (i.e., Chinese; Lin et al., 2011). However, the validation of an instrument for assessing the savoring capacity of individuals across cultures might be beneficial in diagnosing, evaluating, and managing the effectiveness of positive experiences for a wide range of populations including researchers, clinicians, educators, and workers in different contexts. In particular, it might help researchers and practitioners to identify the impact of savoring beliefs on enhancing academic outcomes in educational settings and work outcomes in organizational ones. Besides, it may help clinicians to diagnose their clients' problems in managing positive emotions and understand the efficacy of therapeutic interventions which promote savoring skills (Bryant, 2003; Hurley & Kwon, 2012). The purpose of the present study is to investigate the psychometric properties of the Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI) in a sample of university students in Turkey. It has three specific aims: (a) to translate and adapt the original scale into Turkish, (b) to examine the reliability and validity of the scale in a sample of university students, and (c) to evaluate gender differences in savoring beliefs.

#### METHOD

##### Participants

Based on convenience sampling, a total of 456 undergraduate and graduate students were selected from three Turkish universities located in the capital city, Ankara. The mean age of the

participants was 22.6 ( $SD = 3.5$ , range = 18-41 years). Sixty-five percent was female and 35% was male. The majority of the participants comprised undergraduate students (79.2%). The students were enrolled in the departments of psychology (36%), business administration (34.2%), economics (8.6%), sociology (5.5%), engineering (3.5%), statistics (3.5%), and other departments (8.7%).

### Measures

The data were collected via a questionnaire including demographic questions (age, gender, university, and department) and measures of savoring beliefs, self-esteem, life satisfaction, positive and negative affectivity, and perceived stress.

*Savoring Belief Inventory* (SBI; Bryant, 2003). Savoring Belief Inventory assesses an individual's ability to savor positive experiences. The 24-item scale includes three temporal forms of savoring: "savoring in the present moment" (i.e., "I feel fully able to appreciate good things"), "savoring through anticipation" (i.e., "I feel a joy of anticipation when I think about upcoming good things"), and "savoring through reminiscence about past positive events" (i.e., "I enjoy looking back on happy times from my past"). The respondents rated how much they agreed with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Each subscale consists of eight items, half of which is negatively worded. The composite scores for the SBI total and for each subscale are obtained through averaging the items after rescored the reverse (negatively worded) ones. Thus, the higher scores are indicators of a greater perceived ability to savor positive experiences.

The 24-item SBI is a reliable and valid measure of people's beliefs about their capacity to enjoy positive events. In Bryant's (2003) study, the original scale yielded high internal consistency, strong temporal reliability, and good convergent and discriminant validity among four different samples of college students. In particular, the internal reliability coefficients of the original scale were within the range of .88 and .94 for the SBI total, .68 and .84 for anticipating, .68 and .89 for savoring the moment, and .75 and .84 for reminiscing factors. The test-retest correlations were .84 for the SBI total, .80 for anticipating, .88 for savoring the moment, and .85 for reminiscing factors. The scale also showed good prospective validity by showing that the savoring belief scores on the corresponding temporal subscales predicted college students' actual behaviors and affects before, during, and after a positive event (i.e., Christmas vacation). In addition, it was cross-validated among older adults by showing that savoring beliefs correlate with measures of happiness.

Items of the SBI were translated into Turkish by three independent native English-speaking translators fluent in Turkish, and then reviewed by three native Turkish-speaking psychologists fluent in English to check for accuracy. Any discrepancies were carefully discussed by the three translators and the three psychologists, and then resolved by joint agreement. Back-translation of the final draft was performed by an independent bilingual psychologist, revealing semantically similar items with the original scale.

*Perceived Stress Scale* (PSS; Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). The participants' perceived stress was measured by the 10-item version of the PSS. The scale includes two subscales: the helplessness subscale consists of six items (i.e., "In the last month, how often have



you felt nervous or stressed?”); the perceived self-efficacy subscale consists of four items (i.e., “How often have you felt confident about your ability to handle personal problems?”). The respondents are invited to rate items on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*). Higher scores indicate greater overall distress. Öricü and Demir (2009) adapted the instrument into Turkish, showing internal consistency coefficients of .84 for the PSS total, .83 for the helplessness subscale, and .71 for the perceived self-efficacy subscale. In the present study, alpha coefficients were .86 for the PSS total, .83 for the helplessness subscale, and .73 for the perceived self-efficacy subscale.

*Positive and Negative Affect Scale.* The participants’ positive and negative affectivity was measured by the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988). Respondents are invited to rate how frequently they experience positive feelings (i.e., PA: “enthusiastic,” “alert”) and negative feelings (i.e., NA: “anger,” “guilt”) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Gençöz (2000) adapted the instrument into Turkish and showed internal consistency coefficients of .83 for the PA subscale and .86 for the NA subscale. In the present study, alpha coefficients were .79 for PA and .81 for NA.

*Satisfaction with Life Scale.* Participants’ general sense of satisfaction with their life was assessed by the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985). The scale contains five items (e.g., “I am satisfied with my life”). The respondents are invited to rate items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not appropriate*) to 7 (*very appropriate*) with higher scores indicating greater life satisfaction. Durak, Şenol-Durak, and Gençöz (2010) adapted the instrument into Turkish, showing an internal consistency coefficient of .81. In the present study, the alpha coefficient was .83.

*Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES).* The participants’ self-esteem was measured by Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale. The respondents rated 10 items (e.g., “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”) on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of self-esteem. Çuhadaroglu (1986) adapted the instrument into Turkish and yielded an internal consistency coefficient of .71. In the present study, alpha was .89.

## Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission to use the scale was obtained from the author who developed the original scale. All procedures were approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board. The data were collected among students of three Turkish universities located in the capital city, Ankara. All the respondents voluntarily participated in the study, signed an informed consent form, and were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. The questionnaires including the demographic questions and scales were administered in classroom settings, and the students received extra credit for their participation which took about 10-15 minutes.

## Data Analysis Strategy

In order to examine the factor structure of the SBI, both exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were utilized. In the former, an oblique rotation was performed, whereas in the latter, the covariance matrix was used as an input and the

maximum likelihood estimation was employed via the LISREL 8.51 program (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). The goodness of fit of the model was assessed by applying the following indices:  $\chi^2$ ,  $\chi^2/df$ , standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and comparative fit index (CFI). We used the following rules of thumb:  $\chi^2/df$  ratio should be less than 3; SRMR should be equal or lower than .08; CFI should be equal or higher than .95 (see, Hu & Bentler, 1999). In addition, the convergent validity of the SBI was examined through bivariate correlations between the savoring beliefs and conceptually related measures including self-esteem, life satisfaction, perceived stress, positive and negative affectivity.

## RESULTS

### Reliability Analysis and Descriptive Statistics

First, a reliability analysis was conducted, revealing that one of the items (Item 24) had a low item-total correlation and thus, removed from the scale. The version of the scale with 23 items yielded good internal consistency, with alpha coefficients of .91 for the SBI total, .82 for the anticipating factor, .84 for the savoring the moment factor, and .82 for the reminiscing factor. Similar to past studies (Bryant, 2003; Metin Camgoz, 2014), the total scale was more consistent than the three temporal subscales. The split-half reliability of the scale, with the Spearman-Brown correction, was .87. The item-total-correlation coefficients were satisfactory as well, ranging between .39 (Item 4) to .68 (Item 11). Overall, the participants displayed moderate-to-high levels of savoring beliefs in the total SBI scale ( $M = 5.40$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), in the anticipating factor ( $M = 5.51$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ), in the savoring the moment factor ( $M = 5.00$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ), and in the reminiscing factor ( $M = 5.70$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ).

Gender differences in savoring beliefs were examined. Studies in the past revealed greater capacity among women to savor compared to men (Bryant, 2003; Bryant et al. 2005; Bryant & Veroff, 2007; Gentzler et al., 2016). Accordingly, the results of the current study showed a significant gender difference in multivariate analysis,  $F(3, 447) = 12.57$ ,  $p < .001$ . In line with previous findings (Bryant, 2003), women scored higher than men on the total SBI ( $M_{\text{women}} = 5.52$ ,  $M_{\text{men}} = 5.16$ ),  $F(1,449) = 18.39$ ,  $p < .001$ , the anticipating factor ( $M_{\text{women}} = 5.68$ ,  $M_{\text{men}} = 5.19$ ),  $F(1,449) = 30.19$ ,  $p < .001$ , and the reminiscing factor ( $M_{\text{women}} = 5.82$ ,  $M_{\text{men}} = 5.42$ ),  $F(1,449) = 18.73$ ,  $p < .001$ . However, gender difference was not significant for the savoring the moment factor ( $M_{\text{women}} = 5.09$ ,  $M_{\text{men}} = 4.90$ ),  $F(1,449) = 2.94$ ,  $p = .09$ .

### Factor Structure

#### *Exploratory Factor Analysis*

The factor structure of the scale was first examined by an exploratory factor analysis using the principal-axis factoring extraction method. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value (.92) and the significant Bartlett test result,  $\chi^2(276) = 4324.71$ ,  $p < .001$ , indicated that the sample is pertinent for factor analysis. The initial factor solution, when no restriction was made upon factor numbers, yielded five factors with eigenvalues greater than one. One dominant factor accounted for 34.5% of the variance, followed by other factors accounting for 7.7%, 5.9%, 5.1%, and 4.2%

of the variance. The inspection of the scree-plot indicated one factor assessing individuals' savoring beliefs. Having tested a single factor solution, one item (Item 24) was omitted from the scale since it had low communality (.06) and low item-total correlation (.23). The loadings obtained as a result of EFA are presented in Table 1.

### *Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

Confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) was conducted to evaluate the goodness of fit of the following alternative models: (1) a global, one-factor model of savoring; (2) a three-factor model consisting of anticipating, savoring the moment, and reminiscing factors; (3) a two-factor model consisting of positively and negatively anchored items. As a first step, a confirmatory factor model with all the items clustering under a single latent variable was tested. Modification indexes suggested adding an error covariance between Items 3-9, 12-18, and 6-21. These items showed overlap in the meaning. In addition, Item 24 was removed due to its low loading. After these modifications and the removal of one item, the single factor model showed a better fit to the data:  $\chi^2(227, N = 456) = 684.98, p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 3.01$ ; SRMR = .07; CFI = .95.

In the next step, the original three-factor model (anticipating, savoring the moment, and reminiscing) was tested. In this model, eight items related to savoring through anticipation, eight items related to savoring the moment, and another eight related to savoring through reminiscence were specified. The three-factor model yielded an acceptable fit to the data. Modification indexes suggested adding an error covariance between Items 3-9, 12-18, and 6-21. After this addition and the removal of Item 24, the following goodness-of-fit indexes were obtained:  $\chi^2(224, N = 456) = 687.94, p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 3.07$ ; SRMR = .07; CFI = .95. The three latent factors were positively and strongly correlated. 'Anticipating' was positively correlated with 'savoring the moment' ( $r = .59, p < .001$ ) and 'reminiscing' ( $r = .65, p < .001$ ). 'Savoring the moment' was positively correlated with 'reminiscing' ( $r = .63, p < .001$ ).

Finally, the two-factor model was tested. In this model, 12 positively worded items (positive factor) and 12 negatively worded items (negative factor) were specified. This model yielded an acceptable fit to the data. Modification indexes suggested a residual correlation between Items 3-9 in the positive factor, and between Items 12-18 and 16-22 in the negative factor. After this addition and the removal of Item 24, the following goodness-of-fit indexes were obtained:  $\chi^2(226, N = 456) = 687.90, p < .001$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 3.04$ ; SRMR = .08; CFI = .95. When the three models were compared, a decrease in AIC indicated that the one-factor model (AIC = 782) had a better fit than the two-factor model (AIC = 787) and the three-factor model (AIC = 791). Overall, the results of the CFA analysis provided more support for a one-factor structure of the SBI.

### *Convergent Validity*

In general, convergent validity exists "if the scores on measures that assess similar or related constructs are correlated," and discriminant validity exists "if the scores on measures that



TABLE 1  
Results of exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis on the SBI items

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Factor Loadings	
			EFA	CFA
Item 1	5.79	1.28	.43	.48
Item 2	4.42	1.77	.49	.47
Item 3	6.18	1.13	.57	.62
Item 4	5.41	1.63	.43	.63
Item 5	5.76	1.32	.63	.63
Item 6	5.98	1.33	.55	.55
Item 7	5.72	1.26	.68	.75
Item 8	5.13	1.69	.60	.64
Item 9	5.72	1.24	.72	.76
Item 10	5.65	1.41	.59	.60
Item 11	5.35	1.31	.74	.76
Item 12	5.41	1.62	.58	.63
Item 13	5.25	1.40	.66	.71
Item 14	5.04	1.72	.65	.57
Item 15	5.61	1.28	.64	.68
Item 16	5.20	1.53	.53	.65
Item 17	5.12	1.43	.63	.63
Item 18	5.87	1.40	.62	.52
Item 19	5.58	1.29	.69	.76
Item 20	4.75	1.77	.53	.33
Item 21	5.02	1.44	.64	.44
Item 22	5.50	1.51	.58	.66
Item 23	4.72	1.56	.46	.50

*Note.* The 23 items are reported in Bryant (2003), and there is correspondence between the number of the item in Bryant's and the number of the item in this table.

assess dissimilar or unrelated constructs are not correlated" (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010, p. 197). Accordingly, correlational analyses were conducted between savoring beliefs and conceptually related measures in order to examine the convergent validity of the scale. In a previous research (Bryant, 2003), savoring beliefs was correlated with individual difference variables (i.e., affect intensity, extraversion, optimism, and neuroticism), control beliefs (i.e., internal locus of control), and dimensions of subjective adjustment (i.e., happiness, self-esteem, depression). Similarly, self-esteem, life satisfaction, perceived stress, and positive/negative affectivity were used as criteria for validation, due to their hypothesized relationship with beliefs about savoring. For instance, it is expected that people with a greater capacity to derive pleasure from positive events should experience more positive affectivity, have higher self-esteem and life satisfaction. Additionally, people with greater capacity to savor beliefs should experience less negative affectivity and less perceived stress.

The Pearson's  $r$  coefficients indicated the scale's convergent validity. In particular, correlations revealed that the SBI total score was positively correlated with self-esteem ( $r = .49, p < .001$ ), life satisfaction ( $r = .44, p < .001$ ), and positive affectivity ( $r = .42, p < .001$ ). Furthermore, it was negatively correlated with perceived stress ( $r = -.31, p < .001$ ) and negative affectivity ( $r = -.37, p < .001$ ). Overall, participants with greater capacity to derive pleasure from positive events were shown to experience more positive and less negative affectivity, have higher levels of self-esteem and life satisfaction, and have lower levels of perceived stress.

## DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to adapt and examine the psychometric properties of the SBI in a sample of university students, and also to evaluate the plausible gender differences in savoring beliefs. Inconsistent with the past findings from samples in the USA (i.e., Bryant, 2003), the current study provided more support for a single-factor structure of savoring beliefs. The three-dimensional structure of savoring beliefs in the original scale was not clearly differentiated in the Turkish context. That is, individuals could not distinguish the experiences of positive feelings during a good event from those related to reconsidering the past events and anticipating the future events. In this respect, the present study calls into question the strength of the tripartite model of savoring. Past research (Bryant, 2003; Metin Camgoz, 2014) also yielded mixed empirical support for the distinction between the three forms of savoring. Bryant suggested that it might be due to relatively strong correlations between temporal factors and the overlap between the present-focused and past-focused savoring beliefs. In addition, the distinction between the three temporal factors might be more relevant for clinical groups (i.e., individuals with depression, schizophrenia) than non-clinical, healthy groups. Thus, future research on diverse samples might provide better explanations for the distinction among these three temporal forms of savoring beliefs.

The present findings show adequate levels of internal consistency and good convergent validity. In particular, the total SBI score correlated positively with self-esteem, life satisfaction, and positive affectivity, while it correlated negatively with perceived stress and negative affectivity. This finding is consistent with prior research, which showed significant relations between savoring beliefs with different measures of subjective adjustment (Bryant, 2003; Hurley & Kwon, 2013; Smith & Bryant, 2015, 2016a, 2016b; Smith & Hollinger-Smith, 2015) as well as relations between savoring beliefs and work-family conflict (Metin Camgoz, 2014). Therefore, interventions that attempt to promote generation and intensification of the enjoyment of positive events might be beneficial for individual well-being (Hurley & Kwon, 2012; Smith & Hanni, 2017). Gender difference in savoring beliefs was also in congruence with the previous research (Bryant, 2003; Bryant et al. 2005; Bryant & Veroff, 2007; Gentzler et al., 2016). That is, women scored higher than men on the total SBI score. Overall, findings indicate that women are more able than men to savor positive experiences.

As mentioned earlier, savoring is an important ability related to positive psychological outcomes. Accordingly, the validation of this instrument has important theoretical and practical implications for researchers, clinicians, educators, and workers. For instance, this tool might be used to understand the predictive validity of savoring on students' academic achievement as well as employees' job satisfaction and performance. Given that positive affect, mainly happiness, increases among people who show greater perceived ability to savor positive experiences (Bryant et al., 2005;

Gentzler et al., 2016; Jose et al., 2012; Smith & Bryant, 2016a; Smith & Hollinger-Smith, 2015), it can be argued that this ability can promote performance and satisfaction in educational and organizational settings. Furthermore, savoring beliefs might play an adaptive role specially for college-aged adults who need to cope with demands of life's new challenges, and for employees who need to cope with stressful job-related demands. Therefore, examining the relationship between savoring with academic outcomes and work outcomes may be a promising avenue for future research.

Besides, this tool might be used to identify the clients' problems in managing positive emotions (Bryant, 2003). For instance, the inability to savor positive experiences might play a role in the development of mood disorders such as depression. By using this tool, clinicians might also evaluate the impact of interventions that teach effective strategies for savoring positive experiences (Bryant, 2003; Hurley & Kwon, 2012; Smith & Hanni, 2017), which is specially necessary when the frequency of positive life events is low (Hurley & Kwon, 2013; Jose et al., 2012). Finally, using this tool, researchers may further address certain important, yet unresolved, questions including the neuropsychological foundation of savoring, its correlation with personality traits (i.e., Bryant et al., 2005), its role as a mediator (i.e., Smith & Bryant, 2016a), and how this ability develops throughout life span (i.e., Bryant, Chadwick, & Kluwe, 2011).

This study has also its limitations, one of which is the use of convenience sampling. The sample of the current study includes university students selected from three different universities in the capital city of Turkey. Basically, this type of sample is limited in age range, while the students share similar socioeconomic status, thereby, restricting the generalizability of the findings. Thus, continuing the efforts to collect data in diverse populations (work settings, clinical settings) as well as to link savoring beliefs to older age groups and a broader array of criterion measures (including health and physical functioning) may be useful to extend the generalizability of the study. Likewise, future studies could carry out cross-cultural studies using samples with different cultures to establish the construct validity of the instrument and its usefulness in different sociocultural contexts. The other limitations are related with the mere use of self-report measures which might lead to common method bias, and the cross-sectional nature of the study. In order to establish the prospective validity of the SBI, there exists the need for longitudinal research examining individuals' actual behaviors and affects in anticipating, experiencing, and recalling a positive event (i.e., Bryant, 2003). Finally, the current study did not examine the test-retest reliability.

As a concluding remark, the Turkish adaptation of the SBI shows promise as a measurement tool for assessing an individual's ability to savor positive emotions, and can be used by practitioners and researchers. In other words, the validation of this scale in Turkish enables future cross-cultural studies where savoring beliefs of university students can be researched even further in terms of examining its correlates and consequences across an array of populations. This work also expands the external validity of the SBI as a measure of savoring beliefs by demonstrating its relevance within an important non-Western culture.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Selin Metin Camgöz and Dr. Pınar Bayhan Karapınar for assisting in the design of the study and collection of the data. I would also like to express special appreciation to Dr. Fred B. Bryant for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- Bryant, F. B. (1989). A four-factor model of perceived control: Avoiding, coping, obtaining and savoring. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 773-797. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.ep8970859
- Bryant, F. B. (2003). Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI): A scale for measuring beliefs about savouring. *Journal of Mental Health*, 12, 175-196. doi:10.1080/0963823031000103489
- Bryant, F. B., Chadwick, E. D., & Kluwe, K. (2011). Understanding the processes that regulate positive emotional experience: Unsolved problems and future directions for theory and research on savoring. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1, 107-126. doi:10.5502/ijw.v1i1.18
- Bryant, F. B., Smart, C. M., & King, S. P. (2005). Using the past to enhance the present: Boosting happiness through positive reminiscence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 227-260. doi:10.1007/s10902-005-3889-4
- Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. (2007). *Savoring: A new model of positive experience*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bryant, F. B., & Yarnold, P. R. (2014). Finding joy in the past, present and future: The relationship between Type A behavior and savoring beliefs among college undergraduates. *Optimal Data Analysis*, 3(10), 36-41.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24, 385-396. doi:10.2307/2136404
- Cohen, R. J., & Swerdlik, M. E. (2010). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests & measurement* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Çuhadaroglu, F. (1986). *Self esteem among adolescents* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). Satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Durak, M., Senol-Durak, E., & Gençöz, T. (2010). Psychometric properties of the satisfaction with life scale among Turkish university students, correctional officers and elderly adults. *Social Indicators Research*, 99, 413-429. doi:10.1007/s11205-010-9589-4
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. (2000). Positive affect and the other side of coping. *American Psychologist*, 55, 647-654. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.6.647
- Ford, J., Klibert, J. J., Tarantino, N., & Lamis, N. N. (2017). Savouring and self-compassion as protective factors for depression. *Stress & Health*, 33, 119-128. doi:10.1002/smi.2687
- Gençöz, T. (2000). Positive and negative affect schedule: A study of validity and reliability. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 15(46), 19-28.
- Gentzler, A. L., Palmer, C. A., & Ramsey, M. A. (2016). Savoring with intent: Investigating types of and motives for responses to positive events. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17, 937-958. doi:10.1007/s10902-015-9625-9
- Hou, W. K., Lau, K. M., Ng, S. M., Cheng, A. C. K., Shum, T. C. Y., Cheng, S. T., & Cheung, H. Y. S. (2017). Savoring moderates the association between cancer-specific physical symptoms and depressive symptoms. *Psycho-oncology*, 26, 231-238. doi:10.1002/pon.4114
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Hurley, D. B., & Kwon, P. (2012). Results of a study to increase savoring the moment: Differential impact on positive and negative outcomes. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13, 579-588. doi:10.1007/s10902-011-9280-8
- Hurley, D. B., & Kwon, P. (2013). Savoring helps most when you have little: Interaction between savoring the moment, uplifts on positive affect and satisfaction with life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14, 1261-1271. doi:10.1007/s10902-012-9377-8
- Jose, P. E., Tim, B., & Bryant, F. B. (2012). Does savoring increase happiness? A diary study. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 7, 176-187. doi:10.1080/17439760.2012.671345
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL: Structural equation modeling with SIMPLIS command language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum and Scientific Software International.
- Klein, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Lin, C. W., Chen, S. L., & Wang, R. Y. (2011). Savouring and perceived job performance in positive psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 165-175. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2010.01340.x
- Metin Camgoz, S. (2014). The role of savoring in work-family conflict. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42, 177-188. doi:10.2224/sbp.2014.42.2.177
- Örücü, M. Ç., & Demir, A. (2009). Psychometric evaluation of perceived stress scale for Turkish university students. *Stress & Health*, 25, 103-109. doi:10.1002/smi.1218
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. New Jersey, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (Eds.). (2000). Special issue on happiness, excellence, and optimal human functioning [Special issue]. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-183. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5
- Smith, J. L., & Bryant, F. B. (2015). The benefits of savoring life: Health, savoring and satisfaction with life in older adults. *Gerontologist*, 55(Suppl\_2), 268. doi:10.1093/geront/gnv571.10
- Smith, J. L., & Bryant, F. B. (2016a). Savoring as a mediator of the impact of age on well-being. *Gerontologist*, 56, (Suppl\_3), 665. doi:10.1093/geront/gnw162.2706
- Smith, J. L., & Bryant, F. B. (2016b). The benefits of savoring life: Savoring as a moderator of the relationship between health and life satisfaction in older adults. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 84, 3-23. doi:10.1177/0091415016669146
- Smith, J. L., & Hanni, A. A. (2017). Effects of a savoring intervention on resilience and well-being of older adults. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0733464817693375
- Smith, J. L., & Hollinger-Smith, L. (2015). Savoring, resilience, and psychological well-being in older adults. *Aging & Mental Health*, 19, 192-200. doi:10.1080/13607863.2014.986647
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1063-1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063
- Wood, J., Heimpel, S., & Michela, J. (2003). Savoring versus dampening: Self-esteem differences in regulating positive affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 566-580. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.3.566