



**THE EFFECT OF PARENTING STYLE AND
EMOTIONAL NEEDS ON PARTNER PREFERENCE:
EXAMINATION FROM THE SCHEMA THERAPY
MODEL**

RÜMEYSA BİÇER

Thesis for the Master's Program in Clinical Psychology

Graduate School
Izmir University of Economics
Izmir
2023

**THE EFFECT OF PARENTING STYLE AND
EMOTIONAL NEEDS ON PARTNER PREFERENCE:
EXAMINATION FROM THE SCHEMA THERAPY
MODEL**

RÜMEYSA BİÇER

THESIS ADVISOR: PROF. DR. FALİH KÖKSAL

A Master's Thesis
Submitted to
the Graduate School of Izmir University of Economics
the Department of Clinical Psychology

Izmir
2023

ETHICAL DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have conducted my work in accordance with academic rules and ethical behaviour at every stage from the planning of the thesis to its defence. I confirm that I have cited all ideas, information and findings that are not specific to my study, as required by the code of ethical behaviour, and that all statements not cited are my own.

Name, Surname:

Rümeysa BİÇER

Date:

11.10.2023

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF PARENTING STYLE AND EMOTIONAL NEEDS ON PARTNER PREFERENCE: EXAMINATION FROM THE SCHEMA THERAPY MODEL

Biçer, Rümeyşa

Master's Program in Clinical Psychology

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Falih KÖKSAL

November, 2023

This study examines the impact of maladaptive parenting styles and unmet emotional needs on partner choice. The partner choice variable was assessed through vignettes created by researchers rather than participants' current partners. The study involved 305 participants aged 18 to 67 and comprised two phases: preparing vignette content and psychometric evaluation in the first stage, and data collection through forms in the second stage. Participants completed the Young Parenting Scale, schema-based attraction assessments (vignettes), and a demographic information form. Parenting styles were categorized based on the emotional needs they hindered, including Connection and Acceptance, Autonomy and Performance, Balanced Standards and Responsibility, and Adequate Limits. Vignettes fell into four schema domains: Disconnection and Rejection, Impaired Autonomy and Performance, Excessive Responsibility and Standards, and Impaired Limits. ANOVA analyses indicated that parenting styles impacting Connection and Acceptance needs significantly influenced

the attractiveness of vignettes in the Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain. Similarly, parenting styles affecting Autonomy and Performance, Balanced Standards and Responsibility, and Adequate Limits needs significantly influenced vignette attractiveness in their respective schema domains. In conclusion, this study demonstrated a correlation between perceived parenting styles, emotional needs, and partner choice. Findings suggested the potential influence of the parent's gender on this choice. The results contribute to both theoretical understanding and practical considerations, aligning with existing literature.

Keywords: Partner choice, parenting style, schema therapy, emotional needs, schema domains.



ÖZET

DUYGUSAL İHTİYAÇLAR VE EBEVEYNLİK BİÇİMLERİNİN PARTNER SEÇİMİ ÜZERİNE ETKİSİ: ŞEMA TERAPİ MODELİ ÇERÇEVESİNDEN BİR İNCELEME

Bıçer, Rümeysa

Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Falih KÖKSAL

Kasım, 2023

Bu çalışmada, Şema terapi perspektifinden uyumbozucu ebeveynlik stillerinin ve karşılanmamış duygusal ihtiyaçların partner seçimini nasıl etkilediği incelenmiştir. Partner seçimi, katılımcıların mevcut partnerleri yerine araştırmacılar tarafından oluşturulan kısa senaryolarla değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma, 18-67 yaşları arasındaki 305 katılımcıdan oluşmuş ve iki aşamadan oluşmaktadır. İlk aşama, senaryo içeriğinin hazırlanması ve psikometrik özelliklerin değerlendirilmesidir. İkinci aşama, katılımcılardan formlar aracılığıyla veri toplamayı içermektedir. Katılımcılara Young Ebeveynlik Ölçeği, şemalara göre çekicilik değerlendirmeleri (vinyetler) ve demografik bilgi formu uygulanmıştır. Ebeveynlik stilleri, engelledikleri duygusal ihtiyaçlara göre gruplara ayrılmıştır: Bağlanma ve Kabul ihtiyaçlarını engelleyenler, Özerklik ve Performans ihtiyaçlarını engelleyenler, Dengeli Standartlar ve Sorumluluk ihtiyaçlarını engelleyenler, Sağlıklı Sınırlar ihtiyacını engelleyenler. Vinyetler de içerdikleri şemalara göre Dışlanma ve Reddetme, Zedelenmiş Özerklik ve Performans, Aşırı Sorumluluk ve Standartlar, Zedelenmiş Sınırlar şema alanlarına ayrılmıştır.

Çalışmanın temel sorularını yanıtlamak için yapılan ANOVA analizleri, bağlanma ve kabul ihtiyaçlarını engelleyen ebeveynlik tarzının vinyetlerin çekiciliğini belirgin bir şekilde etkilediğini göstermiştir. Benzer şekilde, Özerklik ve Performans, Dengeli Standartlar ve Sorumluluk, Sağlıklı Sınırlar ihtiyaçlarını engelleyen ebeveynlik tarzları da ilgili şema alanlarındaki vinyetlerin çekiciliğini belirgin bir şekilde etkilemiştir. Sonuç olarak, algılanan ebeveynlik tarzları ile duygusal ihtiyaçlar arasında partner seçimiyle ilişkili bir bağlantı olduğu gösterilmiştir. Bulgular, ebeveynin cinsiyetinin bu seçimde etkili olabileceğini düşündürmektedir. Bu sonuçlar, literatürle uyumlu olarak hem teorik anlayışa hem de pratik düşüncelere katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Partner seçimi, algılanan ebeveynlik biçimi, şema terapi, duygusal ihtiyaçlar, şema alanları.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. <i>Schema Therapy</i>	1
1.1.1. <i>Schema Coping Process</i>	6
1.2. <i>Childhood Emotional Needs</i>	8
1.2.1. <i>Childhood Emotional Needs and Schema Domains</i>	11
1.3. <i>Parenthood</i>	13
1.3.1. <i>Parenting Style and Childhood Emotional Needs</i>	14
1.4. <i>Partner Preference Framework of Schema Therapy Model</i>	17
1.5. <i>Aim of the Study</i>	21
1.5.1. <i>Hypotheses</i>	21
1.5.1.1. <i>Main Hypotheses</i>	22
1.5.1.1.1. <i>Comparison Hypotheses by Parental Style</i>	22
1.5.1.2. <i>Secondary Hypotheses</i>	23
1.5.1.2.1. <i>Comparison Hypotheses by Demographic Variables</i>	23
CHAPTER 2: METHOD.....	24
2.1. <i>Participants</i>	24
2.2. <i>Measures</i>	24
2.2.1. <i>Demographic Information Form</i>	24
2.2.2. <i>Measurement of Attractiveness According to Schemas</i>	24
2.2.3. <i>Young Parenting Inventory (YPI)</i>	26
2.2.3.1. <i>Clustering of Parenting Styles</i>	26
2.3. <i>Procedure</i>	28
2.3.1. <i>Construction of Vignettes</i>	28
2.3.1.1. <i>Psychometric Assessment of Vignettes</i>	29
2.3.2. <i>Collecting Data</i>	34
2.4. <i>Statistical Analyze</i>	35
CHAPTER 3: RESULT	36

3.1. Descriptive Features of Sample.....	36
3.2. Correlation Analyses of Variables	37
3.3. Comparison of the Vignettes by Demographic Variables.....	40
3.3.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender.....	40
3.3.2. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy	41
3.3.3. Comparison of Vignettes by Psychiatric Diagnosis.....	43
3.4. Comparison of the Vignettes by Subscales of Young Parenting Inventory.....	44
3.4.1. Maternal Emotional Deprivation Parenting Style.....	45
3.4.2. Paternal Emotional Deprivation Parenting Style.....	45
3.4.3. Maternal Belittling Parenting Style.....	47
3.4.4. Paternal Belittling Parenting Style.....	48
3.4.5. Maternal Emotional Inhibition Parenting Style.....	51
3.4.6. Paternal Emotional Inhibition Parenting Style.....	52
3.4.7. Maternal Punitive Parenting Style.....	52
3.4.8. Paternal Punitive Parenting Style.....	53
3.4.9. Maternal Conditional Parenting Style.....	54
3.4.10. Paternal Conditional Parenting Style.....	55
3.4.11. Maternal Overprotection Parenting Style.....	57
3.4.12. Paternal Overprotection Parenting Style.....	58
3.4.13. Maternal Permissive/Unlimited Parenting Style.....	59
3.4.14. Paternal Permissive/Unlimited Parenting Style.....	60
3.4.15. Maternal Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting Style.....	61
3.4.16. Paternal Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting Style.....	61
3.4.17. Maternal Controlling Parenting Style.....	64
3.4.18. Paternal Controlling Parenting Style.....	65
3.5. Summary of The Result.....	67
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION.....	73
4.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Demographic Variable.....	73
4.1.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender.....	73
4.1.2. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy	74
4.2. Comparison of the Vignettes by Subscales of Young Parenting Inventory.....	75
4.3. Limitations and Further Suggestions	83
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	85
REFERENCES.....	86

APPENDICES..... 92

Appendix A – Informed Consent Form..... 92

Appendix B – Vignettes 93

Appendix C – Young Parenting Inventory98

Appendix D – Demographical Information Form102

Appendix E – Schema and Parenting Style Form104

Appendix F – Ethics Committee Approval113



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Core Needs.....	9
Table 2. Parenting style description	15
Table 3. Emotional needs and dysfunctional parenting style.....	17
Table 4. Grouping of Vignettes.....	25
Table 5. Clustering of Parenting Styles According to Emotional Needs.....	27
Table 6. Vignettes and their constituent components.....	30
Table 7. Demographic Characteristic of the Participants	36
Table 8. Correlation analysis table of variables.....	38
Table 9. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender.....	40
Table 10. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy	42
Table 11. Comparison of Vignettes by Psychiatric Diagnosis.....	43
Table 12. Comparison of the Vignettes by Emotional Depriving Parenting.....	46
Table 13. Comparison of the Vignettes by Belittling Parenting.....	50
Table 14. Comparison of the Vignettes by Emotional Inhibition Parenting.....	52
Table 15. Comparison of the Vignettes by Punitive Parenting	53
Table 16. Comparison of the Vignettes by Conditional Parenting.....	56
Table 17. Comparison of the Vignettes by Overprotection Parenting.....	59
Table 18. Comparison of the Vignettes by Permissive/Unlimited Parenting.....	61
Table 19. Comparison of the Vignettes by Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting	63
Table 20. Comparison of the Vignettes by Controlling Parenting.....	66
Table 21. Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by Parenting	68

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Choosing a partner is one of the most important decisions affecting an individual's life. This decision affects the individual's happiness, functionality and general well-being (Hsu and Barrett, 2020). Therefore, researchers have emphasized the importance of understanding how individuals choose their partners (Eagly and Wood, 1999; Babacanlı, 2001; Hendric, 2009). Early experiences with parents, emotional needs and evolutionary processes have an impact on partner selection (Grinberg, 2012; Young, 1997; Buss, 1995). Research show that a child's relationship with his/her parents and the fulfillment of childhood emotional needs affect his/her relationship with others (Young et al, 2003; Duck, 2007; Bowlby, 1983). Young et al. (1997), state that schemas affect partner choice. In addition, Young et al. (2003), suggest that parenting styles and the emotional needs that these parenting styles prevent from being met also build schemas. The aim of this thesis is to investigate how parenting styles and emotional needs affect partner choice.

In the following chapters of this thesis, parenting styles and emotional needs will be examined within the framework of schema therapy model. In this direction, schema therapy theory will be explained. How schema therapy theory addresses parenting style and emotional needs will be examined.

1.1. Schema Therapy

Schema therapy developed by Jeffrey Young, evolved from Beck's cognitive therapy to integrate aspects of cognitive therapy, behavioral therapy, object relations, Gestalt therapy, constructivism, attachment models, and psychoanalysis (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Schema therapy focuses on the chronic and characterological aspects of a disorder rather than the symptoms. Its primary goal is to help individuals whose needs have not been met in transition to meet their own needs (Rafaeli et al, 2013). There are four main concepts in Schema therapy: early maladaptive schemas, schema coping styles, schema domains and schema modes. Early maladaptive schemas (EMS) are at the center of the model (Young et al, 2009).

Schemas consist of sensory perceptions, experienced emotions and the meaning given to them, a non-verbal memorization of early childhood experiences (Young et al., 2005

; Arntz et al., 2006). According to Young et al. (2005), maladaptive schemas are developed at an early age as a result of interactions between factors such as the child's temperament, the parent's parenting style, and significant (sometimes traumatic) experiences. Maladaptive schemas are hypothesized to reflect important unmet emotional needs of the child and represent adaptations to negative experiences such as family quarrels, rejection, hostility and even aggression by parents/educators and peers, lack of love and warmth, and inadequate parental care and support (Young et al., 2005). Based on this hypothesis, Young et al. (2005) proposed a model of personality and psychopathology development in which Bowlby's (1988) attachment theory plays an important role.

The 18 schemas in the schema therapy model and their possible familial origins are explained below.

Abandonment/ Instability

This schema involves the perception that others, especially those from whom we expect support and closeness, cannot be trusted to meet these needs (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema feel that the relationships they have established will never last and are constantly worried about being abandoned (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Mistrust/Abuse

This schema includes the expectation that others will harm, abuse, humiliate, deceive, lie or use (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Individuals with this schema are constantly skeptical because they fear that they will be harmed (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Emotional Deprivation

This schema includes the expectation that the person's desire for a normal level of emotional support cannot be adequately met by others (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Individuals with this schema cannot perceive and accept that they are loved by others (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Defectiveness/Shame

This schema involves a sense that the person is fundamentally flawed, bad, undesirable, unworthy, inferior or useless in important ways, or that they are unlovable to significant others if they were to see their true self (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema feel that they do not deserve love, respect or consideration because they feel that they are not worthy, no matter how they actually behave (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Social Isolation/ Alienation

It is the feeling that one is isolated from the rest of the world, especially the social world outside the family (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Individuals with this schema feel alienated from other people and do not feel they belong to anyone. They do not feel that they belong to social groups, even if other people see them in the group (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Dependence/Incompetence

This schema is the belief that a person is not capable of handling daily responsibilities in a skillful way, without help from others (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Vulnerability to Harm

This schema involves an exaggerated fear that disaster is imminent, that it could happen at any moment and that one cannot prevent it (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Enmeshment

This schema involves a poor perception of one's identity. Individuals with this schema usually have a belief that they cannot live or be happy without the constant support of the other (Rafaeli et al, 2013). This can lead to the inability to feel as an "individual" (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Failure to Archive

This schema includes the belief that the person has failed, will inevitably fail, or is deficient in areas of achievement compared to peers (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Entitlement/ Grandiosity

This schema includes the belief that one is superior to other people and has special rights and privileges (Rafaeli et al, 2013). They feel that they do not have to observe the usual boundaries and rules. They hate to be limited or restricted (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Insufficient Self-Control

This schema involves the individual's inability to provide sufficient self-control to achieve goals or to prevent the over-expression of emotions and impulses (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Individuals with this schema often have problems with self-control and the ability to delay gratification (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Subjugation

This schema involves excessive relinquishing of control to others. Individuals with this schema allow other people to establish superiority in their interpersonal relationships (Rafaeli et al, 2013). They shape and implement their own behavior according to the desires and ideas of others (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Self-Sacrifice

This schema involves an excessive focus on voluntarily meeting the needs of others at the expense of one's own happiness (Rafaeli et al, 2013). Individuals with this schema often feel guilty when they focus on their own needs (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Approval Seeking

This schema involves an overemphasis on conforming to others in order to gain their approval and appreciation (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema find it very important to make a good impression on others. They spend a lot of time and energy improving their appearance, social status, behavior and more (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Pessimism

This schema involves focusing on the negative aspects while downplaying or ignoring the positive and optimistic aspects of life, commonly and throughout life (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Emotional Inhibition

This schema usually involves excessive suppression of spontaneous action, emotion and communication in order to avoid the condemnation of others, feelings of shame or loss of control of impulses (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema find it unpleasant or absurd to show spontaneous emotions (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Unrelenting Standards

This schema involves intense effort to meet internalized high standards in the areas of behavior or self-presentation, often in order to avoid criticism (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema feel constantly under pressure to succeed and achieve ambitious goals (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Self-Punitiveness

This schema includes the belief that people should be severely punished for their mistakes (Rafaeli et al, 2013). People with this schema are often cruel and impatient with themselves and others (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

Maladaptive schemas are often continued because the individual avoids situations that could correct them, or is looking for people to validate their schemas, and/or does not recognize information that would nuance their schemas (Rafaeli et al., 2013). There are three ways of dealing with schemas: Surrender, Avoidance and Overcompensation. These coping styles usually provide some relief in the short term, but lead to difficulties in the long term (Young et al, 2009).

1.1.1. Schema Coping Process

The term schema coping refers to how individuals cope with their schemas. This concept is similar to the psychodynamic concept of defense mechanisms. Karen Horney (1946) defined 3 different coping styles. These are; turning towards people, being against people and moving away from people. These defense strategies overlap with the coping responses of surrender, overcompensation and avoidance described in Schema Therapy. However, unlike Horney and other ego psychologists, Young et al.'s model is not based on the idea of unconscious conflict between desires and defenses. Instead, it describes automatic responses that occur without conscious awareness.(Rafaeli et al., 2013)

Young et al. (2003) hypothesize that the basis of schema coping responses is related to the evolutionary process involving the capacity of humans and other living things to "fight", "flee" and "freeze" in the face of danger. It states that these responses to danger correspond to the schema's three forms of coping: overcompensation, avoidance and surrender. In addition, these coping responses are not only related to innate behavioral mechanisms but also involve learning processes including life experiences (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Schemas emerge when basic emotional needs are frustrated. This frustration also includes the fear of intense emotions of schema origin. In the face of threat, the child unconsciously uses combinations of these three coping methods. These coping methods can be considered healthy survival mechanisms for childhood. However, they can lead to some maladaptive consequences in adult life. The continued use of coping methods perpetuates the schema (Young, et al., 2003).

In Schema Therapy, 3 different coping styles are defined; surrender, avoidance and overcompensation. Surrender coping style is the tendency to submit to one's schemas. The person accepts that the schema is real. The pain of the schema is felt directly, and the schemas are passively and helplessly submitted to. Individuals who use this coping style are trapped in patterns that prevent them from meeting their emotional needs. Behaviorally, they choose partners who are likely to behave as "hurtful parents" behave (Arntz and Jacop, 2011).

The second schema coping response is avoidance. Avoidance involves avoiding people or situations that trigger one's schemas. People who use this coping style not only behaviorally but also cognitively avoid situations, people, thoughts or images that are likely to trigger the schema (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Finally, the overcompensation coping style represents attempts to "do the opposite" of the schemas. They try to be as different as possible from the childhood situations in which the schemas were acquired. For example, someone who feels deep shame and failure may develop a dominant, aggressive style in order to elevate themselves to the top. If they felt worthless as a child, they will try to be perfect as an adult. Overcompensation coping style is prominent in individuals with "Cluster B" personality disorders. Overcontrolling and aggression is another form of overcompensation (Rafaeli et al, 2013).

Vreeswijk et al. (2012) describe how these three schema coping processes are realized through the example of abandonment/instability schema.

“Proceeding from the Abandonment/Instability schema, someone decides never to enter into a relationship again (avoidance). He thus gains temporary relief, because no one can hurt him by leaving him. However, in the long run, he becomes very lonely, because he avoids all intimacy. If he decides to compensate for his Over - Compensation schema, he starts looking for the “ perfect relationship ” with someone who will never abandon him. During the initial period of being in love, he might succeed, but after a while, when the partner wants to have more autonomy, he will claim the other person and demand constant availability. There is a good chance that the partner will not be able to tolerate this and will leave him. This way, the schema is confirmed. If he submits to the Surrender schema, he settles for a relationship that offers him insufficient support and security (e.g., with a partner who is often unfaithful or a on/off relationship). In a sense, this feels familiar, but in the long run, the patient remains lonely and unhappy.”

Within the framework of the schema therapy model, it can be mentioned that early experiences and parent-child relationships have an impact on romantic relationships and attitudes towards romantic relationships in adulthood (Atmaca and Gencöz, 2016;

DiFrancesco et al,2017; Gay et al, 2013; Young and Gluhoski, 1997). For this reason, the effects of dysfunctional parenting styles and the emotional needs that these parenting styles prevent to be met on individuals' choice of partners in romantic relationships will be examined in the schema therapy model in the current study. In recent years, Schema Therapy has evolved from an approach focusing on core beliefs to one that now centers on core emotional needs (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). Schema Therapy is considered a treatment that involves meeting basic emotional needs at its center (Giessen - Bloo et al, 2006 ; Farrell et al, 2009 ; Nadort et al, 2009)

1.2. Childhood Emotional Needs

Emotional basic needs models are structured on 4 fundamental criteria, which allow them to be scientifically tested. These are; (1) The fulfillment of the need must cause a change in well-being and produce an effect that encompasses the person's social and psychological system. (2) The need must enhance well-being and not be derived from other needs. (3) The need must be universal. (4) Each need must be consistent with evolutionary explanations (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Flanagan, 2010;).

Flanagan (2010) presented a model of emotional needs based on her observations in her clinical applications. She has proposed six core needs organized in pairs: connection and autonomy, stability and change, and desirability and self - comprehension. Deci and Ryan (2000) introduced the Self-Determination Theory, a comprehensive model of core psychological needs consisting of 3 factors. According to the model they proposed based on the concept of intrinsic motivation, there are 3 basic psychological needs; autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Interactions that support these are necessary to maintain or increase intrinsic motivation. Grawe formulated the concept of emotional needs for adults. These basic needs are attachment, control and orientation (about the environment and self), self-affirmation and pleasure. Roediger (2010) associated these needs with childhood and mentioned the struggles that may arise in adult life when these needs are not met. According to him, when the need for attachment is frustrated, the person feels disconnected and rejected. When the need for control and orientation is not met, children are not autonomous and their development of achievement suffers. If these two basic needs of children are not met, children "sacrifice" the other two needs in order to prove themselves and fulfill these needs. In order to prove themselves, children sacrifice their

need for self-development and growth. Thus they become extremely alienated from themselves. Sometimes they sacrifice pleasure to avoid punishment and thus become oversensitive and inhibited.

The Schema Therapy model emphasizes that children are born with basic emotional needs that are present in all children, with some differences: (1) Secure attachment to others, including safety, stability, care and acceptance; (2) Autonomy, competence and sense of identity; (3) Freedom to express valid needs and feelings; (4) Spontaneity and play; (5) Realistic boundaries and self-control (Young, Klosko, and Weishaar, 2003). Young et al, organized the themes into 15 distinct early maladaptive schemas, each implying a frustrated core emotional need (see table 1) (Vreeswijk et al., 2012).

Table 1. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Core Needs

EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS	CORE NEEDS IN RELATIONSHIP
Abandonment/Instability	A stable and predictable emotional attachment figure
Mistrust/Abuse	Honesty, trustworthiness, loyalty, and absence of abuse.
Emotional Deprivation	Warmth and affection, empathy, protection, guidance, and mutual sharing of personal experience.
Emotional Inhibition	A significant other who can be playful and spontaneous and who invites the same in you and others and encourages you to express emotions and talk about feelings.
Defectiveness/Shame	Unconditional acceptance of, and love for, one's private and public self along with regular praise and the absence of ongoing criticism or rejection. Encouragement to share areas of self-doubt and not keep them secret from others.

Table 1. (continued) Early Maladaptive Schemas and Core Needs

Social Isolation/Alienation	Inclusion in and acceptance by a community with shared interests, and values.
Failure	Support and guidance in developing mastery and competence in chosen areas of achievement (educational, vocational, and recreational)
Vulnerability to Harm or Illness	A reassuring significant other who balances reasonable concern for harm and illness with a sense of manageability of these risks and models taking appropriate action without undue worry or overprotection.
Dependence/Incompetence	Challenge, support, and guidance in learning to handle day - to - day decisions, tasks, and problems on one ' s own, without excessive help from others.
Enmeshment/Undeveloped Self	A significant other who promotes and accepts one having a separate identity and direction in life, and who respects one ' s personal boundaries.
Subjugation	Freedom to express needs, feelings, and opinions in the context of significant relationships without fear of punishment or rejection.
Self-Sacrifice	Balance in the importance of each person's needs. Guilt is not used to control expression and consideration of one's needs.

Table 1. (continued) Early Maladaptive Schemas and Core Needs

<p>Unrelenting Standards/ Hypercriticalness</p>	<p>Guidance in developing appropriate (not too low, rigid, or extreme) standards and ideals and in balancing performance goals with getting other needs met (health, intimacy, relaxation) along with a forgiving attitude toward mistakes or imperfections.</p>
<p>Entitlement/Grandiosity</p>	<p>Guidance and empathic limit - setting to learn the consequences for others of your actions and to empathize with others ' perspectives, rights, and needs. Not made to feel superior to others and limits placed on unrealistic demands.</p>
<p>Insufficient Self - Control/Self - Discipline</p>	<p>Guidance and empathic firmness in forgoing short - term pleasure and comfort in order to complete day - to - day routines, responsibilities, and meet longer - term goals. Limits placed on expressing emotions that are out of control, inappropriate, or impulsive.</p>

1.2.1. Childhood Emotional Needs and Schema Domains

Young et al. (2005), categorized schemas according to core emotional needs and termed these categories as schema domains. In the early version of the Schema Therapy model, the EMS was clustered around 5 domains classified according to the unmet basic emotional needs that were assumed to be most relevant. However, subsequent empirical studies have shown that a four-factor model is more robust. The most recent Schema Therapy model includes 18 EMSs, most of which are clustered in 4 domains. (1) Disconnection and Rejection, (2) Impaired Autonomy and Performance, (3) Excessive Responsibility and Standards, and (4) Impaired Limits

(Bach et al, 2018). When examined together with other theories of emotional needs, the disconnection and rejection domain overlaps with Deci and Ryan's and Flanagan's relatedness and connection need. The Autonomy and Performance cluster (the counterpart of the Impaired Autonomy and Performance cluster) overlaps with Flanagan's need for autonomy but not with Deci and Ryan's need for autonomy (Vreeswijk et al., 2012).

1.2.1.1. Disconnection and Rejection

The schemas in the domain of disconnection and rejection emerge in relation to the unmet emotional need for secure attachment. Individuals with these schemas believe that their needs for stability, security, care, love and belonging will not be met. Typically, their families are unstable, abusive, hostile, rejecting, cold, or isolated from the outside world. Patients with schemas of disconnection and rejection are usually the most damaged (Young et al, 2009). Anxious and fearful attachment patterns are commonly seen in individuals in whom this schema domain is dominant (Bosmans et al, 2010). Schemas are in the domain of disconnection and rejection; mistrust/abuse, defectiveness/shame, emotional deprivation, social isolation/ alienation, emotional inhibition (Vreeswijk et al., 2012).

1.2.1.2. Impaired Autonomy and Performance

Individuals with schemas in this domain have expectations about the world and themselves that conflict with their ability to act independently and to separate themselves from parental figures. They have parents who usually do everything for their children and overprotect them. Often their parents have damaged the competence of the individual and have not supported him/her to lead a proper life outside the home. Consequently, these individuals are unable to form their own identities and build their lives (Young et al, 2009). Schemas in the domain of impaired autonomy and performance; vulnerability to harm and illness, dependence/ incompetence, enmeshment/undeveloped self, abandonment/ instability, subjugation, failure (Vreeswijk et al., 2012).

1.2.1.3. Excessive Responsibility and Standards

Individuals with schemas in this domain suppress spontaneous emotions and impulses. Suppression of emotions and internalized strict rules about their lives stand out. It is estimated that individuals with this schema have a prominent rigidity and prescriptivism in the family during childhood and are not encouraged to play. The typical origin is a harsh, repressed, rigidly ordered childhood (Young et al, 2009). Schemas are in the domain of excessive responsibility and standard; self-sacrifice, unrelenting standards, self-punitiveness (Bach et al, 2018).

1.2.1.4. Impaired Limits

Individuals with schemas in this domain have not developed sufficient internal boundaries about self-discipline or responsiveness. They have difficulties in respecting the rights of others, cooperating, fulfilling promises, and achieving long-term goals. They have mostly grown up in families where boundaries are not set well enough (Young et al, 2009). Schemas are in the domain of impaired limits; entitlement, admiration seeking, insufficient self-control (Bach et al, 2018).

In this study, emotional needs will be assessed on the basis of 4 schema domains. Vignettes were prepared to measure how attractive individuals find people with which schema. These vignettes will be grouped into schema domains according to the schema content.

1.3. Parenthood

Human babies are born less mature than other species, making them vulnerable and needy for longer. This makes parenting for human babies much more important than for other species. According to Bornstein (2001), parenthood is a status that affects an individual's life and has an important function. Supportive, intimate, nourishing and emotional connections with infants and toddlers help the central nervous system to develop adequately. On the other hand, family behaviors that impair nurturing care can lead to impairment of both cognitive and emotional abilities. (Brazelton and Greenspan, 2000). In safe, empathic and nurturing relationships, children learn to be sincere and empathetic and ultimately learn to express their feelings, to think about

their own wishes and to build their own relationships with peers and adults.(Brazelton and Cramer, 1990).

According to Bowlby (1983), a child is born with a tendency to form an emotional bond with a person in order to feel emotionally safe. This person is usually the mother, but can also be the father or the child's caregiver. Feeling safe through this bond, the child's sense of self develops and socializes. The sensitivity of first the mother, and soon both the mother and the father to the child's needs and their role in meeting these needs and allowing the child to explore his/her environment enable the child to develop models about himself/herself, others and the world. The infant develops a definition of self in accordance with these models and establishes a relationship with its environment (Bowlby, 1983;Young et al, 2003).

By definition, a normally developing child can develop an attachment relationship with any caregiver, regardless of the quality of care provided. In fact, children develop relationships even with neglectful and abusive people. Therefore, the quality of the bond between the caregiver and the child is very important (Benoit, 2004). The parent's relationship with the infant and the behaviors and attitudes that the parent shows while establishing this relationship are very important for the infant's mental and physical development. In the next section, parenting style and its impact on the emotional needs of the child will be discussed.

1.3.1. Parenting Style And Childhood Emotional Needs

Along with individual differences in the developmental process, the quality of the parent-child relationship is associated with positive and negative outcomes for the rest of life (Tyano et al, 2010). The post-Freudian theorists who have studied this issue have come up with the ideas that; (1) The bond established early in development affects the person throughout life. (2) Inadequate parenting can lead to emotional difficulties and conflicts in relationships at all stages of life. (3) The more the infant's first relationship with the caregiver satisfies the infant's emotional needs, the more likely the infant will develop a healthy sense of self. (Tyano et al, 2010).

The interaction between a child's biological temperament and early adverse environment (e.g., parental neglect and abuse) is believed to result in these basic needs being inhibited rather than fulfilled, leading to greater vulnerability and emotional

need in adult life (Flanagan, 2010; Young et al., 2003). Unresolved needs from childhood are replayed in current relationships. When the dynamics of attraction and love are out of our awareness, it's inevitable that we'll keep repeating destructive patterns with little or no understanding (Stevens and Roediger, 2017).

Young (1999; Young, et al, 2003) has offered a schema-based structure to account for the parenting-psychopathology link. Young's model builds on some of the notions and research underlying attachment theory and proposes that a potential mediator of the parenting-psychopathology link is the development of early maladaptive schemas or negative core beliefs, especially in Axis II and related pathologies (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). In Young's view, such beliefs usually develop in childhood (2003). Young et al. developed a scale consisting of 17 subscales corresponding to parenting styles that are thought to form the basis of 17 early maladaptive schemas (Soygüt et al, 2008). However, factor analysis studies showed that the scale consisted of 10 sub-dimensions (see table 2) (Soygüt et al, 2008, Taşkale and Soygüt, 2017). The parenting styles determined as independent variables in the current study are the subscales of the Young Parenting Scale.

Table 2. Parenting Style Description

PARENTING STYLE	DESCRIPTION
Belittling/criticizing	Belittling/criticizing parents are overly critical, depreciative, and devaluing to their children.
Permissive/boundless	Permissive/boundless parents are excessively unlimited and cannot show the guidance that their children need
Emotionally depriving	Emotionally deprived parents are cold and emotionally unavailable to their children.
Exploitative/abusive	Exploitative/abusive parents are either physically/emotionally absent or present but physically/emotionally/sexually abusive.

Table 2. (continued) Parenting Style Description

Punitive	Punitive parents accuse and punish their children during problematic times.
Pessimistic/Worried	Pessimistic/worried parents focus on the negative side of the life and expect bad things to happen
Normative	Normative parents are perfectionists and set strict rules for their children. Obedience to rules is critical for them, even at the expense of enjoyment.
Overprotective/Anxious	Overprotective/anxious parents are phobic about everyday life situations; they do not let their children make their own decisions and experience individuation.
Conditional/Achievement Focused	Conditional/achievement-focused parents give importance to status and rivalry. They give love, nurturance, and warmth to their children proportionate to the achievement and status gained.
Restricted/Emotionally Inhibited	Restricted/emotionally inhibited parents find it difficult to disclose their emotions

According to Schema Therapy Theory, the main role of the parent in child development is to provide help in meeting emotional needs (Rafaeli et al,2011). Young et al. (2018) indicated that certain parenting styles are particularly associated with unmet emotional needs (see Table 3). In their hypothesized model, most of the parenting styles were associated with more than one emotional need. According to the results of the study; emotionally depriving parenting may prevent the child from feeling loved and developing a secure attachment. Belittling parenting can cause the child not to feel accepted and valued. Protective parenting can result in a child's lack of self-confidence, autonomy and self-esteem. Perfectionist parenting can cause the

child to feel too much responsibility and make too high demands on authority figures. In the analysis, Young Parenting Inventory subscales will be grouped according to the emotional needs in line with the categories (see Table 3).

Table 3. Emotional Needs And Dysfunctional Parenting Style

EMOTIONAL NEEDS	PARENTING STYLE THAT INTERFERES WITH EMOTIONAL NEED GRATIFICATION				
Connection, acceptance	Emotion-ally Depriving	Belit-tling	Emotionally Inhibited	Punitive	Conditional/ Narcissistic
Autonomy, Performance	Overprotec-tive	Con-trolling	Perfectionist	Emotion-ally Depriving	Belittling
Balanced Standards, Responsibility	Belittling	Con-trolling	Emotionally Depriving		
Adequate Limits	Condition-al/ Narcissis-tic	Over-protective	Pessimistic/ Fearfull		

Unmet emotional needs of individuals in their relationships with their parents during childhood may cause them to develop unhealthy patterns in their interpersonal relationships (Young, 1990). Unmet emotional needs due to dysfunctional parenting styles lead to the emergence of maladaptive schemas (Young et al, 2003). Therefore, parenting styles that lead to early maladaptive schemas are important in understanding individuals' choice of partners in romantic relationships.

1.4. Partner Preference Framework of Schema Therapy Model

Partner choice is critical for the human species due to its physiological and psychological costs. Within the scope of this thesis, the issue of partner selection was examined in accordance with the schema therapy model. Schemas affect the way

individuals perceive emotions, behaviors and environmental stimuli in close relationships (Young et al, 2003) and cause problems (Ali and Mokhtar, 2016; Esmaili et al, 2016). The relationships that individuals establish in their early experiences create an internal working model for whom they will love and feel close to in the future. Therefore, the quality of the relationships established in early experiences affects the quality of relationships in adulthood. (Roediger et al, 2016). Studies on schema therapy and relationship satisfaction have found that the disconnection and rejection domain is negatively related to relationship satisfaction (Güngör, 2015; McDermott, 2008; Yiğit and Çelik, 2016). Individuals with schemas in the area of disconnection and rejection exaggerate the signals that they will be abandoned and have expectations that they will be abandoned or abused (Stevens and Roediger, 2017). It can be considered that the negative effects of schemas in this schema area on relationship satisfaction/quality may pave the way for marital/relationship conflict and problems in intimacy, sincerity, trust, interest, support and love between couples (Yiğit and Çelik, 2016). The schemas belonging to the disconnection and rejection schema domain negatively affect the romantic relationship, while the sexual dimension of the romantic relationship interacts more with the schemas belonging to the autonomy and performance domain. The increase in maladaptive schemas in general negatively affects the romantic relationship (Stiles, 2004).

Young suggests that couples often prefer each other on the basis of their schemas, often by re-experiencing familiar childhood emotions or distressing situations they remember, which he describes as schema chemistry (DiFrancesco et al, 2017). The schemas that emerge as a result of early experiences continue as a pattern throughout the lives of individuals. Hence, individuals' maintenance of these maladaptive patterns is related to their early unmet needs. Schemas bias our perceptions, evaluations and reactions. Steps towards breaking schema patterns and meeting unmet emotional needs are considered as healthy choices. For this reason, attitudes towards romantic relationships may also contribute to the maintenance of maladaptive patterns. When we select a partner who is similar to the people who are important to us in line with our schemas, this gives us a familiar feeling and an implicit perception of "knowing the game" (DiFrancesco et al, 2017). In addition, individuals can also choose partners who are compatible with their schemas. For example, an individual with a Mistrust/abuse schema expects abusive behavior from others. In this case, he/she may choose an

individual to have self-punitiveness schema as a partner, thus adapting to familiar patterns from childhood. Schema chemistry is defined as the congruence of what is familiar to both individuals; attraction is defined as the unconscious knowledge that the relationship will involve overlapping schemas (DiFrancesco et al,2017).

A chemistry between early maladaptive schemas that perpetuate each other (Karaosmanoğlu et al, 2018; Roediger et al., 2018. It is seen that an individual with a high standards schema chooses a partner with a defectiveness or failure schema, or an individual with a justification schema chooses someone with a sacrifice schema as a partner (Karaosmanoğlu et al., 2018): Regarding the basic security and stability in the relationship; it is seen that individuals with abandonment schema constantly want guarantees from their partners that they will not be abandoned or they ensure the continuation of their schemas by choosing unreliable partners. Individuals with mistrust/abuse schema may choose individuals who will verbally or physically abuse them (Young and Glohuski, 1997). People with emotional deprivation schema usually choose cold, self-centered individuals who are unable or unwilling to provide emotional support as their partners (Young et al., 2003,)

People with schemas in the area of disconnection and rejection believe that they cannot have a stable relationship and believe that they cannot find enough emotional support from their significant others (Roediger, 2015). The focus of the schema chemistry of individuals with this schema with their partners is not to be abandoned and not to be alone. The basic need they need in the relationship is spouses who will not make them feel lonely, who will support them emotionally and even offer them a little more than an ordinary spouse, perhaps with a more altruistic side (Lockwood and Perris, 2012). However, in order to sustain themselves, the schemas are influenced by familiar attitudes and behaviors in childhood and they behave in a familiar and familiar way by maintaining their maladaptive structures (Young et al, 2003). Salimoğlu (2022) revealed that individuals with abandonment, emotional deprivation, defectiveness choose people as spouses who do not take responsibility in the relationship, isolate themselves, and trigger their spouses' suspiciousness by not sharing with their spouses about their behaviors in their social lives. Failure and dependency schemas in the domain of impairment of autonomy and performance were shown to actively interact with other schemas and form chemistry. The schemas in this domain appear to

specifically select people who feel more competent as partners and interact with the high standardization schema.

Disconnection and rejection schema domain was the most significant predictor of mate selection attitudes (Saffarizade and Bilondi, 2017) and the abandonment/instability schema significantly predicted mate selection attitudes (Kahvecioğlu, 2014). Caner (2009) examined the effect of perceived parenting styles and schema domains on evaluations towards the spouse and found that maternal overprotective, belittling and punitive parenting and paternal overprotective, belittling and emotional inhibition parenting predicted dependency, disconnection and controlling dimensions in evaluations towards the mate. She stated that disconnection and rejection and impaired autonomy schema domains predicted dependency, disconnection, and controlling dimensions in evaluations towards the mate.

Research on dating violence in romantic relationships and schema therapy was examined. In regards to schema domains and basic emotional needs, disconnection and rejection schema domains are associated with secure attachment, acceptance and nurturing emotional needs. Studies on dating violence indicate that disconnection and rejection schema domains predict dating violence (Atmaca and Gencöz, 2016). Hassiija et al, (2018) investigated the mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in young adult women's perceived parenting styles and experience of violence in intimate relationships. The research findings demonstrated that in terms of parenting styles, the mother's being distant, uncaring, and detached predicts exposure to and perpetration of violence in romantic relationships. In terms of schema domains, parenting styles that cause schemas in the disconnection/rejection domain related to unmet the secure attachment need can be considered as a factor in being involved in violence in romantic relationships. On the other hand, the father's unhealthy parenting styles and especially the presence of schemas in the disconnection-rejection domain are risk factors for exposure to intimate partner violence (Taşkale and Soygüt, 2016). In a study examining the mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in terms of childhood emotional abuse, attachment patterns, and perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence, it was revealed that only the disconnection and rejection schema domain predicted the relationship between childhood emotional abuse and intimate partner violence (Gay et al, 2013). Childhood emotional abuse has been demonstrated

to moderate high schema confirmation in defectiveness , vulnerability to harm, social isolation, and self-sacrifice schemas (O'Dougherty-Wright et al, 2009). Calvete et al. (2006) conducted a study in a sample of more than 300 Spanish women with childhood physical or sexual abuse and found that three schema domains (disconnection/rejection, other-orientation, and impairment of autonomy and performance) were associated with violence in romantic relationships.

1.5. Aim Of The Study

Schema therapy, which was founded by Jeffry Young in the 1990s, focuses on the interactions that occur in the mate selection of individuals with early maladaptive schemas. Examining the studies based on schema therapy theory, mostly personality disorders, eating disorders, depression, alcohol and substance abuse; marital satisfaction, divorce, tendency to infidelity in romantic relationships, etc. (Dumitrescu and Rusu, 2012; Hatamii and Fadayi, 2015; Forouzandeh et al,2017; Forouzandeh et al., 2017; Parvandi and Arefi ; Amirpour et al., 2017). The small number of studies addressing partner selection and the concept of schema chemistry makes the results to be obtained from the present study more significant. The aim of this study is to examine how parenting styles and unmet emotional needs affect mate selection within the framework of the schema therapy model.

Research on partner choice has often focused on current or past partners and relationship attitudes (Kahvecioğlu, 2014)). There are also qualitative studies in which participants were interviewed about their current relationship (Salimoğlu, 2022). In real life, partner selection is influenced by many factors such as physical appearance, status and cultural factors (Buss, 1989;Trivers, 1972). In order to exclude such factors, short texts, so-called vignettes, were designed. Therefore, in the current study, vignettes were created to measure how attractive participants find people with which type of behaviors and attitudes. In the vignettes, the possible behaviors of individuals towards their partners under the influence of parenting styles and their associated schemas are defined.

1.5.1. Hypotheses

Parenting styles and vignettes were grouped when constructing the hypotheses. Parenting styles were categorized into groups according to the emotional needs they

prevented from being met (see Table 5). These groups are; Parenting styles that interfere with Connection, Acceptance needs, Parenting styles that interfere with Autonomy, Performance needs, Parenting styles that interfere with Balanced Standards, Responsibility needs, Parenting styles that interfere with Adequate Limits needs. Vignettes are grouped into 4 schema domains according to the schema contained in them (see Table 4, Table 6). These are; Group 1- Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain, Group 2- Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain, Group 3- Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain, Group 4- Impaired Limits Schema Domain.

1.5.1.1. Main Hypotheses

1.5.1.1.1. Comparison Hypotheses by Parental Style

The degree of maternal and paternal parenting styles is expected to have significant differences on finding vignettes attractive.

1. Participants who experienced parenting style that highly prevents the fulfillment of Connection and Acceptance emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting lowly prevents that needs.
2. Participants who experienced parenting style that highly prevents the fulfillment of Autonomy and Performance emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting lowly prevents that needs.
3. Participants who experienced parenting style that highly prevents the fulfillment of Balanced Standards and Responsibility emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting lowly prevents that needs.
4. Participants who experienced parenting style that highly prevents the fulfillment of Adequate Limits emotional needs are expected to find vignettes

of Impaired Limits Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting lowly prevents that needs.

1.5.1.2. Secondary Hypotheses

1.5.1.2.1. Comparison Hypotheses by Demographic Variables

1. Participants who have psychiatric diagnosis were expected to significantly differ from those who did not have a diagnosis in attractiveness scores given to the vignette.
2. Participants who had received therapy were expected to significantly differ from those who did not receive therapy in attractiveness scores given to the vignette.

CHAPTER 2: METHOD

2.1. Participants

A total of 305 participants aged between 18 and 67 years were included in the study. The participants consisted of 247 women ($M_{age}=29.46$, $SD=7.74$) and 58 men ($M_{age}=33.60$, $SD=10.84$). When the kurtosis and skewness values were analyzed, it was seen that the age distribution was normal for women (skewness=.83 and kurtosis=.01) and men (skewness=1.17 and kurtosis=.95).

2.2. Measures

In the research, the questionnaire included the Young Parenting Inventory (YPI) to evaluate parenting styles of the participants' parents and vignettes in order to evaluate how attractive participants find individuals with which type of schemas in romantic relationships. In addition Demographic Information Form was given to the participants to gather demographic information of the participants.

2.2.1. Demographic Information Form

Demographic Information Form was formed by the researchers, and included questions about age, sex, sexual orientation, marital and romantic relationship status, educational level of the participants, job, the geographical region of Turkey they live, the existence of psychological disorders and their therapy history, and finally the information about people living together in the participant's childhood home and receiving emotional support (see Appendix-D).

2.2.2. Measurement of Attractiveness According to Schemas

In the study, the vignettes were created to measure how attractive individuals find people with which type of schemas. Vignettes are short, descriptive texts that describe the general characteristics of individuals and their behavior in romantic relationships. 11 vignettes were used in the present study. The process of creating and evaluating the vignettes will be explained in the procedure section. For each vignette, the participant scored between 1 ("Completely disagree") and 6 ("Completely agree") on the question "I would like to get to know this person in order to have a romantic relationship". It is

assumed that the higher the score the participant gives to the vignette, the more attractive they find the individual described in the vignette. The scores given to the vignettes are the dependent variable of this study (see Appendix-B) .

Each vignette described how an individual under the influence of a particular schema would behave in a romantic relationship. The vignettes are divided into groups according to the schemes that they contain. These groups are the schema domains (see Table 4).

Table 4. Grouping of Vignettes

GROUPS	DISCON- NECTION AND REJECTION- GROUP 1	IMPAIRED AUTONOMY AND PERFOR- MANCE- GROUP 2	EXCESSIVE RESPON- SIBILITY AND STAN- DARDS- GROUP 3	IMPAIRED LIMITS- GROUP 4
Vignettes	Surrender to emotional deprivation schema	Overcompens ation for abandonment/ instability schema	Surrender to self- punitiveness schema	Surrender to insufficient self-control schema
	Surrender to emotional inhibition schema	Surrender to pessimism schema		Surrender to entitlement/ grandiosity schema
	Overcompens- ation for mistrust/abuse schema	Overcompens- ation for vulnerability to harm schema		

Table 4. (Continued) Grouping of Vignettes

Overcompen- sation for defectiveness/ shame schema	Surrender to dependence/ incompetence schema
---	---

2.2.3. Young Parenting Inventory (YPI)

The Young Parenting Inventory was developed to measure parenting styles that underly EMSs and consists of 72 items. It includes various behaviors of parents that are thought to form the basis of early maladaptive schemas. The participant is asked to rate the behaviors of both mother and father separately according to the statements in the scale items on a scale of 1 (completely wrong) to 6 (completely appropriate). Although there is no cut-off score for this scale, high-scoring items were related to negative parenting styles that may result in early maladaptive schema formation (Young, 1994).

The study conducted by Sheffield, Waller, Emmanuelli, Murray, and Meyer (2005) in a university sample revealed that the scale has an acceptable and usable level of validity and reliability. The scale has 9 different parenting styles: emotionally depriving, overprotective, belittling, perfectionist, pessimistic/fearful, controlling, emotionally inhibited, punitive, and conditional/narcissistic.

Turkish reliability and validity studies of YPI were conducted by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, and Çakır. (2008). As a result of the study, it was determined that a form consisting of 72 items in total with 10 factors consisting of a common structure was appropriate for the mother (YPI-M) and father (YPI-F) forms. The adequate reliability and validity of the Turkish version was confirmed by test-retest reliability, internal consistency analysis, convergent validity and discriminant validity. This adaptation is similar to the original form, but differs from the original version by adding overly permissive/unlimited and exploitative/abusive parenting and eliminating perfectionistic parenting. The internal consistency reliability of this Inventory for the current sample is .94.

In the reliability study of the scale, according to the results of the test-retest reliability analysis for the YPI-M form, Pearson correlation coefficients ranged between $r=.38-.83$ ($p<.01$), while Pearson correlation coefficients for the YPI-F form ranged between $r=.56-.85$ ($p<.01$). The internal consistency coefficient of the scale ranged between $\alpha=.53-.86$ for the mother form and $\alpha=.61-.89$ for the father form in terms of parenting dimensions. The total internal consistency coefficient of the dimensions of the mother form was $\alpha=.90$ and the total internal consistency coefficient of the dimensions of the father form was $\alpha=.90$. (see Appendix-C)

Analyses on the convergent validity of the scale indicated that the mother form showed significant correlations with the YSQ-SF3 at .51 and with the SCL-90-R (Dağ, 2000) at .51 ($p<.01$). The correlation of the mother form with the father form was found to be .68. Analyses regarding the convergent validity of the father form indicated significant correlations of .47 with the YSQ-SF3 and .43 with the SCL-90-R ($p<.01$). In the study to determine discriminant validity, statistically significant differences were observed between the clinical and normal groups in terms of the sub-dimensions of both mother and father forms ($p < .05-.001$).

2.2.3.1. Clustering of Parenting Styles

Young et al. (2003) state that dysfunctional parenting styles prevent emotional needs from being met. They grouped parenting styles according to the satisfaction of 4 emotional needs that they interfere with. In current study, parenting styles were grouped within the framework of 4 basic emotional needs. Hypotheses and analyses were based on this grouping (see Table 5).

Table 5. Clustering of Parenting Styles According to Emotional Needs

GROUPS	PARENTING STYLE				
Connection, Acceptance	Emotionally Depriving	Belittling	Emotional-ly Inhibited	Punitive	Condition-al/ Narcissis-tic

Table 5. (Continued) Clustering of Parenting Styles According to Emotional Needs

Autonomy, Performance	Overprotective	Controlling	Perfectionist	Emotionally depriving	Belittling
Balanced Standards, Responsibility	Belittling	Controlling	Emotionally Depriving		
Adequate Limits	Conditional/ Narcissistic	Overprotective	Pessimistic/ Fearfull		

2.3. Procedure

The research process consists of 2 parts: construction and evaluation of the vignettes and data collection from the participants.

2.3.1. Construction of Vignettes

The content of the vignettes includes the individuals' behavior in romantic relationships, how they are described by their friends, and their characteristics in the work environment. This content was used to make the vignettes neutral in terms of factors that affect attraction in romantic relationships, such as physical appearance and status, and to provide a general framework of the person being described. Physical appearance, age, gender and status are known to be influential in mate selection (Trivers, 1972). Therefore, these variables were constant in the vignettes. For all vignettes, friends' descriptions and characteristics in the work environment are the same: cheerful, honest and helpful.

Individuals' behavior in romantic relationships based on the parenting style described in Young Parenting Inventory. The behaviors of the individuals described in the vignettes were predominantly defined according to the parenting styles. Hence, the main purpose of the study is to see how parenting styles and the emotional needs that

these parenting styles prevent from being met affect the attractiveness of individuals. Another reason is that Young et al. (2003), suggest that parenting styles are the origin of schemas. Parenting styles are related to schemas (Soygüt et al, 2008).

Soygüt et al. (2008), in the Turkish validity and reliability study, found that the YPI consists of 10 factors. These factors are; Belittling/criticizing, Permissive/boundless, Emotionally depriving, Exploitative/abusive, Punitive, Pessimistic/worried, Controlling, Overprotective/anxious, Conditional/achievement focused, Restricted/emotionally inhibited. In collaboration with two advanced schema therapists, it was determined how these parenting styles would behave towards partner in a romantic relationship. Vignettes were created within the framework of these behaviors. Each vignette includes one parenting style. However two different vignettes were created for Permissive/boundless, Conditional/achievement focused, Overprotective/anxious, Exploitative/abusive, Normative styles. The reason for this is that the behaviors of these parenting styles in the romantic relationship are in two different themes. For example, parents in the Exploitative/abusive style emotionally and physically abuse their children and may also have abandoned them at an early age. Thus, two separate vignettes were written for the abandoning part and the abusive part of this parenting style. The content of the vignettes was prepared by the researchers. After the vignettes were created, schemas and schema coping were determined with 2 advanced schema therapists by considering the behaviors of the individuals in these vignettes in romantic relationships. The reason for this was to categorize the vignettes and to facilitate the evaluation of the research results.

2.3.1.1. Psychometric Assessment of Vignettes

15 vignettes were created, each containing a schema and parenting style. After the content of the vignettes was created, a study was conducted to measure their validity. The content of the vignettes was tested to ensure that they represented the schema and parenting style targeted by the researchers. To measure this, an online form was prepared (see Appendix-E). This form includes 15 vignettes and 17 choices. The choices are single sentences that describe the behavior of the individual in the vignette and this individual's schema and schema coping. For example; "Duygularımı bastırın ve duygularımı kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir/ Duygularımı bastırma şemasına teslim", Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir/

Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi" For each vignette, the judges choose one of the 17 choices that he/she thought best captured the vignette. The judges were asked to read the vignettes in the form and then choose one of the 17 choices in line with the question "How do you think this person is in their relationships?". The vignettes in which all judges chose 100% of the same option were used in the study. For 11 vignettes, all judges chose the same choice. For 4 vignettes, different choices were selected and were not included in the study.

Since the content of the vignettes was prepared within the framework of schema therapy theory, the judges were considered to be clinical psychologists who have formation on schema therapy. This form was sent to 12 clinical psychologists who completed schema therapy basic training. To collect data, online questionnaires were prepared through an online survey site (forms.google.com) and distributed through social media tools such as e-mail, WhatsApp mobile messaging application, Facebook and Instagram.

Table 6. Vignettes And Their Constituent Components

VIGNETTE	PAR- ENTING STYLE	SCHEMA SCHEMA COPING	AND	SCHEMA DOMAIN
O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda; bugüne kadar uzun süreli bir ilişkisinin olmadığını biliyoruz. İlişkiler konusunda genellikle kafasının karışık olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman birisiyle flört etmeye başlasam, onunla devam edip etmeme konusunda karar vermekte zorlanıyorum.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.	Exploitative /abusive	Overcompensation for abandonment/instability schema	for	Impaired Autonomy and Performance-Group 2

Table 6. (Continued) Vignettes And Their Constituent Components

<p>Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman mesafeli ve soğuk birisi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Eski partnerlerinden onun nadiren sarıldığını öğreniyoruz. Genelde insanların sorunlarını dinleyip teselli etmekte zorlandığını belirtmektedir. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Emotionally depriving</p>	<p>Surrender to emotional deprivation schema</p>	<p>Disconnection and Rejection-Group 1</p>
<p>Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda onun koruyucu birisi olduğunu görmekteyiz. Hayatına giren insanları adeta bir ebeveyn gibi koruyup desteklediğini öğreniyoruz ve bunu yapmaktan keyif aldığını belirtmektedir. Partneri adına neredeyse her şeyi yapar. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Overprotective/anxious</p>	<p>Overcompensation for vulnerability to harm schema</p>	<p>Impaired Autonomy and Performance-Group 2</p>
<p>Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerinde ise zaman zaman partnerleri tarafından desteklenmek istemektedir. Belirli alanlarda oldukça yetenekli birisi ama bu yeteneklerini ortaya koymakta zorlanmaktadır. Bazı sorumlulukları konusunda yardıma ihtiyacı olmaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Overprotective/anxious</p>	<p>Surrender to dependence/incompetence schema</p>	<p>Impaired Autonomy and Performance-Group 2</p>

Table 6. (Continued) Vignettes And Their Constituent Components

<p>Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda oldukça seçici olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Onun, birisini beğenmesi oldukça zordur. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman biriyle karşılıklı otursam tüm kusurlarını fark ediyorum ve bunu dile getiriyorum. Gerçekten iyi giyinen, kendisine bakan birisini bulmak çok zor.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Belittling/ criticizing</p>	<p>overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema</p>	<p>Disconnection and Rejection- Group 1</p>
<p>O, arkadaşlarının tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman duygularını kontrol etmekte zorlandığını öğrenmekteyiz. Partneri onu rahatsız eden bir şey yaptığında öfke patlamaları yaşayabiliyor. Eski bir partneri yaşadıkları bir deneyimi şöyle anlatmaktadır: “ Onun mesajlarına geç yanıt verdiğim için kıskançlık krizine girdi ve telefonda bana uzun süre bağırıp hakaret etti” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Exploitative/ abusive</p>	<p>overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema</p>	<p>Disconnection and Rejection- Group 1</p>

Table 6. (Continued) Vignettes And Their Constituent Components

<p>Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda duyguları konusunda bazı zorlanmalar yaşadığını öğrenmekteyiz. Onun bir şeye güldüğünü ya da öfkelenmiş olduğunu anlamak gerçekten zorlayıcıdır. Bu durumu şöyle tarif etmektedir “Duyguları zaman zaman gereksiz buluyorum. Genelde olaylar karşısında pek bir şey hissetmem.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Restricted/ emotionally inhibited</p>	<p>surrender to emotional inhibition schema</p>	<p>Disconnection and Rejection- Group 1</p>
<p>Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda kendisini gerçekçi birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır ve bu özelliğinin ilişkilerde sorunlar yarattığını düşünmektedir. Ona göre dünya kötü bir yer ve yaşam sorunlarla dolu. Hayata dair pozitif bir bakış açısı mantıklı değil. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Pessimistic/ worried</p>	<p>surrender to pessimism schema</p>	<p>Impaired Autonomy and Performance- Group 2</p>
<p>Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnerleri onu kurallar konusunda hassas birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Hata yapıldığında bunun mutlaka bir cezasının olması gerektiğine inanmaktadır. Kendisini disiplinli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Punitive</p>	<p>Surrender to self- punitiveness schema</p>	<p>Excessive Responsibility and Standards- Group 3</p>

Table 6. (Continued) Vignettes And Their Constituent Components

<p>Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda eğlenmekten ve keyif almaktan hoşlandığını öğreniyoruz. Sıkıcı şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanmadığını belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Serbest çalışmayı seviyorum, sıkıcı şeylerden ise nefret ederim ve onları tamamlayamam. Benden her şeyi isteyebilirsin ama lütfen bu sıkıcı şeyleri yapmamı isteme” . İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Permissive/ boundless</p>	<p>surrender insufficient control schema</p>	<p>to self-</p>	<p>Impaired Limits-Group 4</p>
<p>O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda bazı hassas noktaları olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Örneğin birlikte yaşadıkları evin düzenli olması. Bu konulara dikkat etmeyen bireylere sevgi ve ilgi duyamadığını öğreniyoruz. Eski partnerlerin birisi bu durumu şöyle anlatmaktadır “ O’nun onaylamadığı bir şey yaptığımda benden uzaklaşırdı. Bu en ufak şeylerde bile böyleydi”. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.</p>	<p>Normative</p>	<p>surrender entitlement/grandiosity schema.</p>	<p>to</p>	<p>Impaired Limits-Group 4</p>

2.3.2. Collecting Data

Permission was obtained from the ethics committee of Izmir University of Economics. After ethics committee permission was obtained, an online questionnaire was prepared to collect data. Online questionnaires for data collection were prepared through an online survey website (forms.google.com) and distributed through social media tools such as e-mail, WhatsApp mobile messaging application, Facebook and Instagram. Participants were given an informed consent form and the procedure of the research

was explained in the informed consent form. In this form, the participants were informed about the purpose of the research, its content, the criteria for participating in the study, and the duration of the trial. It was explained to the participants that the study was completely voluntary and that they could leave the study at any time without any consequences. Participants were not asked for any personal information and were informed that the data obtained would be used for scientific purposes. An e-mail address where they could reach the researcher was added. The study takes approximately 20 minutes and consists of 3 parts; Demographic Information Form, Young Parenting Inventory (YPI), vignettes. The order of the forms was changed after every 100 participants. The forms were given in a total of 3 different orders. Data collection was conducted between February 10 and March 7, 2023.

2.4. Statistical Analyze

Statistical analyses were conducted with 305 participants using IBM SPSS Statistics. Before the analysis, the data were checked for correct data entry, missing values, normal distribution and homogeneity assumption. Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to assess the normality of the data and to understand its distribution. Skewness and kurtosis values should be within the range of +1.5 and -1.5 and +2.0 and -2.0, respectively, to show a normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013; George and Mallery, 2010). All values were within the required range.

For data analysis, descriptive analysis, correlation analysis, t-test, ANOVA were used.

CHAPTER 3: RESULT

3.1. Descriptive Features of Sample

305 participants were included in this study. Descriptive characteristics of the data from different regions of Turkey are presented based on the participants' responses to demographic questions. The age distribution of the participants ranged from 18 to 67 years ($M = 30.55$, $SD = 8.25$). The age distribution of the participants was normally distributed with skewness = 1.11 and kurtosis = 1.27. See Table 1 for frequencies and percentages of the information obtained through the demographic questions.

Table 7. Demographic Characteristic of the Participants

VARIABLES	PARTICIPANT			
	Female		Male	
	N	%	N	%
Sexual Orientation				
Homosexual	3	1.2	2	3.4
Heterosexual	235	95.1	55	94.8
Bisexual	9	3.6	1	1.7
Education tatus				
Primary school graduate	1	.4	1	1.7
High school graduate	16	6.5	5	8.6
University student	68	27.5	10	17.2
University graduate	132	53.4	32	55.2
Master's degree	27	10.9	9	15.5
Phd graduate	3	1.2	1	1.7

Table 7. (Continued) Demographic Characteristic of the Participants

Relationship status				
Married	89	36	29	50
Engaged	14	5.7	6	10.3
Has relationship	58	23.5	13	22.4
No relationship	86	34.8	10	17.2
Receive therapy				
Yes	121	49	11	19
No	126	51	47	81
Psychiatric diagnosis				
Yes	59	23.9	7	12.1
No	188	76.1	51	87.9

3.2. Correlation Analyses of Variables

Spearman correlation analysis between variables that used in the present study were examined with the inclusion of all samples. Vignettes were grouped according to the schema domains. The results of the Spearman correlation analysis are given in Table 8 .

Based on the correlation analysis, there is no significant relationship between Vignettes of Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain and parenting styles. There is a statistically significant negative and low relationship between Paternal Emotional Depriving parenting and Vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain $r = -.118, p < .05$. In addition, there is a statistically significant positive and low correlation $r = .114, p < .05$ between paternal overprotective parenting and Vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain. There is a statistically

significant positive relationship between paternal pessimistic, overprotective and conditional parenting and Vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain. On the other hand, there is a statistically significant positive relationship only between maternal overprotective parenting style and Vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain. There is no statistically significant relationship between Vignettes of Impaired Limits Schema Domain and parenting styles.

Table 8. Correlation analysis table of variables

PARENT- ING STYLE	VIGNETTES OF DISCONNEC- TION AND REJECTION SCHEMA DOMAIN	VIGNETTES OF IMPAIRED AUTONOMY AND PERFOR- MANCE SCHEMA DOMAIN	VIGNETTES OF EXCESSIVE RESPONSI- BILITY AND STANDARDS SCHEMA DOMAIN	VIGNET- TES OF IMPAIR- ED LIMITS SCHEMA DOMAIN
Maternal belittling	.024	.006	.049	.026
Paternal Belittling	.006	-.031	.036	-.096
Maternal permissive	-.082	-.065	-.066	-.029
Paternal permissive	-.108	-.005	-.028	-.021
Maternal emotionally depriving	-.066	-.056	-.071	.000
Paternal emotionally depriving	-.003	-.118*	-.084	-.071

Table 8. (Continued) Correlation analysis table of variables

Maternal exploitative/abusive	-.016	-.039	-.028	-.056
Paternal exploitative/abusive	.037	-.054	.057	-.085
Maternal punitive	.002	-.031	.014	-.032
Paternal punitive	-.026	-.066	.047	-.075
Maternal pessimistic/worried	.069	-.047	.045	.022
Paternal pessimistic/worried	-.001	-.053	.131*	-.055
Maternal controlling	.086	-.012	.093	.014
Paternal controlling	-.006	-.043	.050	-.085
Maternal overprotective	.076	.027	.102	-.006
Paternal overprotective	.075	.114*	.162**	.029
Maternal conditional	.103	-.016	.149**	-.019
Paternal conditional	.032	-.041	.120*	-.094

Table 8. (Continued) Correlation analysis table of variables

Maternal emotionally inhibited	.089	-.20	-.006	.052
Paternal emotionally inhibited	-.007	-.075	.023	-.060

3.3. Comparison of the Vignettes by Demographic Variables

In this section, the participants' scores on the vignettes were compared in terms of gender, receiving therapy and having a psychiatric diagnosis. The gender variable was divided into 2 groups as male and female, and the variables of receiving therapy and having a psychiatric diagnosis were divided into 2 groups as yes and no. Since the variables had two subgroups, independent sample t-test was conducted .

3.3.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender

An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the effect of gender on the scores of the vignettes. The mean parameter values for each of the analyses for females (n=247) and males (n=58) as well as the results of t-tests comparing parameter estimates between genders are presented in table x. In general, males find more attractive vignettes than females.

Table 9. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender

VIGNETTES	FEMALE		MALE		T(DF)	P	COHEN 'D
	M	SD	M	SD			
Overcompensation for abandonment/instability	2.96	1.58	3.29	1.41	t (93,731)=1,559	.122	.22

Table 9. (Continued) Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender

Surrender to emotional deprivation	1.93	1.16	2.70	1.58	T(71,978)=3,485	.001**	.55
Overcompensation for vulnerability to harm	3.81	1.79	4.32	1.47	t(100,478)=2,280	.025*	.31
Surrender to dependence/incompetence	3.31	1.55	4.36	1.18	t(108,467)=5,673	.000**	.76
Surrender to entitlement/grandiosity	2.04	1.33	2.58	1.45	t(303)=2,716	.007**	.36
Overcompensation for defectiveness/shame	2.18	1.39	2.77	1.58	t(303)=2,842	.005**	.00
Overcompensation for mistrust/abuse	1.22	.75	2.03	1.41	t(64,853)=4,233	.000**	.71
Surrender to insufficient self-control	3.40	1.45	3.86	1.40	t(303)=2,143	.033*	.22
Surrender to emotional inhibition	1.78	1.12	2.72	1.44	t(73,932)=4,600	.000**	.72
Surrender to pessimism	1.79	1.14	2.62	1.57	t(71,806)=3,750	.000**	.60
Surrender to self-punitiveness	1.91	1.16	2.87	1.59	t(71,920)=4,372	.000**	.68

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

3.3.2. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy

Independent sample 3t-tests were conducted to examine the effect of receiving therapy on the scores given to the vignettes. The mean parameter values of each analysis for

therapy recipients (n=132) and non-therapy recipients (n=173) and the results of t-tests comparing parameter estimates are presented in Table x. When the content of the vignettes were evaluated, it was observed that individuals who received therapy are less willing to have romantic relationships with people who have surrendered to emotional deprivation schema, surrender to dependence/incompetence schema, overcompensation for a defectiveness/shame, overcompensation for the mistrust/abuse schema, surrendered to self-punitiveness schema compared to individuals who did not receive therapy.

Table 10. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy

VIGNETTES	THERAPY RECIPIENTS		NON-THERAPY RECIPIENTS		T(DF)	P	COHEN'D
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Overcompensation for abandonment/instability	2.945	1.497	3.080	1.604	t(303)= .701	.484	.09
Surrender to emotional deprivation	1.734	1.010	2.346	1.412	t(301.82)= 4.409	.000**	.49
Overcompensation for vulnerability to harm	3.712	1.771	4.063	1.722	t(303)= 1.744	.082	.20
Surrender to dependence/incompetence	3.219	1.494	3.745	1.541	t(303)= 2.991	.003**	.34
Surrender to entitlement/grandiosity	4.075	1.609	4.260	1.531	t(303)= 1.019	.309	.12
Overcompensation for defectiveness/shame	1.984	1.283	2.531	1.523	t(299.96)= 3.398	.001**	.39
Overcompensation for mistrust/abuse	1.159	.603	1.543	1.148	t(272.12)= 3.771	.000**	.42
Surrender to insufficient self-control	2.803	1.344	2.953	1.358	t(303)= .964	.336	.12

Table 10. (continued) Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy

Surrender to emotional inhibition	1.833	1.179	2.069	1.287	T(303)=-1.644	.101	.20
Surrender to pessimism	1.833	1.153	2.046	1.363	t(299.722)=-1.475	.141	.17
Surrender to self-punitiveness	1.848	1.162	2.283	1.383	t(300.153)=-2.979	.003**	.36

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

3.3.3. Comparison of Vignettes by Psychiatric Diagnosis

To investigate the effect of having a psychiatric diagnosis on the scores given to the vignettes, independent sample t-tests were conducted. The mean parameter values for each analysis for those with (n=66) and without (n=239) a psychiatric diagnosis and the results of the t-tests comparing parameter estimates are presented in Table x. According to the content of the vignettes, individuals with psychiatric diagnoses are less willing to have romantic relationships with people who overcompensate for mistrust/abuse schema, surrendered to self-punitiveness schema than individuals without psychiatric diagnoses.

Table 11. Comparison of Vignettes by Psychiatric Diagnosis

VIGNETTES	WITH PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS		WITHOUT PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS		T(DF)	P	CO-HEN'S D
	M	SD	M	SD			
Overcompensation For Abandonment/Instability	2.878	1.583	3.06	1.551	t(303)=.86	.386	.12
Surrender To Emotional Deprivation	1.954	1.257	2.11	1.297	t(303)=.97	.365	.13

Table 11. (Continued) Comparison of Vignettes by Psychiatric Diagnosis

Overcompensation For Vulnerability To Harm	3.909	1.795	3.91	1.740	t(303)=.0	.990	.01
			2		12		
Surrender To Dependence/ Incompetence	3.378	1.516	3.55	1.548	t(303)=.8	.408	.12
			6		29		
Surrender To Entitlement/ Grandiosity	4.075	1.639	4.20	1.546	t(303).61	.541	.09
			9		2		
Overcompensation For Defectiveness/Shame	2.121	1.441	2.3	1.449	t(303)=1.1	.271	.16
			43		02		
Overcompensation For Mistrust/Abuse	1.181	.699	1.4	1.026	t(150,642)	.023	.29
			31		=1,856	*	
Surrender To Insufficient Self- Control	2.878	1.493	2.2	1.314	t(94,587)=	.951	.42
			89		061		
Surrender To Emotional Inhibition	1.833	1.144	2.0	1.271	t(303)=.98	.325	.15
			04		6		
Surrender To Pessimism	1.878	1.143	1.9	1.315	t(303)=.54	.590	.08
			74		0		
Surrender To Self- Punitiveness	1.757	1.110	2.1	1.344	t(122,849)	.009	.35
			88		=2,659	**	

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

3.4. Comparison of the Vignettes by Subscales of Young Parenting Inventory

In the present study, ANOVA analysis was conducted to understand the effect of the degree of maternal and paternal parenting styles on finding vignettes attractive. Analyses were conducted for each maternal and paternal parenting style for each vignettes separately. However, to ensure that the result section is more clear, only significant results are reported. The degree of parenting style was categorized as low, medium and high. Parenting style, which is a continuous variable, was grouped according to the mean and standard deviation values.

3.4.1. Maternal Emotional Deprivation Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of mother's emotional deprivation parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of maternal emotional deprivation parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of emotional deprivation schema $F(2, 302) = 1.891, p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignette of emotional deprivation schema showed a significant difference according to the degree of emotional deprivation parenting style of the mother, $F(2,302)=3.214, p<.05$. According to the LSD multiple comparison test, it was observed that individuals whose mothers showed moderate emotional deprivation parenting style ($M=2.220, SD=1.342$) wanted to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema more than individuals whose mothers showed low emotional deprivation ($M=1.795, SD=1.306$) ($p<.05$).

3.4.2. Paternal Emotional Deprivation Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was used to determine the effects of the father's emotional deprivation parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. The results of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of father's emotional deprivation parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for vignette of emotional deprivation schema, $F(2,302)=1.667, p>.05$ and for vignette of self-punitiveness schema, $F(2,302)=1.813$. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignette of emotional deprivation schema, $F(2,302)=4.054, p<.05$ showed a significant difference according to the degree of father's emotional deprivation parenting style. According to LSD multiple comparison test, individuals whose fathers showed moderate emotional deprivation parenting style ($M=2.239, SD=1.333$) wanted to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema more than individuals whose fathers showed high emotional deprivation ($M=1.725, SD=1.058$) ($p<.01$).

As a finding of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignette of self-punitiveness schema, $F(2,302)=3.375$, $p<.05$ eta showed a significant difference according to the degree of emotional deprivation parenting style of the father. Based on LSD multiple comparison test, it was found that individuals whose fathers showed high ($M=1.725$, $SD=1.088$) emotional deprivation parenting style were less willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to punitiveness schema than individuals whose fathers showed low ($M=2.288$, $SD=1.426$) and medium ($M=2.157$, $SD=1.319$) emotional deprivation parenting ($p<.05$).

As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignette of pessimism schema $F(2,130.020)=5.095$, $p<.01$. and vignette of emotional inhibition schema $F(2,133.076)=6.178$, $p<.01$, showed differentiation according to the father's emotional deprivation parenting degree. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch F test was used during the analysis. According to the results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test individuals whose fathers showed moderate emotional deprivation parenting style ($M=2.152$, $SD=1.325$) wanted to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to surrender of emotional inhibition schema more than individuals whose fathers showed low emotional deprivation ($M=1.627$, $SD=.980$) ($p<.05$).

Based on the results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test individuals whose fathers showed moderate emotional deprivation parenting style ($M=2.125$, $SD=1.351$) wanted to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to pessimism schema more than individuals whose fathers showed high emotional deprivation ($M=1.612$, $SD=1.061$) ($p<.01$).

Table 12. Comparison of the Vignettes by Emotional Depriving Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE		VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
			N	M	SD	F
Maternal depriving	emotional	Surrendered to Emotional Deprivation				$F(2,302)=3.214^*$

Table 12. (Continued) Comparison of the Vignettes by Emotional Depriving Parenting

Low		49	1.795	1.306
Medium		195	2.220	1.342
High		61	1.868	1.024
Paternal emotional depriving	Surrendered to Emotional Deprivation			F(2,302)=4.054*
Low		59	1.966	1.299
Medium		184	2.239	1.333
High		62	1.725	1.058
	Surrendered to Self-punitiveness			F(2,302)=3.375,*
Low		59	2.288	1.426
Medium		184	2.157	1.319
High		62	1.725	1.088
	Surrendered to Emotional Inhibition			F(2,133.076)=6.178**
Low		59	1.627	.980
Medium		184	2.152	1.325
High		62	1.741	1.129
	Surrendered to Pessimism			F(2,130.020)=5.095**
Low		59	1.779	1.175
Medium		184	2.125	1.351
High		62	1.612	1.061

3.4.3. Maternal Belittling Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of mother's belittling parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignette of self-punitiveness schema showed a significant difference according to the degree of belittling parenting style of the mother, $F(2,139.721)=4.268$, $p<.05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch Ftest was used during the analysis. According to the

results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test, individuals whose mothers showed medium belittling parenting style ($M=2.275$, $SD=1.339$) wanted to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to self-punitiveness schema more than individuals whose mothers showed high belittling ($M=1.785$, $SD=1.123$) ($p<.05$).

3.4.4. Paternal Belittling Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of father's belittling parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of abandonment $F(2,302)=4.884$, $p<.01$, emotional deprivation $F(2,302)=3.231$ $p<.05$, dependence/incompetence $F(2,111.870)=5.183$ $p<.01$, defectiveness/shame $F(2,302)=4.440$, $p<.01$, pessimism $F(2,302)=3.727$, $p<.05$ and self-punitiveness schemas $F(2,132.132)=4.286$, $p<.05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of belittling parenting style of the father.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of paternal belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of abandonment/instability schema $F(2, 302) = 1.536$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers presented moderately belittling parenting style ($M=3.244$, $SD=1.489$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for abandonment/instability schema than individuals whose fathers presented low ($M=2.776$, $SD=1.631$), $p<.05$ and high ($M=2.592$, $SD= 1.584$), $p<.01$ levels of belittling parenting style.

The analysis resulted that the variances for the scores on the vignette of emotional deprivation schema for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal, $F(2, 302) = 2.451$, $p > .05$. The multiple comparison LSD test indicated that individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderate level of belittling parenting style ($M=2.228$, $SD=1.343$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema than

individuals whose fathers exhibited a high level of belittling parenting style ($M=1.777$, $SD=1.003$), $p<.05$.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the dependency schema vignette for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 3.511$, $p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose fathers showed a moderate level of belittling parenting style ($M=3.750$, $SD=1.449$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to the dependence/incompetence schema than individuals whose fathers showed a high level ($M=3.166$, $SD=1.501$), $p<.05$ and low ($M=3.164$, $SD=1.710$), $p<.05$ level of belittling parenting style.

As a result of the analysis, the variances for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to the vignette of defectiveness/shame schema $F(2, 302) = 1.918$, $p > .05$. The multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderate level of belittling parenting style ($M=2.478$, $SD=1.470$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for the defectiveness/shame schema than individuals whose fathers exhibited a high level of belittling parenting style ($M=1.851$, $SD=1.351$), $p<.01$.

As a result of the analysis, the variances for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to the vignette of pessimism schema $F(2, 302) = 2.602$, $p > .05$. The multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderate level of belittling parenting style ($M=2.108$, $SD=1.358$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered for the pessimism schema than individuals whose fathers exhibited a low level of belittling parenting style ($M=1.641$, $SD=1.082$), $p<.01$.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the self-punitiveness schema vignette for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 4.309$, $p < .05$. Since the variances of

the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose fathers showed a moderate level of belittling parenting style (M=2.260, SD=1.401) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered to the self punitiveness schema than individuals whose fathers showed a high level of belittling parenting style (M=1.814, SD=1.029), $p < .05$.

Table 13. Comparison of the Vignettes by Belittling Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Maternal belittling	Surrendered to Self-punitiveness	$F(2,139.721)=4.268^*$			
		Low	74	1.918	1.155
		Medium	174	2.275	1.399
		High	56	1.785	1.123
Paternal belittling	Surrendered to Emotional Deprivation	$F(2,302)=3.231^*$			
		Low	67	1.925	1.294
		Medium	184	2.228	1.343
		High	54	1.777	1.003
	Surrendered to Self-punitiveness	$F(2,132.132)=4.286^*$			
		Low	67	1.865	1.179
		Medium	184	2.260	1.401
		High	54	1.814	1.029

Table 13. (Continued) Comparison of the Vignettes by Belittling Parenting

	Surrendered to dependence/ incompetence				F(2,111.870)=5.183*
Low		67	3.164	1.710	
Medium		184	3.750	1.449	
High		54	3.166	1.501	
	Surrendered to pessimism				F(2,302)=3.727*
Low		67	1.641	1.179	
Medium		184	2.108	1.401	
High		54	3.181	1.029	
	Overcompensated for Abandonment/ Instability				F(2,302)=4.884**
Low		67	2.776	1.631	
Medium		184	3.224	1.489	
High		54	2.592	1.584	
	Overcompensated for the defectiveness/ shame				F(2,302)=4.440**
Low		67	2.149	1.384	
Medium		184	2.478	1.470	
High		54	1.851	1.351	

3.4.5. Maternal Emotional Inhibition Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the mother's emotion suppressive parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there were no significant differences.

3.4.6. Paternal Emotional Inhibition Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of father's emotional inhibition parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of vulnerability to harm schema $F(2,302)=3.154$, $p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of emotional inhibition parenting style of the father.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of paternal emotional inhibition parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of vulnerability to harm schema $F(2, 302) = .613$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers presented moderately emotional inhibition parenting style ($M=4.056$, $SD=1.726$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for vulnerability to harm schema than individuals whose fathers presented low ($M=3.354$, $SD=1.682$) levels of emotional inhibition parenting style $p < .05$.

Table 14. Comparison of the Vignettes by Emotional Inhibition Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Paternal Emotional Inhibition	Overcompensated for the Vulnerability to Harm				$F(2,302)=3.154^*$
Low		48	3.354	1.682	
Medium		195	4.065	1.726	
High		62	3.887	1.881	

3.4.7. Maternal Punitive Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of mother's punitive parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was

conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of defectiveness/shame schema $F(2,84.849)=3.651, p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of punitive parenting style of the mother. The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the dependency schema vignette for the three levels of father's belittling parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 3.671, p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose mothers showed a moderate level of punitive parenting style ($M=2.357, SD=1.448$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensating for a scheme of defectiveness/shame than individuals whose mothers showed a high ($M=1.867, SD=1.240$) level of punitive parenting style, $p < .05$.

3.4.8. Paternal Punitive Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the father's punitive parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there were no significant differences.

Table 15. Comparison of the Vignettes by Punitive Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Maternal punitive	Surrendered to Emotional Deprivation	$F(2,84.849)=3.651^*$			
		Low	42	2.523	1.611
		Medium	210	2.357	1.448
		High	53	1.867	1.240

3.4.9. Maternal Conditional Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of mother's conditional parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of abandonment $F(2,302)=3.574$, $p < .05$, defectiveness/shame $F(2,110.321)=3.380$, vulnerability to harm $F(2,302)=3.701$, $p < .05$ and mistrust/abuse schemas $F(2,126.094)=7.551$, $p < .01$ showed a significant difference according to the degree of conditional parenting style of the mother.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of maternal conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of abandonment/instability schema $F(2, 302) = .810$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose mothers presented moderately conditional parenting style ($M=3.188$, $SD=1.502$) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for abandonment/instability schema than individuals whose mothers presented low ($M=2.581$, $SD=1.618$), levels of conditional parenting style, $p < .05$.

The analysis revealed that the variances for the three levels of the mother's conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) for the scores given to the vignette of vulnerability schema were equal, $F(2, 302) = 1.428$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test indicated that individuals whose mothers exhibited a moderate conditional parenting style ($M=4.316$, $SD=1.572$) were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who overcompensated for vulnerability to harm schema compared to individuals whose mothers exhibited a low conditional parenting style ($M=3.672$, $SD=1.633$), $p < .05$.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the vignette of defectiveness/shame for the three levels of mother's conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 3.729$, $p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals

whose mothers showed a moderate level of conditional parenting style ($M=2.449$, $SD=1.502$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensation of defectiveness/shame schema than individuals whose mothers showed a low ($M=2.000$, $SD=1.333$) level of conditional parenting style, $p<.05$.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the vignette of mistrust/abuse for the three levels of mother's conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 10.387$, $p < .001$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose mothers showed a moderate level of conditional parenting style ($M=1.443$, $SD=1.023$) were less willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensation of mistrust/abuse schema than individuals whose mothers showed a high ($M=1.111$, $SD=.371$) level of conditional parenting style, $p<.01$.

3.4.10. Paternal Conditional Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of the father's conditional parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of defectiveness/shame $F(2,101.468)=6.387$, $p<.01$ and mistrust/abuse schemas $F(2,111.773)=10.556$, $p<.001$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of conditional parenting style of the father.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the vignette of mistrust/abuse for the three levels of father's conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 14.895$, $p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose fathers showed a moderate level of conditional parenting style ($M=1.464$, $SD=1.083$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensation of mistrust/abuse schema than individuals whose fathers showed a high ($M=1.082$, $SD=.331$) level of conditional parenting style, $p<.001$.

The outcome of the analysis indicates that the variances of the scores on the vignette of defectiveness/shame for the three levels of father's conditional parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal $F(2, 302) = 3.889, p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Games-Howell multiple comparison test results revealed that individuals whose fathers showed a moderate level of conditional parenting style ($M=2.469, SD=1.476$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensation of defectiveness/shame schema than individuals whose fathers showed a high ($M=1.819, SD=1.162$) level of conditional parenting style, $p < .01$.

Table 16. Comparison of the Vignettes by Conditional Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Maternal conditional	Overcompensated for Abandonment/instability	$F(2,302)=3.574^*$			
		Low	55	2.581	1.618
		Medium	196	3.188	1.502
		High	54	2.888	1.621
	Overcompensated for Vulnerability to harm	$F(2,302)=3.701^*$			
		Low	55	3.381	1.659
		Medium	196	4.045	1.556
		High	54	3.963	1.331
	Overcompensated for Defectiveness/shame	$F(2,110.321)=3.380^*$			
		Low	55	2	1.333
		Medium	196	2.449	1.502

Table 16. (Continued) Comparison of the Vignettes by Conditional Parenting

High		54	2.037	1.288	
	Overcompensated for Mistrust/abuse				F(2,126.094)=7.5 51**
Low		55	1.444	1.134	
Medium		196	1.433	1.023	
High		54	1.111	.371	
Paternal conditional	Overcompensated for Defectiveness/ shame				F(2,101.468)=6.3 87**
Low		46	2.173	1.539	
Medium		198	2.469	1.476	
High		61	1.819	1.162	
	Overcompensated for mistrust/abuse				F(2,111.773)=10. 556**
Low		46	1.391	.954	
Medium		198	1.464	1.083	
High		61	1.082	.331	

3.4.11 Maternal Overprotection Parenting Style

In order to determine the effect of the mother's overprotective parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes, one-way independent ANOVA was conducted. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of dependence/incompetence $F(2,302)=3.088$, $p < .05$, vulnerability to harm $F(2,302)=4.300$, $p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of overprotective parenting style of the mother.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of maternal overprotection parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of dependence/incompetence schema $F(2, 302) = .731$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose mothers presented moderately overprotection

parenting style (M=3.640, SD=1.483) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered for dependence/incompetence schema than individuals whose mothers presented low (M=3.055, SD=1.559), levels of overprotection parenting style, $p < .05$.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of maternal overprotection parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of vulnerability to harm schema $F(2, 302) = .436, p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose mothers presented moderately (M=4.244, SD=1.516), $p < .05$ and high (M=4.457, SD=1.600), $p < .01$ overprotection parenting style were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for vulnerability to harm schema than individuals whose mothers presented low (M=3.648, SD=1.603), levels of overprotection parenting style.

3.4.12 Paternal Overprotection Parenting Style

In order to determine the effect of the father's overprotective parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes, one-way independent ANOVA was conducted. Levene's test was conducted to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to vignettes of dependence/incompetence $F(2,302)=3.791, p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of overprotective parenting style of the father.

The result of the analysis showed that the variances for the three levels of paternal overprotection parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to vignette of dependence/incompetence schema $F(2, 302) = .240, p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for this data. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers presented moderately overprotection parenting style (M=3.655, SD=1.501) were more likely to want to have romantic relationships with individuals who surrendered for dependence/incompetence schema than individuals whose fathers presented low (M=2.977, SD=1.605), levels of overprotection parenting style, $p < .05$.

Table 17. Comparison of the Vignettes by Overprotection Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS				
		N	M	SD	F	
Maternal overprotective	Surrendered to Dependence/incompetence				F(2,302)=3.08	
					8*	
		Low	54	2.963	1.624	
		Medium	192	4.187	1.667	
High		59	3.881	1.839		
	Overcompensated for vulnerability to harm				F(2,302)=4.30	
					0*	
		Low	54	3.055	1.559	
		Medium	192	3.640	1.483	
High		59	3.542	1.653		
Paternal overprotective	Surrendered to Dependence/incompetence				F(2,302)=3.79	
					1*	
		Low	44	2.977	1.606	
		Medium	215	3.655	1.501	
High		46	3.391	1.570		

3.4.13. Maternal Permissive/Unlimited Parenting Style

To determine the effect of the mother's permissive/unlimited parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes, one-way independent ANOVA was conducted. Levene's test was performed to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to the vignettes of dependency/insufficiency $F(2,302)=3.605$, $p < .05$, abandonment/instability $F(2,84.662)=3.918$, $p < .05$, insufficient self-control $F(2,302)=3.303$, $p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of the mother's permissive/unlimited parenting style.

The outcome of the analysis indicated that the variances for the three levels of maternal permissive parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores on the vignette of dependency/incompetence schema $F(2, 302) = 2.544, p > .05$. For these data, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose mothers exhibited a low permissive/unlimited parenting style ($M=3.866, SD=1.419$) were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to the dependence/incompetence schema than individuals whose mothers exhibited a highly permissive/unlimited parenting style ($M=3.100, SD=1.515$), $p < .05$.

As a result of the analysis, the variances for the three levels of maternal permissive/unlimited parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores obtained from the vignette of insufficient self-control schema $F(2, 302) = .492, p > .05$. Comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose mothers exhibited a low permissive parenting style ($M=3.883, SD=1.415$) were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to an insufficient self-control schema compared to individuals whose mothers exhibited a high ($M=3.222, SD=1.576$) and moderate ($M=3.434, SD=1.432$), permissive parenting style $p < .05$.

Results of the analysis showed that the variances of the scores on the vignette of abandonment/instability for the three levels of maternal permissive/unlimited parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal, $F(2, 302) = 3.220, p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. According to the results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test, individuals whose mothers showed a low level of permissive/unlimited parenting style ($M=3.500, SD=1.432$) were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for abandonment schema than individuals whose mothers showed a moderate level of permissive/unlimited parenting style ($M=2.926, SD=1.530$), $p < .05$.

3.4.14. Paternal Permissive/Unlimited Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the father's permissive/unlimited parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there were no significant differences.

Table 18. Comparison of the Vignettes by Permissive/Unlimited Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Maternal Permissive	Surrendered to Dependence/ incompetence	F(2,302)=3.605*			
		Low	60	3.866	1.419
		Medium	205	3.497	1.564
		High	40	3.100	1.515
	Surrendered Insufficient self-control	F(2,302)=3.303*			
		Low	60	3.883	1.415
		Medium	205	3.434	1.432
		High	40	3.225	1.576
	Overcompensated for Abandonment/ instability	F(2,84.662)=3.918*			
		Low	60	3.500	1.432
		Medium	205	2.928	1.530
		High	40	2.825	1.767

3.4.15. Maternal Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting Style

In order to determine the effect of mothers' pessimistic/fearful parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes, one-way independent ANOVA was conducted. No significant difference was found as a result of the analysis.

3.4.16. Paternal Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting Style

Independent one-way ANOVA was used to determine the effect of the father's pessimistic parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was

performed to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to the vignettes of emotional deprivation schema $F(2,302)=5.181$, $p<.01$, vulnerability to harm schema $F(2,302)=6.594$, $p<.01$, defectiveness/shame schema $F(2,104.174)=3.229$, $p<.05$, and emotion inhibition schema $F(2,302)=3.169$, $p<.05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of the father's pessimistic/fearful parenting style.

Analyses revealed that the variances for the three levels of father's pessimistic/fearful parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores on the emotional deprivation schema vignette $F(2, 302) = 2.092$, $p > .05$. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderately pessimistic/fearful parenting style ($M=2.259$, $SD=1.324$) were more likely to want to have a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema compared to individuals whose fathers exhibited low ($M=1.727$, $SD=1.044$), $p<.01$, and high ($M=1.824$, $SD=1.283$), $p<.05$ levels of pessimistic/fearful parenting style.

As a result of the analysis, the variances for the three levels of father's pessimistic/fearful parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to the vignette of vulnerability to harm $F(2, 302) = .056$, $p > .05$. A multiple comparison LSD test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a low level of pessimistic parenting style ($M=3.181$, $SD=1.689$) were less likely to want to have a romantic relationship with individuals who overcompensated for the vulnerability to harm schema compared to individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderate ($M=4.010$, $SD=1.725$), $p<.01$ and high ($M=4.280$, $SD=1.719$), $p<.01$ level of pessimistic/fearful parenting style.

The analysis revealed that the variances for the three levels of father's pessimistic/fearful parenting style (low, medium, high) were equal for the scores given to the vignette of emotion inhibition schema $F(2, 302) = 1.988$, $p > .05$. The LSD multiple comparison test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a moderately pessimistic/fearful parenting style ($M=2.098$, $SD=1.248$) were more likely to want to have a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to the emotion inhibition schema compared to individuals whose fathers exhibited a highly ($M=1.666$, $SD=1.091$) pessimistic parenting style, $p<.05$.

According to the results of the analysis, the variances of the scores given in the vignette of the defectiveness schema for the three levels of the father's pessimistic parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal, $F(2, 302) = 5.224, p < .01$. Because the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. Based on the results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test, individuals whose fathers displayed low ($M=2.527, SD=1.676$), $p < .05$ and moderate ($M=2.347, SD=1.398$), $p < .05$ levels of pessimistic/fearful parenting style were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for the defectiveness/shame schema than individuals whose fathers displayed high ($M=1.894, SD=1.318$) levels of pessimistic/fearful parenting style.

Table 19. Comparison of the Vignettes by Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Paternal pessimistic/fearful	Overcompensated For The Vulnerability To Harm	$F(2,302)=6.594^{**}$			
		Low	55	3.181	1.689
		Medium	193	4.010	1.725
		High	57	4.280	1.719
	Surrendered To Emotional Deprivation	$F(2,302)=5.181^{**}$			
		Low	55	1.727	1.044
		Medium	193	2.259	1.324
		High	57	1.824	1.283

Table 19. (Continued) Comparison of the Vignettes by Pessimistic/Fearful Parenting

	Overcompensated for defectiveness/shame				F(2,104.174)=3.229*
Low		55	2.527	1.676	
Medium		193	2.347	1.398	
High		57	1.894	1.318	
	Surrendered to the emotion inhibition				F(2,302)=3.169*
Low		55	1.818	1.334	
Medium		193	2.098	1.248	
High		57	1.666	1.091	

3.4.17. Maternal Controlling Parenting Style

One-way independent ANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the mother's controlling parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes. Levene's test was performed to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the scores given to the vignettes of vulnerability to harm schema $F(2,118.130)=5.054$, $p < .01$, and dependence/incompetence schema $F(2,302)=3.356$, $p < .05$, showed a significant difference according to the degree of the mother's controlling parenting style.

According to the results of the analysis, the variances of the scores on the vignette of vulnerability to harm schema for the three levels of the mother's controlling parenting style (low, medium, high) were not equal, $F(2, 302) = 3.886$, $p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. According to the results of the Games-Howell multiple comparison test, individuals whose mothers exhibited moderate ($M=4.118$, $SD=1.609$), $p < .01$ and high ($M=3.937$, $SD=1.958$), $p < .05$ levels of controlling parenting style were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensate for a vulnerability to harm schema compared to individuals whose mothers exhibited low ($M=3.301$, $SD=1.792$) levels of controlling parenting style.

For the three levels of maternal controlling parenting style (low, medium, high), the analysis revealed that the variances were equal for scores on the vignette of dependency schema $F(2, 302) = .853, p > .05$. Analysis of LSD multiple comparison tests revealed that individuals whose mothers exhibited a medium level of controlling parenting style ($M=3.657, SD=1.469$) were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to an dependence/incompetence schema compared to individuals whose mothers exhibited a low ($M=3.079, SD=1.639$), $p < .05$, level of controlling parenting style.

3.4.18. Paternal Controlling Parenting Style

In order to determine the effect of the father's controlling parenting style on the scores given to the vignettes, one-way independent ANOVA was conducted. Levene's test was performed to examine the equality of variances in different groups. As a result of the analysis, it was found that emotional deprivation schema $F(2,302)=4.452, p < .05$, and defectiveness/shame schema $F(2,131.341)=4.457, p < .05$, the scores given to the vignettes showed a significant difference according to the degree of father's controlling parenting style.

Analysis for the three levels of paternal controlling parenting style (low, medium, high) revealed equal variances for scores on the emotional deprivation vignette $F(2, 302) = 1.344, p > .05$. LSD multiple comparison tests analysis revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a medium ($M=2.226, SD=1.311$) level of controlling parenting style were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema compared to individuals whose fathers exhibited low ($M=1.873, SD=1.276$), $p < .05$ and high ($M=1.784, SD=1.165$), $p < .05$ levels of controlling parenting style.

The variances of the scores obtained from the vignette of defectiveness/shame schema for the three levels (low, medium, high) of the father's controlling parenting style were not equal, $F(2, 302) = 3.692, p < .05$. Since the variances of the compared groups were not homogeneous, Welch's Ftest was used during the analysis. The Games-Howell multiple comparison test revealed that individuals whose fathers exhibited a medium ($M=2.440, SD=1.460$) level of controlling parenting style were more willing to have romantic relationships with individuals who overcompensated for the

defectiveness/shame schema compared to individuals whose fathers exhibited a high (M=1.876, SD=1.243), $p < .05$ level of controlling parenting style.

Table 20. Comparison of the Vignettes by Controlling Parenting

DEGREE OF PARENTING STYLE	VIGNETTE	VIGNETTE SCORE OF ATTRACTIVENESS			
		N	M	SD	F
Maternal controlling	Surrendered to Dependence/incompetence	F(2,302)=3.356*			
		Low	63	3.079	1.639
		Medium	178	3.657	1.469
		High	64	3.562	1.582
	Overcompensated for vulnerability to harm	F(2,118.130)=5.054**			
		Low	63	3.301	1.792
		Medium	178	4.118	1.609
		High	64	3.937	1.958
Paternal controlling	Surrendered to Emotional Deprivation	F(2,302)=4.452*			
		Low	63	1.873	1.276
		Medium	117	2.265	1.311
		High	65	1.784	1.165
	Overcompensated for Defectiveness/shame	F(2,131.341)=4.457*			
		Low	63	2.317	1.543
		Medium	117	2.440	1.460
		High	65	1.876	1.243

3.5. Summary of The Result

This section includes a summary of the results of the hypothesis investigated in this current study. According to the t-test analysis, men generally find vignettes more attractive than women. For the 9 vignettes the difference is statistically significant, but not for the vignettes of emotional deprivation schema and the vulnerability to harm schema. When analyzed in terms of the variable of receiving therapy, it was revealed that individuals who received therapy were less willing to establish romantic relationships with people with emotional deprivation, dependency/incompetence, defectiveness/shame, mistrust/abuse, and insufficient self-control schemas vignettes compared to individuals who did not receive therapy. In addition, individuals with psychiatric diagnoses are less willing to establish romantic relationships with individuals with mistrust/abuse and insufficient self-control schemas than individuals without psychiatric diagnoses.

Significant difference across the degrees of maternal and paternal parenting emotional on vignettes score is expected. According to the ANOVA analysis results, the degree of maternal emotional deprivation significantly differentiates the scores given to emotional deprivation schema vignette, and the degree of paternal emotional deprivation significantly differentiates the scores given to emotional deprivation, self-punitiveness, emotional inhibition and pessimism schema vignettes.

The degree of maternal belittling significantly differentiates the scores given to self-punitiveness schema vignette. However the degree of paternal belittling significantly differentiates the scores given to abandonment/instability, emotional deprivation, dependence/incompetence, pessimism, self-punitiveness schema vignettes.

The degree of maternal emotional inhibition does not differentiate the scores given to the vignettes. On the other hand, the degree of paternal emotional inhibition statistically differentiates the score given to vulnerability to harm schema vignette.

The degree of maternal punitiveness differentiates the score given to the defectiveness/shame schema vignettes. In contrast, the degree of paternal punitiveness does not differentiate the scores given to the vignettes.

The degree of maternal conditional significantly differentiates on abandonment/instability, defectiveness/shame and mistrust/abuse schema vignettes scores. However, the degree of paternal conditional significantly differentiate mistrust/abuse and defectiveness/shame schema vignette scores.

The degree of maternal overprotectiveness significantly differentiate dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm, failure to archive schema vignettes score. On the other hand, the degree of paternal overprotectiveness statistically differentiates on the score given to dependence/incompetence schema vignette.

The degree of maternal permissive significantly differentiates on dependence/incompetence, insufficient self control, abandonment/instability schema vignettes score. Besides, the degree of paternal permissive does not significantly differentiate on vignette score.

The degree of maternal pessimistic/fearful does not significantly differentiate on vignettes score. However, the degree of paternal pessimistic/fearful significantly differentiate on emotional deprivation, vulnerability to harm, emotional inhibition, defectiveness/shame schema vignette score.

Lastly, the degree of maternal controlling significantly differentiates on vulnerability to harm and dependence/incompetence schema vignette score. On the other hand, the degree of paternal controlling significantly differentiate on emotional deprivation, defectiveness/shame schema vignette score.

Table 21. Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by

PARENTING STYLE	EMOTIONAL NEEDS	VIGNETTES			
Maternal parenting		Disconnection and Rejection- Group 1	Impaired Autonomy and Performance- Group 2	Excessive Responsibility and Standards -Group 3	Impaired Limits- Group 4

Table 21. (Continued) Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by

Emotional depriving	1- connection, acceptance 2- autonomy, Performance 3-balanced standards, Responsibility	1.surrendered to emotional deprivation schema	
Belittling	1- Connection, Acceptance 2- Autonomy, Performance 3-Balanced Standards, Responsibility		1.Surrender to self-punitiveness schema
Emotional inhibition	1- Connection, Acceptance		
Punitive	1- Connection, Acceptance	1- overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema	
Conditional	1- connection, acceptance 4-adequate limits	1- overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema 2- overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema	1- overcompensation for abandonment /instability schema 2- overcompensation for vulnerability to harm schema

Table 21.(Continued) Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by

Overprotective	1-Autonomy, Performance 2- Adequate limits	1-overcompensation for vulnerability to harm schema 2-surrender to dependence/ incompetence schema	
Controlling	1-Autonomy, Performance 2- Balanced Standards, Responsibility	1-overcompensation for vulnerability to harm schema 2-surrender to dependence/ incompetence schema	
Pessimistic/ Fearful	1- Autonomy, Performance 2-Adequate Limits		
Permissive/ boundless	1- adequate limits	1-overcompensation for abandonment/ instability schema 2-surrender to dependence/ incompetence schema	1- surrender to insuffi- cient self- control schema
Paternal parenting			

Table 21.(Continued) Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by

Emotional depriving	1- connection, acceptance 2- autonomy, Performance 3-balanced standards, Responsibility	1.surrendered to emotional deprivation schema		1.surrender to self- punitiveness schema
Belittling	1- connection, acceptance 2- autonomy, performance 3-balanced standards, Responsibility	1.surrendered to emotional deprivation schema 2- overcompen- sation for defectiveness/ shame schema	1- overcompen- sation for abandonment /instability schema 2- surrender to dependence/i ncompetence schema 3- surrender to pessimism schema	1.surrender to self- punitiveness schema
Emotional inhibition	1- connection, acceptance		1- overcompen- sation for vulnerability to harm schema	
Punitive	1- Connection, Acceptance			

Table 21.(Continued) Summary of Comparison of the Vignettes by

Conditional	1- connection, acceptance 4-adequate limits	1- overcompensation for defectiveness/ shame schema 2- overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema	
Overprotective	1-Autonomy, Performance 2- Adequate Limits		1-surrender to dependence/ incompetence schema
Pessimistic/ Fearful	1- Adequate Limits 2- Autonomy, Performance	1-surrender to emotional deprivation schema 2- surrender to emotional inhibition schema 3- overcompensation for defectiveness/ shame schema	1- overcompensation for vulnerability to harm schema
Controlling	1-Autonomy, Performance 2- Balanced Standards, Responsibility	1-surrender to emotional deprivation schema 2- overcompensation for defectiveness/ shame schema	
Permissive/ boundless	1- adequate limits		

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

The aim of this study is to investigate how unmet emotional needs and perceived parenting styles influence partner choice in romantic relationships. This chapter will discuss the results within the framework of schema therapy. The discussion will follow the order of the results section. Finally, strengths, limitations and suggestions for future research will also be included in this chapter.

4.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Demographic Variable

In this section, the scores given by the participants to the vignettes will be compared according to their gender, receiving therapy and psychiatric diagnosis. The gender variable was divided into 2 groups as male and female. The study included 305 participants. 81% of the participants were female. 43% of the participants stated that they had received psychotherapy support before and 78.4% did not have a psychiatric diagnosis. While 49% of women reported receiving therapy, 19% of men reported receiving therapy. In addition, 23.9% of women and 12.1% of men had a psychiatric diagnosis.

4.1.1. Comparison of the Vignettes by Gender

Hypothesis: Participants who had received therapy were expected to significantly differ from those who did not receive therapy in attractiveness scores given to the vignette.

The mean scores of vignettes examined in the light of gender differences, there were found significant differences between, abandonment/instability, dependence/incompetence, defectiveness/shame, mistrust/abuse, emotional inhibition, pessimism, self-punitiveness, insufficient self-control, entitlement/grandiosity schemas vignettes differ by gender.

In the vignettes, people's behaviors in their romantic relationships are depicted within the framework of a maladaptive schema. Therefore, it includes the personality traits of individuals and their behaviors in the relationship. Since these behaviors involve a maladaptive schema, vignettes are likely to be less attractive, especially when assessed in terms of personality traits. It is found that women generally find vignettes less

attractive than men. These results are thought to be consistent with sexual strategies theory of partner selection and asymmetry of parental investment theory.

Based on the asymmetry of parental investment (Trivers, 1972), males generally prefer partners based on physical characteristics, especially those that signal fertility and reproductive health. Physical characteristics are important for both short- and long-term relationships by males. On the other hand, females generally value physical and personal characteristics in a partner in short-term relationships. In long-term relationships, in addition to personal traits, traits related to social status and resource acquisition are also important (Castro and Lopes, 2011). No physical characteristics are given in the vignettes, but it can still be inferred that men pay less attention to personality traits than women.

4.1.2. Comparison of Vignettes by Receiving Therapy

Hypothesis: Participants who have psychiatric diagnosis were expected to significantly differ from those who did not have a diagnosis in attractiveness scores given to the vignette.

When analyzed in terms of the variable of receiving therapy, it was revealed that individuals who received therapy were less willing to establish romantic relationships with people with emotional deprivation, dependency/incompetence, defectiveness/shame, mistrust/abuse, and insufficient self-control schemas vignettes compared to individuals who did not receive therapy.

Since the 1930s, many studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of psychotherapies (Lambert and Ogles, 2004). Psychotherapies do not only treat symptoms, but also help individuals to improve their well-being and find meaning in their lives (Strupp and Hadley, 1977). The main goal of some schools of therapy is not symptom relief. For example, the primary goal of schema therapy is to help individuals whose needs are not met during the transition process to meet their own needs (Rafaeli et al., 2013). In a study of 80 clients who received 25 sessions of dynamically oriented psychotherapy, clients were asked to report the most important changes they had experienced from the psychotherapy. The clients' feedback was categorized into 4 groups: improvement in symptoms, improvement in self-understanding, improvement in self-confidence and better self-definition (Connolly and Strupp, 1996). Participants' reason for seeking

therapy, number of sessions, and school of therapy are not known. However, in the vignettes, the behaviors of individuals in romantic relationships are represented within the framework of a maladaptive schema. Therefore individuals who are aware of their own emotional needs and understand themselves better are likely to find these vignettes less attractive.

4.2. Comparison of the Vignettes by Subscales of Young Parenting Inventory

In the present study, ANOVA analysis was conducted to understand the effect of the degree of maternal and paternal parenting styles on finding vignettes attractive. Analyses were conducted for each maternal and paternal parenting style separately. In this section, before discussing the hypotheses, a common result will be evaluated. According to the results of the analysis, in general, individuals who rated the parenting style low or high find the vignettes attractive at a similar rate. The outcome was evaluated from the perspectives of attachment, betrayal trauma and object relations theories.

Attachment theory and betrayal trauma theory assess responses to traumatic events in romantic relationships through early relationships. Both theories argue that because the establishment and maintenance of the attachment relationship is crucial for our survival, individuals externalize information about caregiver abuse and/or selectively process experiences of maltreatment by a caregiver. Freyd (1996) argues that if realizing one's betrayal would damage the bond, the individual experiences an amnesia and tries to maintain the bond. The degree of a trauma significantly affects the individual's cognitive encoding of the trauma, the accessibility of the event to awareness (Freyd, 1996). The closer and more necessary one's relationship with the perpetrator(s), the greater the degree of trauma. Under conditions where betrayal is strongest, victims may experience "betrayal blindness" where the betrayed person has no conscious awareness (Freyd et al., 2001). Bowlby (1980) suggested that information that threatens the representational model of our attachment relationship can be "defensively" excluded from awareness.

In Fairbairn's model, the infant is object seeking. The rejected child finds satisfaction in contact with its objects. The rejected infant or child has no power to change its parents and no ability to meet its own needs. All structures and defenses stem directly

from attempts to meet the child's needs. Every decision the child makes maximizes its attachment to the objects it desperately needs. He/she has no alternative but to reject or accept his object. The rejected child is developmentally frozen and stuck to the parental objects that rejected them. The child's ego structures are filled by the internalization of abusive and rejecting objects. Both of these strategies (internalization of the rejected object and intense focus on the rejected object) prevent the collapse of the child's ego. Once the neglectful object has been internalized, the child retains and values these now available objects, because at least he can trust that the internal object will be there when he needs it (Celani, 1999).

In the light of the information in the literature, we can assume that individuals who score low on parenting styles leave out the negative aspects of their parents, and that their emotional needs may not be adequately met. The fact that individuals who give low and high ratings to parenting styles find vignettes similarly attractive can be explained by these theoretical perspectives. However, depending on some parenting styles and the schema represented by the vignette, changes are observed. Individuals whose mothers were highly overprotective found individuals who overcompensated for the vulnerability to harm schema (a vignette that includes traits such as fearless, strong, etc.) more attractive than low and medium ones. Similarly, individuals whose fathers showed high levels of pessimistic/fearful parenting found individuals who overcompensated for the vulnerability to harm schema more attractive than low and medium ones. The overprotective and pessimistic style may not be perceived by the child as traumatic or damaging to attachment. Therefore, the child may not have excluded these characteristics of the parent.

The findings of the hypotheses regarding the levels of perceived parenting styles (low, medium, high) and finding the vignettes created according to schemas and parenting styles attractive are discussed below under subheadings respectively.

Hypothesis 1: Participants who experienced a high degree of the parenting style that prevents the fulfillment of Connection and Acceptance emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting at a low degree.

Parenting styles that interfere with meeting the emotional needs of Connection and Acceptance are: emotional depriving, belittling, emotional inhibition, punitive and conditional. In the results, the degree of emotional depriving, belittling, punitive and conditional parenting styles significantly differentiates the attractiveness of vignettes of Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain.

Failure to meet the emotional needs of Connection and Acceptance can lead to the formation of schemas in the Disconnection and Rejection schema area (Young et al., 2003). Parenting styles that prevent the fulfillment of Connection and Acceptance emotional needs are associated with schemas in this area (Young et al., 2003). People with schemas in the disconnection/rejection domain have difficulty in establishing attachment and have beliefs that their needs for love, belonging and security cannot be satisfied (Young et al., 2003). Since these individuals perceive other people as harmful or distant-cold (Young and Lindemann, 2002), they may choose emotionally detached, overly critical partners (Roediger, 2015).

Individuals whose mothers had a moderate emotional deprivation parenting style were found to be more attracted to individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema (cold emotionally uncaring) than those whose mothers had a low emotional deprivation parenting style. The three dimensions of the emotional deprivation parenting style are care (attention, warmth, connection, love), empathy (listening, sharing emotions and being understood) and protection (help, guidance, guidance) (Lockwood and Perris, 2012). People whose these needs are not met in the early period are considered to continue their close relationships in adulthood in the direction of re-enactment of the same scene, and it is thought to support the view (Young et al., 2003) that they may choose selfish, indifferent, distant, cold; in short, "disconnected" partners due to their schema chemistry. However, the opposite result was for the father's emotional deprivation parenting style. When the mother was emotionally depriving, the partner who resembled the mother was found attractive, whereas when the father was emotionally depriving, the partner who resembled the father was found less attractive. Literature has shown that the effect of the paternal parenting style on child psychopathology is relatively higher compared to the maternal parenting style (Blissett and Haycraft 2008; Soygüt and Karaosmanoğlu 2005). In addition, studies conducted in Turkey have revealed that the influence of the father on the development

of EMSs is relatively greater than the influence of the mother's parenting style (Soygüt 2012). Parental dimensions may be thought to affect the individual's choice of partner in romantic relationships differently according to the gender of the parent.

Degree of maternal belittling did not differentiate the attractiveness of vignettes in the Disconnection and Rejection schema domain. On the contrary, individuals whose fathers were highly belittling parenting found individuals who surrendered to emotional deprivation schema less attractive than individuals whose fathers were moderately belittling. Belittling parenting prevents the emotional need for connection and acceptance from being met (DiFrancesco et al,2017). These individuals may need people with whom they can establish intimate connections in their relationships. For this reason, individuals who surrender to the emotional deprivation schema, that is, cold and distant individuals, may be thought to be less attractive. At this point, it is thought that individuals may be choosing individuals who are uncritical, generally warmer and more empathic, in other words, individuals who are defined as "schema healers" (Young et al., 2003) who can be good for their schemas (Young et al., 2003) as spouses instead of the condescending and punitive characteristics of their parents.

Individuals whose mothers had a moderate conditional parenting style were found to be more attracted to individuals who overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema and overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema than those whose mothers had a low emotional deprivation parenting style. Contrary, Individuals whose fathers had a moderate conditional parenting style were found to be more attracted to individuals who overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema and overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema than those whose fathers had a high emotional deprivation parenting style. Conditional parenting style is associated with approval seeking schema (Soygüt et al., 2008). People with approval seeking schema associate their self-worth entirely with how much others approve and appreciate them. In these individuals, the need to be loved, seen and accepted by others is very intense (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). The person in the overcompensation for defectiveness/shame schema vignette is difficult to like and overly critical, while the overcompensation for mistrust/abuse schema is emotionally unstable and bullies their partner for meeting someone they don't want to. These two individuals cannot provide the acceptance and approval that the individual with approval seeking schema needs. Couples often

choose each other on the basis of their schemas, often by re-experiencing familiar childhood emotions and recalling distressing situations(DiFrancesco et al,2017). For maternal conditional parenting, the findings are consistent with schema chemistry. For paternal conditional parenting findings, this finding may involve a "pathological adjustment" that results in maintaining schemas that are maladaptive through "schema avoidance" (Young et al., 2003). Conditional parenting, depending on the form, it is thought that an individual who may have an approval seeking schema may be avoiding rejection and criticism in close relationships (schema avoidance).

Pessimistic parenting is associated with the emotional needs of Autonomy, Performance and Adequate Limits (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). However, degree of paternal pessimistic/fearful significantly differentiate on emotional deprivation, emotional inhibition, defectiveness/shame schema vignette score. The pessimistic parent believes that things will always turn out negatively (Taşkale and Soygüt, 2017). Therefore, they may not be able to offer the security, support and guidance that the child needs. Individuals who are reared by unsupportive and unresponsive parents to have an insecure attachment style. Therefore, the child's need for attachment may not be met. This may have made a difference in finding vignettes in this area attractive.

Hypothesis 2: Participants who experienced a high degree of the parenting style that prevents the fulfillment of Autonomy and Performance emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting at a low degree.

Parenting styles that interfere with meeting the emotional needs of Autonomy and Performance are: Overprotective, controlling, emotional depriving, belittling. In the results, the degree of overprotective, controlling and belittling parenting significantly differentiates the attractiveness of vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain.

Individuals whose mothers or fathers are moderately overprotective find individuals who surrendered for dependence/incompetence schema more attractive than those whose mothers or fathers are low overprotective. On the other hand, individuals whose mothers are moderately and highly overprotective find individuals who

overcompensate for the vulnerability to harm schema more attractive than those whose mothers are low overprotective. Overprotective parenting is associated with dependency, vulnerability to harm and undeveloped self-schemas (Soygüt et al, 2008). The emotional needs of individuals with this schema in a romantic relationship are a model that takes precautions against risks without overprotection, acceptance that they have a separate identity, and respect for their boundaries (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). The individual in the vignette of surrender to the dependency schema is someone who looks for guidance in terms of responsibilities and decision-making. An individual in the overcompensation vignette of the vulnerability to harm schema is someone who overprotects their partner against dangers and risks. The attractiveness of these individuals is consistent with schema chemistry. It can be thought that the more overprotective the parent is, the more attractive a parent-like individual is found. In women, the perception of the parent as overprotective predicts the evaluation of the husband as "dependent" (Caner, 2008). They may be maintaining a mutual dependency relationship with their husbands by reinforcing each other's feelings of inadequacy (Tucker and Anders, 1999).

The child's need for autonomy is related to the control dimension of parenting (Schafer, 1965). The control dimension has a complex structure and basically includes behavioral and psychological control dimensions (Darling and Steinberg, 1993). Behavioral control is aimed at regulating the child's behavior, disciplinary, rewarding or guiding behaviors, while psychological control the child's affect, verbal expressions, identity and attachment experience corresponds to manipulative and intrusive forms of parenting (Barber, 2002). Psychological control is also known to be generally associated with autonomy, competence, inability to gain a stable identity and dependency (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). It can be thought overprotective parenting is associated with behavioral control, whereas controlling, belittling and emotionally depriving parenting is associated with psychological control. In the results, the degree of permissive, pessimistic, conditional and emotional inhibition parenting also significantly differentiates the attractiveness of vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain. Permissive parents do not guide their children and are excessively authoritative (Taşkale and Soygüt, 2017). Therefore, permissive parenting may be thought to be related to behavioral control. On the other hand, emotional inhibition parenting is thought to be related to psychological control. Thus, since they

prevent the fulfillment of the need for autonomy, they may have influenced the attractiveness of vignettes in this domain.

Individuals with moderately controlling mothers find individuals who surrender to dependency schema and overcompensate for vulnerability to harm schema more attractive than individuals with low controlling mothers. It can be thought that as the mother's controlling parenting increases, individuals find partners who will prevent them from meeting their autonomy and competence needs attractive. It can be said that individuals are more attracted to partners who can prevent the fulfillment of emotional needs that are not met by the parent. This finding is consistent with schema chemistry. In addition, controlling parenting has a nature that does not allow separation and is associated with separation anxiety (Gürlek Yüksel, 2006 ;Özbaran, 2004). Therefore, individuals who are exposed to controlling parenting style can be considered to find attractive individuals who are dependent on them or who will not overprotect and abandon them.

Individuals whose mothers exhibited moderate conditional parenting found individuals who overcompensated for the resilience schema more attractive than those whose mothers exhibited low conditional parenting. Conditional parents expect high achievement from their children. The child may feel inadequate and vulnerable in the face of these demands that they cannot fulfill (Arntz and Jacop, 2011). This prevents their emotional needs for autonomy and performance from being met (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). These individuals may therefore be attracted to individuals who will protect and guide them like a parent.

Hypothesis 3: Participants who experienced a high degree of the parenting style that prevents the fulfillment of Balanced Standards and Responsibility emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting at a low degree.

Parenting styles that interfere with meeting the emotional needs of Balanced Standards and Responsibility are: belittling, emotional depriving and controlling. In the results, the degree of emotional depriving and belittling parenting significantly differentiates

the attractiveness of vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain.

Individuals whose mothers or fathers were highly belittling parents were less attracted to individuals with punitiveness schema than those whose mothers or fathers were moderately belittling parents. In addition, individuals whose fathers showed high levels of emotional deprivation parenting found individuals with punitiveness schema less attractive than those whose fathers showed low levels of emotional deprivation. At this point, it is suggested that individuals may be choosing people who are defined as "schema healers" (Young et al., 2003), who can be good for their schemas in a non-critical, non-punitive and non-prescriptive way, instead of the condescending and detached characteristics of their parents. This may mean that individuals do not always choose partners who are similar to their parents; on the contrary, they may choose partners who can respond to their emotional needs that are not met by their parents.

Belittling parenting is associated with subjection and emotionally depriving parenting is associated with self-sacrifice schemas (Soygüt et al., 2008). Individuals with subjection schema need the freedom to express their needs, feelings and opinions in the context of important relationships without fear of punishment or rejection in relationships. Individuals with self-sacrifice schema need a balance in the importance of their own needs in relationships (Vreeswijk et al., 2012). The individual in the punitiveness schema vignette is a punitive person with strict rules. Therefore, the individual in the vignette may not be able to provide the emotional care that individuals with these schemas need in the relationship. Therefore, they may find them less attractive.

Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain has only 1 vignette. This makes it difficult to assess the emotional need for Balanced Standards and Responsibility.

Hypothesis 4: Participants who experienced a high degree of the parenting style that prevents the fulfillment of Adequate Limits emotional needs are expected to find vignettes of Impaired Limits Schema Domain more attractive than those participants who experienced such parenting at a low degree.

Parenting styles that interfere with meeting the emotional needs of Adequate Limits are: conditional, overprotective, pessimistic, permissive. In the results, the degree permissive parenting significantly differentiates the attractiveness of vignettes of Impaired Limits Schema Domain.

Individuals whose mothers exhibited a low permissive parenting style were more likely to want to be in a romantic relationship with individuals who surrendered to an insufficient self-control schema compared to individuals whose mothers exhibited a high and moderate permissive parenting style. Permissive parenting is associated with insufficient self-control schema (Soygüt et al, 2008). Permissive parents do not provide the guidance that children need (Taşkale and Soygüt, 2017). The lack of boundaries and guidance prevents the child's emotional needs for autonomy and competence from being met (Young et al, 2003). Individuals whose mothers are highly permissive find individuals who surrender to the dependency schema and overcompensate for the vulnerability schema more attractive than those whose mothers are low permissive parents. This finding can be considered to be consistent with the fact that the emotional needs for autonomy and competence of those whose parents are highly permissive are not met. The individual in the vignette of insufficient self-control schema has difficulty taking responsibility and completing daily tasks. Therefore, those whose parents are highly permissive find individuals who have insufficient discipline and need guidance less attractive. Because these individuals need guidance in the relationship. Individuals with insufficient self-control schema may not be able to provide this guidance.

4.3. Limitations and Further Suggestions

The present study has some limitations. The scale used to assess parenting styles is a self-report scale. Participants read the questions and chose the most appropriate answer for themselves. In the analysis of the responses, it was assumed that the participants gave accurate and consistent answers to the questions. However, the defense mechanisms or modes used by the participants may have affected the responses to the scale. Therefore, the degree of perceived parenting style may not reflect reality. The fact that only maladaptive parenting styles were evaluated is one of the limitations of the study.

Another limitation is that no scale was used to assess the defense mechanisms or schema modes used by the individuals. The use of these scales may make the effect of the degree of parenting style on finding vignettes attractive more understandable. In addition, no scale was used to measure emotional needs. Measuring emotional needs and measuring not only maladaptive parenting but also healthy parenting may help to evaluate the results.

The number of male and female participants was not equal. In order to generalize the study, it should be repeated with more male participants. Men and women have different motivations for choosing partners in romantic relationships. Therefore, more male participants will produce more generalizable results.

There are 2 vignettes in the Impaired Limits Schema Domain and 1 vignette in the Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain. The lack of enough vignettes in these domains prevented the evaluation and generalization of the findings.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study examined how unmet emotional needs and perceived parenting styles affect partner choice in romantic relationships. For this purpose, vignettes were prepared depicting individuals' behaviors in romantic relationships under the influence of certain schemas and parenting styles. The effects of perceived parenting styles and the degree of emotional needs on the attractiveness of the vignettes were investigated.

There are significant differences between participants' gender, therapy status and psychiatric diagnosis and finding vignettes attractive. Men generally find vignettes more attractive than women. Individuals who received therapy were less willing to establish romantic relationships with people with emotional deprivation, dependency/incompetence, defectiveness/shame, mistrust/abuse, and insufficient self-control schemas vignettes compared to individuals who did not receive therapy. Individuals with psychiatric diagnoses are less willing to establish romantic relationships with individuals with mistrust/abuse and insufficient self-control schemas than individuals without psychiatric diagnoses.

The degree of perceived parenting style (low, medium, high) significantly differentiates finding the vignette attractive. The degree of emotional depriving, punitive, conditional, belittling, pessimistic, controlling parenting significantly differentiates finding the vignettes of Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domains. The degree of conditional, overprotective, controlling, permissive, emotional inhibition, belittling, pessimistic parenting significantly differentiates finding the vignettes of Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domains. The degree of belittling and emotional depriving parenting significantly differentiates finding the vignettes of Excessive Responsibility and Standards Schema Domain. The degree of permissive parenting significantly differentiates finding the vignettes of Impaired Limits Schema Domain.

The findings were discussed within the framework of schema therapy. The results are consistent with the concept of schema chemistry proposed by Young et al. (2003). In addition, the gender of the parent and the nature of the emotional need were also found to have an impact on partner choice.

REFERENCES

- Arntz, A. and Jacop, G. (2019) *Uygulamada şema terapi/ Şema mod yaklaşımına giriş rehberi* (Soygüt, G. Eds). Nobel Yayıncılık (Original published date 2011).
- Apostolou, M. (2008) *Parent–offspring conflict over mating: The case of beauty*. *Evolutionary Psychology*, Vol. 6(2), pp. 303-315.
- Atmaca, S. and Gençöz, T. (2016) *Exploring revictimization process among Turkish women: The role of early maladaptive schemas on the link between child abuse and partner violence*. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 52, pp. 85–93.
- Bach, B., Lockwood, G. and Young, J.E. (2018) *A new look at the schema therapy model: organization and role of early maladaptive schemas*, *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, Vol. 47:4, pp. 328-349.
- Bacanlı, H. (2001) *Eş tercihleri*. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, Vol. 15(2), pp. 7-16.
- Barber, B. K. (Ed.) (2002) *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.
- Benoit, D. (2004) *Infant-parent attachment: Definition, types, antecedents, measurement and outcome*. *Paediatr Child Health* Vol. 9(8), pp. 541-545.
- Bornstein, R. F. (2001) *The impending death of psychoanalysis*. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, Vol. 18(1), pp. 3–20.
- Bowlby, J. (1983) *Attachment: attachment and loss*, Volume One (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
- Brazelton, T.B. and Cramer, B. (1990) *The earliest relationship; parents, infants and drama of early attachment*. Cambridge Press.
- Brazelton, T.B and Greenspan, S.I. (2000) *Irreducible needs of children; What every child must have to grow, learn and flourish*. Da Capo Press. ISBN:0738205168
- Buss, D.M. and Schmitt, D.P. (2019) *Mate preferences and their behavioral manifestations*. *Annual Review Psychol.* 2019, Vol. 70, pp. 77–110.
- Buss, D.M. (1989) *Sex differences in human mate preferences: evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures*. *Behav. Brain Sci.*, Vol. 12(1), pp. 1–14.
- Buss, D.M. (1995) *Psychological sex differences: origins through sexual selection*. *Am. Psychol.* Vol. 50, pp. 164–68.

- Buss, D.M. and Schmitt, D.P. (1993) *Sexual strategies theory: an evolutionary perspective on human mating*. Psychol. Rev., Vol. 100(2), pp. 204–32.
- Caner, M. (2009) *Evli bireylerde kendi ebeveynlerini algılama biçimleri, erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar ve eşe yönelik değerlendirmeler arasındaki ilişkiler: şema terapi modeli çerçevesinde bir inceleme* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi).
- Calvete, E., Fernández-González, L., Little, T.D. and Orue, I. (2016) *Exposure to Family Violence and Dating Violence Perpetration in Adolescents: Potential Cognitive and Emotional Mechanisms*. Psychology of Violence, Vol. 8 (1), pp. 67–75.
- Castro, F. N. and Lopes, F. A. (2011) *Romantic preferences in brazilian undergraduate students: From the short term to the long term*. Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 48(5), pp. 479-485.
- Celani, D.P. (1999) *Applying Fairbairn's object relations theory to the dynamics of the battered woman*. American Journal Psychotherapy. Celani. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. Psychoanal. Rev., Vol. (99)(3), pp. 452-454.
- Connolly, M. and Strupp, H.H. (1996) *Cluster analysis of patient reported psychotherapy outcomes, psychotherapy research*, Vol. 6:1, pp. 30-42.
- Darling, N. and Steinberg, L. (1993) *Parenting style as context: An integrative model*. Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 113, pp. 487-496.
- DiFrancesco, C. S., Roediger, E. and Stevens, B.A. (2017) *Şemalar ve modlar* (İ. Yiğit, Çev.), Çiftlerle şema terapi klinisyenin ilişkileri iyileştirme rehberi. I. G. Danışman (Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Duck, S. (2007) *Human relationship 4th edition*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications
- Dumitrescu, D. and Rusu, A. S. (2012) *Relationship between early maladaptive schemas, couple satisfaction and individual mate value: An evolutionary psychological approach*. Journal of Cognitive & Behavioral Psychotherapies, Vol. 12(1), pp. 63- 76.
- Eber, M. (1996) *The Illusion of Love: Why the Battered Woman Returns to Her Abuser* by David P. Celani New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. Psycholanic. Books, Vol. (7)(3), pp. 378-381.
- Eagly, A. H. and Wood, H. (1999) *The origins of sex differences in human behavior. Evolved dispositions versus social roles*. American Psychologist.

- Fugère, M.E., Ciccarelli, N.C. and Cousins, A.J. (2023) *The importance of physical attractiveness and ambition/intelligence to the mate choices of women and their parents*. Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences.
- Fraiberg, S. (1977) *Every Child's Birthright: In Defense of Mothering*. Basic Books, New York
- Gay, L., Harding, HG., Jackson, JL., Burns, EE. and Baker, BD. (2013) *Attachment style and early maladaptive schemas as mediators of the relationship between childhood emotional abuse and intimate partner violence*. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, Vol. 22(4).
- Flanagan, C. M. (2010) *The case for needs in psychotherapy*. Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, Vol. 20(1), pp. 1–36.
- Geçtan, E. (2020) *Psikanaliz ve sonrası*. Metis Yayınları. İSBN:9789753424639
- Giesen-Bloo, J., Dyck, R., Spinhoven, P., Tilburg, W., Dirksen, C. Asselt T., ... and Arntz, A. (2006) *Outpatient Psychotherapy for Borderline Personality Disorder: Randomized Trial of Schema-Focused Therapy vs Transference-Focused Psychotherapy*. Achieves of General Psychiatry, Vol. 63(6), pp. 649-658.
- Gürlek Yüksel, M. (2006) *Üniversite öğrencilerinde ayrılma bireyleşme özellikleri ve etkileyen etmenler*. Uzmanlık Tezi, Manisa.
- Grinberg, H. (2012) *Fairbairn's Object Relations Theory in the Clinical Setting*. By David P.
- Hassija, C.M., Robinson, M., Silva, Y. and Lewin, M.R. (2017) *Dysfunctional Parenting and Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration and Victimization among College Women: the Mediating Role of Schemas*. J Fam, Vol. (33), pp. 65–73.
- Hendrick, S. S. (2009) *Yakın ilişkiler psikolojisi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Hull, C. L. (1943) *Principles of behavior: An introduction to behavior theory*. Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Hsu, T. L., and Barrett, A. E. (2020) *The association between marital status and psychological well being: Variation across negative and positive dimensions*. Journal of Family Issues, Vol. 41(11), pp. 2179–2202.
- Karaosmanoğlu, A., Şaşıoğlu, M., and Azizlerli, N. (2018) *İlişkiler, başlatmak, sürdürmek, bitirmek*. İstanbul: Psikonet Yayınları.

- Kahveciođlu, C. (2014) *Eş seçimin terk edilme şeması, baskın nöral sistemler, evlilik mitleri ve bağlanma stilleri açısından incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul.
- Konner, M. (2010) *The evolution of childhood: Relationships, emotion, mind*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Lambert, M. J., and Ogles, B. M. (2004) *The efficacy and effectiveness of psychotherapy*. In M. J. Lambert (Ed.), *Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (5th ed., pp. 139-193). New York: Wiley
- Lobbestael, J., van Vreeswijk, M., Spinhoven, P., Schouten, E. and Arntz, A. (2010) *Reliability and validity of the short Schema Mode Inventory (SMI)*. *Behav Cogn Psychother*, Vol. 38(4), pp. 437-58.
- Lichtenberg, J.D. (1989) *Psychoanalysis and Motivation*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Louis, J.P., Wood, A. and Lockwood, G. (2018) *Development and validation of the Positive Parenting Schema Inventory (PPSI) to complement the Young Parenting Inventory (YPI) for Schema Therapy (ST) assessment*.
- Maccoby, E. E. and Martin, J. A. (1983) *Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction*. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- O'Donnell C.J., Smith A. and Madison J.R. (2002) *Using demographic risk factors to explain variations in the incidence of violence against women*. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 17, pp. 1239-1262.
- Refaeli, E., Bernstein, A.P. and Young, J.E. (2013) *Şema terapi ayırıcı özellikler* (Karaosmanođlu, A., Azizlerli, N. Eds). Psikonet Yayınları (Original published date 2011).
- Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000) *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being*. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 55(1), pp. 68-78.
- Roediger, E., Behary, W.T. and Zarbock, G. (2018) *Demek ki oluyormuş Şema terapi ile eşler arası anlaşmazlıkları anlamak ve çözmek* (N. Azizlerli, Çev.). İstanbul: Psikonet Yayınlar

- Salimođlu, K.B. (2015) *Lise öđrencilerinin uyum bozucu Őemalarının karŐılaŐtırmalı olarak incelenmesi, Kırgızistan ve TŪrkiye örneđi*. Manas Sosyal AraŐtırmalar Dergisi, Vol. 4(2), pp. 131-154
- Salimođlu, K.B. (2022) *Őema kimyasının eŐ seĀimindeki rolŪ ve Őema kimyası ölĀeđinin geliŐtirilmesi: karma yŪntemler ĀalıŐması*. Doktora Tezi, EskiŐehir.
- Stiles, O. E. (2004) *Early maladaptive schemas and intimacy in young adult's romantic relationships*. Doctorate thesis, Alliant International University, San Francisco
- Sheffield, A., Waller, G., Emanuelli, F., Murray, J., and Meyer, C. (2005) *Links between parenting and core beliefs: preliminary psychometric validation of the young parenting inventory*. Cognitive Therapy and Research, Vol. 29(6), pp. 787–802.
- Spitz, R. (1950) *Relevance of direct infant observation*. Psychoanalytic Study of Child, Vol. 5(1), pp. 66-73.
- Strupp, H. H. and Hadley, S. (1977) *A tripartite model of mental health and therapeutic out-comes*. American Psychologist, Vol. 32, pp. 187- 196.
- SoygŪt, G., Cakir, Z. and Karaosmanoglu, A. (2008) *Assessment of parenting styles: A psychometric study of the Turkish young parenting inventory*. Turkish Psychological Reviews, Vol. 11(22), pp. 17–30.
- SoygŪt, G., GŪlŪm, İ.V., Ersayan, A.E., Lobbestael, J. and Bernstein, A.P. (2021) *A preliminary psychometric study of the Turkish Schema mode inventory-forensic (SMI-F)*. Current Psychology
- Steven, B.A. and Roediger, E. (2017) *Breaking negative relationship patterns*. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Publication ISBN Hardback: 9781119162773
- TaŐkale, N. and SoygŪt, P. (2017) *Risk Factors for Women's Intimate Partner Violence Victimization: An Examination from the Perspective of the Schema Therapy Model*. Journal of Family Violence, Vol. 32, pp. 3–12.
- Tucker, J. S. and Anders, S. L. (1999) *Attachment style, interpersonal perception accuracy, and relationship satisfaction in dating couples*. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 25, pp. 403–412.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972) *Parental investment and sexual selection*. In: *Sexual selection and the descent of man*, ed. B. Campbell. Aldine.

- Tyano, S., Keren, M., Herrman, M. and Cox, J. (2010) *Parenthood and mental health: a bridge between infant and adult psychiatry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. ISBN: 978-0-470-74722-3
- Vreeswijk, M., Broersen, J. and Nadort, M. (2012) *The handbook of schema therapy; theory, research and practice*. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication ISBN 978-0-470-97561-9
- Young, J.E., and Gluhoski, V.L. (1997) *A schema-focused perspective on satisfaction inclose relationships*. R. J. Sternberg and M. Hojjat (Ed.), Satisfaction in close relationships
- Young, J. and Klosko, J. S. (1994) *Reinventing your life*. New York: Plume.
- Young, J. (1990) *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema –focused approach*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S. and Weishaar, M. E. (2003) *Schema therapy: a practitioner’s guide*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Yiğit, İ. and Celik, C. (2016) *İlişki doyumunun erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar, kişilerarası ilişki tarzları ve kendilik algısı açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, Vol. 19 (38), pp. 77-87

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - KATILIMCI BİLGİLENDİRME VE ONAM FORMU

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu çalışma, İzmir Ekonomi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans programı öğrencisi Rümeyza Biçer Tekin tarafından yürütülen ve Prof. Öğretim Üyesi Falih Köksal danışmanlığında sürdürülen bir tez çalışmasıdır. Çalışma kapsamında duygusal ihtiyaçlarımız ve partner seçimlerimiz arasındaki ilişki hakkında bilgi toplamak amaçlanmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada sizden, ekte sunulacak olan ölçekleri eksiksiz olarak doldurmanız beklenmektedir. Çalışma toplamda 4 bölümden oluşmakta ve yaklaşık olarak 20 dakika sürmektedir. Çalışmaya katılabilmemiz için 18 yaş ve üstü olmanız gerekmektedir.

Katılımınız araştırma hipotezinin test edilmesi ve yukarıda açıklanan amaçlar doğrultusunda literatüre sağlayacağı katkılar ve klinik uygulamalar bakımından oldukça önemlidir. Bu sebeple, soruların samimi bir şekilde ve eksiksiz doldurulması büyük önem arz etmektedir. Ölçekleri doldururken sizi tam olarak yansıtmadığını düşündüğünüz durumlarda size en yakın yanıtı işaretleyiniz.

Çalışma kapsamında katılımcılardan elde edilen veriler isim kullanılmaksızın analizlere dahil edilecektir; yani çalışma sürecinde size bir katılımcı numarası verilecek ve isminiz araştırma raporunda yer almayacaktır.

Çalışmaya katılmanız tamamen kendi isteğinize bağlıdır. Katılımı reddetme ya da çalışma sürecinde herhangi bir zaman diliminde devam etmeme hakkına sahiptir. Eğer görüşme esnasında katılımınıza ilişkin herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, araştırmacıyla e-posta adresi üzerinden iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum ve verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

EVET

HAYIR

APPENDIX B - VİNYETLER

Değerli katılımcı, aşağıda bazı bireyler tanımlanmaktadır. Lütfen her tanımlamayı dikkatle okuyun ve "bu kişiyi romantik ilişki yaşamak için tanımak isterim" ifadesi için 1 ile 6 arasında, size en uygun dereceyi seçin.

1 - Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

2 - Katılmıyorum

3 - Kısmen katılmıyorum

4 - Kısmen katılıyorum

5 - Katılıyorum

6 - Kesinlikle katılıyorum

1) O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda; bugüne kadar uzun süreli bir ilişkisinin olmadığını biliyoruz. İlişkiler konusunda genellikle kafasının karışık olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman birisiyle flört etmeye başlasam, onunla devam edip etmeme konusunda karar vermekte zorlanıyorum.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

2) Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman mesefali ve soğuk birisi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Eski partnerlerinden onun nadiren sarıldığını öğreniyoruz. Genelde insanların sorunlarını dinleyip teselli etmekte zorlandığını belirtmektedir. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

3) Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda onun koruyucu birisi olduğunu görmekteyiz. Hayatına giren insanları adeta bir ebeveyn gibi koruyup desteklediğini öğreniyoruz ve bunu yapmaktan keyif aldığını belirtmektedir. Partneri adına neredeyse her şeyi yapar. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

4) Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerinde ise zaman zaman partneri tarafından desteklenmek istemektedir. Belirli alanlarda oldukça yetenekli birisi ama bu yeteneklerini ortaya koymakta zorlanmaktadır. Bazı sorumlulukları konusunda yardıma ihtiyacı olmaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

5) Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda oldukça seçici olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Onun, birisini beğenmesi oldukça zordur. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman biriyle karşılıklı otursam tüm kusurlarını fark ediyorum ve bunu dile getiriyorum. Gerçekten iyi giyinen, kendisine bakan birisini bulmak çok zor.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

6) O, arkadaşlarının tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman duygularını kontrol etmekte zorlandığını öğrenmekteyiz. Partneri onu rahatsız eden bir şey yaptığında öfke patlamaları yaşayabiliyor. Eski bir partneri yaşadıkları bir deneyimi şöyle anlatmaktadır: “Onun mesajlarına geç yanıt verdiğim için kısıknçlık krizine girdi ve telefonda bana uzun süre bağırıp hakaret etti” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

7) Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda duyguları konusunda bazı zorlanmalar yaşadığını öğrenmekteyiz. Onun bir şeye güldüğünü ya da öfkeli olduğunu anlamak gerçekten zorlayıcıdır. Bu durumu şöyle tarif etmektedir “Duyguları zaman zaman gereksiz buluyorum. Genelde olaylar karşısında pek bir şey hissetmem.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

8) Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda kendisini gerçekçi birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır ve bu özelliğinin ilişkilerde sorunlar yarattığını düşünmektedir. Ona göre dünya kötü bir yer ve yaşam sorunlarla dolu. Hayata dair pozitif bir bakış açısı mantıklı değil. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

9) Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnleri onu kurallar konusunda hassas birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Hata yapıldığında bunun mutlaka bir cezasının olması gerektiğine inanmaktadır. Kendisini disiplinli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

10) Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda eğlenmekten ve keyif almaktan hoşlandığını öğreniyoruz. Sıkıcı şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanmadığını belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Serbest çalışmayı seviyorum, sıkıcı şeylerden ise nefret ederim ve onları tamamlamayam. Benden her şeyi isteyebilirsin ama lütfen bu sıkıcı şeyleri yapmamı isteme” . İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum

11) O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda bazı hassas noktaları olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Örneğin birlikte yaşadıkları evin düzenli olması. Bu konulara dikkat etmeyen bireylere sevgi ve ilgi duyamadığını öğreniyoruz. Eski partnerlerin birisi bu durumu şöyle anlatmaktadır “ O’nun onaylamadığı bir şey yaptığımda benden uzaklaşırdı. Bu en ufak şeylerde bile böyleydi”. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Bu kişiyi romantik ilişki kurmak için tanımak isterim.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılmıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kısmen Katılıyorum



APPENDIX C - YOUNG -E

Aşağıda anne ve babanızı tarif etmekte kullanabileceğiniz tanımlamalar verilmiştir. Lütfen her tanımlamayı dikkatle okuyun ve ebeveynlerinize ne kadar uyduğuna karar verin. 1 ile 6 arasında, çocukluğunuz sırasında annenizi ve babanızı tanımlayan en yüksek dereceyi seçin. Eğer sizi anne veya babanız yerine başka insanlar büyüttü ise onları da aynı şekilde derecelendirin. Eğer anne veya babanızdan biri hiç olmadı ise o sütunu boş bırakın.

- 1 - Tamamı ile yanlış
- 2 - Çoğunlukla yanlış
- 3 - Uyan tarafı daha fazla
- 4 - Orta derecede doğru
- 5 - Çoğunlukla doğru
- 6 - Ona tamamı ile uyuyor.

Anne Baba

1. ____ Beni sevdi ve bana özel birisi gibi davrandı.
2. ____ Bana vaktini ayırdı ve özen gösterdi.
3. ____ Bana yol gösterdi ve olumlu yönlendirdi.
4. ____ Beni dinledi, anladı ve duygularımızı karşılıklı paylaştık.
5. ____ Bana karşı sıcaktı ve fiziksel olarak şefkatliydi.
6. ____ Ben çocukken öldü veya evi terk etti.
7. ____ Dengesizdi, ne yapacağı belli olmazdı veya alkolikti.
8. ____ Kardeş(ler)imi bana tercih etti.
9. ____ Uzun süreler boyunca beni terk etti veya yalnız bıraktı.
10. ____ Bana yalan söyledi, beni kandırdı veya bana ihanet etti.
11. ____ Beni dövdü, duygusal veya cinsel olarak taciz etti.
12. ____ Beni kendi amaçları için kullandı.
13. ____ İnsanların canını yakmaktan hoşlanırdı.
14. ____ Bir yerimi inciteceğim diye çok endişelenirdi.
15. ____ Hasta olacağım diye çok endişelenirdi.
16. ____ Evhamlı veya fobik/korkak bir insandı.
17. ____ Beni aşırı korurdu.
18. ____ Kendi kararlarımı veya yargılarıma güvenememe neden oldu
19. ____ İşleri kendi başıma yapmama fırsat vermeden çoğu işimi o yaptı.
20. ____ Bana hep daha çocukmuşum gibi davrandı.

21. ____ Beni çok eleştirirdi.
22. ____ Bana kendimi sevmeye layık olmayan veya dışlanmış bir gibi hissettirdi.
23. ____ Bana hep bende yanlış bir şey varmış gibi davrandı.
24. ____ Önemli konularda kendimden utanmama neden oldu.
25. ____ Okulda başarılı olmam için gereken disiplini bana kazandırmadı.
26. ____ Bana salakmışım veya beceriksizmişim gibi davrandı.
27. ____ Başarılı olmamı gerçekten istemedi.
28. ____ Hayatta başarısız olacağıma inandı.
29. ____ Benim fikrim veya isteklerim önemsizmiş gibi davrandı.
30. ____ Benim ihtiyaçlarımı gözetmeden kendisi ne isterse onu yaptı.
31. ____ Hayatımı o kadar çok kontrol altında tuttu ki çok az seçme özgürlüğüm oldu.
32. ____ Her şey onun kurallarına uymalıydı.
33. ____ Aile için kendi isteklerini feda etti.
34. ____ Günlük sorumluluklarının pek çoğunu yerine getiremiyordu ve ben her zaman kendi payıma düşenden fazlasını yapmak zorunda kaldım.
35. ____ Hep mutsuzdu ; destek ve anlayış için hep bana dayandı.
36. ____ Bana güçlü olduğumu ve diğer insanlara yardım etmem gerektiğini hissettirdi.

Anne Baba

37. ____ Kendisinden beklentisi hep çok yüksekti ve bunlar için kendini çok zorlardı.
38. ____ Benden her zaman en iyisini yapmamı bekledi.
39. ____ Pek çok alanda mükemmeliyetçiydi; ona göre her şey olması gerektiği gibi olmalıydı.
40. ____ Yaptığım hiçbir şeyin yeterli olmadığını hissetmeme sebep oldu.
41. ____ Neyin doğru neyin yanlış olduğu hakkında kesin ve katı kuralları vardı.
42. ____ Eğer işler düzgün ve yeterince hızlı yapılmazsa sabırsızlanırdı.
43. ____ İşlerin tam ve iyi olarak yapılmasına, eğlenme veya dinlenmekten daha fazla önem verdi.
44. ____ Beni pek çok konuda şımarttı veya aşırı hoşgörülü davrandı.

45. ____ ____ Diğer insanlardan daha önemli ve daha iyi olduğumu hissettirdi.
46. ____ ____ Çok talepkardı; her şeyin onun istediği gibi olmasını isterdi.
47. ____ ____ Diğer insanlara karşı sorumluluklarımın olduğunu bana öğretmedi.
48. ____ ____ Bana çok az disiplin veya terbiye verdi.
49. ____ ____ Bana çok az kural koydu veya sorumluluk verdi.
50. ____ ____ Aşırı sinirlenmeme veya kontrolümü kaybetmeme izin verirdi.
51. ____ ____ Disiplinsiz bir insandı.
52. ____ ____ Birbirimizi çok iyi anlayacak kadar yakındık.
53. ____ ____ Ondan tam olarak ayrı bir birey olduğumu hissedemedim veya bireyselliğimi yeterince yaşayamadım.
54. ____ ____ Onun çok güçlü bir insan olmasından dolayı büyürken kendi yönümü belirleyemiyordum.
55. ____ ____ İçimizden birinin uzağa gitmesi durumunda, birbirimizi üzebileceğimizi hissedirdim.
56. ____ ____ Ailemizin ekonomik sorunları ile ilgili çok endişeli idi.
57. ____ ____ Küçük bir hata bile yapsam kötü sonuçların ortaya çıkacağını hissettirirdi.
58. ____ ____ Kötümser bir bakışı açısı vardı, hep en kötüsünü beklerdi.
59. ____ ____ Hayatın kötü yanları veya kötü giden şeyler üzerine odaklanırdı.
60. ____ ____ Her şey onun kontrolü altında olmalıydı.
61. ____ ____ Duygularını ifade etmekten rahatsız olurdu.
62. ____ ____ Hep düzenli ve tertipliydi; değişiklik yerine bilineni tercih ederdi.
63. ____ ____ Kızgınlığını çok nadir belli ederdi.
64. ____ ____ Kapalı birisiydi; duygularını çok nadir açardı.
65. ____ ____ Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda kızardı veya sert bir şekilde eleştirdiği olurdu.
66. ____ ____ Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda beni cezalandırdığı olurdu.
67. ____ ____ Yanlış yaptığımda bana aptal veya salak gibi kelimelerle hitap ettiği olurdu.
68. ____ ____ İşler kötü gittiğinde başkalarını suçlardı.
69. ____ ____ Sosyal statü ve görünümüne önem verirdi.
70. ____ ____ Başarı ve rekabete çok önem verirdi.
71. ____ ____ Başkalarının gözünde benim davranışlarımın onu ne duruma düşüreceği ile çok ilgiliydi.

72. ____ ____ Başarılı olduğum zaman beni daha çok sever veya bana daha çok özen gösterirdi.



APPENDIX D - KATILIMCI BİLGİ FORMU

Cinsiyetiniz

1. Kadın
2. Erkek

Cinsel Yöneliminiz

1. Homoseksüel
2. Heteroseksüel
3. Biseksüel

Doğum Yılıınız

Eğitim Durumunuz

1. İlköğretim mezunu
2. Lise mezunu
3. Üniversite mezunu
4. Yüksek lisans mezunu
5. Doktora mezunu

Yaşadığınız Bölge

1. İç Anadolu Bölgesi
2. Marmara Bölgesi
3. Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi
4. Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi
5. Ege Bölgesi
6. Karadeniz Bölgesi
7. Akdeniz Bölgesi

İlişki Durumunuz

1. Evli
2. Nişanlı
3. İlişkim var
4. İlişkim yok

Daha önce bireysel terapiye gittiniz mi?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

Daha önce tanı aldığımız psikolojik bir sorunuz var mı?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

Çocukluk evinizde kimlerle yaşadınız

1. Annem, babam ve kardeşimle/kardeşlerimle

2. Annem ve babam ile
3. Sadece annem ile
4. Sadece babam ile
5. Diđer

Çocukluk ve ergenlik döneminizde ebeveynleriniz dışında desteđini aldığınız birisi oldu mu? Yanıtınız evetse lütfen bu kişinin kim olduğunu (örn: hala, abi vs) belirtiniz.

Mesleđinizi/Okuduđunuz bölümü belirtiniz

Sizi anne ve babanız dışında başka birisi büyüttü mü? Yanıtınız evet ise lütfen kim olduğunu (Örn: hala, abi vs) belirtiniz



APPENDIX E – ŞEMA VE EBEVEYNLİK STİLİ FORMU

Bu çalışma Rümeyza Biçer Tekin tarafından Prof. Falih Köksal danışmanlığında yürütülmekte olan bilimsel bir araştırma çalışmasıdır. Araştırma aşağıda verilen senaryolardaki kişilerin romantik ilişkilerdeki özelliklerinin tanımlanmasını içermektedir. Her bir senaryo için uygun bulduğunuz bir seçeneği işaretleyiniz. Araştırmaya katılmak isterseniz, aşağıdaki soruları doldurmanız gerekmektedir. Araştırmada verdiğiniz bilgiler yalnızca araştırma ekibi tarafından görülecek ve araştırmada kullanılacaktır. Senaryolara verdiğiniz yanıtlar doğrultusunda gerekli durumlarda yanıtınız hakkında bilgi almak için araştırma ekibi size mail atacaktır. Araştırmaya başladıktan sonra devam etmek istemezseniz formun herhangi bir aşamasında araştırmadan ayrılabilirsiniz.

Mail adresiniz:

Mesleğiniz:

Şema Terapi Kuramını nerede öğrendiniz:

1) O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda; bugüne kadar uzun süreli bir ilişkisinin olmadığını biliyoruz. İlişkiler konusunda genellikle kafasının karışık olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman birisiyle flört etmeye başlasam, onunla devam edip etmeme konusunda karar vermekte zorlanıyorum.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir.

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

2) Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman mesefeli ve soğuk birisi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Eski partnerlerinden onun nadiren sarıldığını öğreniyoruz. Genelde insanların sorunlarını dinleyip teselli etmekte zorlandığını belirtmektedir. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kiři ilifkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Őemasına teslim)
- Baę ve ilifki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma Őemasına teslim)
- Bařarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar Őemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endiřeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık Őemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık Őemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim Őemasına teslim)
- İstedięi kořulları yerine getirmedięinde karřısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık Őemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleřtirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Ařırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Baęımlılık Őemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuřkuculuk Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun bařaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Bařarısızlık Őemasına teslim).
- Yoęun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin ařırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduęunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık Őemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda Őemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik Őemasına teslim)

3) Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduęunu düşünmektedir. Kiřisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilifkilerine baktığımızda onun koruyucu birisi olduęunu görmekteyiz. Hayatına giren insanları adeta bir ebeveyn gibi koruyup destekledięini öğreniyoruz ve bunu yapmaktan keyif aldıęını belirtmektedir. Partneri adına neredeyse her Őeyi yapar. İř arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kiři ilifkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Őemasına teslim)
- Baę ve ilifki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma Őemasına teslim)
- Bařarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar Őemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endiřeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık Őemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık Őemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim Őemasına teslim)
- İstedięi kořulları yerine getirmedięinde karřısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık Őemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleřtirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Ařırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Baęımlılık Őemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuřkuculuk Őemasının ařırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun bařaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Bařarısızlık Őemasına teslim).
- Yoęun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin ařırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduęunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık Őemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda Őemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik Őemasına teslim)

4) Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kiřisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilifkilerinde ise zaman zaman partleri tarafından desteklenmek istemektedir. Belirli

alanlarda oldukça yetenekli birisi ama bu yeteneklerini ortaya koymakta zorlanmaktadır. Bazı sorumlulukları konusunda yardıma ihtiyacı olmaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir. (Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir. (Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir. (Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir. (Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir. (Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir. (Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir. (Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir. (Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir. (Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir. (Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir. (Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir. (Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

5) Etrafındaki insanlar onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnerini tehlikelerden korumak konusunda oldukça istekli olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Çok az şey onu korkutup tedirgin edebilir. Bunun yanında fiziksel olarak da güçlü olduğu bilinmektedir. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlıyor.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir. (Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir. (Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir. (Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir. (Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir. (Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir. (Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir. (Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir. (Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir. (Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir. (Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir. (Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir. (Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)

- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

6) Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda oldukça seçici olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Onun, birisini beğenmesi oldukça zordur. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Ne zaman biriyle karşılıklı otursam tüm kusurlarını fark ediyorum ve bunu dile getiriyorum. Gerçekten iyi giyinen, kendisine bakan birisini bulmak çok zor.” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

7) O, arkadaşlarının tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda zaman zaman duygularını kontrol etmekte zorlandığını öğrenmekteyiz. Partneri onu rahatsız eden bir şey yaptığında öfke patlamaları yaşayabiliyor. Eski bir partneri yaşadıkları bir deneyimi şöyle anlatmaktadır: “ Onun mesajlarına geç yanıt verdiğim için kısıknçlık krizine girdi ve telefonda bana uzun süre bağırıp hakaret etti” İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)

- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

8) Onu tanıyanlar, onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir.Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda genellikle şu geri bildirim aldığımız belirtmektedir “ Çok başarılısın, belki de az sayıda kişinin başarabileceği şeyleri başardın, ama bunu fark etmiyorsun.Ulaşmak istediğin hedef hep daha uzakta. Katı kuralların var ve bunları esnetmekte zorlanıyorsun”. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

9) Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda duyguları konusunda bazı zorlanmalar yaşadığını öğrenmekteyiz. Onun bir şeye güldüğünü ya da öfkelenildiğini anlamak gerçekten zorlayıcıdır. Bu durumu şöyle tarif etmektedir “ Duyguları zaman zaman gereksiz buluyorum. Genelde olaylar karşısında pek bir şey hissetmem.”İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)

- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

10) Yakınları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda kendisini gerçekçi birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır ve bu özelliğinin ilişkilerde sorunlar yarattığını düşünmektedir. Ona göre dünya kötü bir yer ve yaşam sorunlarla dolu. Hayata dair pozitif bir bakış açısı mantıklı değil. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

11) Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnerleri onu kurallar konusunda hassas birisi olarak

tanımlamaktadır. Hata yapıldığında bunun mutlaka bir cezasının olması gerektiğine inanmaktadır. Kendisini disiplinli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanısızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanısızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

12) Yakınları onun eğlenceli birisi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda eğlenmekten ve keyif almaktan hoşlandığını öğreniyoruz. Sıkıcı şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanmadığını belirtmektedir. Bu durumu şöyle tanımlamaktadır “ Serbest çalışmayı seviyorum, sıkıcı şeylerden ise nefret ederim ve onları tamamlamayam. Benden her şeyi isteyebilirsin ama lütfen bu sıkıcı şeyleri yapmamı isteme” . İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanısızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)

- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

13) O, etrafındaki insanların tanımlamasına göre eğlenceli birisidir. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda bazı hassas noktaları olduğunu öğreniyoruz. Örneğin birlikte yaşadıkları evin düzenli olması. Bu konulara dikkat etmeyen bireylere sevgi ve ilgi duyamadığını öğreniyoruz. Eski partnerlerin birisi bu durumu şöyle anlatmaktadır “ O’nun onaylamadığı bir şey yaptığımda benden uzaklaşırdı. Bu en ufak şeylerde bile böyleydi”. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

14) Onu tanıyanlar onu, eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnerleri onu kaygılı birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Her zaman tehlikelerin olacağını ve bunun için tedbirler alınması gerektiğini söyler durur. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)

- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

15) Arkadaşları onu eğlenceli birisi olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kişisel bakımına özen göstermektedir. Romantik ilişkilerine baktığımızda partnerleri onun sık sık sınavlara girmekten kaçtığını söyler. Ne yaparsa yapsın asla başarılı olacağına inanmıyor, onunla başarı konusunda konuşmanın zorlayıcı olduğunu belirtiyorlar. İş arkadaşları ve patronu ise onu dürüst ve yardımsever olarak tanımlamaktadır.

Sizce bu kişi ilişkilerinde nasıl birisidir?

- Partnerine duygusal bakım veremeyen birisidir.(Duygusal Yoksunluk Şemasına teslim)
- Bağ ve ilişki kurmakta zorlanan bir bireydir.(Terk edilme şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Duygularını bastıran ve duyguları kabul etmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Duyguları bastırma şemasına teslim)
- Başarı konusunda yüksek standartları olan, kalıpları ve kuralları esnetmekte zorlanan birisidir.(Yüksek standartlar şemasına teslim)
- Kötümser/Endişeli birisidir.(Karamsarlık şemasına teslim)
- Kurallar konusunda hassas, hatalara müsemaha gösteremeyen cezalandırıcı birisidir.(Cezalandırıcılık şemasına teslim)
- Sınırlara uymakta ve sorumlulukları yerine getirmede zorlanan birisidir.(Yetersiz özdenetim şemasına teslim)
- İsteddiği koşulları yerine getirmediğinde karşısındakinden ilgisini ve sevgisini geri çeken birisidir.(Haklılık şemasına teslim)
- Küçümseyen, kusur bulan ve eleştirel birisidir.(Kusurluluk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Aşırı koruyucu birisidir.(Dayanıksızlık şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Desteklenmek isteyen birisidir.(Bağımlılık şemasına teslim)
- Duygusal açıdan dengesiz ve partnerine zarar verebilecek birisidir.(Kuşkuculuk şemasının aşırı telafisi)
- Her ne olursa olsun başaramayacağına inanan birisidir. (Başarısızlık şemasına teslim).
- Yoğun ve katı bir günlük takvimi vardır. (Yetersiz özdenetimin aşırı telafisi)
- Her zaman tehlikede olduğunu düşünen birisidir (Dayanıksızlık şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin ihtiyaçlarını kendi ihtiyaçlarının önünde tutar. (Kendini feda şemasına teslim)
- Partnerinin onayını almak isteyen birisi. (Boyun eğicilik şemasına teslim)

APPENDIX F - ETİK KURUL KARAR YAZISI

SAYI : B.30.2.EÜ.0.05.05-020-271

28.02.2023

KONU : Etik Kurul Kararı hk.

Sayın Prof. Dr. Falih Köksal ve Rümeyza Biçer Tekin,

“The Effects of Parenting Style and Childhood Emotional Needs on Partner Preference in Romantic Relationships: The Mediating Role of Healthy Adult and Happy Child Mode” başlıklı projenizin etik uygunluğu konusundaki başvurunuz sonuçlanmıştır.

Etik Kurulumuz 28.02.2023 tarihinde sizin başvurunuzun da içinde bulunduğu bir gündemle toplanmış ve Etik Kurul üyeleri projeleri incelemiştir.

Sonuçta 28.02.2023 tarihinde **“The Effects of Parenting Style and Childhood Emotional Needs on Partner Preference in Romantic Relationships: The Mediating Role of Healthy Adult and Happy Child Mode”** konulu projenizin etik açıdan uygun olduğuna oy birliğiyle karar verilmiştir.

Gereği için bilgilerinize sunarım.

Saygılarımla,

Prof. Dr. Murat Bengisu

Etik Kurul Başkanı