

T.C.
ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
THE MASTER PROGRAM OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

**THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN CHILDHOOD TRAUMA, DISSOCIATIVE
EXPERIENCES, EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS
AND MATE SELECTION ATTITUDES OF SINGLE
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

MASTER THESIS

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

Istanbul

February-2023

T.C.
ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
THE MASTER PROGRAM OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

**THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
CHILDHOOD TRAUMA, DISSOCIATIVE EXPERIENCES,
EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND MATE SELECTION
ATTITUDES OF SINGLE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

MASTER THESIS

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK

Istanbul

February-2023

THESIS APPROVAL

To the Director of Graduate Education Institute,

This study has been approved in partial fulfilment of the requirements for MA degree in the Department of Psychology, the Field of Clinical Psychology.

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK

Signature

Member

Asst. Prof. Yusuf BİLGE

Signature

Member

Asst. Prof. Volkan KOÇ

Signature

Approval by

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erhan İÇENER

Director of Graduate Education Institute

DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that this MA thesis titled “The Investigation of the Relationship Between Childhood Trauma, Dissociative Experiences, Early Maladaptive Schemas and Mate Selection Attitudes of Single University Students” is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of Sabahattin Zaim University. I have fully referenced, in both the text and bibliography, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK, for his help and support. I am also thankful to Asst. Prof. Volkan Koç and Research Assistant İsa Çakır for the advice they gave me about the analysis part of my thesis.

I would like to thank TÜBİTAK, which has supported me with the TÜBİTAK 2210-A General Domestic Graduate Scholarship Program during my master's degree and helped me to focus better on my thesis by providing me with financial comfort.

I am very grateful to my dear friends Merve BOZ, Merve AYDIN, Macide Zeynep BİLSEL SÜNER who give me time among her own preoccupations, always give me valuable advice and whose emotional support I always feel. I would also like to thank and express my gratitude to my friends Betül Firdevs ZENGİN, Ayşe GÖÇER, Beyzanur AKDERE and Dr. Hasan KARACA who gave me time among their own preoccupations, read my thesis, gave their suggestions about it and improved my thesis.

My greatest thank goes to my beloved family, especially my mother Gülçin Karakuş and my sister Cemile Karakuş for their encouragement and support during my thesis.

Last, but not least, special thanks go to my cat, Şifa, who is small in size but has a great support to me and is always with me in the mornings and evenings when I write my thesis

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

İstanbul - 2023

ABSTRACT

THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILDHOOD TRAUMA, DISSOCIATIVE EXPERIENCES, EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND MATE SELECTION ATTITUDES OF SINGLE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

Master, Clinical Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK

February-2023, 96 Pages

This study aims to investigate the predictive effects of childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas on mate selection attitudes in single university students. The sample of the study consisted of 287 single undergraduate students between the ages of 18-31, 204 (71.1%) females, 82 (28.6%) males, with a mean age of 21.26. “Demographic Information Form”, “Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale”, “A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)”, “Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES)” and “Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3)” were given to the participants to fill out, and the data obtained were analysed with IBM SPSS Statistics 22. Statistical analyses were conducted to compare all variables according to gender and the presence or absence of psychiatric diagnosis history; to compare mate selection attitudes according to the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience, the type of current relationship, whether or not marriage is considered in the future, which method participants want their future marriage to be, and the cut-off score of Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES); to examine the relationships between the variables; and to evaluate how much childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas predicted mate selection attitudes. According to the results of the regression analysis, other-directedness and impaired limits significantly predicted the mate selection attitude and explained 7% of the variance of the mate selection attitude. The results were discussed in the light of the literature.

Keywords: Mate Selection Attitude, Childhood Trauma, Dissociative Experiences, Early Maladaptive Schemas

ÖZET

BEKAR ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÇOCUKLUK ÇAĞI TRAVMALARI, DISSOSİYATİF YAŞANTILARI, ERKEN DÖNEM UYUMSUZ ŞEMALARI İLE EŞ SEÇİMİ TUTUMU ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

Yüksek Lisans, Klinik Psikoloji
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK
Şubat-2023, 96 Sayfa

Bu çalışmada, bekar üniversite öğrencilerinin çocukluk çağı travmaları, dissosiyatif yaşantıları ve erken dönem uyumsuz şemalarının eş seçimi tutumunu ne kadar yordadığının araştırılması amaçlanmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini 18-31 yaş arası %71.1'i (n = 204) kadın, %28.6'sı (n = 82) erkek, yaş ortalaması 21.26 olan 287 bekar lisans öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır. Katılımcılara doldurmaları için Demografik Bilgi Formu, Romantizm ve Eş Seçimi Tutum Ölçeği, Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları Ölçeği, Dissosiyatif Yaşantılar Ölçeği ve Young Şema Ölçeği Kısa Form-3 verilmiştir ve elde edilen veriler IBM SPSS 22 ile analiz edilmiştir. Bütün değişkenleri cinsiyet ve psikiyatrik tanı varlığına göre karşılaştırmak için; romantik ilişki deneyiminin varlığına, şu anki ilişkisinin çeşidine, gelecekte evlilik düşünüp düşünmemeye, gelecekteki evliliğinin gerçekleşmesini istediği yönteme ve Dissosiyatif Yaşantılar Ölçeğinin kesme puanına göre eş seçimi tutumlarının karşılaştırılması için; değişkenlerin arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi için; ve çocukluk çağı travmaları, dissosiyatif yaşantılar ve erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların eş seçimi tutumunu ne kadar yordadığını değerlendirmek amacıyla istatistiksel analizler yapılmıştır. Regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre, başkalarına yönelimlilik ve zedelenmiş sınırlar şema alanlarının eş seçim tutumunu istatistiksel açıdan anlamlı olarak yordadığı ve eş seçim tutumuna ait varyansın %7'sini açıkladığı görülmektedir. Sonuçlar ilgili literatür ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eş Seçimi Tutumu, Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları, Dissosiyatif Yaşantılar, Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemalar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| THESIS APPROVAL | i |
| DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| ÖZET | v |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vi |
| LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xii |
| CHAPTER I | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| 1.2. Purpose of the Study..... | 2 |
| 1.3. Research Questions | 2 |
| 1.4. Significance of the Study | 3 |
| 1.5. Limitations of the Study | 3 |
| 1.6. Organization of Chapters..... | 4 |
| CHAPTER II | 5 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 |
| 2.1. Mate Selection | 5 |
| 2.1.1. Factors Affecting Mate Selection | 5 |
| 2.1.1.1. Gender | 5 |
| 2.1.1.2. Age | 6 |
| 2.1.1.3. Education..... | 6 |
| 2.1.1.4. Personality Characteristics | 6 |
| 2.1.1.5. Culture..... | 7 |
| 2.1.2. Theories of Mate Selection | 8 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.1.2.1. Evolutionary Theory | 8 |
| 2.1.2.2. Social Role Theory..... | 8 |
| 2.1.2.3. Psychoanalytic Theory | 9 |
| 2.1.2.4. Homogamy Theory | 9 |
| 2.1.2.5. Complementary Needs Theory | 9 |
| 2.1.2.6. Stimulus-Value-Role Theory | 9 |
| 2.1.2.7. Filter Theory..... | 10 |
| 2.1.3. Mate Selection Attitudes..... | 10 |
| 2.1.3.1. One and Only | 10 |
| 2.1.3.2. The Perfect Partner..... | 11 |
| 2.1.3.3. The Perfect Self..... | 11 |
| 2.1.3.4. The Perfect Relationship..... | 11 |
| 2.1.3.5. Try Harder | 12 |
| 2.1.3.6. Love is Enough | 12 |
| 2.1.3.7. Cohabitation | 12 |
| 2.1.3.8. Opposites Complement | 13 |
| 2.1.3.9. Choosing Should Be Easy | 13 |
| 2.2. Childhood Trauma..... | 14 |
| 2.2.1. The Types of Childhood Trauma..... | 15 |
| 2.2.1.1. Childhood Neglect | 15 |
| 2.2.1.2. Childhood Abuse..... | 17 |
| 2.2.1.3. Overprotection-Overcontrol | 19 |
| 2.3. Dissociation | 20 |
| 2.3.1. Dissociative Disorders | 20 |
| 2.3.1.1. Dissociative Identity Disorder..... | 21 |
| 2.3.1.2. Depersonalization/ Derealization Disorder | 22 |
| 2.3.1.3. Dissociative Amnesia..... | 22 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.3.1.4. Other Specified Dissociative Disorder..... | 23 |
| 2.3.1.5. Unspecified Dissociative Disorder..... | 23 |
| 2.4. Schema and Early Maladaptive Schemas..... | 23 |
| 2.4.1. The Origins of Schemas..... | 24 |
| 2.4.1.1. Core Emotional Needs | 24 |
| 2.4.1.2. Early Life Experiences..... | 24 |
| 2.4.1.3. Emotional Temperament..... | 24 |
| 2.4.2. Schema Domains and Early Maladaptive Schemas..... | 25 |
| 2.4.2.1. Disconnection and Rejection..... | 25 |
| 2.4.2.2. Impaired Autonomy and Performance..... | 26 |
| 2.4.2.3. Impaired Limits..... | 27 |
| 2.4.2.4. Other-Directedness..... | 27 |
| 2.4.2.5. Overvigilance and Inhibition..... | 28 |
| 2.5. Current Study | 29 |
| CHAPTER III | 31 |
| RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 31 |
| 3.1. Model of the Research..... | 31 |
| 3.2. Sample | 31 |
| 3.3. Data Collection..... | 32 |
| 3.3.1. Demographic Information Form..... | 32 |
| 3.3.2. Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale | 33 |
| 3.3.3. A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)..... | 34 |
| 3.3.4. Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES)..... | 35 |
| 3.3.5. Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3)..... | 35 |
| 3.4. Procedure..... | 37 |
| 3.5. Analysis of Data | 37 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER IV | 38 |
| FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION | 38 |
| 4.1. Descriptive Statistics | 38 |
| 4.2. Comparison Analyses..... | 40 |
| 4.2.1. Comparison Analyses by Demographical Information | 40 |
| 4.2.1.1. Gender | 40 |
| 4.2.1.2. Psychiatric Diagnosis | 42 |
| 4.2.1.3. Romantic Relationship Experiences | 45 |
| 4.2.1.4. The Type of Current Relationship..... | 45 |
| 4.2.1.5. Future Marriage Thoughts | 46 |
| 4.2.1.6. The Method of Future Marriage..... | 47 |
| 4.2.2. Comparison Analysis by Cut-off Score of DES | 48 |
| 4.3. Correlation Analyses | 49 |
| 4.4. Regression Analysis | 52 |
| CHAPTER V | 53 |
| CONCLUSION | 53 |
| 5.1. Findings on Comparison Analyses..... | 53 |
| 5.1.1. Findings on Comparison Analysis by Demographic Information..... | 53 |
| 5.1.1.1. Gender | 53 |
| 5.1.1.2. Psychiatric Diagnosis | 54 |
| 5.1.1.3. Romantic Relationship Experiences | 55 |
| 5.1.1.4. The Type of Current Relationship..... | 56 |
| 5.1.1.5. Future Marriage Thoughts | 57 |
| 5.1.1.6. The Method of Future Marriage..... | 57 |
| 5.1.2. Findings on Comparison Analysis by Cut-off Score of DES | 58 |
| 5.2. Findings on Correlation Analyses | 59 |
| 5.3. Findings on Regression Analysis | 60 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 5.4. Conclusion..... | 61 |
| REFERENCES..... | 64 |
| APPENDICES | 76 |
| Appendix A: Informed Consent Form..... | 76 |
| Appendix B: Demographical Information Form | 77 |
| Appendix C: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University Ethical Committee Approval . | 79 |
| Appendix D: The Utilization Permit of the Scales..... | 81 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE..... | 83 |



LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 3.1: Demographical Information..... | 32 |
| Table 3.2: Subscales and Items of Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale | 34 |
| Table 3.3: Subsections and Items of a Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)..... | 35 |
| Table 3.4: Schema Domains, Schema Dimensions, and Items of Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 | 36 |
| Table 4.1: Reliability Coefficient Values, Descriptive Statistics, Skewness and Kurtosis Values for the Total Scores of the Scales and their Subscales | 39 |
| Table 4.2: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS, CTQ-33, DES and YSQ-SF3 by Gender | 41 |
| Table 4.3: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS, CTQ-33, DES and YSQ-SF3 by the Presence of Psychiatric Diagnosis History..... | 44 |
| Table 4.4: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Presence of Romantic Relationship Experiences | 45 |
| Table 4.5: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Type of Current Relationship | 46 |
| Table 4.6: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Presence of Future Marriage Thoughts..... | 47 |
| Table 4.7: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Method of Future Marriage..... | 48 |
| Table 4.8: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by Cut-off Score of DES | 49 |
| Table 4.9: Correlations between the Total Scores of the Scales and their Subscales | 51 |
| Table 4.10: Multiple Regression Analysis for the Total Score of Mate Selection Attitudes (ARMSS Total) | 52 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

α : Cronbach Alpha Value

Adj. R^2 : Adjusted R Square

ANOVA: Analysis of Variance

APA: American Psychiatric Association

ARMSS: Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale

β : Beta

BASK: Behaviour, Affect, Sensation and Knowledge

CTQ-28: Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form

CTQ-33: A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire

DES: Dissociative Experiences Scale

DSM: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders

Ed.: Edition

Eds: Editors

e.g.: For example

et al.: and others

Ibid: In the same place

i.e.: That is

M: Mean

N: Number

n.d.: No date

NSPCC: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children

Rev.: Revision

SD: Standard Deviation

SE: Standard Error

SES: Socioeconomic status

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

T.R.: Turkish Republic

U.S.: United States

vd.: ve diğeri (and others)

WHO: World Health Organization

WorldSAFE: The World Studies of Abuse in the Family Environment

YSQ-SF3: Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter; statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of study, limitations of the study and organization of other chapters are explained.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Marriage is one of the most important milestones in life, along with birth and death. In order for marriage to take place, people must first select a mate. With the mate selection, people decide with whom they will probably spend the rest of their lives (Yıldırım, 2007: 16). Young adults (i.e., age range from 20 to 30) are among the age groups in which mate selection is most common (Bacanlı, 2018: 59). In other words, a lot of mate selection is made at university age. Therefore, this study was conducted with single university students.

Mate selection attitudes are constraining beliefs about mate selection. Since mate selection is both an important and difficult process for people, it is also important to understand the concept of mate selection attitude. These beliefs affect relationships and marriages. Thus, attitudes about mate selection, relationship and marriage predicted marital or relationship satisfaction (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181; Sullivan and Schwebel, 2016: 298). Moreover, in a relationship or a marriage, both female and male have their own childhood experiences and schemas that they bring to the relationship from their childhood. Furthermore, psychiatric disorders such as dissociative disorders affect relationships (Szajnberg, et al., 1993: 215). Therefore, childhood traumas, dissociative symptoms and early maladaptive schemas negatively predicted marital or relationship satisfaction (Dumitrescu and Rusu, 2012: 63; Goff, et al., 2007: 344; Whisman, 2006: 375). That is, all the variables in this thesis predict marital satisfaction. Based on this information, it was thought that there might be a relationship between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The main aim of the study was to examine how much childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas predict mate selection attitudes because there are very few studies in the literature that study these variables together, so the literature is very limited. According to these limited studies, mate selection attitudes were predicted by childhood traumas and some early maladaptive schemas or schema domains such as disconnection and abandonment (Kahvecioğlu, 2014: 91; Köylü, 2022: 52; Saffari-zade and Bilondi, 2017: 103). However, in the literature, no study has been found that examines dissociative experiences and mate selection attitudes together. In conclusion, the aims of this thesis were to examine the relationships between these variables and the predictive levels of the independent variables (childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas) on mate selection attitudes, and to compare these variables according to some demographic information and Dissociative Experiences Scale's cut-off score.

1.3. Research Questions

This study focused on the following nine research questions:

1. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes, childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas according to gender?
2. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes, childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas according to the presence or absence of a psychiatric diagnosis history?
3. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience?
4. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to the type of current relationship?
5. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to whether or not marriage is considered in the future?
6. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to the method of future marriage?

7. Is there any difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to cut-off score of DES?

8. Is there any correlation between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes?

9. To what extent do childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas predict mate selection attitudes?

1.4. Significance of the Study

There are some significant aspects of this study. Firstly, there are very few studies examining the relationship and prediction of childhood traumas, dissociative experiences or early maladaptive schemas with mate selection attitudes. Therefore, it was aimed that this thesis contributes to the literature by filling this gap in the literature. Moreover, the use of A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33) in this study is also an important contribution to the literature because overprotection-overcontrol was added to the old scale (CTQ-28) as a new subscale, and this scale has just been introduced to the literature in 2021. Thus, there are very scarce studies using this scale in the literature until now.

It is supposed a relationship between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes in this study. If the hypotheses are confirmed by the results, it may encourage future interventions about this relationship. In addition, it may shed light on families, psychiatrists, psychologists, psychological counselors and other mental health professionals in the process of defining childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas, and taking necessary educational and psychological precautions for the sake of mate selection process.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations of this study. Two of them are that data collection was online, and scales were used to collect data. When data is collected online, people's answers may be affected by external factors or people may find it difficult to share information about their trauma because especially trauma is a sensitive subject. Therefore, online data collection is a limitation. Moreover, the strengths and

weaknesses of scales should be considered. They are not diagnostic tools and rely only on the answers that people give. Therefore, not using different methods in the evaluation of the main variables of the study may be seen as a limitation.

Another limitation is related to the sample of the study. The number of females and males in the study was not equalised. In addition, the study was conducted in Turkey and only with single undergraduate students, so with a certain age group. Therefore, different results may be given with different age groups, different education levels and different cultures.

1.6. Organization of Chapters

In this chapter; statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance and limitations of the study were explained. Chapter II of the study presents literature review about mate selection attitudes, childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas. In Chapter III, the method of the study, ie. information about model of the research, sample, data collection tools, procedure and analysis of data, is given. Chapter IV consists of the findings related to analyses conducted in this study. The last chapter of this thesis is conclusion. In this chapter, the data of the study are interpreted by comparing them with the literature. Finally, the strengths and limitations of the study, its contributions to the literature and suggestions for future research are presented.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Mate Selection

Mate selection is one of the most significant choices people make in their lives (Maliki, 2009: 165). According to APA Dictionary of Psychology, mate selection is to choose a proper spouse for reproduction (American Psychological Association, n.d.). Moreover, mate selection means the process of selecting a spouse in order to establish a marriage bond or a long-term relationship like marriage (Brackett, 2016: 1).

2.1.1. Factors Affecting Mate Selection

There are many factors affecting mate selection. Some of the factors are gender, age, education, personality characteristics and culture.

2.1.1.1. Gender

The effect of gender on mate selection is universal (Hou, Shu and Fang, 2022: 2). Age, physical attraction, physical appearance, education, financial situation and occupation have substantial gender differences in terms of mate selection (Islam, 2021: 1). While males give more weight to physical attraction, females focus more on non-physical characteristics, i.e., personality, socioeconomic status (SES), intelligence and ambition (Feingold, 1992: 125). According to another study, while males in all ages prioritized physical attraction, it was important for only females under 40 years of age (Gil-Burmann et al., 2002: 493). In addition, social skills, height, conscientiousness, religious and political opinion are also significant for females in order to select their mates (Furnham, 2009: 262). On the other hand, according to Amador and colleagues (2005: 19), same religious background and pudicity are important for both females and males in mate selection. Furthermore, in every culture, females prefer older males than themselves, whereas males do the opposite (Buss, 1989: 9). Moreover, the order of importance of the criteria for choosing a mate is physical attraction, education, financial situation, physical appearance, occupation and age for males, whereas it is education, physical appearance, financial situation, occupation, physical attraction and age for females (Islam, 2021: 4).

2.1.1.2. Age

Age is an important factor for mate selection (Günayer Şenel, 2014: 71). Older people may think about marrying a person who has a previous marriage and children, and they are likely to value a domestic and creative mate more than younger people (Schwarz and Hassebrauck, 2012: 455-459). Furthermore, as both males and females grow older, they prefer mates with more intelligence (Buunk et al., 2002: 275). Moreover, the change in mate selection criteria with increasing age may be different for men and women. As age increases, males' preferences for younger females increase, and females prefer younger males, and their preferences for older males decrease (Schwarz and Hassebrauck, 2012: 457-458). In addition, at older ages, males give more weight to household care skills, whereas females do the opposite (Chaloupková, Topinková and Šetinová, 2021: 902). On the other hand, according to Buunk and colleagues (2002: 271), mate selection criteria are relatively constant throughout life.

2.1.1.3. Education

Educational background is important in mate selection (Hu and Qian, 2016: 148). Because of modernization, both of females and males place more value on a mate's educational background (Ibid: 149). More males and females around the world have received a university education in recent decades (Carnoy et al., 2013: 34). This caused the change in marriage markets by increasing the number of mates with higher education (Hu and Qian, 2016: 149). Therefore, individuals with university graduate might choose a mate with the same educational level rather than with less education level (Ibid: 150). In other words, according to prior research, individuals have a tendency to prefer mates with the same level of education as theirs (Blossfeld, 2009: 513). However, according to another study, females choose to marry higher educated mates than themselves, whereas males do the opposite (Qian and Qian, 2014: 1355). Moreover, as individuals' educational levels increase, males are more likely to marry, but females are less likely to marry, particularly among those over age 30 (Ibid: 1337). Therefore, more marriages include older males with higher education and younger females with less education (Ibid).

2.1.1.4. Personality Characteristics

Personality is correlated with mate selection (Furnham, 2009: 262). Bozgeyikli and Toprak (2013: 83-84) found in their study conducted with university students that both

males and females chose personality as the most important criterion in mate selection. Both females and males would like partners with similar personality characteristics to themselves (Botwin, Buss and Shackelford, 1997: 129). At the same time, there are some personality characteristics that individuals want in their partners. According to Buss and Barnes (1986: 562), ten most desirable personality traits in a spouse are to be interesting to talk to, a good friend, trustworthy, compassionate, polite, loyal, honest, intelligent, understanding and thoughtful; whereas according to Efe (2013: 50), they are to be loved by the spouse, to be loyal, respectful, honest, clean/ well-kept, responsible, compassionate, tolerant, dependable and psychologically healthy. On the other hand, the most undesirable personality characteristics in a mate are to be a liar, prone to sexual harassment, narrow-minded, uninterested, inconsiderate, repulsive, inhibiting, ungrateful, malicious, dirty, unfaithful, prone to violence, sneaky, accusatory, homosexual, rude, and to have low mental potential, weak character, lack of self-control, and likely to cheat one's spouse (Yıldırım, 2007: 21).

2.1.1.5. Culture

Mate selection criteria vary according to culture. In societies where the gender roles of males and females are not separated sharply, there is less difference in mate selection between males and females (Wood and Eagly, 2002: 721). However, in patriarchal societies, females prefer older and rich males, while males prefer younger females with good cooking and housekeeping skills (Ibid). The Americans value to be social, polite, religious and highly educated, to have high earning potential, sense of humour, attraction, a good heritage and background, and to desire to have children more than the Chinese, whereas the Chinese value to be good at housekeeping, creative, rich, and to have a good health, power, an exciting personality and high socioeconomic status more than the Americans (Toro-Morn and Sprecher, 2003: 160).

Buss (1989: 1) conducted extensive research including 33 countries and also 37 different cultures. According to the findings of this research; in 36 of 37 cultures, female participants give more importance to their mates to be in a good financial situation than male participants. Moreover, in 34 cultures, males place more importance on physical attractiveness than females. This study also found that across all cultures, males prefer to marry younger females than themselves and to marry at the age of 28 on average, whereas females prefer to marry older males than themselves

and to marry at the age of 25 on average. Furthermore, participants from Taiwan, China, Israel (Palestinian Arabs only), Iran, Indonesia and India express prior sexual intercourse as an undesirable situation in the potential mate, while participants from the Netherlands, Finland, West Germany, Sweden, France and Norway mostly state that this was not important to them (Buss, 1989: 11-12).

2.1.2. Theories of Mate Selection

The factors affecting mate selection are also discussed with various theories. (Aydın and Demir, 2017: 629). The basis of these theories is that mate selection is intentional and conscious (Bacanlı, 2001: 8). Some of these theories are evolutionary, social role, psychoanalytic, homogamy, complementary needs, stimulus-value-role and filter theory.

2.1.2.1. Evolutionary Theory

Evolution theory was based on Darwin's theory of the evolution of species (Yıldırım, 2007: 17). In this theory, Darwin stated that species have two main functions to adapt: "natural selection for survival" and "sexual selection for the continuation of the species" (Miller, 2000: 3). Natural selection means "survival of the fittest" (Buss and Barnes, 1986: 559). That is, it is the survival of species that can adapt to changes in the environment (Aydın and Demir, 2017: 629). The evolutionary approach based mate selection on the concept of sexual selection (Yıldırım, 2007: 17). In sexual selection, the opposite sex is evaluated according to her/his reproductive capacity and selected as a mate (Ibid). However, females and males use different indicators to evaluate reproductivity (Ibid). Thus, while males give importance to age and health for reproductivity and choose their mates according to physical appearance, females choose mates with good earning capacity due to the financial advantage they will provide to their offspring (Ibid; Buss and Barnes, 1986: 560).

2.1.2.2. Social Role Theory

Social Role Theory explains the differences between females and males in mate selection (Eagly and Wood, 1999: 408). These differences in mate selection are because females and males have different social roles (Yıldırım, 2007: 18). That is, social roles of females and males, gender-based division of work, patriarchal structure, upbringing, socialization and gender inequality affect mate selection (Ibid: 17). In

conclusion, males value family discipline and physical attractiveness in selecting a mate, while females value physical strength, earning capacity, status and self-confidence (Ibid: 18).

2.1.2.3. Psychoanalytic Theory

Psychoanalytic Theory of Freud is the oldest of the theories explaining mate selection (Parsons, 1997: 11). This theory will be explained by the information in the study of Parsons (1997: 11). According to this theory, mate selection is based on the fixations in the psychosexual developmental stages which are the oral, anal, phallic, and genital stages. Therefore, if a male's oedipal complex is unresolved during the phallic stage, he selects a mate who is similar to his mother, older than him, or the opposite of his mother. A female experiences this in terms of resemblance to her father and Electra complex (Parsons, 1997: 11).

2.1.2.4. Homogamy Theory

According to Homogamy Theory, people select mates who are similar to them in age, personality, ethnic background, race, personality, social status and educational level (Kasapkara and Kasapkara, 2013: 792). Such similarities prevent conflicts in the first years of marriage (Ibid).

2.1.2.5. Complementary Needs Theory

According to Complementary Needs Theory, people select mates who have different characteristics from their own and are complementary to their own needs (Kasapkara and Kasapkara, 2013: 792; Schellenberg and Bee, 1960: 227). That is, people would like to find a mate they believe she/he can satisfy their needs at the highest level (Efe, 2013: 16).

2.1.2.6. Stimulus-Value-Role Theory

Bernard Murstein developed Stimulus-Value-Role Theory (1970: 465). The stages of this theory will be explained by the information in the study of Parsons (1997: 24-25). In the first stage called stimulus, mates evaluate each other according to the equality of stimulus such as status and physical attractiveness. If the reciprocal stimulus exchange brings to a positive result, the second stage called value starts. In this stage, mates assess each other with regard to the similarity of values, interests, needs and attitudes through verbal communication. If the similarity about these is provided, the

last stage called role starts. In last stage, mates evaluate each other according to the fulfilment of their expectations or the conformity of their behaviour to the actually mentioned values (Parsons, 1997: 25). If their roles are compatible as a result of their observations, their relationship continues (Kalkan, 2015: 35).

2.1.2.7. Filter Theory

Filter Theory will be explained by the information in the study of Parsons (1997: 21-22). The theory of Kerckhoff and Davis (1962) is one of filter theories, and it is based on homogamy and complementary theories. According to this theory, people try to recognize their mates by using certain three filters respectively. People select their mates according to the resemblance of social characteristics such as education and religion (as the first filter), the resemblance of values (as the second filter) and the completion of needs (as the third filter) (Parsons, 1997: 22).

2.1.3. Mate Selection Attitudes

People have mate selection attitudes when selecting a mate. Mate selection attitudes mean constraining beliefs about mate selection. There are nine constraining beliefs about mate selection (Larson, 1992: 242). These are “one and only”, “the perfect partner”, “the perfect self”, “the perfect relationship”, “try harder”, “love is enough”, “cohabitation”, “opposites complement” and “choosing should be easy” (Ibid: 244-249).

2.1.3.1. One and Only

This belief is that “There is only one ideal partner for a person”. It states that there is only one right person in the world to marry (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). This belief is similar to believe that there is a second half or soul mate, and this constraining belief can cause one person to wait passively because the person does not know how to have insight into who the only one right person is (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 222-223). Furthermore, people with this belief might not feel the desire to know and date other people in more intimacy (Priest et al., 2009: 49). However, as a more reasonable and alternative belief, there is more than one person with whom an individual can have a happy marriage (Jedlicka, 1975: 389).

2.1.3.2. The Perfect Partner

People with this belief think that they should not marry until they find the perfect partner to marry (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). However, nobody is perfect at everything, so people with this belief may find it difficult to decide for marriage and may wait for a long time to find a perfect mate (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 223). Moreover, people with this belief often have a short-term relationship tendency to assess their mate without spending time to get to know their mate (Priest et al., 2009: 49). In addition, high expectations about partner may not be met. Therefore, both the people who evaluate and the people who are evaluated may be disappointed due to this belief (Priest et al., 2009: 49). Mate choice is more reasonable when it includes two headings: qualities that are most significant to an individual and qualities that can be made concessions by an individual (Larson, 1992: 245). In fact, the core of mate selection is the balance between the real mate and the ideal mate (Aydın, 2016: 29).

2.1.3.3. The Perfect Self

This belief indicates that people should not marry until they are sure of themselves as a future mate (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). Therefore, these people's dating relationships may go on much longer than necessary (Priest et al., 2009: 49), and they are single for a long time because of this belief (Larson, 1992: 245). However, nobody actually feels entirely self-assured about being a partner (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 223). Moreover, this belief ignores the dual nature of relationships, but in fact a healthy marriage requires the joint work of both spouses instead of one perfect spouse (Aydın, 2016: 29).

2.1.3.4. The Perfect Relationship

In this belief, people think that they must prove that their relationship will continue before they get married (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). That is, the people who hold this belief may think that a relationship worth getting married has to be perfect (Aydın, 2016: 29). Therefore, they may date, stay engaged, or live together for a long time to demonstrate that their relationship will be successful (Larson, 1992: 245). Furthermore, these people can test their relationship's strength (Priest et al., 2009: 49). However, their partner might get tired of these tests and end the relationship (Larson, 1992: 245). Moreover, there is no way to know before marriage that a

marriage will be successful, so marital success cannot be made certain in advance (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 223).

2.1.3.5. Try Harder

This belief states that if people put in enough effort, they can be happy with the person they select to marry (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). People with this belief may undervalue the mate selection process and may not devote enough time on the mental readiness phase of marriage (Priest et al., 2009: 49). Moreover, according to Priest and colleagues (2009: 49), they might think that they alone can repair the marriage after marriage. Therefore, they enter into their marriage with immature first steps (Aydın, 2016: 30). However, everybody is not ready for marriage (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 223). Therefore, two compatible and mature people are required for a marriage to be successful, so it is necessary to be very selective and sensitive in selecting a partner (Larson, 1992: 247).

2.1.3.6. Love is Enough

People with this belief think that they can get married to one person just for falling in love with this person (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). However, these people may undervalue the importance of other determinants for a healthy marriage (Larson, 1992: 248). Love is important in marriage, but it is not enough on its own (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). That is because besides love, many determinants such as reasonable expectance, marriage age, happy childhood, preparedness for marriage, shared backgrounds and values, are all crucial for determining whether a marriage will succeed (Larson, 1992: 248).

2.1.3.7. Cohabitation

In this belief, people think that if they live with the person they will marry before marriage, they can increase their chances of happiness in marriage (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). However, people who live together before marriage have less marital satisfaction and are more likely to divorce than those who do not live together before marriage (Larson, 2001: 8-9). These can be due to the qualities of cohabitators instead of being a result of cohabitation (Seltzer, 2000: 1252). As examples of these qualities, compared to people who do not live together before marriage, people who live together before marriage are more likely to place less significance on marriage, to

have loyalty problem and to view divorce favourably (Larson, 2001: 9). Furthermore, in these days people choose to live together before marriage as a preparation for marriage (Kalkan and Kaya, 2007: 36). However, this does not enhance marital success in the future because marriage and cohabitation are considerably different from each other (Larson, 1992: 248). As a more reasonable and alternative belief, people might know each other more as a result of cohabitation, but it will not make certain of a happy marriage or function as a preparation for marriage (Larson, 1992: 248).

2.1.3.8. Opposites Complement

This belief states that people should select a mate whose personal traits are the opposite of their own to marry (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). This belief causes people to seek partners with different characteristics than themselves (Aydın, 2016: 31). However, according to Larson and Holman (1994: 232), the literature about premarital determinants of marital success indicates that one of the best determinants is similarity in “attitudes, values, beliefs, and personality characteristics”, contrary to the widely held belief that two quite different people complete each other's weaknesses and strengths. Whereas significant discrepancy in attitudes and beliefs can cause more hardships, similarity in education level, economic status, age, external source of motivation for marriage and giving importance to autonomy are correlated with better quality in marriage (Kurdek, 1993: 222-225). In addition, this belief prevents people from changing themselves and causes irresponsibility (Larson, 1992: 248) because people may prefer to compensate with their partners with opposite characteristics instead of overcoming their deficiencies and improving themselves (Tuzer, 2016: 17).

2.1.3.9. Choosing Should Be Easy

In this belief, people think that mate selection should be easy and accidental (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). These people may think that choosing a partner is something that just happens to them instead of something that they do (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003: 223). The person with this belief expects to fall in love at first sight and meet by chance, instead of attending social activities where people may find the person to marry (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 181). In fact, selecting a partner has become more difficult now than 50 years ago because of the impact of inflation on

families, the requirement for higher education, increasing expectances for marriage, increasing divorce rate, and shifting gender roles (Larson, 1992: 249).

2.2. Childhood Trauma

According to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which Turkey is a party, every individual under the age of 18 is considered as a child (Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1995: 15). Childhood traumas can be defined as the loss of a parent, separation from parents, divorce, migration, accidents, natural disasters and witnessing violence, as well as sexual, physical and emotional abuse and neglect that individuals are exposed to before the age of 18 (Herman, 2015: 122). Childhood abuse and neglect under the age of 18 is also called child maltreatment (World Health Organization, n.d.). According to the World Health Organization (WHO, n.d.), "Child maltreatment includes all kinds of emotional and/or physical abuse, neglect or negligent behaviour, sexual abuse, or any commercial or non-commercial exploitation that harms or has the potential to harm the child's life, development, healthiness, and honour within the power, trust and liability relationship established with the child". The harm does not have to be intentional (Gilbert et al., 2009: 69). Therefore, what is important is not the purpose of the adult while performing the action, but the effect of this action on the child (Bahar, Savaş and Bahar, 2009: 52).

Krug and colleagues (2002: 59) also mentioned that childhood traumas can be defined differently in different cultures, and pointed out that culture is an effective factor in issues such as child education and care, discipline of the child and definition of neglect and abuse concepts. However, although these definitions vary, these researchers also reported that there is a consensus in the world that child abuse and neglect are a behaviour that should be prevented. In fact, it is stated in article 19 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1995: 7) that all administrative, legal, educational and social precautions should be taken to protect children from physical or mental assault, violence or exploitation, neglect or negligent treatment, ill-treatment and abuse including rape while in the presence of their parents or only one of them, their legal guardian or guardians, or any person who takes care of children.

2.2.1. The Types of Childhood Trauma

Children might undergo a range of experiences categorized as psychological trauma. Psychological traumas consist of natural or accidental traumas (such as storm, fire, traffic accident, etc.), major social disasters (such as war, migration, etc.), medical traumas (such as stroke, heart attack, etc.), personal traumas (such as witnessing attack, rape, violence, etc.) and finally interpersonal traumas (i.e., neglects and abuses) (Fink et al., 1995: 1329). Therefore, this research covers only interpersonal traumas in childhood, that is, child maltreatment. Child maltreatment has four subheadings, and these are neglect, physical, emotional and sexual abuse (WHO, 2006: 10). However, according to Bernstein and colleagues (1994: 1132), neglect has two types as physical and emotional neglect. Furthermore, overprotection-overcontrol may be as traumatic as these types of childhood traumas (Şar et al., 2021: 35). Therefore, this dissertation studies physical and emotional neglect, physical, emotional and sexual abuse and overprotection-overcontrol as the types of childhood traumas.

The most important feature that distinguishes childhood neglect and abuse from each other is that abuse consists of situations that are actively applied, and neglect consists of situations that are passively applied (Pelendecioglu and Bulut, 2009: 50). It is considered all kinds of direct or indirect negative behaviour towards children under the age of 18 as abuse, and failure to fulfil their basic self-care and needs as neglect (Polat, 2007: 80).

2.2.1.1. Childhood Neglect

Child neglect means that the person or people responsible for the child or the state do not meet the child's vital needs such as health, nutrition, protection, shelter, supervision and clothing (Kara, Biçer and Gökalp, 2004: 144). It also means failure to meet children's emotional and social needs (Uzun, 2018). Therefore, neglect can only occur when the family or caregiver has access to sufficient resources, so it is differentiated from situations of poverty, but some definitions of neglect contain poverty (WHO, 2002: 60-65).

Actions, such as humiliation, excessive protection and authority, excessive expectation from the child beyond her/his capacity, severe punishment, teasing, not showing the necessary attention for optimal living conditions, clothing, nutrition, medical and emotional needs, are considered as childhood neglect (Kocaer, 2006: 34). Other

examples of neglect are poor cleanliness, abandonment and exposure to drugs (WHO, 2002: 61), and intentionally ignoring their emotional and educational needs (Oral et al., 2001: 283). Furthermore, while the most frequently experienced neglect behaviour by the participants of the study conducted by Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Social Services and Child Protection Agency (2010: 19) is not showing love, other types of neglect mentioned are not trying to explain, not showing interest, not sending them to school and not meeting their educational needs. In the same research, it has been determined that the most common form of neglect among children between the ages of 7-18 is to be left alone, and children show the neglecting person's economic problems as the most common cause for all types of neglect (Ibid: 33).

Children who are neglect victims experience many indications such as negative eating habits, growth retardation and difficulties in making friends (Uzun, 2018). However, while negative experiences such as physical abuse and sexual abuse can be detected more easily due to their event-specific nature, it is more difficult to detect neglect due to its nature involving chronic events (Hildyard and Wolfe, 2002: 680).

There are two types of childhood neglect which are emotional and physical:

a) Emotional Neglect

Emotional neglect can be defined as families not responding emotionally to their children's desires and needs, and keeping them at a distance, acting avoidant and indifferent towards them (Egeland, 2009: 22). In addition, emotional neglect means the failure to meet the child's fundamental psychological needs such as motivation, love, support and belongingness (Kong and Bernstein, 2009: 1898), and emotional closeness by caregivers (Aust et al., 2012: 226).

Nonorganic growth retardation, which results in failure to improve physically despite sufficient nourishment, is probably the most well-known type of emotional neglect (Egeland, 2009: 22). Other examples of emotional neglect are not rewarding their success, not sending them to school, depriving them of control, being excluded and ignored (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 7-8).

b) Physical Neglect

Physical neglect means that caregivers fail to meet a child's fundamental physical requirements, such as health, food, safety, accommodation and supervision (Kong and

Bernstein, 2009: 1898). Moreover, physical neglect is harm caused by insufficient hygiene, dressing, feeding and care for a child (Kaplan, Pelcovitz and Labruna, 1999: 1215). Furthermore, physical neglect means depriving children of socially available resources through harming their development (Aral, 2001: 2).

Some examples of physical neglect are living in a neglected and dirty environment, not taking precautions against accidents, smoking and drinking alcohol during pregnancy (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 8-9).

2.2.1.2. Childhood Abuse

Child abuse is the most difficult type of childhood trauma to be named and cured because of its repeatability and the fact that the child is exposed to this situation by the closest relatives (Yüksel and Saner, n.d.). Childhood abuse means any behaviour that jeopardizes the life, health or development of the children, and that violates their right (WHO, 1999: 14). These behaviours do not absolutely have to be perceived by the child or done consciously by the adult (Topbaş, 2004: 76). Child abuse, which negatively affects the growth of the child, has been encountered in every culture (Kara, Biçer and Gökalp, 2004: 140). Moreover, it does not emerge to be limited to a particular sociodemographic group or a particular period of life (Hedin, 2000: 353).

All child participants of the study conducted by Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Social Services and Child Protection Agency (2010: 18) stated that abuse occurred most at home, school and on the street, respectively. They also stated that the most common abusers were respectively father, teacher, mother, friend and neighbour. Furthermore, the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect reported that 77% of abusers are parents, 11% are other relatives, and 5% are non-caretakers. (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1995: 2-12).

There are three types of childhood abuse which are emotional, physical and sexual:

a) Emotional Abuse

Emotional abuse is the most common type of childhood trauma (Helvacı Çelik and Hocaoglu, 2018: 699). Although it can exist alone without other types of abuse, it almost always accompanies them (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 8). However, it is the most difficult type of abuse to be defined, noticed and proved legally (Uzun, 2018). Emotional abuse means that children are exposed to the expectations which are not

appropriate for their age and characteristics, and the behaviours such as threatening, rejection, blaming and humiliation (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 8). In addition, emotional abuse is the failure to meet the needed love, attention and care for children, and it negatively affects their psychology (Helvacı Çelik and Hocaoğlu, 2018: 702).

Some examples of emotional abuse are “rejecting their requests for help, ignoring and making distinction between siblings” (Uzun, 2018), and “intimidation, excessive tolerance, directing delinquency, criticizing, witnessing domestic violence and forcing the child to take sides in domestic problems” (Güner, Güner and Şahan, 2010: 109). Furthermore, the most frequently experienced forms of emotional abuse by the participants of the study conducted by Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Social Services and Child Protection Agency are comparison with others, shout, insultation, threat, pressure, mock, humiliation, blaming, calling with nicknames and not asking for the child’s opinion (2010: 18).

b) Physical Abuse

Physical abuse means all non-accidental injuries because of behaviours such as burning, shaking, beating and biting by people who are responsible for caring of the child (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 9). Moreover, the purposeful use of physical force against children that harms or has a substantial possibility of harming the child's life, health, development or self-respect is referred to as physical abuse (WHO, 2006: 10). Furthermore, physical abuse can be defined as an adult's use of violence in a way that leaves a mark on the child’s body in order to express anger, punish or gain authority (Güner, Güner and Şahan, 2010: 108).

Some examples of physical abuse are poisoning, kicking and choking (WHO, 2006: 10). According to Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Social Services and Child Protection Agency (2010: 18-34), the most common types of physical abuse are hitting with hands, ear or hair pulling, slapping and throwing objects, whereas the most common type of physical abuse used by mothers is throwing slippers.

Most physical abuse against children at home is used for punishment (WHO, 2006: 10). According to the WorldSAFE study (as cited in Krug and colleagues, 2002: 63), while physical punishments such as shaking the children, placing hot pepper in their mouth are considered as moderate, physical punishments such as hitting violently, strangling, burning the children are considered as severe. Although physical abuse is

the easiest type of childhood trauma to detect, it gets difficult to detect (Helvacı Çelik and Hocaoglu, 2018: 7020) because some cultures do not perceive and define these forms of punishment as abuse, and they consider that these punishments are necessary for the discipline of the child (Topbaş, 2004: 77).

c) Sexual Abuse

Sexual abuse is defined as meeting the adults' sexual desires through children by using deception, threat or force over them (Aktepe, 2009: 95). According to the World Health Organization (2006: 10), sexual abuse means including in sexual activity that a child does not fully understand, cannot consent to, is not developmentally ready, or that violates social taboos and laws. Both adults and other children, due to their stages of development or ages, can sexually abuse the children because of their status of liability, confidence and control over these victim children (Ibid).

It is possible to classify sexual abuse in two groups as contact sexual abuse (touching, sexual penetration, oral sex, kissing, forcing a child to touch or undress, etc.) and non-contact abuse (forcing a child to masturbate or watch pornography, etc.) (National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, NSPCC, n.d.). In addition, actions such as exhibitionism and using the child in pornography or prostitution are referred to as sexual abuse (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 5). The most common form of sexual abuse is genital penetration (Ballı, 2010: 96).

Childhood sexual abuse is often not told to anyone because of the guilt and shame, and it only emerges if there is physical damage (Aktepe: 2009: 97). According to known cases, only 5-15% of sexual abusers are females, so they are more often males (Ibid: 95).

2.2.1.3. Overprotection-Overcontrol

Overprotection is explained as excessive protection of the children by the parent without considering their development (Thomasgard et al., 1995: 244). Overcontrol means excessively controlling the children's actions by not allowing them to grow up as a separate individual from their parents (Schaefer, 1965: 555). Therefore, overcontrol increases the dependency of the children to their parents (Wood et al., 2003: 135).

Overprotection-overcontrol may be as traumatic as other childhood traumas (Şar et al., 2021: 35). In addition, it is common in Turkish society (Şar et al., 2021: 36, as cited in Şar et al., 2017). Therefore, while Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form (CTQ-28) was adapted into Turkish, it was expanded and revised (CTQ-33, the scale used in this study), and overprotection-overcontrol was added to the scale as a factor in addition to sexual, emotional and physical abuse, emotional and physical neglect (Şar et al., 2021). Thus, overprotection-overcontrol is used as the sixth type of childhood trauma in this study. In conclusion, this study contains physical and emotional neglect, physical, emotional and sexual abuse, and overprotection-overcontrol as the types of childhood traumas.

2.3. Dissociation

Pierre Janet was the first to thoroughly examine dissociation as an important psychological concept (van der Kolk and van der Hart, 1989: 1530). Dissociation is the opposite of association or bonding, and it means separation (Şar, 2000: 8). In addition, the meaning of dissociation is that people perceive certain situations as insufferable at the conscious level, so they push them out of consciousness and perceive as if they have happened to someone else (Beyazova and Şahin, 2006: 4). Moreover, Braun defined it as a concept characterized by the separation between ideational stream and stream of consciousness (1988: 4). Dissociation can be observed in people of all ages, race, ethnicity and socioeconomic groups according to National Alliance on Mental Illness (n.d.). In addition, it is universal (Yargıç, Tutkun and Şar, 1995: 12).

Dissociation is not pathological in itself and has adaptive aspects (Şarлак and Öztürk, 2018: 16). Furthermore, it is one of the defence mechanisms that arise in the face of stressful factors and ensure the mental balance, but when used severely and continuously, it causes symptoms, i.e., dissociative disorders (Şar, 2000: 8). Therefore, people experience dissociation in three ways as the normal personality traits, a defence mechanism and the pathological syndromes in some disorders (Şarлак and Öztürk, 2018: 16).

2.3.1. Dissociative Disorders

It is seen that dissociative disorders were included in a diagnosis and classification category named "hysteric neurosis, dissociative type" under the main heading of

hysterical neurosis in DSM-II (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 2nd edition), which is a new diagnosis that contains the old "Transformation response" and "Dissociation response" diagnoses in DSM-I (American Psychiatric Association, APA, 1968: 39-40). Dissociative disorders were classified under a separate heading in the DSM-III (APA, 1980: 253) and in the DSM-III-R (APA, 1987: 269). This situation continued in the same way in DSM-IV (APA, 1994: 477) and in DSM 5 (APA, 2013: 291). Moreover, in DSM 5 (Ibid: 298-307) dissociative fugue was included in the heading of dissociative amnesia, and two new headings for dissociative disorders have been described as other specified dissociative disorders and unspecified dissociative disorders in the place of atypical dissociative disorder in DSM-III, dissociative disorder not otherwise specified in DSM-III-R and DSM-IV.

DSM-5 (APA, 2013: 291) defines dissociative disorder as discontinuity or/and dissociation in identity, memory, awareness, body representation, action, affect, motor control and perception that should normally be in unity. Dissociative disorders are divided into five types as dissociative identity disorder, depersonalization/derealization disorder, dissociative amnesia, other specified dissociative disorder and unspecified dissociative disorder (Ibid).

Dissociative disorders are often encountered after trauma (APA, 2013: 291). Among all psychiatric disorders, the highest frequency of childhood psychological trauma was found in dissociative patients, and the frequency is 62.9 % for child neglect, 57.1% for child emotional abuse, 62.9-82.4% for child physical abuse and 57.1%-90.2% for child sexual abuse (Şarlak and Öztürk, 2018: 16).

2.3.1.1. Dissociative Identity Disorder

Dissociative identity disorder is defined as the occurrence of two or more separate personality or an experience of being possessed in some cultures, and repetitive amnesic episodes (APA, 2013: 291). The disruption in identity contains evident discontinuity in sense of self and perception of being able to manage one's actions, and there are associated changes in cognition, action, memory, emotion, perception, awareness, and/or sensory-motor functioning (Ibid: 292). Moreover, these signs may be noticed by others, or the person may report them (Ibid). In addition, a person with dissociative identity disorder has repetitive gaps in remembering everyday incidents, significant autobiographical information, and/or traumatic events that cannot be

explained by usual forgetfulness (APA, 2013: 292). In addition, the person has sleep problems, headache, depression, self-harm and suicide attempts as common symptoms (Soner and Aykut, 2017: 132).

A person with dissociative identity disorder may have 2-10 alter identities, and the host identity gives names to alter identities (Derin and Öztürk, 2018: 32). Identities can have different names and different ages (Öztürk and Şar, 2016: 4). Furthermore, rapid changes in facial expression and/or emotions, memory problems and inner speech are indicators of alter identity (Yanık, 2017: 186).

2.3.1.2. Depersonalization/ Derealization Disorder

Depersonalization/ derealization disorder is defined as depersonalization (i.e., undergoing unreality, disconnection from or being an external observer with individual's self, body or mind) and/or derealization (i.e., undergoing unreality or disconnection from individual's surroundings) that are clinically important, persistent or repetitive (APA, 2013: 291-302). During derealization, it is perceived that people or objects are inanimate, dreamy, unrealistic, visually distorted or foggy (Ibid: 302). In addition, episodes of depersonalization/ derealization disorder could change widely in duration from short (hours or days) to long (weeks, months, or years) (Ibid: 304). However, the perception of reality is not impaired in the individual with depersonalization/ derealization disorder (Ibid: 302).

2.3.1.3. Dissociative Amnesia

Dissociative amnesia is described as the inability to recollect significant personal knowledge which is generally stressful or traumatic and is incoherent with usual forgetting (APA, 2013: 298). The amnesia may be localized (i.e., a single incident or period of time), specific (i.e., a certain feature of an incident), or generalized (i.e., life history and identity) (Ibid: 291). Furthermore, people with dissociative amnesia usually have no awareness or a limited awareness of their problems (Ibid: 299).

a) Dissociative Fugue

According to DSM 5 (APA, 2013: 298), dissociative fugue was included in the heading of dissociative amnesia. Dissociative fugue is defined as a sudden, unexpected departure from one's home or usual environment, resulting in an inability to remember one's personal history and confusion about identity or the presume of a new identity

(APA, 1994: 477). While dissociative fugue is uncommon in people with dissociative amnesia, it is common in those with dissociative identity disorder (APA, 2013: 291).

2.3.1.4. Other Specified Dissociative Disorder

This diagnosis is used for people who have overt dissociative symptoms but do not meet all criteria for any of the standard dissociative disorder's diagnoses mentioned above, and for situations that the clinician selects to provide reasons why the criteria are not met (APA, 2013: 306). Some examples of other specified dissociative disorders are identity disturbance because of extended and severe coercive persuasion, mixed dissociative symptom syndromes that are persistent and repetitive, dissociative trance (i.e., a total or acute loss of consciousness of one's immediate surroundings), and acute dissociative reactions to stressful situations, which normally take less than a month (Ibid: 306-307).

2.3.1.5. Unspecified Dissociative Disorder

This diagnosis is used for people who have overt dissociative symptoms but do not meet all criteria for any of the standard dissociative disorder's diagnoses mentioned above, and for situations that the clinician selects not to provide reasons why the criteria are not met (Morrison, 2014: 248). There is not enough information to establish a more particular diagnosis (e.g., in emergency service) (APA, 2013: 307).

2.4. Schema and Early Maladaptive Schemas

The concept of schema in psychology is most related with Piaget working in cognitive psychology (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 7). According to Piaget, people have the fundamental building blocks, which are the schema, to arrange knowledge (McLeod, 2018). Afterwards, the concept of schema was introduced to cognitive therapy by Beck, and in cognitive therapy, schema is considered as a concept that causes psychiatric disorders to continue (Padesky, 1994: 267). Subsequently, Young elaborated the schema (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 7). Schema often results from adverse childhood experiences in childhood or adolescence, develop over time and continue to show its effect later in life (Ibid). Furthermore, it can be the cause of chronic disorders such as personality disorders (Ibid). There are both adaptive and maladaptive schemas, and they can develop in childhood or later (Ibid). Early maladaptive schemas, which are importantly dysfunctional, are an extensive pattern of

feelings, recollections, sense of body and considerations, and are associated with people's relationships with themselves and others (Ibid).

2.4.1. The Origins of Schemas

Schemas derive from core emotional needs, early life experiences and emotional temperament (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 9-12). In this part of the study, the origins of schemas will be explained according to Young, Klosko and Weishaar (2003: 9-12).

2.4.1.1. Core Emotional Needs

Schemas emerge when core emotional needs, which are universal, are not met in childhood. There are five core emotional needs: "self-control and rational limits; secure relationships with other people; play and spontaneity; being freely able to show feelings; autonomy". When these are met, people become psychologically healthy (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 9-10).

2.4.1.2. Early Life Experiences

The hardest early maladaptive schemas stem from the earliest adverse life experiences in the elementary family. There are four types of early life experiences that cause the emergence of the schemas. The first of them is "toxic frustration of needs", and it happens when the children have little of or are deprived of a good and significant thing. The second of these experiences is "traumatization". The third of them occurs when children are given too much of a good thing that is useful for them on average. Examples of this type are overprotection and too much freedom by parents. The last of these early life experiences is "selective internalization with significant others". Parents' some characteristics such as emotions, actions and thoughts were selectively internalized by their children. Temperament partly mediates the relationship of selective internalization between children and their parents (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 10-11).

2.4.1.3. Emotional Temperament

Every child is born with a unique and different temperament which is stable over time. There is an interaction between temperament and adverse childhood experiences in the acquisition of schemas. Two children with different temperaments and the same type of parents are exposed to different experiences and obtain different results. For

example, an abusive parent may abuse a passive child less than an aggressive child (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 11-12).

2.4.2. Schema Domains and Early Maladaptive Schemas

There are 18 early maladaptive schemas collected under 5 schema domains (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 12). In this part of the study, schema domains and early maladaptive schemas will be explained according to Young, Klosko and Weishaar (2003: 12-21).

2.4.2.1. Disconnection and Rejection

Many people with this schema domain have insecure relationships and childhood traumas. Therefore, they think that their requirements for belonging, security, nourishment and love will not be satisfied, so they keep away from intimate relationships. Moreover, early maladaptive schemas in this domain are often the most devastating. There are five early maladaptive schemas in this domain: “abandonment/ instability”, “mistrust/ abuse”, “emotional deprivation”, “defectiveness/ shame” and “social isolation/ alienation” (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

a) Abandonment/ Instability

The family origins of people with this schema are often unstable. Therefore, they perceive instability in their relationships and believe that their needs for love, safety or support will not be met by their beloved one because she/he may die in a short span of time and may abandon them for better others than themselves (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

b) Mistrust/ Abuse

The family origins of people with this schema are often abusive. Therefore, they believe that they will be abused, deceived, harmed, lied, exploited or humiliated by others, and they think that this harm is deliberate (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

c) Emotional Deprivation

The family origins of people with this schema are often cold. Therefore, they think that others will not meet their needs for support. It has three forms: the absence of empathy, nurturance and protection (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

d) Defectiveness/ Shame

The family origins of people with this schema are often rejecting. Therefore, they feel imperfect, bad, insignificant, undesirable, and unlovable by others. In addition, they are extremely sensitive to rejection and criticism (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

e) Social Isolation/ Alienation

The family origins of people with this schema are often isolated. Therefore, they experience the sense of isolation from the social environment, alienation from others and a lack of belonging to any community (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13).

2.4.2.2. Impaired Autonomy and Performance

The family origins of people with this schema domain are overprotective, harm these people's confidence, sometimes ignore them and do not encourage them to perform outside the home. Therefore, they cannot generate their own purposes, identities and lives. Moreover, they cannot act independently from others, and they act like a child during their lifetime. This schema domain has four early maladaptive schemas: "dependence/ incompetence", "vulnerability to harm or illness", "enmeshment/ undeveloped self" and "failure" (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 13-18).

a) Dependence/ Incompetence

People with this schema believe that they cannot do their own daily tasks without the help of others. For example, they think that they cannot make a good decision, overcome the problems and take responsibility for a task. Therefore, they are often helpless and passive (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 18).

b) Vulnerability to Harm or Illness

People with this schema are afraid that a disaster will happen to them at any moment and that they will not be able to overcome it. These disasters may be emotional, medical and external (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 15).

c) Enmeshment/ Undeveloped Self

People with this schema establish closeness to another or others (mostly parents) in a way that prevents their social development and individualization. Moreover, they

believe that they cannot live without the other. Thus, they feel empty, disorientated and suppressed by others, and they think that they do not have a clear identity (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 15).

d) Failure

People with this schema feel unsuccessful and inadequate, especially in areas such as school and career. Therefore, they believe that they are stupid, unsuccessful and incompetent (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 15).

2.4.2.3. Impaired Limits

Instead of treating the children with convenient limits and discipline, the family origins of people with this schema domain are overly permissive and do not give direction to their children. Therefore, people with this schema domain do not have sufficient personal limits about themselves and others. Thus, these people cannot collaborate with others, do not care about the rights of others, cannot set goals for themselves and move towards these goals. Moreover, they are irresponsible and selfish. This domain has two early maladaptive schemas: “entitlement/ grandiosity” and “insufficient self-control/ self-discipline” (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 18).

a) Entitlement/ Grandiosity

People with this schema feel superior to others, so they think they should have special rights and can do anything they would like regardless of the impact of these on others. Moreover, they control others for their own sake. Therefore, they are usually dominative and devoid of empathy (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 19).

b) Insufficient Self-Control/ Self-Discipline

People with this schema avoid discomfort and taking responsibilities. In addition, they do not and cannot show adequate self-control to obtain their goals and to control their emotions (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 19).

2.4.2.4. Other-Directedness

The family origins of people with this schema accept their children conditionally and expect children to repress some of their characteristics in order to give them care, affection and approval. Furthermore, the feelings of these people’s parents are more important than their own feelings in their families. Therefore, in order to obtain

approval and affection, people with this schema put others' needs and feelings first rather than their own. Three early maladaptive schemas are defined in this domain: “subjugation”, “self-sacrifice” and “approval-seeking/ recognition-seeking” (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 19).

a) Subjugation

Subjugation is seen in two different forms as suppression of needs and feelings. Therefore, people with this schema do not value their own needs and feelings. Moreover, they comply with others and accept being controlled by others not to experience abandonment and anger. However, these people may experience anger-related problems such as outbursts of anger and substance abuse (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 16).

b) Self-Sacrifice

People with this schema are very sensitive to the problems of others. Therefore, they give priority to the needs of others over their own. They do this to prevent others from suffering, to obtain self-confidence or not to experience feelings of guilt (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 20).

c) Approval-Seeking/ Recognition-Seeking

People with this schema often place too much value on money, social position, and achievement in order to obtain approval and recognition from others. Furthermore, their self-esteem depends on this recognition or approval. Therefore, they cannot improve a real sense of self and have a fear of rejection (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 20).

2.4.2.5. Overvigilance and Inhibition

The family origins of people with this schema domain are punitive, persistent and cruel. Moreover, their families expect the children to be perfect, make no mistakes and not to show their emotions. Therefore, these people with this domain do not play games in childhood, and they do not seek happiness and intimate relationships in adulthood. Furthermore, they are strict, pessimistic and do not show their emotions. There are four early maladaptive schemas in this domain: “negativity/ pessimism”, “emotional inhibition”, “unrelenting standards/ hypercriticalness” and “punitiveness” (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 20).

a) Negativity/ Pessimism

People with this schema underrate positive events whereas they overrate negative events. In addition, these people get extremely anxious about making mistakes and something going wrong (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 17).

b) Emotional Inhibition

People with this schema restrain their emotions, behaviours and conversations so as to inhibit embarrassment, criticism by others and being out of impulse control. The most prevalent forms of inhibition are to suppress “positive impulse (e.g., love, sexual intercourse), aggressiveness, emotions and exhibiting vulnerability” (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 17).

c) Unrelenting Standards/ Hypercriticalness

People with this schema would like to meet excessive standards to prevent rejection or criticism. Moreover, they are perfectionistic, overly critical of themselves and others, and have strict rules (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 21).

d) Punitiveness

People with this schema think that severe punishment should be given for mistakes. Furthermore, they do not care about human flaws and emotions. They are also irritable and intolerant (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 21).

2.5. Current Study

Marriage is one of the most important moments in life. People need to select a mate before getting married. However, they have constraining beliefs when selecting a mate, called the mate selection attitudes. These beliefs can be influenced by a variety of variables. Mate selection attitudes were predicted by childhood traumas and some early maladaptive schemas or schema domains (Kahvecioğlu, 2014: 91; Köylü, 2022: 52; Saffari-zade and Bilondi, 2017: 103). However, there are very few studies in the literature examining the correlation and prediction between childhood traumas, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes. In addition, there was no study about the relationship between mate selection attitudes and dissociative experiences which are a variable of this study. That is, the literature is limited about these subjects.

In the light of aforementioned literature, the main aim of the current study was to examine how much mate selection attitudes were predicted by childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas. Furthermore, this thesis aimed to examine the relationships between these variables, to compare all variables according to gender and the presence or absence of psychiatric diagnosis history, and to compare mate selection attitudes according to the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience, the type of current relationship, whether or not marriage is considered in the future, which method participants want their future marriage to be, and the cut-off score of Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES).



CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the research method. That is, model of the research, research sample, data collection tools, procedure and analysis of data are included in this chapter.

3.1. Model of the Research

This study is a quantitative study which uses standardized measures having the same results for everybody such as scales (Arkes, 2019: 11). In this study, which examines “The Relationship between Childhood Trauma, Dissociative Experiences, Early Maladaptive Schemas and Mate Selection Attitudes of Single University Students”, relational screening model from Quantitative Research models were taken as a basis. Relational screening model aims to examine the changes and relationships between variables (Üredi, 2017: 175). Correlation and regression techniques from relational screening model were used in this study. Correlation technique is the examination of the strength and direction of the linear relationship between variables (Pallant, 2017: 144). Regression technique is used to examine the relationship between a continuous dependent variable and one or more independent variables (Ibid: 164).

3.2. Sample

The sample of this study consists of 287 university students from different universities of Turkey. 204 (71.1%) of them are females, while 82 (28.6%) of them are males. Their age ranges from 18 to 31 ($M = 21.26$; $SD = 2.60$). The participants were recruited through social media groups of different universities. They were selected through convenience sampling. The participants' demographical characteristics can be seen in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Demographical Information

| | | N | % |
|---|--------------|-----|------|
| Gender | Female | 204 | 71.1 |
| | Male | 82 | 28.6 |
| Where have you spent most of your life? | Village | 20 | 7.0 |
| | Town | 16 | 5.6 |
| | City | 114 | 39.7 |
| | Metropolitan | 135 | 47.0 |
| Employment Status | Yes | 33 | 11.5 |
| | No | 254 | 88.5 |
| Family Income Status | Very Low | 3 | 1.0 |
| | Low | 40 | 13.9 |
| | Middle | 200 | 69.7 |
| | High | 43 | 15.0 |
| | Very High | 1 | 0.3 |
| Have you ever been diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder? | Yes | 53 | 18.5 |
| | No | 234 | 81.5 |
| Romantic Relationship Experiences | Yes | 162 | 56.4 |
| | No | 125 | 43.6 |
| The Type of Current Relationship | Flirt | 17 | 5.9 |
| | Beloved | 69 | 24.0 |
| | Fiancee | 4 | 1.4 |
| Future Marriage Thoughts | Yes | 231 | 80.5 |
| | No | 56 | 19.5 |
| The Method of Future Marriage | Flirt | 234 | 81.5 |
| | Arranged | 36 | 12.5 |

3.3. Data Collection

After informed consent, participants respectively completed “Demographic Information Form”, “Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale”, “A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)”, “Dissociative Experiences Scale” and “Turkish version of Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3”.

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form included questions about participants’ age, gender, where they spent most of their lives, employment status, families’ income status, psychiatric diagnosis history, romantic relationship experiences, the type of current relationship, future marriage thoughts and the method of future marriage.

3.3.2. Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale

Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale (ARMSS) was developed by Cobb, Larson and Watson (2003) to measure constraining beliefs about mate selection. Participants rated items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from very strongly disagree (1) to very strongly agree (7) in the original scale. ARMSS was translated into Turkish by Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik (2011). Unlike the original scale, participants rated items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) in this Turkish translated scale. This scale is used for unmarried individuals. The scale consists of 32 items. There are 5 reversed items (6, 10, 16, 24 and 29). This scale has eight subscales according to the original ARMSS. The eighth subscale includes 4 distracting items (1, 9, 20 and 30). That is, there are 28 items and 7 subscales except distracting items in ARMSS (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011: 180). These seven subscales are “One and Only”, “Love is Enough”, “Cohabitation”, “Complete Assurance”, “Idealization”, “Ease of Effort”, “Opposites Complement”. The item numbers of subscales can be seen in Table 3.2. Distracting items are not included in the score calculation. The scoring range is between 28 and 140. Whereas higher scores indicate higher constraining beliefs about mate selection, lower scores indicate lower constraining beliefs about mate selection (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011, 182-184).

The original ARMSS’s Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .88 for total score, whereas Cronbach Alpha coefficient was between .64 and .98 for seven subscales. Furthermore, test-retest reliability was .90 for total score, while test-retest reliability was between .59 and .92 for seven subscales. The correlation between total scores of the Romantic Beliefs Scale (Sprecher and Metts, 1989) and ARMSS was .45 (Cobb, Larson and Watson, 2003). The Turkish ARMSS’s Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was .65, whereas the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of subscales was found to be between .33 and .98. Moreover, test-retest reliability of this scale was .61 (Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011).

Table 3.2: Subscales and Items of Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale

| Subscales | Item Numbers |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| One and Only | 10, 25 |
| Love is Enough | 2, 3, 11, 17, 18, 26 |
| Cohabitation | 4, 12, 19, 27 |
| Compete Assurance | 5, 13, 15, 21, 28 |
| Idealization | 6, 14, 22, 29 |
| Ease of Effort | 7, 23, 31 |
| Opposites Complement | 8, 16, 24, 32 |

3.3.3. A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)

Childhood Trauma Questionnaire was developed by Bernstein and colleagues (1994) to evaluate childhood abuse and neglect before the age of 20. This scale was shortened by the original authors, and Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form (CTQ-28) was created by them. CTQ-28 was translated into Turkish by Şar, Öztürk and İkikardeş (2012). CTQ-28 was revised and expanded with a factor evaluating overprotection-overcontrol, and CTQ-33 was revealed by Şar and colleagues (2021). CTQ-33 is a culture sensitive revision and expansion of Turkish translated CTQ-28. CTQ-33 contains 33 items. There are 11 reversed items (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 19, 26, 28 and 31). Participants rated items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to very often (5). CTQ-33 includes six factors. These factors are emotional neglect, emotional abuse, physical neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse and overprotection-overcontrol. The item numbers of factors can be seen in Table 3.3. This scale has 5 items for each factor and 3 items of denial of trauma (10, 16 and 22). The denial items are not added to the total scale scores. The total scoring range is between 25 and 150. Higher scores indicate higher probability to have childhood trauma (Şar, et al., 2021).

In the original long version of CTQ, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was .95 for the entire scale, whereas Cronbach Alpha was between .79 and .94 for all subsections. Furthermore, test-retest reliability coefficient was .88 for the entire scale, while test-retest reliability coefficient was between .80 and .83 for all subsections (Bernstein and colleagues, 1994). CTQ-33's Cronbach Alpha was .87, and Gutmann split half coefficient was .69. The correlation between the total scores of the CTQ-33 and the original CTQ-28 was .94, whereas the correlation between the total scores of

the CTQ-33 and the revised CTQ-28 was .98. Moreover, Pearson correlation coefficient for the revised CTQ-28 and CTQ-33 total scores between two assessments was .96 (Şar et al., 2021).

Table 3.3: Subsections and Items of a Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)

| Subsections | Item Numbers |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Emotional Abuse | 3, 8, 14, 18, 25 |
| Physical Abuse | 9, 11, 12, 15, 17 |
| Physical Neglect | 1, 2, 4, 6, 26 |
| Emotional Neglect | 5, 7, 13, 19, 28 |
| Sexual Abuse | 20, 21, 23, 24, 27 |
| Overprotection-Overcontrol | 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 |

3.3.4. Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES)

The Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES) was developed by Bernstein and Putnam (1986) to evaluate dissociation. DES was translated into Turkish by Yargıç, Tutkun and Şar (1995). This scale is not for diagnosis. The scale consists of 28 items. Participants rated items from 0% to 100% increasing by 10 (0%, 10%, 20%...). The result of participants is obtained by dividing the total scores by 28 and calculating the average. The cut-off score is 30. That is, scores 30 or above 30 indicate that the probability of having a dissociative disorder is high (Carlson and Putnam, 1993: 21).

The original DES's test-retest reliability coefficient was .84, whereas the median reliability coefficient of the item scores was .60 (Bernstein and Putnam, 1986). The Turkish DES's test-retest reliability coefficient was .78, whereas the median reliability coefficient of the item scores was .62. Furthermore, Split-half reliability coefficients ranged from .74 to .89 for different groups of people such as schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorder, non-patient group, etc. Moreover, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was .91 (Yargıç, Tutkun and Şar, 1995).

3.3.5. Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3)

Whereas the original long version of Young Schema Questionnaire was developed by Young (1990), Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3) was developed by Young, Klosko and Weishaar (2003). This scale consists of 90 items to measure early maladaptive schemas. YSQ-SF3 was translated into Turkish by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu and Çakır (2009). Whereas the original YSQ-SF3 has 5 schema

domains and 18 schema dimensions, the Turkish YSQ-SF3 has 5 schema domains and 14 schema dimensions because of the suitability to Turkish culture. These 5 schema domains are disconnection, impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and other-directedness. These 14 schema dimensions are “emotional deprivation”, “suppressing emotions”, “imperfection”, “dependence/ incompetence”, “vulnerability to harm or illness”, “failure”, “pessimism”, “abandonment”, “social isolation/ insecurity”, “approval-seeking”, “cliquishness/ insufficient self-control”, “self-sacrificing”, “punitiveness” and “unrelenting standard/hypercriticalness”. The item numbers of these domains and dimensions can be seen in Table 3.4. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “entirely untrue of me” (1) to “describes me perfectly” (6). The total scoring range is between 90 and 540. Higher scores indicate higher early maladaptive schemas (Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu and Çakır, 2009).

In the Turkish YSQ-SF3 (Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu and Çakır, 2009), test-retest reliability coefficient was between .66 and .82 for schema dimensions, whereas test-retest reliability coefficient was between .66 and .83 for schema domains. Moreover, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was between .63 and .80 for schema dimensions, while Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was between .53 and .81 for schema domains (Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu and Çakır, 2009).

Table 3.4: Schema Domains, Schema Dimensions, and Items of Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3

| Schema Domains | Schema Dimensions | Item Numbers |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Disconnection | Emotional Deprivation | 1, 19, 37, 55, 73 |
| | Suppressing Emotions | 12, 30, 48, 66, 84 |
| | Social Isolation/Insecurity | 3, 4, 40, 57, 58, 75, 76 |
| | Imperfection | 23, 41, 43, 59, 77, 90 |
| Impaired Autonomy | Dependence/Incompetence | 7, 9, 10, 25, 63, 64, 79, 81, 82 |
| | Vulnerability to Harm or Illness | 21, 39, 44, 62, 71 |
| | Failure | 6, 24, 33, 42, 60, 78 |
| | Pessimism | 8, 17, 26, 35, 80 |
| | Abandonment | 2, 20, 28, 38, 74 |
| Unrelenting Standards | Unrelenting Standard/ Hypercriticalness | 13, 14, 31 |
| Impaired Limits | Approval-seeking | 16, 34, 52, 56, 70, 88 |
| | Cliquishness/Insufficient Self-control | 15, 22, 32, 50, 51, 68, 69 |
| Other-Directedness | Self-sacrificing | 11, 29, 47, 65, 83 |
| | Punitiveness | 18, 49, 53, 54, 72, 89 |

3.4. Procedure

First of all, before data collection, ethical permission was obtained from Ethical Committee of Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University. The data were collected online via convenience sampling. Online survey was created via Google forms. The research was announced in the social media groups of different universities, and data was collected from these groups. The total participants of this study were 287 single undergraduate students. After informed consent was obtained from the participants about volunteering and about the fact that the study would take approximately 40 minutes, participants respectively completed “Demographic Information Form”, “Attitudes about Romance and Mate Selection Scale”, “A Revised and Expanded Version of The Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33)”, “Dissociative Experiences Scale” and “Turkish version of Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3”. Personal identifying information of participants was not asked throughout the study.

3.5. Analysis of Data

IBM SPSS Statistics 22 was used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics of the data were conducted, and normal distribution was checked. Parametric tests were used for variables which show normal distribution, whereas non-parametric tests were used for variables which do not show normal distribution. Firstly, the comparison analyses according to demographical information were made with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the independent samples t-test for variables which show normal distribution, and Mann Whitney U test for variables which do not show normal distribution. Secondly, after transforming DES into a categorical variable according to its cut-off score, ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to the cut-off score of DES with the independent samples t-test analysis. Thirdly, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient as the parametric test and Spearman’s Rank Correlation Coefficient as the non-parametric test were used to calculate the relationship between variables. Lastly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate whether the scores of CTQ-33 total, DES total, disconnection, impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and other-directedness together predict ARMSS total score.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this part of the study, the results of the analysis of the data obtained from this study are included. Firstly, descriptive statistics of scales and subscales will be presented, and kurtosis and skewness values will be examined to test the normal distribution before analysis. Then, after giving the reliability coefficients of the scales and subscales in this study, comparisons made according to demographic variables and the cut-off score of Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES), and then the correlations between scales and subscales will be examined. Finally, the results of the regression analysis will be given to determine how much mate selection attitude is predicted by other variables.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 shows the scales' and their subscales' reliability coefficient values, descriptive statistics, skewness and kurtosis values. According to George ve Mallery (2016: 114), skewness and kurtosis values between +1 and -1 are considered as normal distribution, but values between +2 and -2 are also acceptable. Therefore, this was taken as a basis in this study, and values between +2 and -2 was accepted as normal distribution. As it can be seen in Table 4.1, the variables except physical abuse and sexual abuse showed normal distribution. Therefore, non-parametric tests were used for statistical analyses of physical and sexual abuse, and these parts were marked as # in the tables.

Reliability coefficient values were calculated to determine the reliability of the scales and subscales in this study (Table 4.1). As a result of the analysis, Cronbach's Alpha values for ARMSS Total and its subscales ranged from .36 (Ease of Effort) to .97 (Cohabitation). Moreover, these values for CTQ-33 Total and its subscales were found between .80 (Physical Neglect) and .94 (Sexual Abuse). Furthermore, whereas Cronbach's Alpha for DES Total is .93, these values for YSQ-SF3 Total and its subscales ranged from .73 (Impaired Limits) to .93 (Impaired Autonomy).

Table 4.1: Reliability Coefficient Values, Descriptive Statistics, Skewness and Kurtosis Values for the Total Scores of the Scales and their Subscales

| | α | Mean | SD | Skewness | Kurtosis | |
|----------------|----------------------------|------|-------|----------|----------|-------|
| ARMSS | One and Only | .66 | 5.10 | 1.87 | .48 | -.41 |
| | Love is Enough | .70 | 18.83 | 4.30 | -.07 | -.03 |
| | Cohabitation | .97 | 11.71 | 5.43 | -.03 | -1.38 |
| | Compete Assurance | .59 | 18.29 | 2.87 | -.25 | -.03 |
| | Idealization | .68 | 12.73 | 3.05 | .20 | -.39 |
| | Ease of Effort | .36 | 10.12 | 2.10 | -.18 | .17 |
| | Opposites Complement | .60 | 9.37 | 2.54 | .37 | -.16 |
| | ARMSS Total | .67 | 86.15 | 9.76 | -.03 | .16 |
| CTQ-33 | Emotional Abuse | .87 | 8.63 | 4.12 | 1.48 | 1.94 |
| | Physical Abuse | .82 | 6.05 | 2.29 | 3.37 | 14.20 |
| | Sexual Abuse | .94 | 6.25 | 2.99 | 3.27 | 11.27 |
| | Emotional Neglect | .85 | 11.46 | 4.46 | .56 | -.23 |
| | Physical Neglect | .80 | 7.66 | 2.93 | 1.38 | 1.80 |
| | Overprotection-Overcontrol | .87 | 10.79 | 4.61 | .90 | .25 |
| | CTQ-33 Total | .92 | 50.84 | 15.40 | 1.16 | 1.59 |
| DES | DES Total | .93 | 21.74 | 15.31 | .94 | .49 |
| YSQ-SF3 | Disconnection | .92 | 59.02 | 20.06 | .55 | -.06 |
| | Impaired Autonomy | .93 | 77.02 | 25.94 | .45 | -.22 |
| | Unrelenting Standards | .79 | 31.68 | 8.30 | .09 | -.26 |
| | Impaired Limits | .73 | 25.33 | 6.41 | -.07 | -.25 |
| | Other-directedness | .80 | 38.14 | 9.34 | .08 | .06 |

4.2. Comparison Analyses

4.2.1. Comparison Analyses by Demographical Information

4.2.1.1. Gender

Table 4.2 shows that male and female participants' total scores of mate selection attitudes (seven subscales that are one and only, love is enough, cohabitation, compete assurance, idealization, ease of effort and opposite complement), dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas (disconnection, impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and other-directedness) and childhood traumas (emotional and physical neglect, overprotection-overcontrol and emotional abuse) were compared with the independent samples t-test analysis. Moreover, Mann Whitney U test was used for the analysis of physical and sexual abuse that did not have normal distribution because Mann Whitney U is the non-parametric equivalent of the independent samples t-test.

As the results of the analyses, the "One and Only" scores of females ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 1.83$) were significantly higher than the "One and Only" scores of males ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.93$) ($t = 2.46$, $p = .015$), whereas females' scores ($M = 10.61$, $SD = 5.38$) from "Cohabitation" were significantly lower than males' scores ($M = 14.39$, $SD = 4.59$) ($t = -5.98$, $p < .001$). While females' "Ease of Effort" scores ($M = 10.30$, $SD = 2.03$) were significantly higher than males' ($M = 9.71$, $SD = 2.19$) ($t = 2.17$, $p = .030$), males' ARMSS Total scores ($M = 88.18$, $SD = 10.29$) were significantly higher than females' ($M = 85.32$, $SD = 9.46$) ($t = -2.25$, $p = .025$). The "Disconnection" scores of females ($M = 57.27$, $SD = 20.53$) were significantly lower than the "Disconnection" scores of males ($M = 63.23$, $SD = 18.34$) ($t = -2.29$, $p = .023$). Females' scores from "Physical Neglect" ($M = 7.34$, $SD = 2.64$) were significantly lower than males' scores ($M = 8.49$, $SD = 3.43$) ($t = -2.72$, $p = .008$). Females' scores (Mean Rank = 148.99) were significantly higher than males' (Mean Rank = 129.85) in terms of "Sexual Abuse" ($U = 7245.00$, $z = -2.26$, $p = .024$).

Table 4.2: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS, CTQ-33, DES and YSQ-SF3 by Gender

| | | Female (N=204) | | Male (N=82) | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | T-test | M | SD | M | SD | t | |
| ARMSS | One and Only | 5.28 | 1.83 | 4.68 | 1.93 | 2.46* | |
| | Love is Enough | 18.75 | 3.92 | 19.02 | 5.16 | -.43 | |
| | Cohabitation | 10.61 | 5.38 | 14.39 | 4.59 | -5.98** | |
| | Compete Assurance | 18.22 | 2.91 | 18.41 | 2.77 | -.52 | |
| | Idealization | 12.72 | 2.98 | 12.76 | 3.26 | -.10 | |
| | Ease of Effort | 10.30 | 2.03 | 9.71 | 2.19 | 2.17* | |
| | Opposites Complement | 9.45 | 2.40 | 9.21 | 2.86 | .67 | |
| | ARMSS Total | 85.32 | 9.46 | 88.18 | 10.29 | -2.25* | |
| DES | DES Total | 22.43 | 16.13 | 19.79 | 12.87 | 1.32 | |
| YSQ-SF3 | Disconnection | 57.27 | 20.53 | 63.23 | 18.34 | -2.29* | |
| | Impaired Autonomy | 77.73 | 26.84 | 75.06 | 23.72 | .79 | |
| | Unrelenting Standards | 31.72 | 8.19 | 31.40 | 8.46 | .29 | |
| | Impaired Limits | 25.35 | 6.32 | 25.30 | 6.69 | .06 | |
| | Other-directedness | 37.84 | 9.35 | 38.69 | 9.20 | -.70 | |
| CTQ-33 | CTQ-33 Total | 50.34 | 15.88 | 51.54 | 13.35 | -.60 | |
| | Emotional Neglect | 11.25 | 4.59 | 11.87 | 4.08 | -1.05 | |
| | Physical Neglect | 7.34 | 2.64 | 8.49 | 3.43 | -2.72** | |
| | Overprotection-Overcontrol | 10.70 | 4.73 | 10.90 | 4.21 | -.34 | |
| | Emotional Abuse | 8.78 | 4.39 | 8.17 | 3.28 | 1.28 | |
| | Mann Whitney U | Mean Rank | | Mean Rank | | U | Z |
| | Physical Abuse [#] | 138.55 | | 155.82 | | 7353.50 | -1.95 |
| | Sexual Abuse [#] | 148.99 | | 129.85 | | 7245.00 | -2.26* |

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

There was not a statistically significant difference between females and males in terms of “Love is Enough” ($t = -.43, p = .665$), “Compete Assurance” ($t = -.52, p = .606$), “Idealization” ($t = -.10, p = .920$), “Opposites Complement” ($t = .67, p = .506$), “DES Total” ($t = 1.32, p = .187$), “Impaired Autonomy” ($t = .79, p = .432$), “Unrelenting Standards” ($t = .29, p = .772$), “Impaired Limits” ($t = .06, p = .954$), “Other-directedness” ($t = -.70, p = .482$), “CTQ-33 Total” ($t = -.60, p = .545$), “Emotional Neglect” ($t = -1.05, p = .294$), “Overprotection-Overcontrol” ($t = -.34, p = .737$), “Emotional Abuse” ($t = 1.28, p = .202$) and “Physical Abuse” ($U = 7353.50, z = -1.95, p = .051$) (See Table 4.2).

4.2.1.2. Psychiatric Diagnosis

In Table 4.3, the variables were compared according to the presence or absence of psychiatric diagnosis history with the independent samples t-test analysis. Furthermore, Mann Whitney U test was used for the analysis of physical and sexual abuse that did not have normal distribution.

As the results of the analyses, the “Cohabitation” scores of participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 13.74, SD = 5.05$) were significantly higher than the “Cohabitation” scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 11.26, SD = 5.42$) ($t = 3.04, p = .003$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 27.03, SD = 16.47$) from “DES Total” were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 20.55, SD = 14.82$) ($t = 2.82, p = .005$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 68.36, SD = 19.70$) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 56.91, SD = 19.57$) in terms of “Disconnection” ($t = 3.84, p < .001$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 87.32, SD = 27.01$) from “Impaired Autonomy” were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 74.69, SD = 25.17$) ($t = 3.25, p = .001$). The “Unrelenting Standards” scores of participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 33.81, SD = 8.36$) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 31.20, SD = 8.22$) ($t = 2.08, p = .038$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 26.92, SD = 6.59$) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 24.97, SD = 6.32$) in terms of “Impaired Limits” ($t = 2.01, p = .045$). The scores of those with a

psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 41.36$, $SD = 8.08$) from “Other-directedness” were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 37.41$, $SD = 9.47$) ($t = 2.81$, $p = .005$). The “CTQ-33 Total” scores of participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 59.79$, $SD = 18.63$) were significantly higher than the “CTQ-33 Total” scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 48.81$, $SD = 13.83$) ($t = 4.04$, $p < .001$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 13.58$, $SD = 4.90$) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 10.97$, $SD = 4.22$) in terms of “Emotional Neglect” ($t = 3.94$, $p < .001$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 8.58$, $SD = 3.36$) from “Physical Neglect” were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 7.45$, $SD = 2.78$) ($t = 2.57$, $p = .011$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 12.66$, $SD = 5.70$) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 10.37$, $SD = 4.23$) in terms of “Overprotection-Overcontrol” ($t = 2.75$, $p = .008$). The “Emotional Abuse” scores of participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 10.74$, $SD = 4.89$) were significantly higher than the “Emotional Abuse” scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history ($M = 8.15$, $SD = 3.77$) ($t = 3.61$, $p = .001$). The scores of those with a psychiatric diagnosis history (Mean Rank = 172.02) were significantly higher than the scores of those without a psychiatric diagnosis history (Mean Rank = 137.65) in terms of “Sexual Abuse” ($U = 4716.00$, $z = -3.46$, $p = .001$). There was not a statistically significant difference between the presence and absence of psychiatric diagnosis history in terms of “One and Only” ($t = -1.49$, $p = .136$), “Love is Enough” ($t = -.49$, $p = .627$), “Compete Assurance” ($t = -.75$, $p = .454$), “Idealization” ($t = -.89$, $p = .376$), “Ease of Effort” ($t = -1.03$, $p = .302$), “Opposites Complement” ($t = .97$, $p = .331$), “ARMSS Total” ($t = .70$, $p = .483$) and “Physical Abuse” ($U = 5414.00$, $z = -1.76$, $p = .079$).

Table 4.3: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS, CTQ-33, DES and YSQ-SF3 by the Presence of Psychiatric Diagnosis History

| | T-test | Yes (N=53) | | No (N=234) | | t |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| | | M | SD | M | SD | |
| ARMSS | One and Only | 4.75 | 1.93 | 5.18 | 1.86 | -1.49 |
| | Love is Enough | 18.57 | 4.72 | 18.88 | 4.21 | -.49 |
| | Cohabitation | 13.74 | 5.05 | 11.26 | 5.42 | 3.04** |
| | Compete Assurance | 18.02 | 3.02 | 18.35 | 2.84 | -.75 |
| | Idealization | 12.40 | 2.84 | 12.81 | 3.10 | -.89 |
| | Ease of Effort | 9.85 | 2.36 | 10.18 | 2.04 | -1.03 |
| | Opposites Complement | 9.68 | 2.10 | 9.30 | 2.62 | .97 |
| | ARMSS Total | 87.00 | 10.50 | 85.96 | 9.59 | .70 |
| DES | DES Total | 27.03 | 16.47 | 20.55 | 14.82 | 2.82** |
| YSQ-SF3 | Disconnection | 68.36 | 19.70 | 56.91 | 19.57 | 3.84** |
| | Impaired Autonomy | 87.32 | 27.01 | 74.69 | 25.17 | 3.25** |
| | Unrelenting Standards | 33.81 | 8.36 | 31.20 | 8.22 | 2.08* |
| | Impaired Limits | 26.92 | 6.59 | 24.97 | 6.32 | 2.01* |
| | Other-directedness | 41.36 | 8.08 | 37.41 | 9.47 | 2.81** |
| CTQ-33 | CTQ-33 Total | 59.79 | 18.63 | 48.81 | 13.83 | 4.04** |
| | Emotional Neglect | 13.58 | 4.90 | 10.97 | 4.22 | 3.94** |
| | Physical Neglect | 8.58 | 3.36 | 7.45 | 2.78 | 2.57* |
| | Overprotection-Overcontrol | 12.66 | 5.70 | 10.37 | 4.23 | 2.75** |
| | Emotional Abuse | 10.74 | 4.89 | 8.15 | 3.77 | 3.61** |
| | | Mann Whitney U | Mean Rank | Mean Rank | U | Z |
| CTQ-33 | Physical Abuse [#] | 158.85 | | 140.64 | 5414.00 | -1.76 |
| | Sexual Abuse [#] | 172.02 | | 137.65 | 4716.00 | -3.46** |

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

4.2.1.3. Romantic Relationship Experiences

Table 4.4 shows that ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to the presence or absence of any romantic relationship experiences with the independent samples t-test analysis. As the results of the analysis, the “One and Only” scores of participants who have a romantic relationship (M = 4.76, SD = 1.84) were significantly lower than the “One and Only” scores of those who do not have a romantic relationship (M = 5.54, SD = 1.82) ($t = -3.59, p < .001$), whereas the scores of those who have a romantic relationship (M = 13.62, SD = 4.90) were significantly higher than the scores of those who do not have a romantic relationship (M = 9.24, SD = 5.09) in terms of “Cohabitation” ($t = 7.38, p < .001$). The scores of those who have a romantic relationship (M = 9.83, SD = 2.23) from “Ease of Effort” were significantly lower than the scores of those who do not have a romantic relationship (M = 10.49, SD = 1.86) ($t = -2.65, p = .009$). There was not a significant difference between the presence and absence of a romantic relationship experience in terms of “Love is Enough” ($t = -1.54, p = .124$), “Compete Assurance” ($t = -.51, p = .611$), “Idealization” ($t = .13, p = .893$), “Opposites Complement” ($t = -.72, p = .471$) and “ARMSS Total” ($t = 1.59, p = .114$).

Table 4.4: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Presence of Romantic Relationship Experiences

| | Yes (N=162) | | No (N=125) | | t |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------|------------|------|---------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| One and Only | 4.76 | 1.84 | 5.54 | 1.82 | -3.59** |
| Love is Enough | 18.49 | 4.73 | 19.26 | 3.64 | -1.54 |
| Cohabitation | 13.62 | 4.90 | 9.24 | 5.09 | 7.38** |
| Compete Assurance | 18.21 | 2.98 | 18.38 | 2.73 | -.51 |
| Idealization | 12.75 | 3.23 | 12.70 | 2.82 | .13 |
| Ease of Effort | 9.83 | 2.23 | 10.49 | 1.86 | -2.65** |
| Opposites Complement | 9.28 | 2.63 | 9.50 | 2.41 | -.72 |
| ARMSS Total | 86.95 | 10.16 | 85.11 | 9.15 | 1.59 |

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

4.2.1.4. The Type of Current Relationship

Table 4.5 shows that ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to the type of current relationship with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The type of current relationship was classified into 3 groups as flirt (n = 17), beloved (n = 69) and fiancée (n = 4). As the results of the analysis, there was not a statistically significant difference between the different types of relationship in terms of “One and Only” ($F_{2,87}$

= 1.07, $p = .346$), “Love is Enough” ($F_{2,87} = 1.05, p = .353$), “Cohabitation” ($F_{2,87} = .68, p = .511$), “Compete Assurance” ($F_{2,87} = .29, p = .747$), “Idealization” ($F_{2,87} = 2.71, p = .072$), “Ease of Effort” ($F_{2,87} = .36, p = .696$), “Opposites Complement” ($F_{2,87} = 1.83, p = .166$) and “ARMSS Total” ($F_{2,87} = .77, p = .465$).

Table 4.5: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Type of Current Relationship

| | Flirt (N= 17) | | Beloved (N= 69) | | Fiancee (N= 4) | | F |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------|--------------------|------|-------------------|-------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | |
| One and Only | 4.29 | 1.49 | 4.88 | 1.79 | 5.50 | 2.65 | 1.07 |
| Love is Enough | 17.94 | 6.13 | 19.13 | 4.59 | 21.75 | 4.03 | 1.05 |
| Cohabitation | 12.59 | 6.03 | 14.07 | 4.70 | 14.75 | 4.99 | .68 |
| Compete Assurance | 17.71 | 3.75 | 18.27 | 3.02 | 18.75 | 1.71 | .29 |
| Idealization | 14.29 | 2.47 | 12.41 | 3.44 | 14.25 | 2.22 | 2.71 |
| Ease of Effort | 9.88 | 2.57 | 9.78 | 2.12 | 10.75 | 2.22 | .36 |
| Opposites Complement | 9.71 | 2.73 | 9.27 | 2.54 | 7.00 | 1.41 | 1.83 |
| ARMSS Total | 86.41 | 11.76 | 87.83 | 8.37 | 92.75 | 11.44 | .77 |

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

4.2.1.5. Future Marriage Thoughts

Table 4.6 shows that ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to whether or not marriage is considered in the future with the independent samples t-test analysis. As the results of the analysis, the “Love is Enough” scores of participants who consider marriage in the future ($M = 19.44, SD = 4.05$) were significantly higher than the “Love is Enough” scores of those who do not consider marriage in the future ($M = 16.29, SD = 4.40$) ($t = 5.14, p < .001$), while the scores of those who consider marriage in the future ($M = 11.06, SD = 5.43$) were significantly lower than the scores of those who do not consider marriage in the future ($M = 14.43, SD = 4.54$) in terms of “Cohabitation” ($t = -4.79, p < .001$). Whereas the scores of those who consider marriage in the future ($M = 12.43, SD = 3.02$) from “Idealization” were significantly lower than the scores of those who do not consider marriage in the future ($M = 13.98, SD = 2.89$) ($t = -3.48, p = .001$), the “Ease of Effort” scores of participants who consider marriage in the future ($M = 10.27, SD = 2.10$) were significantly higher than the “Ease of Effort” scores of those who do not consider marriage in the future ($M = 9.50, SD = 2.01$) ($t = 2.48, p = .014$). There was not a statistically significant difference between considering and not considering marriage in the future in terms of “One and

Only” ($t = 1.17, p = .245$), “Compete Assurance” ($t = -1.56, p = .119$), “Opposites Complement” ($t = -1.30, p = .194$) and “ARMSS Total” ($t = -1.26, p = .208$).

Table 4.6: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Presence of Future Marriage Thoughts

| | Yes (N=231) | | No (N=56) | | t |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------|-----------|------|---------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| One and Only | 5.16 | 1.90 | 4.84 | 1.73 | 1.17 |
| Love is Enough | 19.44 | 4.05 | 16.29 | 4.40 | 5.14** |
| Cohabitation | 11.06 | 5.43 | 14.43 | 4.54 | -4.79** |
| Compete Assurance | 18.16 | 2.82 | 18.82 | 3.04 | -1.56 |
| Idealization | 12.43 | 3.02 | 13.98 | 2.89 | -3.48** |
| Ease of Effort | 10.27 | 2.10 | 9.50 | 2.01 | 2.48* |
| Opposites Complement | 9.28 | 2.43 | 9.77 | 2.92 | -1.30 |
| ARMSS Total | 85.79 | 9.84 | 87.62 | 9.36 | -1.26 |

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

4.2.1.6. The Method of Future Marriage

Table 4.7 shows that ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to which method participants want their future marriage to be with the independent samples t-test analysis. As the results of the analysis, the “One and Only” scores of participants who want marriage with flirt in the future ($M = 4.99, SD = 1.79$) were significantly lower than the “One and Only” scores of those who want arranged marriage in the future ($M = 5.72, SD = 1.99$) ($t = -2.25, p = .026$), whereas the scores of those who want marriage with flirt in the future ($M = 12.89, SD = 5.12$) were significantly higher than the scores of those who want arranged marriage in the future ($M = 6.33, SD = 3.02$) in terms of “Cohabitation” ($t = 10.84, p < .001$). The scores of those who want marriage with flirt in the future ($M = 18.51, SD = 2.73$) from “Compete Assurance” were significantly higher than the scores of those who want arranged marriage in the future ($M = 17.36, SD = 2.85$) ($t = 2.33, p = .021$). The “ARMSS Total” scores of participants who want marriage with flirt in the future ($M = 87.77, SD = 9.12$) were significantly higher than the “ARMSS Total” scores of those who want arranged marriage in the future ($M = 79.81, SD = 8.06$) ($t = 4.95, p < .001$). There was not a statistically significant difference between marriage with flirt and arranged marriage in terms of “Love is Enough” ($t = .87, p = .385$), “Idealization” ($t = .68, p = .497$), “Ease of Effort” ($t = -.63, p = .528$) and “Opposites Complement” ($t = .53, p = .600$).

Table 4.7: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by the Method of Future Marriage

| | Flirt (N=234) | | Arranged (N=36) | | t |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------|-----------------|------|---------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| One and Only | 4.99 | 1.79 | 5.72 | 1.99 | -2.25* |
| Love is Enough | 19.08 | 4.33 | 18.42 | 3.77 | .87 |
| Cohabitation | 12.89 | 5.12 | 6.33 | 3.02 | 10.84** |
| Compete Assurance | 18.51 | 2.73 | 17.36 | 2.85 | 2.33* |
| Idealization | 12.73 | 3.07 | 12.36 | 2.78 | .68 |
| Ease of Effort | 10.16 | 2.03 | 10.39 | 2.06 | -.63 |
| Opposites Complement | 9.41 | 2.62 | 9.22 | 1.93 | .53 |
| ARMSS Total | 87.77 | 9.12 | 79.81 | 8.06 | 4.95** |

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

4.2.2. Comparison Analysis by Cut-off Score of DES

DES has a cut-off score. This score is 30. That is, participants who have 30 or over scores have higher probability of having a dissociative disorder (Carlson and Putnam, 1993: 21). DES was transformed into a categorical variable according to its cut-off score, and participants grouped as those who score “less than 30”, and score “30 and above”. While 75.99% of participants were those who score less than 30 (N = 218), 24.04% of them were those who score 30 and above (N = 69).

Table 4.8 shows that ARMSS Total and its subscales were compared according to the cut-off score of DES with the independent samples t-test analysis. As the results of the analysis, the “Cohabitation” scores of participants who score 30 and above (M = 12.97, SD = 5.20) significantly higher than the “Cohabitation” scores of those who score less than 30 (M = 11.32, SD = 5.45) ($t = 2.22, p = .027$). The scores of those who score 30 and above (M = 9.91, SD = 2.82) were significantly higher than the scores of those who score less than 30 (M = 9.20, SD = 2.42) in terms of “Opposites Complement” ($t = 2.04, p = .042$). The scores of those who score 30 and above (M = 89.38, SD = 9.41) from “ARMSS Total” were significantly higher than the scores of those who score less than 30 (M = 85.13, SD = 9.66) ($t = 3.20, p = .002$). There was not a statistically significant difference between participants with and without sexual abuse in terms of “One and Only” ($t = .74, p = .461$), “Love is Enough” ($t = 1.00, p = .320$), “Compete Assurance” ($t = 1.27, p = .206$), “Idealization” ($t = .66, p = .512$) and “Ease of Effort” ($t = 1.11, p = .269$).

Table 4.8: Comparison of Total Scores and Subscales of ARMSS by Cut-off Score of DES

| | ≥ 30 (N = 69) | | <30 (N = 218) | | t |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------|---------------|------|--------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| One and Only | 5.25 | 2.09 | 5.05 | 1.80 | .74 |
| Love is Enough | 19.27 | 4.40 | 18.68 | 4.27 | 1.00 |
| Cohabitation | 12.97 | 5.20 | 11.32 | 5.45 | 2.22* |
| Compete Assurance | 18.67 | 3.07 | 18.16 | 2.80 | 1.27 |
| Idealization | 12.94 | 3.18 | 12.66 | 3.01 | .66 |
| Ease of Effort | 10.36 | 2.24 | 10.04 | 2.05 | 1.11 |
| Opposites Complement | 9.91 | 2.82 | 9.20 | 2.42 | 2.04* |
| ARMSS Total | 89.38 | 9.41 | 85.13 | 9.66 | 3.20** |

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

4.3. Correlation Analyses

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes. However, because physical and sexual abuse, which are subscales of CTQ-33, did not have normal distribution, Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between these variables and other variables. In the analyses, it was used "CTQ-33 total, emotional and physical neglect, overprotection-overcontrol, emotional, physical and sexual abuse" for childhood traumas; "disconnection, impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and other-directedness" for early maladaptive schemas; and "one and only", "love is enough", "cohabitation", "compete assurance", "idealization", "ease of effort", "opposites complement" and "ARMSS total" for mate selection attitudes.

As the results of the analyses (See Table 4.9), "One and Only" was negatively correlated with emotional neglect ($r = -.12, p = .043$), overprotection-overcontrol ($r = -.12, p = .037$) and CTQ-33 Total ($r = -.12, p = .034$). However, there were no statistically significant correlations between "One and Only" and any early maladaptive schemas. "Love is Enough" was positively correlated with unrelenting standards ($r = .13, p = .029$), other-directedness ($r = .19, p = .001$), while it was negatively correlated with emotional neglect ($r = -.14, p = .019$). "Cohabitation" was positively correlated with DES total ($r = .12, p = .034$), CTQ-33 total ($r = .12, p = .045$), emotional abuse ($r = .13, p = .029$) and all early maladaptive schemas, i.e., disconnection ($r = .20, p = .001$), impaired autonomy ($r = .20, p = .001$), unrelenting

standards ($r = .18, p = .003$), impaired limits ($r = .16, p = .007$), and other-directedness ($r = .12, p = .05$). “Compete Assurance” was positively correlated with all early maladaptive schemas except impaired autonomy; i.e., disconnection ($r = .12, p = .038$), unrelenting standard ($r = .16, p = .006$), impaired limits ($r = .18, p = .002$), and other-directedness ($r = .24, p < .001$). However, there were no statistically significant correlations between “Compete Assurance” and any childhood traumas. “Idealization” was positively correlated with only impaired limits ($r = .16, p = .007$). It had no statistically significant correlations with all other variables. “Ease of Effort” was positively correlated with impaired autonomy ($r = .13, p = .027$), unrelenting standards ($r = .15, p = .013$) and other-directedness ($r = .12, p = .041$), whereas it was negatively correlated with physical neglect ($r = -.14, p = .020$). There were no statistically significant correlations between “Opposites Complement” and any other variables, i.e., CTQ-33, DES and YSQ-SF3 total and their subscales. “ARMSS Total” was positively correlated with DES total ($r = .20, p = .001$) and all early maladaptive schemas, i.e., disconnection ($r = .18, p = .002$), impaired autonomy ($r = .17, p = .005$), unrelenting standard ($r = .24, p < .001$), impaired limits ($r = .21, p < .001$), and other-directedness ($r = .25, p < .001$). However, there were no statistically significant correlations between “ARMSS Total” and any childhood traumas.

“DES Total” was positively correlated with all early maladaptive schemas and all childhood traumas. Moreover, it was positively correlated with only “Cohabitation” ($r = .12, p = .034$) and “ARMSS Total” ($r = .20, p = .001$) among mate selection attitudes. Disconnection and impaired autonomy were positively correlated with all childhood traumas. Whereas unrelenting standards were positively correlated with all childhood traumas except physical neglect, impaired limits were positively correlated with all childhood traumas except sexual abuse. Other-directedness was positively correlated with all childhood traumas except physical neglect and sexual abuse.

Table 4.9: Correlations between the Total Scores of the Scales and their Subscales

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|-----------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | .28** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | -.25** | -.05 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | .15** | .22** | .24** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | .18** | -.06 | .06 | .36** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .03 | .23** | -.06 | .12* | -.08 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | -.05 | -.14* | -.01 | -.18** | -.19** | .04 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | .27** | .53** | .56** | .65** | .40** | .31** | .08 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | .10 | .09 | .12* | .11 | .04 | .03 | .08 | .20** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | .01 | -.07 | .20** | .12* | .11 | .04 | .09 | .18** | .46** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | -.06 | -.06 | .20** | .11 | .06 | .13* | .07 | .17** | .46** | .73** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | .003 | .13* | .18** | .16** | .03 | .15* | -.04 | .24** | .33** | .43** | .49** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | .000 | -.005 | .16** | .18** | .16** | .03 | .07 | .21** | .25** | .35** | .42** | .47** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 14 | -.02 | .19** | .12* | .24** | .01 | .12* | .01 | .25** | .34** | .48** | .52** | .55** | .37** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 15 | -.12* | -.08 | .12* | .03 | .06 | -.08 | .07 | .03 | .41** | .48** | .50** | .26** | .24** | .22** | 1 | | | | | |
| 16 | -.12* | -.14* | .10 | .002 | .04 | -.09 | .11 | -.004 | .32** | .47** | .39** | .20** | .17** | .14* | .83** | 1 | | | | |
| 17 | -.01 | -.06 | .07 | -.11 | .09 | -.14* | .02 | -.02 | .31** | .29** | .19** | .06 | .13* | .03 | .59** | .53** | 1 | | | |
| 18 | -.12* | -.03 | .08 | .05 | -.02 | -.004 | .07 | .03 | .23** | .35** | .45** | .21** | .21** | .21** | .74** | .51** | .20** | 1 | | |
| 19 | -.11 | -.06 | .13* | .03 | .03 | -.04 | .10 | .06 | .39** | .41** | .47** | .27** | .27** | .21** | .85** | .67** | .35** | .59** | 1 | |
| 20[#] | .02 | .06 | .07 | .05 | .11 | -.05 | -.01 | .10 | .30** | .26** | .31** | .14* | .18** | .13* | .54** | .40** | .39** | .31** | .50** | 1 |
| 21[#] | -.08 | .01 | -.002 | -.03 | .02 | -.09 | -.07 | -.04 | .25** | .21** | .27** | .14* | .04 | .05 | .37** | .22** | .17** | .17** | .29** | .20** |

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; #Variables made with Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient

Note. 1. One and Only, 2. Love is Enough, 3. Cohabitation, 4. Compete Assurance, 5. Idealization, 6. Ease of Effort, 7. Opposites Complement, 8. ARMSS Total, 9. DES Total, 10. Disconnection, 11. Impaired Autonomy, 12. Unrelenting Standards, 13. Impaired Limits, 14. Other-directedness, 15. CTQ-33 Total, 16. Emotional Neglect, 17. Physical Neglect, 18. Overprotection-Overcontrol, 19. Emotional Abuse, 20. Physical Abuse, 21. Sexual Abuse

4.4. Regression Analysis

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate whether the scores of CTQ-33 total, DES total, disconnection, impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and other-directedness together predict ARMSS total score (See Table 4.10).

As the result of the regression analysis, it was found that other-directedness ($R^2 = .06$, $\beta = .20$, $t = 3.21$, $p = .001$) and impaired limits ($R^2 = .02$, $\beta = .14$, $t = 2.33$, $p = .021$) significantly predicted ARMSS total score and explained 7% of the variance of ARMSS total score ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = .07$, $F_{2,284} = 12.26$, $p < .001$).

Table 4.10: Multiple Regression Analysis for the Total Score of Mate Selection Attitudes (ARMSS Total)

| Independent Variables | B | SE | β | t | R^2 | F | Adj. R^2 |
|-----------------------|-------|------|---------|---------|-------|---------|------------|
| Constant | 72.82 | 2.76 | | 26.41** | | | |
| Other-directedness | .20 | .06 | .20 | 3.21** | .06 | 12.26** | .07 |
| Impaired Limits | .22 | .09 | .14 | 2.33* | .02 | | |

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

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the results related to all statistical analyses were discussed in the light of literature. Firstly, the findings of the study regarding comparison analyses according to demographic information and cut-off score of Dissociative Experiences Scale (DES) were discussed. Secondly, the results about the relationships between the scales total scores and their subscales scores were discussed. Thirdly, the findings regarding stepwise multiple regression analysis conducted to determine the level of prediction of mate selection attitudes by other variables were discussed. Lastly, the strengths and limitations of the study and suggestions for future research were explained.

5.1. Findings on Comparison Analyses

5.1.1. Findings on Comparison Analysis by Demographic Information

5.1.1.1. Gender

Independent samples t-test for the variables which showed normal distribution and Mann Whitney U for those that did not show normal distribution were conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from the main variables of this study differed significantly according to gender.

As the results of the analyses, it was seen that the scores of “One and Only”, “Cohabitation”, “Ease of Effort” which are the subscales of ARMSS, and ARMSS total score differed significantly according to gender. “One and Only” and “Ease of Effort” scores of females were higher than males, whereas “Cohabitation” and ARMSS total scores of males were higher than females. The reason for the gender difference in “Cohabitation” and “One and Only” may be that Turkish society sets different boundaries for females and males in terms of romantic relationships. For example, while it may be considered normal for males to live with a female in the same house before marriage, the man whom a woman will marry may be expected to be the first and only male in her life. Although there were studies in the literature that yielded different results, the results of the majority of these studies and the results of this thesis were the same in "Love is Enough", “Cohabitation”, “Idealization”, “Opposites Complement”, “Compete Assurance” and ARMSS total (Koca, 2021: 80; Şimşek,

2018: 52). However, unlike this thesis, most studies in the literature did not yield statistically significant results for “One and Only” and “Ease of Effort” (Daldaban, 2021: 54-55; Korkulu, 2019: 42).

When the results were examined, DES total score did not differ significantly according to gender. While some studies were consistent with the result of this thesis and found no gender differences (Bernstein and Putnam, 1986: 730; Yargıç, Tutkun and Şar, 1995: 12), other studies stated that females had more dissociation than males (Yılmaz, 2020: 50). According to Şar (2010: 27), whereas dissociation was more common in females in clinical populations, there was not a gender difference in the general population. Therefore, this study may not have found gender differences because the clinical population was not studied.

According to the results, only “Disconnection” scores from schema domains differed significantly in gender. The “Disconnection” scores of males were higher than females. The reason for this result may be that males show their emotions (Fabes and Martin, 1991: 532) and sadness less than females (Kelley, et al., 1978: 473), so males may disconnect from their emotions and people. Although there were studies with different results in the literature, most studies stated that females had more early maladaptive schemas than males (Irkörücü, 2016, 103; Shorey, Anderson and Stuart, 2012: 108).

The results of the analyses demonstrate that the scores of physical neglect and sexual abuse among the types of childhood trauma differed significantly according to gender. Whereas females got significantly higher scores on sexual abuse compared to males, males got significantly higher scores on physical neglect than females. According to the literature, male suffered from physical abuse more than females (Baydemir, et al., 2014: 755; Sofuoğlu, et al., 2014: 47), while females had sexual abuse more than males (Demirkapı, 2013: 81). Therefore, the result for sexual abuse was consistent with the literature. Moreover, whereas some studies in the literature stated that neglect was more common in females (Sofuoğlu, et al., 2014: 47), others said the opposite (Baydemir, et al., 2014: 755).

5.1.1.2. Psychiatric Diagnosis

To determine whether the scores obtained from the main variables of this study differed significantly according to the presence or absence of any psychiatric diagnosis

history, independent samples t-test for the variables which showed normal distribution and Mann Whitney U for those that did not show normal distribution were conducted.

When the results were examined, only “Cohabitation” scores from mate selection attitudes differed significantly according to the presence or absence of any psychiatric diagnosis history. The participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history had higher “Cohabitation” scores than those without a psychiatric diagnosis history. The reason for this difference may be that people with psychiatric diagnoses may have a high sense of loneliness (Aksu, et al., 2022: 154; Orłowski, 2021: I). Due to this feeling of loneliness, they may think that living together before marriage may predict happiness in marriage because living together can make them feel good by alleviating their sense of loneliness. Furthermore, the scores of all schema domains, DES total and all types of childhood trauma except physical abuse differed significantly according to the presence or absence of any psychiatric diagnosis history. The scores of participants with a psychiatric diagnosis history were higher in all schema domains, DES total and all types of childhood trauma except physical abuse than those without a psychiatric diagnosis history. According to the literature, people with a psychiatric diagnosis history had all schema domains (Velibaşoğlu, 2021: 67), dissociation (Foote, et al., 2006: 623) and childhood trauma (Álvarez, 2011: 156; Helvacı Çelik and Hocaoğlu, 2018: 706) more than those without a psychiatric diagnosis history. That is, the results of this thesis were consistent with the literature.

5.1.1.3. Romantic Relationship Experiences

Independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from mate selection attitudes differ significantly according to the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience.

The results of the analysis point out that “One and Only”, “Cohabitation” and “Ease of Effort” scores differed significantly in the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience. Participants who have a romantic relationship got significantly higher “Cohabitation” scores than those who do not have any romantic relationship, while participants who have a romantic relationship got significantly lower scores on “One and Only” and “Ease of Effort” compared to those who do not have any romantic relationship. The reason for lower scores in these two subscales may be that people who do not have a relationship experience may not make an effort

to have a relationship by thinking that there is only one right person to marry. The results for “Idealization”, “Opposites Complement” and “Compete Assurance” were in agreement with the literature. That is, there was no statistically significant difference in these scores according to the presence or absence of a romantic relationship experience (Odabaşı, 2021: 52; Özinan, 2018: 82; Şimşek, 2018: 64; Yılmaz, Güngör and Çelik, 2013: 421). In addition, while the results for “Cohabitation”, “One and Only”, “Love is Enough” and ARMSS total of some studies in the literature were consistent with this study, others were inconsistent. In other words, some of them found statistically significant difference for these variables (Özinan, 2018: 82; Şimşek, 2018: 64; Yılmaz, Güngör and Çelik, 2013: 421), whereas others obtained nonsignificant results (Odabaşı, 2021: 52; Özinan, 2018: 82). Moreover, this study stated the statistically significant results for “Ease of Effort”, but there were no statistically significant results according to any studies in the literature (Odabaşı, 2021: 52; Özinan, 2018: 82; Şimşek, 2018: 64; Yılmaz, Güngör and Çelik, 2013: 421). The reason for these inconsistencies with the literature may be that some studies included married individuals and that some studies had very few individuals who did not have a relationship, so these may have affected the results of their analysis.

5.1.1.4. The Type of Current Relationship

To determine whether the scores obtained from mate selection attitudes differ significantly according to the type of current relationship, one-way ANOVA was conducted.

When the results of the analysis were examined, there was no statistically significant difference in the scores of mate selection attitudes according to the types of relationship. However, in the literature (Şimşek, 2018: 66-67; Yılmaz, Güngör and Çelik, 2013: 420-421), people who were married, engaged, had a flirt and did not have any relationship differed significantly in “One and Only”, “Love is Enough” and “Cohabitation”. As the results of these studies, people who had a flirt got higher “Cohabitation” scores than those who did not have any relationship. Furthermore, the engaged people had higher scores on “One and Only” and “Love is Enough” compared to those who did not have any relationship. However, another study had nonsignificant results like this study (Tuzer, 2016: 36). Consequently, it was thought that the reason for this inconsistency with the literature may be the inclusion of married individuals

and those who did not have a relationship in the analysis of the studies that found significant results.

5.1.1.5. Future Marriage Thoughts

Independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from mate selection attitudes differ significantly according to whether or not marriage is considered in the future.

On the basis of the results of the analyses, the scores of “Love is Enough”, “Cohabitation”, “Idealization” and “Ease of Effort” differed significantly according to whether or not considering marriage in the future. Whereas participants who consider marriage in the future had significantly higher scores on “Love is Enough” and “Ease of Effort” compared to those who do not consider marriage in the future, those who do not consider marriage in the future had significantly higher scores on “Cohabitation” and “Idealization” compared to those who consider marriage in the future. These are because individuals who think that everything should be ideal in order to get married may not think of marriage in the future and so may look at living together positively. The results for “One and Only”, “Love is Enough”, “Cohabitation” and “Ease of Effort” were consistent with the literature (Çelik, 2018: 80; Tuzer, 2016: 37). However, the same studies found different results for “Opposites Complement” and “Compete Assurance” as significant and insignificant. Moreover, although the results for “Idealization” were also statistically significant in the studies in the literature, the results of some of these studies were contrary to the results of this study. That is, according to these studies’ results, people who consider marriage in the future got higher “Idealization” scores than those who do not consider marriage in the future (Çelik, 2018: 81).

5.1.1.6. The Method of Future Marriage

To determine whether the scores obtained from mate selection attitudes differ significantly according to which method participants want their future marriage to be, independent samples t-test was conducted.

According to the results of the analysis, the scores of “One and Only”, “Cohabitation”, “Compete Assurance” and ARMSS total differed significantly in terms of which method participants would like their future marriage to be. While “Cohabitation”,

“Compete Assurance” and ARMSS total scores of participants who want marriage with flirt in the future were higher than those who want arranged marriage in the future, only “One and Only” scores of those who want arranged marriage in the future were higher than those who want marriage with flirt in the future. In an arranged marriage, people meet through familiar people, and they are introduced according to common characteristics and needs. But in marriage with flirt, people try to get to know the other party themselves. Therefore, constraining beliefs about mate selection may be more dominant in people who want marriage with flirt in the future.

There was only one study in the literature on this subject, and its results did not agree with the results of this thesis except “Idealization” and “Opposites Complement” which had insignificant results (Tuzer, 2016: 40-41). According to the only one study’s results, there was a statistically significant difference between different methods of future marriage in terms of “Love is Enough” and “Ease of Effort”. However, this study also had family decision and another option as a method of marriage, so these may have influenced its results.

5.1.2. Findings on Comparison Analysis by Cut-off Score of DES

DES has a cut-off score which is 30, so participants were divided into two groups based on the cut-off score of DES which was changed into a categorical variable. Independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from mate selection attitudes differ significantly according to the cut-off score of DES.

Based on the results of the analysis, the scores of “Cohabitation”, “Opposites Complement” and ARMSS total differed significantly according to the cut-off score of DES. Participants who scored 30 and above got significantly higher “Cohabitation”, “Opposites Complement” and ARMSS total scores than those who scored less than 30. That is, participants who were more likely to have a dissociative disorder had these mate selection attitudes more. Therefore, this partially confirmed the hypothesis. There have been no previous studies in the literature examining dissociation and mate choice attitudes together. Dependency problems are common among people with dissociative disorder (Steele, van der Hart and Nijenhuis, 2001: 79). Therefore, it can be that people with attachment problems like this may have higher mate selection attitudes than other people because attachment styles predict mate selection criteria (Parsaei, Refahi and Zaker, 2014: 1080).

5.2. Findings on Correlation Analyses

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient for the variables which showed normal distribution and Spearman's Rank Correlation coefficient for physical and sexual abuse which did not show normal distribution were conducted to calculate the relationship between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes.

When the results were examined, there were statistically significant results in the relationship between childhood traumas and mate selection attitudes. "One and Only" was negatively correlated with CTQ-33 total, emotional neglect and overprotection-overcontrol. "Love is Enough" was negatively correlated to emotional neglect, and "Ease of Effort" was negatively correlated with physical neglect. However, "Cohabitation" was positively correlated to CTQ-33 total and emotional abuse. Besides these significant results, there was not a statistically significant correlation of "Compete Assurance", "Idealization", "Opposites Complement" and ARMSS total with any childhood traumas. There were few studies in the literature investigating the relationship between childhood traumas and mate selection attitudes. According to the results of these studies (Köylü, 2022: 50; Özınan, 2018: 43), there was a significant correlation between "Ease of Effort" and physical, emotional neglect; "Opposite Complements" and physical neglect; "Compete Assurance" and physical, emotional neglect, CTQ-33 total. However, these correlations were positive in one study and negative in another. Consequently, the results of this thesis were generally not consistent with the literature. Such different results in all studies may be because the correlations between childhood traumas and mate selection attitudes were very low even if they are significant. Moreover, there may be cultural differences because a study was conducted in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Furthermore, in another study, data were collected from only one university. These may indicate that the relationship between these variables should be studied in a more general population.

As the results of the analysis, in the relationship between mate selection attitudes and dissociative experiences, DES total was positively correlated with "Cohabitation" and ARMSS total. This is similar to the result of comparison analysis by cut-off score of

DES in this thesis. However, there have been no previous studies in the literature about the correlation between mate selection attitudes and dissociative experiences.

When the results were examined, there were statistically significant results in the positive relationship between early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes. There was a significantly positive relationship between unrelenting standards, other-directedness and 'Love is Enough'. "Compete Assurance" was positively correlated with all early maladaptive schemas except impaired autonomy. Furthermore, it was found that "Idealization" had a significantly positive relationship with only "Impaired Limits". "Ease of Effort" was positively correlated to "Impaired Autonomy", "Unrelenting Standards" and "Other-directedness". Whereas "Cohabitation" and ARMSS total were positively correlated with all early maladaptive schemas, there was not a statistically significant relationship between "One and Only", "Opposites Complement" and all early maladaptive schemas. There have been scarce studies in the literature examining the relationship between mate selection attitudes and early maladaptive schemas. According to the results of these studies, mate selection attitudes were significantly correlated with early maladaptive schemas (Saffari-zade and Bilondi, 2017: 103). For example, Kahvecioğlu (2014: 91) stated that the abandonment schema which is in the schema domain of impaired autonomy had a positive correlation with "Cohabitation" and "Ease of Effort".

Based on the results of the analysis, there were significantly positive correlations between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas. These results were consistent with literature. According to thirty-three studies in the literature review of Pilkington, Bishop and Younan (2020: 569), childhood neglect and abuse were positively correlated with early maladaptive schemas. Moreover, dissociative experiences mediated the relationship between childhood trauma and early maladaptive schemas, but it was also positively correlated to early maladaptive schemas (Sienski and Ziarko, 2022: 4) and childhood traumas (Classen, Koopman and Spiegel, 1993: 178; Gershuny and Thayer, 1999: 631).

5.3. Findings on Regression Analysis

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas together predict mate selection attitudes.

When the results were examined, other-directedness and impaired limits which are schema domains significantly predicted mate selection attitudes, and they explained 7% of the variance of mate selection attitudes. That is, as other-directedness and impaired limits increased, mate selection attitudes also increased. In the literature about early maladaptive schemas, it was seen that individuals select their mates according to their schemas (Silabkhorri and Kachooei, 2020: 45), and inappropriate mate selections perpetuate the maladaptive schemas (Young, Klosko and Weishaar, 2003: 46). According to the results of the limited number of studies in the literature, “Disconnection” was the most significant predictor of mate selection attitudes (Saffari-zade and Bilondi, 2017: 103). Another study stated that the abandonment schema significantly predicted mate selection attitudes (Kahvecioğlu, 2014: 91). The knowledge that early maladaptive schemas have a predictive value in mate selection is consistent with the literature.

There have been no previous studies in the literature about the prediction of dissociative experiences on mate selection attitudes. According to the literature on childhood trauma, childhood experiences (Gyuris, Járαι and Bereczkei, 2010: 1) and abuse (Roberts, Lyall and Weisskopf, 2017: 1998) have an impact on mate selection. Moreover, childhood traumas predicted the likelihood of selecting a mate who had any childhood traumas (Andersson, et al., 2021: 1) or similar childhood trauma (Redd, 2017: 110-111). Furthermore, childhood traumas predicted mate selection attitudes as statistically significant and negative (Köylü, 2022: 52). Therefore, the childhood trauma related result of the regression analysis was inconsistent with the literature.

5.4. Conclusion

In this study, the main aim of the study was to examine how much mate selection attitudes were predicted by childhood traumas, dissociative experiences and early maladaptive schemas. When the results were examined, it can be seen that they were modest but significant. Although the low variance rate undermines the persuasiveness, the prediction value of around 10% can be considered as significant in psychology studies. Moreover, it was also aimed to investigate the correlation between childhood traumas, dissociative experiences, early maladaptive schemas and mate selection attitudes. The results showed that there were statistically significant results in these correlations, but the correlation values were low. The correlation and prediction of

childhood traumas and early maladaptive schemas to mate selection attitudes have been studied very rare in the literature, while dissociative experiences' relationship and prediction with mate selection attitudes have never been studied. Therefore, these results are very substantial for the literature. Moreover, another aim of the study was to compare all variables according to gender and the presence or absence of a psychiatric diagnosis history. It was also aimed to compare only mate selection attitudes according to the presence of absence of a romantic relationship experience, the type of current relationship, whether or not marriage is considered in the future, the method of future marriage and the cut-off score of DES. Many significant results were found in the comparative analyses. Although most of the results were consistent with the literature, there were some inconsistent results. The reason for this inconsistency may be the different sample characteristics from other studies.

This study has some strengths. One of them is the use of CTQ-33 because it was a newly introduced scale to the literature. Therefore, the use of this scale in this study and so the results related to overprotection-overcontrol were very substantial for the literature. Furthermore, there has not been much cumulative information in the literature to compare results with it, since very scarce studies has been done on these variables together. Thus, this is an important contribution to the literature. In addition, psychologists should pay particular attention to the prediction of mate choice attitudes by some schema domains in this study for their future interventions because this is new and little studied information.

This study also has some limitations. The use of only single undergraduate students and a certain age group is a limitation of this study. Therefore, as a future study, the current study can be expanded with different age groups, different education levels and married people. In addition, culture may also affect the results for the variables in this study, but the cultures of the participants were not considered in this study. Thus, the study can be repeated in different cultures, or the results can be compared in terms of East-West culture in Turkey. Moreover, future studies can be done with only people with trauma or a diagnosis of dissociative disorder. Because such a distinction was not made in this study, the number of people with trauma or dissociative experiences may be low in such a population, and this may impact on the results. Furthermore, in comparison analyses, the number of participants in the groups was not the same. For example, in the comparison by the type of current relationship, the number of fiancee

participants was only four. Therefore, it should be taken into account that this number inequality between groups may have affected the results.

The sample did not show a normal distribution in physical and sexual abuse. Therefore, non-parametric tests were used, but they are less reliable than parametric tests, so this may have affected the results. When there are enough participants, the results can approach the normal distribution. Thus, future studies with more participants may contribute to the results. Another reason for not being normal distribution in this study may be that most participants responded to these variables with the lowest score. This may be the real results of the participants. However, since the study was conducted as online and trauma is a sensitive subject, the responses of the participants may have been affected by external factors or they may have had difficulty in sharing their childhood traumas. Therefore, their responses may have been affected by all of these.

REFERENCES

- Aktepe, E. (2009). Çocukluk çağı cinsel istismarı. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, 1: 95-119.
- Aksu, M. H., et al. (2022). Yeni tip koronavirüs salgınının psikiyatrik hastalarda yaşam kalitesi ve intihar düşüncelerine etkisi. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 33(3) :149-157. <https://doi.org/10.5080/u26525>
- Álvarez, M. J., et al. (2011). Prevalence and clinical impact of childhood trauma in patients with severe mental disorders. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 199(3) :156-161. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31820c751c>
- Amador, J., et al. (2005). Sex and generational differences in desired characteristics in mate selection. *Psychological Reports*, 96(1) : 19–25.
- American Psychiatric Association (1968). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed., rev.). Washington, DC: Author.
- (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (Fifth Edition) (DSM V). Washington, DC.
- American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *APA dictionary of psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/mate-selection>
- Andersson, S. O., et al. (2021). Adverse childhood experiences are associated with choice of partner, both partners' relationship and psychosocial health as reported one year after birth of a common child. A cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*, 16(1) :1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244696>
- Aral, G. (2001). Çocuk hakları çerçevesinde çocuk ihmal ve istismarı. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*:1-25.
- Arkes, J. (2019). *Research analysis: A practical introduction*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Aust, S., et al. (2013). The role of early emotional neglect in alexithymia. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 5(3): 225-232.

- Aydın, G. S. (2016). *The effectiveness of a cognitive behavioral group program on constraining beliefs about mate selection and romantic beliefs of graduate students* (PhD dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Aydın, G. S., & Demir, A. (2017). Lisansüstü öğrencilerinin eş seçimini etkileyen ve sınırlandıran görüş ve inançları. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 18(2) :627–652.
- Bacanlı, H. (2001). Eş seçimi tercihleri. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(15) : 7-16.
- (2018). *Eğitim psikolojisi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Bahar, G., Savaş H. A., & Bahar A. (2009). Çocuk istismarı ve ihmali: Bir gözden geçirme. *Fırat Sağlık Hizmetleri Dergisi*, 4(12) :51-65.
- Ballı, Ö. (2010). *Çukurova Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi'ne başvuran çocuk istismarı ve ihmali olgularının değerlendirilmesi* (Yayınlanmamış uzmanlık tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi, Adana.
- Baydemir, C., et al. (2014). The effect of childhood trauma life on self-esteem in school of health students in a province of Western Turkey. *Life Science Journal*, 11(11) :749-757.
- Bernstein, D. P., et al. (1994). Initial reliability and validity of a new retrospective measure of child abuse and neglect. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 151(8) : 1132–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.151.8.1132>
- Bernstein, E. M., & Putnam, F. W. (1986). Development, reliability, and validity of a dissociation scale. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 174: 727-735.
- Beyazova, U., & Şahin, F. (2006). Çocuk istismarı ve ihmali terimleri. *Logos Tıp Yayıncılığı*: 1-20.
- Blossfeld, H. P. (2009). Educational assortative marriage in comparative perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35: 513–530.
- Botwin, M. D., Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 65(1) : 107-136.
- Bozgeyikli, H., & Toprak, E. (2013). Üniversiteli gençlerin eş seçim kriterlerinin sıralama yargılarıyla ölçeklenmesi. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1) : 68-87.
- Brackett, K. P. (2016). Mate selection. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Family Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119085621.wbef314>
- Braun, B. G. (1988). The BASK model of dissociation. *Dissociation*, 1(1) : 4-23.

- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(1) : 1-49.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(3) : 559-570.
- Buunk, B. P., et al. (2002). Age and gender differences in mate selection criteria for various involvement levels. *Personal Relationships*, 9(3) : 271-278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00018>
- Carlson, E. B., & Putnam, F. W. (1993). An update on the dissociative experiences scale. *Dissociation*, 6(1) : 16-27.
- Carnoy, M., et al. (2013). *University Expansion in a Changing Global Economy: Triumph of the BRICs?*. Stanford: California.
- Chaloupková, J. K., Topinková, R., & Šetinová, M. (2021). Partner selection across the life-course: Age variation in partner preferences in the Czech Republic. *Sociological Research Online*, 26(4):889–907. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1360780421992378>
- Classen, C., Koopman, C., & Spiegel, D. (1993). Trauma and dissociation. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 57(2), 178-194.
- Cobb, N. P., Larson, J. H., & Watson, W. L. (2003). Development of the attitudes about romance and mate selection scale. *Family Relations*, 52: 222-231.
- Çakır, İ. (2021). *Davranışsal inhibisyon ve davranışsal aktivasyon sistemleri ile çocukluk çağı travmalarının kişilik bozukluklarındaki yordayıcı etkilerinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Çelik, A. R. (2018). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçim tutumlarında toplumsal cinsiyet roller algısı ve değer yönelimlerinin etkileri* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Çocuk Haklarına Dair Sözleşme (1995, 27 Ocak). Resmi Gazete (Sayı: 22184). <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/22184.pdf>
- Daldaban, E. (2021). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin romantizm ve eş seçimi tutumları ile aile iklimi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Demirkapı, E. Ş. (2013). *Çocukluk çağı travmalarının duygu düzenleme ve kimlik gelişimine etkisi ve bunların psikopatolojiler ile ilişkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Aydın.

- Derin, G., & Öztürk, E. (2018). Dissosiyatif bozukluklar ve sınırda (borderline) kişilik bozukluğunda ruhsal travma. *Bartın Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(3), 29-41.
- Dumitrescu, D., & Rusu, A. S. (2012). Relationship between early maladaptive schemas, couple satisfaction and individual mate value: An evolutionary psychological approach. *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 12(1) : 63-76.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54(6) : 408-423.
- Efe, E. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçme eğilimleri* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Egeland, B. (2009). Taking stock: Childhood emotional maltreatment and developmental psychopathology. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33(1) : 22-26
- Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (1991). Gender and age stereotypes of emotionality. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5) : 532-541.
- Feingold, A. (1992). Gender differences in mate selection preferences: A test of the parental investment model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1) : 125-139.
- Fink, L. A., et al. (1995). Initial reliability and validity of the childhood trauma interview: A new multidimensional measure of childhood interpersonal trauma. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152: 1329-1335.
- Foote, B., et al. (2006). Prevalence of dissociative disorders in psychiatric outpatients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163: 623-629.
- Furnham, A. (2009). Sex differences in mate selection preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(4) : 262–267.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. (14th Press). New York: Routledge.
- Gershuny, B. S., & Thayer, J. F. (1999). Relations among psychological trauma, dissociative phenomena, and trauma-related distress: A review and integration. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19(5) : 631-657.
- Gilbert, R., et al. (2009). Burden and consequences of child maltreatment in high-income countries. *The Lancet*, 373(9657), 68–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(08\)61706-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(08)61706-7)
- Gil-Burmann, C., Pelaez, F., & Sanchez, S. (2002). Mate choice differences according to sex and age. *Human Nature*, 13(4): 493–508.

- Goff, B. S. N., et al. (2007). The impact of individual trauma symptoms of deployed soldiers on relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(3) :344-353.
- Günayer Şenel, H. (2014). *Eş seçimi kararı*. Haluk Yavuzer (Ed.), Evlilik okulu. (10.Baskı). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Güner, Ş. İ., Güner, S., & Şahan, M. H. (2010). Çocuklarda sosyal ve medical bir problem; istismar. *Van Tıp Dergisi*, 17(3) :108-113.
- Güngör, H. C., Yılmaz, M. & Çelik, S. B. (2011). Romantizm ve eş seçimi tutum ölçeğinin uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(36) : 180-190.
- Gyuris, P., Járαι, R., & Bereczkei, T. (2010). The effect of childhood experiences on mate choice in personality traits: Homogamy and sexual imprinting. *Personality and Individual Differences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.04.021>
- Hedin, L. W. (2000). Physical and sexual abuse against women and children. *Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 12: 349-355.
- Helvacı Çelik, F. G., & Hocaoglu, Ç. (2018). Çocukluk çağı travmaları: Bir gözden geçirme. *Sakarya Tıp Dergisi*, 8(4) : 695-711.
- Herman, J. L. (2015). *Trauma and recovery* (2015 edition). New York, BasicBooks.
- Hildyard, K. L., & Wolfe, D. A. (2002). Child neglect: Developmental issues and outcomes. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26 :679- 695.
- Hou, J., Shu, T., & Fang, X. (2022). The influence of time resources on mate selection: The moderating role of mating strategies and gender. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 186, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111388>
- Hu, A., & Qian, Z. (2016). Does higher education expansion promote educational homogamy? Evidence from married couples of the post-80s generation in Shanghai, China. *Social Science Research*, 60:148–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.05.001>
- Irkörücü, A. (2016). Gender difference in early maladaptive schemas. *Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(9) : 103-119.
- Islam, M. N. (2021). Gender differences in mate selection criteria among university students in Bangladesh: A study from the social homogamy perspective. *Heliyon*, 7, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07378>
- Jedlicka, D. (1975). Sequential analysis of perceived commitment to partners in premarital coitus. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37(2) :385-390.

- Johnson, C. F. (2000). Abuse and neglect of children. In R. E. Behrman, R. M. Kleigman, & A. M. Arvin (eds), *Nelson Textbook of Pediatrics*. Philadelphia: WB Saunders: 110-114.
- Kahveciođlu, C. (2014). *Eş seçiminin, terk edilme şeması, baskın nöral sistemler, evlilik mitleri ve bağlanma stilleri açısından incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Kalkan, M. (2015). *Evlilik öncesi psikolojik danışma*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Kalkan, M., & Kaya, Ö. (2007). Evlilik Öncesi İlişkileri Deęerlendirme Ölçeğinin (EÖİDÖ) geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. [The development of premarital relationship assesment scale: Validity and realiability study]. *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 3(11) :35-40.
- Kaplan, S. J., Pelcovitz, D., & Labruna, V. (1999). Child and adolescent abuse and neglect research: A review of the past 10 years. Part I: Physical and emotional abuse and neglect. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38(10) :1214-1222.
- Kara, B., Biçer, Ü., & Gökalp, A. S. (2004). Çocuk istismarı. *Çocuk Sağlığı ve Hastalıkları Dergisi*, 47:140-151.
- Kasapkara, A., & Kasapkara, B. (2013). 20-30 yaş grubu bekar erkeklerin eş seçimine yönelik tutumları ve eşten beklentilerinin bazı demografik deęişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(34) :792-800.
- Kelley, H. H., et al. (1978). Sex differences in comments made during conflict within close heterosexual pairs. *Sex Roles*, 4(4) :473-492.
- Koca, N. (2021). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde dini tutum, romantizm ve eş seçim tercihleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi (Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi örneęi)* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.
- Kocaer, Ü. (2006). *Hekim ve hemşirelerin çocuk istismarı ve ihmaline yönelik farkındalık düzeyleri* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Kong, S., & Bernstein, K. (2009). Childhood trauma as a predictor of eating psychopathology and its mediating variables in patients with eating disorders. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 18(13) : 1897-1907.
- Korkulu, A. (2019). *Anne baba tutumunun eş seçiminde sınırlandırıcı inançlar ile ilişkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Köylü, B. (2022). *Yetişkinlerde medeni durum açısından çocukluk çaęı travması, eş seçimi ve bağlanma stillerinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Yakın Doęu Üniversitesi, Lefkoşa.

- Krug, E. G., et al. (2002). *World Report on violence and health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1993). Predicting marital dissolution: A 5-year prospective longitudinal study of newlywed couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(2), 221-242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.221>
- Larson, J. H. (1992). “You’re my one and only”: Premarital counseling for unrealistic beliefs about mate selection. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 20(3) : 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926189208250893>
- (2001) The verdict on cohabitation vs. marriage. *Marriage and Families*:7–12.
- Larson, J. H., & Holman, T. B. (1994). Premarital predictors of marital quality and stability. *Family Relations*, 43(2) : 228–237. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585327>
- Maliki, A. E. (2009). Determinants of mate selection choice among university students in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, 2(2) : 165-174.
- McLeod, S. A. (2018, June 06). *Jean piaget's theory of cognitive development*. Simply Psychology. www.simplypsychology.org/piaget.html
- Miller, G. (2000) *The mating mind: How sexual choice shaped the evolution of the human nature*. London: Doubleday.
- Morrison, J. (2014). *DSM-5 made easy the clinician’s guide to diagnosis*. The Guilford Press, The United States of America.
- Murstein, B. I. (1970). Stimulus-Value-Role: A theory of marital choice. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 32(3) :465-481. <https://doi.org/10.2307/350113>
- National Alliance on Mental Illness (n.d.). *Dissociative disorders*. <https://www.nami.org/About-Mental-Illness/Mental-Health-Conditions/Dissociative-Disorders>
- National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (n.d.). *Sexual abuse*. <https://www.nspcc.org.uk/what-is-child-abuse/types-of-abuse/child-sexual-abuse/>
- Odabaşı, Ö. (2021). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçim tutumları ile kendilik algısı ve mükemmelliyetçilik ilişkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Haliç Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Oral, R., et al. (2001). Child abuse in Turkey: An experience in overcoming denial and a description of 50 cases. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 25:279-290.
- Orlowski, D. D. (2021). *Müzik terapinin demans tanılı geriatric psikiyatri hastalarında duygudurumu, bilişsel ve sosyal davranışları üzerindeki etkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli.

- Özinan, Ö. (2018). *Kişilik tiyolojileri ve çocukluk çağı travmasının bireylerin romantik ilişkileri (aşk) ile olan ilişkisi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Öztürk, E., & Şar, V. (2016). Formation and functions of alter personalities in dissociative identity disorder: A theoretical and clinical elaboration. *Journal of Psychology and Clinical Psychiatry*, 6(6) : 1-6.
- Padesky, C. A. (1994). Schema change processes in cognitive therapy. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 1(5) :267-278.
- Pallant, J. (2017). *SPSS kullanma kılavuzu: SPSS ile adım adım veri analizi*. (Çev. S. Balcı, B. Ahi). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Parsaei, M. K., Refahi, Z., & Zaker, B. S. (2014). Predicted mate selection on the basis of personality characteristic and attachment styles. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 3(9) :1077-1081.
- Parsons, T. T. (1997). *Sources and stages of mate selection, relationship development and marriage* (Doctoral dissertation). United States.
- Pelendecioğlu, B., & Bulut, S. (2009). Çocuğa yönelik aile içi fiziksel istismar. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(1) : 49-62.
- Pilkington, P. D., Bishop, A., & Younan, R. (2020). Adverse childhood experiences and early maladaptive schemas in adulthood: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 28(3): 569-584. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2533>
- Polat, O. (2007). *Tüm boyutlarıyla çocuk istismarı*. 1. Seçkin Yayınevi, Ankara: 77-83.
- Priest, J., et al. (2009). Relationship dissolution and romance and mate selection myths. *Family Science Review*, 14, 48-57.
- Qian, Y., & Qian, Z. (2014) The gender divide in urban China: Singlehood and assortative mating by age and education. *Demographic Research*, 31(45) :1337–1364.
- Redd, M. (2017). *Adverse childhood experiences and couple relationships: Impacts on relationship quality and partner selection* (Graduate thesis). University of Akron, USA.
- Roberts, A. L., Lyall, K., & Weisskopf, M. G. (2017). Maternal exposure to childhood abuse is associated with mate selection: Implications for autism in offspring. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 47(7) :1998-2009.

- Saffari-zade, F., & Bilondi, H. R. (2017). Attitudes related to mate selection: The roles of perfectionism and early maladaptive schemas. *Islam & Psychological Research*, 3(7) :103-118.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29(6) : 552-557.
- Schellenberg, J. A., & Bee, L. S. (1960). A re-examination of the theory of complementary needs in mate selection. *Marriage and Family Living*, 22(3), 227-232.
- Schwarz, S., & Hassebrauck, M. (2012). Sex and age differences in mate-selection preferences. *Human Nature*, 23(4), 447–466. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-012-9152-x>
- Seltzer, J. A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4):1247–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01247.x>
- Shorey, R. C., Anderson, S. E., & Stuart, G. L. (2012). Gender differences in early maladaptive schemas in a treatment-seeking sample of alcohol-dependent adults. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 47:108–116.
- Sienski, M. M., & Ziarko, M. (2022). Psychological consequences of experiencing violence in childhood—The role of dissociation in the formation of early maladaptive schemas. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 11(17) :1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11174996>
- Silabkhorı, Z., & Kachooei, M. (2020). The effectiveness of schema therapy on dysfunctional attitudes toward mate selection and emotional adjustment in female students. *Advances in Nursing and Midwifery*, 29(1) : 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.29252/anm.29804>
- Sofuođlu, Z., et al. (2014). Trkiye'nin  ilinde olumsuz ocukluk ađı deneyimleri epidemiyolojik alıřması. *Trk Pediatri Arřivi*, 49(1) :47-56.
- Soner, S., & Aykut, S. (2017). Dissosiyatif kimlik bozukluđu temelinde sosyal bir sorun: Ensest ve sosyal hizmet. *Trkiye Sosyal Hizmet Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2) :129–141.
- Soygt, G., Karaosmanođlu A., & akır, Z. (2009). Erken dnem uyumsuz řemaların deđerlendirilmesi: Young řema leđi kısa form-3'n psikometrik zelliklerine iliřkin bir inceleme. *Trk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 20(1) :75–84.
- Steele, K., van der Hart, O, & Nijenhuis, E. R. S. (2001). Dependency in the treatment of complex posttraumatic stress disorder and dissociative disorders. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 2(4) :79-116.

- Sullivan, B. F. & Schwebel, A. I. (1995). Relationship belief and expectations of satisfaction in marital relationships: Implications for family practitioners. *The Family Journal*, 3(4) : 298-305.
- Szajnberg, N., et al. (1993). Psychopathology and relationship measures in children with inflammatory bowel disease and their parents. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 23(3) : 215-232.
- Şar, V. (2000). Çoğul kişilik kavramı ve dissosiyatif bozukluklar. *Psikiyatri Dünyası*, 4 : 7-11.
- (2010). Dissosiyatif kimlik bozukluğu: Ruhsal travma kökenli bir psikopatoloji. *Klinik Gelişim*, 22(4) : 26-33.
- Şar, V., et al. (2021). A revised and expanded version of the Turkish Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-33): Overprotection-overcontrol as additional factor. *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation*, 22(1) :35-51.
- Şar, V., Öztürk, E. & İkkardeş, E. (2012). Validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ). *Türkiye Klinikleri Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi (Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences)*, 32(4) :1054-1063.
- Şarlak, D., & Öztürk, E. (2018). Dissosiyatif bozuklukların epidemiyolojisi. *Ruhsal Travma ve Dissosiyasyon. Ankara: Türkiye Klinikleri* : 14-19.
- Şimşek, M. Z. (2018). *Romantizm ve eş seçimi tutumunun romantik ilişki yaşantıları ve romantik ilişkilerdeki inançlar açısından incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Burdur.
- T.C. Başbakanlık Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu. (2010). *Türkiye’de çocuk istismarı ve aile içi şiddet araştırması*: 1-40.
- Thomasgard, M., et al. (1995). Parent– child relationship disorders. Part I: Parental overprotection and the development of the Parent Protection Scale. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 16(4) : 244–250
- Topbaş, M. (2004). İnsanlığın büyük bir ayıbı: Çocuk istismarı. *TSK Koruyucu Hekimlik Bülteni*, 3(4) :76-80.
- Toro-Morn, M., & Sprecher, S. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of mate preferences among university students: The United States vs. the People’s Republic of China (PRC). *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 34(2), 151-170. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.34.2.151>
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 48-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00048.x>

Tuzer, D. (2016). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçimi tutumlarının bireysel özellikleri açısından incelenmesi*. Çağ Üniversitesi, Mersin.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (1995). *Child Maltreatment 1993: Reports from the States to the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Uzun, B. (2018). *Çocuk ihmal ve istismarı*. Retrieved from https://content.bau.edu.tr/editor/5aab7f4b4141f_bau-cocuk-ihmal-ve-istismari-kitapci.pdf

Üredi, L. (2017). Investigating the relationship between job satisfaction levels of the teachers in educational institutions and their attitudes towards teaching profession. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(12), 175-182.

van der Kolk, B. A., & van der Hart, O. (1989). Pierre Janet and the breakdown of adaptation in psychological trauma. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 146(12), 1530–1540. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.146.12.1530>.

Velibaşoğlu, B. (2021). *Erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar ve Young Pozitif Şema Ölçeği ile değerlendirilen erken dönem uyumlu şemalar üzerinden obsesif kompulsif bozukluk belirtileri ve müdahale* (Doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Whisman, M. A. (2006). Childhood trauma and marital outcomes in adulthood. *Personal Relationships*, 13(4) : 375-386.

Wood, J. J., et al. (2003). Parenting and childhood anxiety: Theory, empirical findings, and future directions. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 44(1) : 134–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00106>

Wood, W. & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(5), 699-727. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699>

World Health Organization (n.d.). *Child maltreatment*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/child-maltreatment>

----- (1999). *Report of the consultation on child abuse prevention* : 1-54.

----- (2002). *World report on violence and health* : 1-346.

----- (2006). *Preventing child maltreatment: A guide to taking action and generating evidence*. 1-90.

Yanık, M. (2017). Dissosiyatif kimlik bozukluğu'nun tedavisi. *Türkiye Klinikleri J Psychiatry- Special Topics*, 10(3) : 185-193.

- Yargıç, L. I., Tutkun, H., & Şar, V. (1995). Reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the Dissociative Experiences Scale. *Dissociation*, 8(1) : 10–13.
- Yıldırım, İ. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin eş seçme kriterleri. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(27) : 15-28.
- Yılmaz, A. (2020). *Son ergenlik döneminde dissosiyatif bulgular ile ruminasyon arasındaki ilişkide duyguları ifade etmenin rolü* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Işık Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Yılmaz, M., Güngör, H. C., & Çelik, S. B. (2013). Investigation romance and mate selection myths of university students. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(2) : 416-427.
- Young, J. (1990) *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach*. Sarasota, FL. Professional Resource Pres.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner guide*. Guildford Publications: New York.
- Yüksel, Ş., & Saner, S. (n.d.). Çocuk cinsel istismarı ve zor açığa çıkması bilgilendirme dosyası.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ GÖNÜLLÜ OLUR FORMU

Sizi Zeynep Karakuş tarafından yürütülen “Bekar Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları, Çözülmeli Yaşantıları, Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemaları ile Eş Seçimi Tutumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi” başlıklı araştırmaya davet ediyoruz. Bu araştırmanın amacı bekar üniversite öğrencilerinin çocukluk çağı travmaları, çözülmeli yaşantıları, erken dönem uyumsuz şemaları ile eş seçimi tutumu arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Araştırmada sizden tahminen 40 dakika ayırmanız istenmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen **gönüllülük** esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı veya telkini altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir. Ancak, çalışmaya katılmama veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir anda çalışmayı bırakma hakkına da sahiptir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup kişisel bilgileriniz **gizli tutulacaktır**. Araştırmada Kişisel veri toplanacağından **6698 sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu** ve ilgili mevzuat uyarınca kişisel verileri korumak amacıyla gerekli tüm tedbirler alınacaktır. Eğer araştırmanın amacı ile ilgili verilen bu bilgiler dışında şimdi veya sonra daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyaç duyarsanız araştırmacıya şimdi sorabilir veya [REDACTED] e-posta adresi ve [REDACTED] numaralı telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.

Yukarıda yer alan ve araştırmadan önce katılımcıya verilmesi gereken bilgileri okudum ve katılmam istenen çalışmanın kapsamını ve amacını, gönüllü olarak üzerime düşen sorumlulukları anladım. Çalışma hakkında yazılı ve sözlü açıklama aşağıda adı belirtilen araştırmacı/araştırmacılar tarafından yapıldı. Bana, çalışmanın muhtemel riskleri ve faydaları sözlü olarak da anlatıldı. Kişisel bilgilerimin özenle korunacağı konusunda yeterli güvence verildi.

Bu koşullarda söz konusu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve telkin olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının İmzası:

Appendix B: Demographical Information Form

Demografik Bilgi Formu

1) Kaç yaşındasınız? (Rakamla belirtiniz):

2) Cinsiyetiniz nedir?:

Kadın

Erkek

3) Yaşamınızın çoğunu nerede geçirdiniz?:

Köy

Kasaba

Şehir

Büyükşehir

Yurtdışı

Diğer

4) Ücretli bir işte çalışıyor musunuz?:

Evet

Hayır

5) Ailenizin gelir durumu?

Çok düşük

Düşük

Orta

Yüksek

Çok yüksek

6) Şimdiye kadar hiçbir psikiyatrik tanı aldınız mı?

Evet

Hayır

7) Karşı cinsle romantik bir ilişki deneyiminiz oldu mu?

Evet

Hayır

8) Şu an bir ilişkiniz varsa ilişkinizin türü nedir?:

Flört

Sevgili

Sözlü/ Nişanlı

Diğer

9) Gelecekte evlilik düşünüyor musunuz? (Şu anki ilişkinizden bağımsız olarak):

Evet

Hayır

10) Bir gün evlenecek olsanız hangi yöntemle gerçekleşmesini istersiniz?:

Flört yolu ile

Görücü usulü ile

Diğer

Appendix C: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University Ethical Committee Approval

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 12.11.2021-E.17001



T.C.
İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
ETİK KURULU BAŞKANLIĞI

Sayı : E-20292139-050.01.04-17001
Konu : Etik Kurul Kararları

Sayın Zeynep KARAKUŞ
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Klinik Psikoloji Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

"Bekar Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları, Dissosiyatif Yaşantıları, Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemaları ile Eş Seçimi Tutumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi" başlıklı araştırmanız kurulumuzun 28.10.2021 tarihli ve 2021/10 sayılı toplantısında değerlendirilerek etik açıdan uygun bulunduğu katılanların oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU
Kurul Başkanı

Ek:1-Zeynep KARAKUŞ Etik Onay Belgesi (1 sayfa)

Mevcut Elektronik İmzalar

NASUH USLU (Etik Kurulu Başkanlığı - Kurul Başkanı) 12.11.2021 12:35

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : *BS5MN0D47* Pin Kodu : 07381
Adres: Halkalı Caddesi No: 281 Küçükçekmece/İstanbul
Telefon: 444 97 98 Faks: +90 (212) 693 82 29
e-Posta: bilgi@izu.edu.tr Web: www.izu.edu.tr
Kep Adresi: izu@hs01.kep.tr

Belge Takip Adresi : <https://ebys.izu.edu.tr/enVision/Dogrula/0N3>

Bilgi için: Zeynep Funda TEZ
Unvanı: Yeminli Katip
Tel No: +902126929606





T.C.
İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
ETİK KURULU

ETİK ONAY BELGESİ

| | |
|--|---|
| Tarih | 28.10.2021 |
| Sayı | 2021/10 |
| Araştırmanın Niteliği | Yüksek Lisans Tezi |
| Araştırmanın Adı | <i>Bekar Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları, Dissosiyatif Yaşantıları, Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemaları ile Eş Seçimi Tutumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi</i> |
| Sorumlu Araştırmacının Adı Soyadı | Zeynep KARAKUŞ |
| Diğer Araştırmacılar/Danışman Adı Soyadı | Doç. Dr. Ahmet ÖZTÜRK |
| Karar | UYGUNDUR |

(İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu'nun kararı tavsiye niteliğinde olup, Üniversitemizle ilgili etik ilkelerinin belirlenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi amacını taşımaktadır.)

Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU
Başkan

(İzinli)
Prof. Dr. Metin TOPRAK
Üye

Prof. Dr. Mustafa ATEŞ
Üye

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Emin KÖKTAŞ
Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Nefise BAHÇECİK
Üye

Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal YOĞURTÇU
Üye

Av. Bilal ŞAMAT
Üye

Kurul Yeminli Kâtibi

Zeyneb Funda TEZ

Appendix D: The Utilization Permit of the Scales

Romantizm ve Eş Seçimi Tutum Ölçeği Hakkında

3 ileti

10 Eylül 2021 10:48

Merhabalar,

Ben Zeynep Karakuş. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi'nde klinik psikoloji yüksek lisansı yapıyorum. Tezimde bağımlı değişken olarak eş seçimi tutumu kavramını kullanmak istiyorum. Sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın Romantizm ve Eş Seçimi Tutum Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanmasını yaptığınızı gördüm. Eğer izniniz olursa tezimde veri toplamak için sizin Türkçe uyarlamanızı kullanmak istiyorum.

Saygılarımla,
Zeynep Karakuş

10 Eylül 2021 11:19

Merhaba
İstemiş olduğunuz ölçeği ekte gönderiyorum. Çalışmanızın sonuçlarını paylaşabilirseniz sevinirim.
iyi çalışmalar

Çocukluk Çağı Ruhsal Travma Ölçeği ve Dissosiyatif Yaşantılar Ölçeği Hakkında

3 ileti

10 Eylül 2021 11:01

Merhabalar,

Ben Zeynep Karakuş. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi'nde klinik psikoloji yüksek lisansı yapıyorum. Tezimde iki bağımsız değişken olarak çocukluk çağı travmaları ve dissosiyatif yaşantılar kavramlarını kullanmak istiyorum. Sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın Çocukluk Çağı Ruhsal Travma Ölçeği'nin ve Dissosiyatif Yaşantılar Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanmasını yaptığınızı gördüm. Eğer izniniz olursa tezimde veri toplamak için sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın Türkçe uyarlamasını yaptığınızı bu iki ölçeği kullanmak istiyorum.

Saygılarımla,
Zeynep Karakuş

11 Eylül 2021 14:25

Kullanabilirsiniz. Ekteki yeni versiyonu tercih edebilirsiniz.

Young Şema Ölçeđi Kısa Form 3 Hakkında

3 ileti

13 Eylül 2021 11:56

Merhabalar,

Ben Zeynep Karakuş. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi'nde klinik psikoloji yüksek lisansı yapıyorum. Tezimin bağımsız deđişkenlerinden biri olarak erken dönem uyumsuz şemalar kavramını kullanmak istiyorum. Sizin ve arkadaşlarınızın Young Şema Ölçeđi Kısa Form 3'ün Türkçe'ye uyarlanmasını yaptığınızı gördüm. Eđer izniniz olursa tezimde veri toplamak için sizin Türkçe uyarlamasını kullanmak istiyorum.

Saygılarımla,
Zeynep Karakuş

17 Eylül 2021 08:00

Tabii kullanabilirsiniz, iyi çalışmalar dilerim,

Prof. Dr. Gonca Soygüt, PhD

CURRICULUM VITAE

Zeynep KARAKUŞ

EDUCATION

MA: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Clinical Psychology (2020-2023)

Undergraduate: Middle East Technical University, Psychology Department
(2014-2020)

Erasmus: Kazimierz Wielki University, Poland (September 2019 – February 2020)

High School: Özel Çağrı Anadolu Lisesi (2010-2014)

INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE

October 2021- February 2022 Intern Psychologist, Bakırköy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman
Mental Health and Neurological Diseases Education and Research Hospital

June – July 2019 Intern Psychologist, Dışkapı Yıldırım Beyazıt Training and Research
Hospital

RESEARCH AND WORK EXPERIENCE

2022-... ZSU GMBH, Online psychological counselling and guidance for Funeral
Workers of Turkish-Islamic Union of Religious Affairs in German

January-April 2022 Research Assistant, University College London, United Kingdom,
Erasmus Traineeship

February – May 2019 Research Assistant, METU, Beck Depression Inventory-2
Reliability and Validity Research under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Deniz Canel
Çınarbaş

SKILLS

Foreign Language Skills:

- English (Advanced writing, reading, listening and speaking)

Computer Skills: Microsoft Office Programs, SPSS