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Abstract

The relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and intimate partner acceptance-rejection among married individuals: mediating role of early maladaptive schemas

Babaşçu, Begüm
M.S., Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hürol Fişiloğlu
September 2014, 93 pages

Present study aimed to investigate the relationship among parental acceptance-rejection, intimate partner acceptance-rejection, and early maladaptive schemas in married individuals. In addition, the mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in the relationship between remembered parental acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner acceptance rejection was another purpose of the study to examine. In order to meet these aims, 228 married individuals between the ages of 23-75 participated in the study, and answered adult version of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, and Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form 3. Relationships among the study variables were examined by using Pearson Correlation analyses. According to the results, remembered childhood rejection from mothers or fathers was related to higher perceived rejection from spouses. Moreover, remembered parental (both maternal and paternal) rejection was also found to be significantly correlated to all schema domains namely disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, impaired limits, other directedness, and unrelenting standards. On the other hand, perceived rejection from intimate partner was found to be related with disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, and unrelenting standards schema domains. After correlation analyses, mediation analyses through Bootstrapping method were conducted. Results
of the mediation analyses reveled that disconnection/rejection schema domain significantly mediated the relationship between remembered parental (both maternal and paternal) acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection. In the light of earlier studies and theoretical backgrounds, findings of current study were evaluated and discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, firstly the background of the study was presented. Secondly, the purpose of the study, and hypotheses with following research questions were mentioned. Thirdly, significance and implications of the present study were presented.

1.1. Background of the Study

Many theoretical views (e.g. Freud, 1910; Bowlby, 1973; Rohner, 1986; Young, 1999), despite of their different explanations, agree on the idea that childhood experiences have various impacts on one’s adult life. Especially, with the development of psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1910), the role of parent-child relationship on one’s psychological and social adjustment gained interest of both researchers and clinicians. It has been stated that the child’s feelings of being loved and accepted by his/her parents has a strong influence on psychological development. Besides psychological adjustment, the parent-child relationship also creates a role model for the child’s interpersonal relationships (Freud & Burlingham, 1944). Object Relations Theory (Klein, 1984) also mentions that the child internalizes the experiences with his/her parents; consequently, this parent-child relationship creates mental representations about interpersonal relationships, influencing adulthood social interactions. These cognitive images of their mothers and fathers influence intimate partner preferences and romantic relationships of the individuals (Hendrix, 1990). Similarly, attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973) proposed that the attachment style formed in childhood extends into adulthood and re-appears in adulthood intimate relationships. According to this theory, adult romantic love is also an attachment process, in which an emotional bond between adults is formed,
just like the bond between parent and child during childhood. Therefore, the way the child attached to his/her parents shows itself in intimate relationships and affects one’s emotions, expectations, and satisfaction accordingly (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

One of the theories studying parent-child relationship and its correlates in adulthood is Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) developed by Rohner (1975, 1986). PARTheory is an evidence-based theory of life span development and socialization, which aims to investigate the parental acceptance-rejection’s role on individuals’ emotional, behavioral and social-cognitive development, and psychological adjustment all around the world (Rohner, 1986). Rohner (1986) defined parental acceptance-rejection as a dimension referring to the quality of the affectional bond between the child and the parent. At the “acceptance” end, the child gets love, warmth, affection, and care from the parents while at the “rejection” end, there is lack of warmth, indifference, neglect, and aggression towards the child. An important note is that the child’s subjective perceptions and feelings of whether he/she was accepted or rejected by his/her parents are given much more importance than objective behaviors of the parents when evaluating the emotional bond in the parent-child relationship. Feeling accepted or rejected in childhood, according to PARTheory, influences one’s personality dispositions, psychological adjustment, and behavioral functioning not only in childhood but also in adulthood persistently (Rohner, 1975). PARTheory proposes that the child develops mental representations about the parent-child relationships, and these representations extend into adulthood, shaping one’s emotional and socio-cultural development and psychological adjustment (Rohner, 2004). Therefore, one of the purposes of PARTheory is to examine childhood parental acceptance-rejection’s correlates in adulthood (Rohner, 1986).

It is possible to mention some individual correlates of parental acceptance-rejection according to literature. Besides links with demographic variables of gender (e.g. Chyung & Lee, 2008; Kazarian, Moghnie, & Martin, 2010; Yakin, 2011) and age (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012), parental acceptance-rejection’s connection with psychological adjustment, and maladaptive personality constructs were investigated. Meta-analyses (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Rohner &
Khaleque, 2010; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012) including the studies investigating this topic revealed that adults’ remembrances of parental acceptance-rejection in their childhood is associated with their psychological adjustment in adulthood cross-culturally. In addition, parental rejection was also found to be related to several specific mental health issues such as depression (Heller, 1996; Yakın, 2011; Sarıtaş-Atalar & Gençöz, in press), anxiety (Yakın, 2011; Sarıtaş-Atalar & Gençöz, in press) substance abuse (Gray, 1997), and eating disorders (Dominy, 1997; Hoppe-Rooney, 2004). Furthermore, studies examining parental acceptance-rejection’s relationship with some maladaptive personality constructs in the literature concluded that perceived rejection from parents is correlated with pessimistic attribution to life (Heller, 1996), lower self esteem (Arenson-Kemp, 1995), higher neuroticism, perfectionism, and more external locus of control (Yakın, 2011).

Besides individual correlates, PARTheory postulates that the quality of the bond between the child and his/her parents influences his/her interpersonal relationships as well, especially intimate relationships in adulthood (Rohner, 1986; Rohner, 2004). Therefore, the link between parental acceptance-rejection and relationship satisfaction was also a focused topic. Results revealed that remembered rejection from parents is connected to lower intimate relationship satisfaction in adulthood (Yalçınkaya, 1997; Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006).

Later on in PARTheory, in 1999, Rohner stated that not only rejection from parents but also rejection from any attachment figure, especially intimate partner, in any time of life has detrimental effects on one’s psychological and social adjustment (as cited in Rohner, 2008). Rohner (2001) defines “intimate partner acceptance-rejection” as one’s subjective perception and feeling of being loved or rejected by his/her partner, similarly with parental acceptance-rejection. With Rohner (2001)’s development of Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire, intimate partner acceptance/rejection started to be a research topic of interest.

To date, connection between partner acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment has been an examined issue. Results generally concluded that for both men and women that more accepting the individuals perceived their partners to be, more psychologically adjusted they were (Ripoll-Nuñez & Alvarez, 2008; Varan et
al., 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2008; Parmar et al., 2008; Chyung & Lee, 2008). However, some studies in different cultures resulted in differences regarding gender. In Khaleque, Rohner, and Laukkala (2008)’s study among Finnish adults and Rohner, Uddin, Shamsunnaher and Khaleque (2008)’s study among Japanese university students, only women’s partner acceptance-rejection was related with their psychological adjustment, not men’s.

Besides psychological adjustment, perceived partner rejection’s role in relationships was also investigated. Varan (2005), Eryavuz (2006), and Karpat (2010) examined how perceived partner acceptance-rejection levels differentiate according to the satisfaction in relationship. Results revealed that respondents who were unsatisfied with their relationships reported more rejection from their partners than individuals with satisfied relationships reported.

Intimate partner acceptance-rejection’s relationship with parental acceptance-rejection, is an investigated topic across various cultures. Results revealed a significance relationship between remembered rejection from parents and perceived rejection from intimate partner (Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006; Chyung & Lee, 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2008; Parmar, Ibrahim, & Rohner, 2008, Rohner, Melendez, & Kraimer-Rickaby, 2008; Varan et al., 2008). This result in literature can be considered as an indicator of PARTTheory’s proposed continuity of childhood parental acceptance-rejection into adulthood relationship with intimate partner.

As mentioned above, the extension of parental acceptance-rejection in childhood to the adulthood experiences and intimate relationships in adulthood is explained by mental representations in PARTTheory (Rohner, 1986). Children who perceive rejection by their parents develop distorted mental representations of self, significant others and the world. These representations influence both the quality of the relationship and how one perceives his/her partner’s acceptance of him/her (Rohner, 2004). Hence, what are these mental representations and how do they result in this continuity from childhood to adulthood?

Schema Theory and Early Maladaptive Schemas can be addressed to elaborate these mental representations. Schema Theory postulates that every human being, universally, has five core emotional needs namely; 1) secure attachment to others, 2)
autonomy, competence and sense of identity, 3) freedom to express valid needs and emotions, 4) spontaneity and play, 5) realistic limits and self-control. One’s toxic childhood experiences, which clashes with his/her innate temperament frustrate these basic needs, and results in the formation of early maladaptive schemas. Early maladaptive schemas are defined as extremely stable and enduring, self-destructive emotional and cognitive patterns, built up during early childhood (Young, Kolosko, & Weishaar, 2003). These schemas are carried by the individual throughout his/her lifetime, and crucially maladaptive. Experiences through the lifespan are processed by using these schemas as cognitive prototypes, determining one’s emotions, cognitions, behaviors and bonds with others in adulthood (Young, 1999), as distorted mental representations’ role mentioned in PARTheory. The model describes 18 schemas that are grouped into five categories of unmet emotional needs that are called “schema domains” (Young et al., 2003): (1) disconnection and rejection (abandonment / instability, mistrust / abuse, emotional deprivation, defectiveness/shame, social isolation/alienation); (2) impaired autonomy and performance (dependence / incompetence, vulnerability to harm or illness, enmeshment / undeveloped self, failure); (3) impaired limits (entitlement / grandiosity, insufficient self-control / self discipline); (4) other-directedness (subjugation, self-sacrifice, approval seeking / recognition seeking); (5) overvigilance and inhibition (negativity / pessimism, emotional inhibition, unrelenting standards/hypercriticalness, and punitiveness).

According to the Schema Model, early maladaptive schemas develop when the core emotional needs in early childhood are not met; therefore, parenting has a strong role in formation of early maladaptive schemas (Young et al., 2003). Several studies (Harris & Curtin, 2002; Cecero, Nelson & Gillie, 2004; Thimm, 2010a; Gök, 2012; Ünal, 2012; Sarıtaş-Atalar & Gençöz, in press) also revealed that negative parenting practices are associated with higher early maladaptive schemas in individuals. Consequently, the Schema Model suggests that child’s negative experiences due to parenting forms early maladaptive schemas, which results in problems in one’s adulthood psychological functioning (Young et al., 2003). Studies investigating schemas’ link with some mental health topics stated that higher early maladaptive
schemas is correlated to depression (Harris & Curtin, 2002), anxiety disorders (Camara & Calvete, 2012; Kim, Lee, & Lee, 2014), posttraumatic stress disorder (Cockram, Drummond, & Lee, 2010), and personality disorders (Jovev & Jackson, 2004; Gilbert & Daffern, 2013).

Additionally, because of their rigid and self-confirming nature, early maladaptive schemas are also considered to be significantly related with interpersonal problems, linked especially with close relationships in adulthood. If an individual’s early core needs are not met, which leads to the formation of early maladaptive schemas, dysfunctional intimate relationship functioning may develop in adulthood (Young & Gluhoski, 1997). Previous research contributing to this model by investigating the connection between early maladaptive schemas and constructs related with romantic relationships, found that higher early maladaptive schema scores are associated with lower intimacy levels (Stiles, 2004), higher jealousy scores (Göral-Alkan, 2010), higher susceptibility to divorce (Yoosefi, Etemadi, Bahrami, Al-sadat Fatehizade & Ahmadi, 2010) and lower relationship satisfaction (Freeman, 1998; Göral-Alkan, 2010; Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012).

Schema Model explains the connection between early maladaptive schemas and negative relationship constructs with the term “schema chemistry”: Because of schemas’ self-confirming nature, individuals choose partners that will perpetuate their early maladaptive schemas, which results in poor relationship functioning (Young et al., 2003). Specifically, partners’ own relationship patterns results in schema clashes and maladaptive cycles, which in turn reinforce and activate each partner’s schemas. In addition, these maladaptive cycles are mostly triggered by the activation of partners’ early maladaptive schemas and emotional pathways of childhood unmet needs of stability, safety, nurturance, love and belonging (Atkinson, 2012). Therefore, early maladaptive schemas may be an explanatory factor of mental representations’ role in the continuity mechanism of remembered parental rejection in childhood to perceived rejection from intimate partner.
1.2. Purpose of the Study

Until now, earlier research in literature mostly focused on testing the universality of PARTheory’s hypothesis stating that experiences in childhood create consequences extending into the adulthood (Varan, 2005). Besides perceived childhood parental acceptance-rejection’s link with adulthood psychological adjustment (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002a; Rohner & Khaleque, 2010; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012), remembered rejection from parents in childhood and perceived rejection from intimate partner in adulthood close relationships was also revealed to be connected (Varan, 2005, Eryavuz, 2006, Chyung & Lee, 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2008; Parmar, Ibrahim, & Rohner, 2008, Rohner, Melendez, & Kraimer-Rickaby, 2008, Varan, et al., 2008) PARTheory (Rohner, 1986) explains this assumed continuity of rejection in childhood into adulthood by mental representations, formed in childhood, about oneself, others, and the world. These mental representations’ mediating role in the continuity of maternal acceptance-rejection into psychological adjustment in adulthood was found to be significant (Sarıtaş-Atalar & Gençöz, in press). Yet, there is no research investigating the role of mental representations in the relationship between perceived acceptance-rejection from parents in childhood and perceived intimate partner rejection in adulthood. Because cognitive constructs about self and others possibly have an influencing role in the relationship between past experiences with parents and present experiences in close relationships, there is a need for more evidence for how parental relationships are related to the relationship with intimate partners, and how individuals’ mental representations mediate this relationship (Parker, Barrett & Hickie, 1992). By studying the mediating role of early maladaptive schema domains, rigid and persistent mental structures formed in early years of life and continue throughout the lifespan, in the link between parental acceptance-rejection and partner acceptance-rejection, present study aimed to fill this gap in the literature.

Furthermore, the connections of early maladaptive schemas with some relationship constructs such as intimacy (Stiles, 2004), divorce (Yoosefi et al., 2010), jealousy (Göral-Alkan, 2010), and relationship satisfaction (Göral-Alkan, 2010,
Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012) were displayed. Still, their link with individuals' perception that whether their emotional needs are met or unmet by their partners was not examined. Hence, the study also aimed to investigate this connection, as well. An important point to highlight is that the current study used schema domains rather than separate early maladaptive schemas. The reason for this preference is that because early maladaptive schemas contain common characteristics such as negative beliefs about self or others, it is redundant to examine separate schemas, and more useful to reduce them to higher-order schema domains (Hoffart et al., 2005).

To sum up, in the light of existing literature, current study aimed to investigate the relationship among parental acceptance-rejection, intimate partner acceptance-rejection, and early maladaptive schema domains. More specifically, the study’s purpose was to examine the mediating role of early maladaptive schema domains in the relationship between remembered parental acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection among Turkish married individuals.

1.2.1. Hypotheses and Research Question of the Study

Examining the relationship among parental acceptance-rejection, intimate partner acceptance-rejection and early maladaptive schemas for married individuals, it was hypothesized that;

1) Higher parental rejection would be related to higher rejection from intimate partner.
2) Higher parental rejection would be related to higher scores in early maladaptive schema domains.
3) Higher intimate partner rejection would be related to higher scores in early maladaptive schema domains.
4) Early maladaptive schema domains would mediate the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and intimate partner acceptance-rejection.
   • Higher remembered rejection from parents would predict higher scores in early maladaptive schema domains, which would in turn
predict higher perceived intimate partner rejection.

In addition, the study also aimed to answer the following research question:

- Which early maladaptive schema domains have a mediating role in the relationship between remembered parental acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection in married individuals?

1.3. Significance and Implications of the Study

This is the first study in the literature to examine the mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in the relationship between remembered parental acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection. Although both PARTheory and Schema Model proposed that extension of childhood relationships with parents into adulthood close relationships occur through maladaptive cognitive structures formed by negative experiences with parents in early years, no study tested their role in this suggested continuity. Therefore, present study aimed to fill this gap in the literature. Moreover, the knowledge about early maladaptive schema domains’ role in intimate relationships is limited, and their connection to intimate partner acceptance-rejection is unknown. Hence, by investigating schema domains’ link with perceived rejection from intimate partners among married individuals for the first time, present study enhanced the knowledge about the role of early maladaptive schema domains in marriage.

Current study also presented implications for both theoreticians and clinicians by bringing more light to how married individuals’ perceived acceptance or rejection from their partners is linked to their past experiences with their parents and their cognitive constructs. In other words, this research opened a way for understanding one’s current experiences with his/her intimate partner through looking both at childhood relationships with parents and at one’s dysfunctional mental representations. Furthermore, revealing how and which schema domains play a role in this continuity between past and present, clinicians can investigate and offer specific treatments to heal these schemas in marriage, helping married individuals break maladaptive cyclic behaviors related to their relationship problems.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, literature regarding current study variables (Parental Acceptance-Rejection, Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection, and Early Maladaptive Schemas) was reviewed in detail. After defining the variables of the study, their related individual and relationship variables were evaluated through earlier studies. Lastly, the connection between literature and purpose of the study was elaborated.

2.1. Parental Acceptance-Rejection

2.1.1. Development of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) (Rohner, 1975, 1986) is an evidence-based theory of socialization and lifespan development aiming to explain and predict main predecessors, associates, and consequences of parental acceptance-rejection all around the world. This theory asserts that individuals all around the world have a need to get affection from people who are significant to them. According to this fundamental assumption of the theory, this need for affection is present for whole humanity, independently from any restrictive condition such as culture, race, physical appearance, social status, language and geography (Rohner, 1975).

In 1999, the PARTheory’s paradigm and focus shifted from parental acceptance-rejection to interpersonal acceptance-rejection (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2012). Initially, the central hypothesis of the PARTheory was that perceived parental acceptance-rejection is related to one’s personality dispositions. The revised version postulates that these personality dispositions are associated with not only parental acceptance-rejection, but also acceptance or rejection by an
attachment figure at any point of life. Consequently, interpersonal acceptance-
rejection, including parental acceptance-rejection, peer and sibling acceptance-
rejection, intimate partner acceptance-rejection, and acceptance-rejection in other
attachment relationships are present all through the lifespan. Nevertheless, the name
PARTTheory is continued to be used because of it’s widely recognition internationally
(Rohner et al., 2012).

PARTTheory is divided into three complementary subtheories namely;
personality subtheory, coping subtheory, and sociocultural systems subtheory.
“Personality subtheory attempts to predict and explain major personality or
psychological—especially mental health-related—consequences of perceived
parental acceptance-rejection in childhood and adulthood” (Rohner, 2004, p. 831).
According to personality subtheory, rejection from not only parents’ but also any
other attachment figure leads to seven specific maladaptive psychological and
personality outcomes, including 1) hostility-aggression, 2) dependence, 3) low self-
esteeem, 4) low self-adequacy, 5) emotional unresponsiveness, 6) emotional
instability, and 7) negative worldview. Coping subtheory, on the other hand, attempts
to investigate on how and why some children and adults do not show psychological
dysfunction despite the fact that they experience/experienced rejection from their
significant others (Rohner, 2004; Rohner et al., 2012). Finally, sociocultural systems
subtheory struggles to answer the question that “In what way is the total fabric of a
society as well as the behavior and beliefs of individuals within that society (e.g.,
people’s religious beliefs and artistic preferences) affected by the fact that most
parents in the society tend to either accept or reject their children?” (Rohner, 2004,
p.831). From these subtheories, so far, the most studied and evaluated is the
personality subtheory while there is not enough research to investigate the latter two
theories’ postulates and questions (Khaleque & Rohner, 2012; Rohner et al., 2012).

2.1.2. Definition of Parental Acceptance-Rejection

As mentioned above, fundamental assumption of PARThory is that all
humans have a need to get affection and warmth from their significant others
(Rohner, 1975). Every human being experienced more or less warmth and love throughout their childhood by their caregivers (mostly from their mothers and fathers). According to PARTheory, this warmth and love from parents to child can be evaluated with a continuum; at the one end of the continuum, there is parental acceptance, and at the other end, there is parental rejection (Rohner, 1986).

Parental acceptance means warmth, affection, nurturance, support, concern, love etc. Parents show their acceptance to their child by physical expressions, including behaviors such as hugging, caressing, kissing, smiling. In addition, verbal expressions, including behaviors like saying nice things about the child, complimenting, singing or telling stories to the child, can be reflections of parental acceptance (Rohner, 1986; Rohner et al., 2012).

What is meant by parental rejection, on the other hand, is nonexistence or significant withdrawal of acceptance feelings and behaviors, but presence of behaviors and emotions that are physically and psychologically upsetting for the child (Rohner et al., 2012). According to Rohner (1986), parents can be rejecting to the child by behaving in any combination of these four ways: 1) cold and unaffectionate, 2) hostile and aggressive, 3) indifferent and neglecting and 4) undifferentiated rejecting. When parents are cold and unaffectionate towards their child, they withhold their love, warmth and affection from their child. Rejecting the child by hostile and aggressive way includes the feelings of anger, resentment, hostility, and hate all of which generally results in aggressive behaviors. Parents can be physically aggressive by behaviors such as hitting, pushing, pinching the child, or throwing things to him/her, or verbally aggressive by cursing, mocking, shouting, saying sarcastic, thoughtless or humiliating things to the child etc. When parents are indifferent and neglecting, they are unavailable both physically and psychologically, paying no attention to the child’s needs. Neglecting the child can be a result of parents’ feelings of indifference, or feelings of anger towards the child. Parents feeling angry towards the child can be neglecting because they do not want to cause harm due to their anger. Undifferentiated rejection occurs when there is no overt indicator of rejection; however, the child feels he/she is rejected and not loved or wanted. While differentiated rejection can show itself objectively by aggressive or
neglecting behaviors, or subjectively by feelings of anger, hostility or indifference, in undifferentiated rejection, there is no behavioral sign of neglect, coldness, or aggression, yet the child believes that his/her parents do not really love them or care about them (Rohner, 1986).

In PARTheory, rather than the actual behaviors of the parents, the focus is on how the individual perceives, remembers, interprets and explains the experiences with his/her parents because parents’ effects on the child are shaped through the child’s inner and perceptual processes. In addition, because the way parents show their warmth or rejection can change according to different cultures, focusing on the emotions of the child rather than parents’ behaviors allows cross-cultural empirical studies without any ethnic limitations (Rohner et al., 2012).

2.1.3. Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Individual Variables

The first individual correlate of parental acceptance-rejection to evaluate is gender. Although many studies do not reveal the result of gender differences in scores of parental acceptance-rejection (Khaleque & Rohner, 2012), differences according to gender of the parent or gender of the offspring can be mentioned for some findings. Both meta-analyses by Khaleque and Rohner (2002), and Rohner and Khaleque (2010) found no significant difference according to either the gender of the offspring or the gender of the parent. On the other hand, according to Chyung and Lee (2008)’s study among Korean young adults, Rohner, Uddin, Shamsunnaher and Khaleque (2008)’s study among Japanese adults, and Kazarian et al. (2010)’s study among Lebanese individuals, although there is no difference of gender in perceived maternal warmth or rejection, men evaluated their fathers to be less accepting and more rejecting than women.

Investigating gender differences in Turkish studies (Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006; İşık, 2010; Yakın, 2011) also revealed various outcomes. Varan (2005) in his study stated no significant difference in terms of parental acceptance-rejection according to either the gender of the offspring or the gender of the parents. Eryavuz (2006)’s study also revealed no difference in parental acceptance-rejection scores
according to the gender of the offspring; however, when the gender of the parent is concerned, participants perceived their fathers to be more rejecting than their mothers. According to both Işık (2010)’s and Yakın (2011)’s studies among university students, on the other hand, although there is no difference of gender in perceived maternal warmth or rejection, men evaluated their fathers to be less accepting and more rejecting than women.

Another demographic variable linked with parental acceptance-rejection besides gender is age. Perceived parental acceptance-rejection levels are found to be differentiating between younger and older individuals according to meta-analyses (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012) involving the studies in the area. Both the meta-analysis of Khaleque and Rohner conducted in 2002 including 43 studies worldwide and the meta-analysis of Khaleque and Rohner conducted in 2012 including 66 studies worldwide concluded that adult participants’ evaluation of their parents’ acceptance or rejection levels are weaker than children and adolescents. In order to explain this discrepancy, it has been stated that because as the age increase and one transitions into adulthood, individuals’ various life experiences with various people increase, experiences with their parents are not as strong as it was in their younger ages (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Khaleque & Rohner, 2012). However, in Turkey, Yakın (2011) resulted that among university students, age did not significantly correlated with perceived parental rejection.

An important individual factor revealed to be related with parental acceptance-rejection is psychological adjustment. According to the meta analysis of Khaleque and Rohner conducted in 2002, involving 43 studies worldwide, the meta analysis of Rohner and Khaleque conducted in 2010, involving 17 studies from 13 nations, and the meta analysis carried out by Khaleque and Rohner in 2012, involving 66 studies from 22 countries, it was concluded that there is no sample across the world that failed to emerge the hypothesized connection between psychological adjustment, as defined in the personality subtheory, and parental acceptance-rejection. Accordingly, perceived rejection from either mother or father during childhood is connected to psychological maladjustment for both children and adults universally (Rohner et al., 2012).
Additionally, it is possible to mention parental rejection’s connection with specific mental health issues, as well. Heller (1996)’s study among adolescents concluded that perceived parental rejection predicts higher levels of depressive symptomatology. Moreover, the study of Gray (1997) reported that perceived rejection from parents was related to increased levels of substance abuse. Dominy (1997) investigated the relationship between binge eating disorder and parental acceptance-rejection, and revealed that obese women with binge eating disorder reported more paternal rejection than women with no eating disorder. Hoppe-Rooney (2004) also investigated disordered eating among university students. The results showed that individuals with disordered eating habits had greater maternal and paternal rejection scores than ones with no disordered eating.

Parental acceptance-rejection’s connection with psychological well-being was also examined by Turkish studies (Sartaş, 2007; Yakın, 2011; Sartaş-Atalar & Gençöz, in press). Sartaş (2007)’s study examining the relationship between maternal acceptance-rejection and psychological distress of Turkish adolescents concluded that perceived maternal rejection was linked with higher depression, higher trait anger, and higher trait anxiety. In addition, Yakın (2011)’s study among Turkish university students resulted that higher parental rejection predicts higher depression, higher trait anxiety and higher trait anger. Lastly, Sartaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press) examined maternal acceptance-rejection’s role in psychological well-being and found that maternal rejection was connected with higher depressive symptomatology and higher trait anxiety.

Moreover, parental acceptance-rejection’s relationship with some maladaptive personality constructs is also a studied topic. Heller (1996)’s study concluded that parental rejection predicts more pessimistic attribution to life. In addition, the study of Arenson-Kemp (1995) stated that higher remembrance of parental rejection was correlated to lower self-esteem. In Turkey, Yakın (2011) also examined the relationship between maladaptive personality constructs and parental acceptance-rejection. In her study, Yakın (2011) revealed that remembered rejection from parents is connected with higher neuroticism, perfectionism, and more external locus of control.
2.1.4. Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Relationship Variables

Marital status is the first relationship variable of parental acceptance-rejection to evaluate. Studies from Turkey (Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006) examining the connection between individuals’ marital status and their perceived parental-acceptance rejection resulted in different outcomes. Varan (2005)’s study among Turkish adults resulted in no difference in parental acceptance between married and dating participants. Eryavuz (2006)’s findings, on the other hand, yielded that married individuals reported to be having more rejecting mothers than dating individuals.

The other relationship correlate of parental acceptance-rejection is relationship satisfaction. Meth (1999)’s study concluded that men’s, but not women’s, remembrances of parental acceptance in childhood was correlated with relationship satisfaction in their adulthood, meaning that as remembered parental acceptance of men increases, they report being more satisfied in their intimate relationships. In Turkey, both Varan (2005)’s and Eryavuz (2006)’s studies reveled that individuals perceiving their parents as more accepting and less rejecting experienced higher relationship satisfaction. On the other hand, Yalcinkaya (1997)’s study among Turkish married women reached the conclusion that only paternal, not maternal, acceptance is related with higher relationship satisfaction.

2.2. Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection

2.2.1. Definition of Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection

In 1999, Rohner postulated that not only parental rejection in childhood but also rejection by an attachment figure at any point in life span results in maladaptive psychological outcomes. Accordingly, PARTheory experienced a paradigm shift from studying parental acceptance-rejection to investigating interpersonal acceptance-rejection. Consequently, acceptance-rejection from one’s intimate partner
started to be a topic to study among PARTheory researchers (as cited in Rohner, 2008, p. 6).

Similar to parental acceptance-rejection, in intimate partner acceptance-rejection, the quality of emotional bond between the partners is evaluated through a bipolar continuum named as the warmth dimension. At the one end of this dimension, there is intimate partner acceptance, and at the other end there is intimate partner rejection. Acceptance end includes partner’s positive expressions of warmth such as affection, love, caring, support, and comfort. In the same way defined for parental acceptance-rejection, a rejecting partner would be cold and unaffectionate, indifferent and neglecting, or hostile and aggressive towards the other partner. In addition, individuals can feel undifferentiated rejection from their partners, referring to the belief that their partner does not really care about or love them, while there are no clear objective behavioral indicators of rejection. Because in the theory it is considered that all humans have a phylogenetically acquired needs for love, care, comfort, support etc., from the people most significant for them, when these emotional needs are not met from their intimate partner, individuals tend to develop psychological and social maladjustments, likewise in the situation of parental rejection. Therefore, PARTheory also focuses on investigating correlates of intimate partner acceptance-rejection (Rohner, 2008).

2.2.2. Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection and Individual Variables

The first individual associate of intimate partner acceptance-rejection to investigate is gender. Ripoll-Nuñez and Alvarez (2008)’s study among Colombian and Puerto Rican youths, examining the gender correlates of intimate partner acceptance-rejection, found no gender difference in perception of acceptance-rejection from the partner. However, the study of Chyung and Lee (2008), studying Korean College students, reached to a different conclusion, stating that women perceived their partners more accepting than men perceive theirs. In three Turkish studies (Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006; Varan et al., 2008), examining gender differences in intimate partner acceptance-rejection among individuals in a romantic
relationship, no difference between men and women in perceived rejection from intimate partner was reported.

Intimate partner acceptance-rejection’s relationship with psychological adjustment is another examined subject in PARTheory. Intimate partner acceptance rejection, generally, has been found to be significantly correlated with psychological adjustment for both men and women; meaning that the more men or women perceived their partners as rejecting, the lower their psychological adjustment becomes (Parmar & Rohner, 2005; Chyung & Lee, 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2008; Parmar, Ibrahim, & Rohner, 2008; Ripoll-Nuñez & Alvarez, 2008; Rohner, Melendez, & Kraimer-Rickaby, 2008; Rohner et al., 2008). On the contrary, gender differences in the link between intimate partner rejection and psychological adjustment can be stated according to some findings. For instance, Khaleque et al. (2008)’s study among Finnish adults and Rohner et al. (2008)’s study among Japanese adults concluded that women’s, but not men’s, psychological adjustment was correlated with their partner’s acceptance-rejection. When studies in Turkey are evaluated, both Eryavuz (2006)’s and Varan et al. (2008)’s study among individuals in intimate relationships concluded that, for both men and women, intimate partner acceptance-rejection is related to psychological adjustment. Gültekin (2011)’s study among Turkish young adults demonstrated that men’s, but not women’s, psychological adjustment was related to their partner’s acceptance-rejection.

Intimate partner acceptance-rejection’s relationship with parental acceptance-rejection is also a highly researched topic across various cultures. Chyung and Lee (2008)’s study among Korean college students with ongoing romantic relationships, Parmar and Rohner (2008)’s research among Indian married adults, and Parmar, Ibrahim, and Rohner (2008)’s study among married individuals from Kuwait all concluded that remembered childhood parental acceptance-rejection was related to intimate partner acceptance-rejection, meaning that as the remembered parental rejection levels increased, perceived intimate partner rejection levels also increased. On the other hand, both Rohner, Melendez, and Kraimer-Rickaby (2008)’s study among American adults and Ripoll-Nunez and Alvarez (2008)’s study among Colombian and Puerto Rican adults reported that while women’s intimate partner
rejection was associated with both parents’ rejection, men’s partner rejection was related only to their fathers’ rejection. Khaleque et al. (2008)’s study among Finnish adults also reached a significant relationship between intimate partner rejection and both parents’ rejection for women; however, reporting no link for either mother or father rejection and men’s partner rejection. In Turkey, Varan (2005)’s, Eryavuz (2006)’s, Varan et al. (2008)’s, and Karpat (2010)’s studies reported that remembered rejection from either mother or father in childhood was significantly related with perceived rejection from intimate partner.

2.2.3. Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection and Relationship Variables

A relationship factor influencing perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection is marital status. In Turkey, the study of Varan (2005)’s and Eryavuz (2006)’s study among couples demonstrated that dating individuals reported higher acceptance and lower rejection from their partners than married individuals did. Eryavuz (2006)’s research also investigated the gender difference in this connection, and concluded that while men’s perception of their partners did not changed significantly according to their marital status, married women reported more rejection from their partners than women in a dating relationship did. Moreover, while men reported more rejection from their partners than women among dating individuals, when married respondents are concerned, women perceived their partners to be more rejecting than men did.

Relationship satisfaction is other relationship variable found to be linked with intimate partner acceptance-rejection. Examining perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection’s connection with relationship satisfaction; three studies from Turkey (Varan, 2005; Eryavuz, 2006; Karpat, 2010) compared perceived partner acceptance-rejection levels of individuals satisfied with their relationships and individuals unsatisfied with their relationships. All of these studies came to the conclusion that respondents who were unsatisfied with their relationships reported more rejection from their partners than individuals with satisfied relationships reported.
2.3. Early Maladaptive Schemas

2.3.1. Definition of Early Maladaptive Schemas

The term “schema” is originated from the data processing theory, stating that schemas are cognitive frameworks helping people to organize and interpret information and from one’s early years; experiences are accumulated in autobiographic memory through the way of schemas (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). People understand, interpret and order their experiences and the world around them through the glasses of their established schemas, sometimes excluding information that does not conform to their pre-existing mental frameworks, which may result in a distorted point of view of the reality (Edwards & Arntz, 2012). According to Young (1999), some of these schemas, especially ones formed as a result of early negative experiences, might be at the core of psychological dysfunctions; therefore, he produced the term *early maladaptive schemas*.

Early Maladaptive Schemas are self-destructive emotional and cognitive patterns that are extremely firm, repetitive and persistent, constructed during childhood or adolescence. These schemas include memories, emotions, cognitions, and bodily sensations, elaborated and carried by the individual throughout his/her lifespan, and dysfunctional to a significant degree (Young et al., 2003). Future experience is processed by using these schemas as templates (Young, 1999).

The Schema Model states that, early maladaptive schemas develop when their *core emotional needs* are not met in their childhood (Young, 1990; Young et al., 2003). These core emotional needs are named as; 1) secure attachment to others (including security, stability, care and acceptance), 2) autonomy, competence and sense of identity, 3) realistic limits and self-control, 4) freedom to express one’s needs and emotions, and 5) spontaneity and play. In the Schema Model, there are 18 early maladaptive schemas, each grouped into five schema domains representing the unmet core emotional needs (Young et al., 2003). These five schema domains and consisting schemas are defined in detail below:
Disconnection and Rejection schema domain refers to an insecure and unsatisfying attachment to other people. Individuals with schemas in this domain believe that others are unstable and untrustworthy, and their emotional needs for care, affection, acceptance, empathy and security will remain unmet. This schema domain often includes most damaged individuals with traumatic, toxic experiences in childhood and self-destructive, unsatisfying relationships in adulthood. In addition, typically these individuals own parents or caregivers that are cold, rejecting, unpredictable or abusive. This domain includes the schemas of 1) abandonment/instability, 2) mistrust/abuse, 3) emotional deprivation, 4) defectiveness/shame and 5) social isolation. While people with abandonment/instability schemas expect that their significant others will not remain to provide support, love or connection because they are not stable, in mistrust/abuse schema, individuals predict that they will get hurt, deceived, abused, embarrassed or used by others. People with emotional deprivation schema, on the other hand, assume that others will never sufficiently satisfy their emotional needs for nurturance, empathy or protection. When defectiveness/shame schema is dominant, one thinks and feels that he/she is unlovable, bad, unwanted, inferior, flawed etc., including high reaction to criticism, comparisons, rejection and blame, and shame of one’s supposed flaws. Lastly, people with high social isolation schema perceive themselves as being different and isolated from others, and not belonging to a group or a community (Young et al., 2003).

People with schemas in Impaired Autonomy and Performance domain perceive themselves as unable to survive or function autonomously and perform effectively. These individuals’ families are typically enmeshed, overprotective and undermining the child’s competencies outside the family. Schemas of 1) dependence/incompetence, 2) vulnerability to harm or illness, 3) enmeshment/undeveloped self, and 4) failure compose this domain. People with dependence/incompetence schema perceive themselves as incompetent to cope with everyday responsibilities on their own. Ones with vulnerability to harm or illness schema excessively fear that they will encounter an unexpected catastrophe (medical, emotional or external) that they cannot prevent or handle. When
enmeshment/undeveloped schema is prominent, one cannot fully individuate but involve with or get close to one’s significant others excessively. One also feels that without the enmeshed relationship with their significant others, he/she will not survive or be happy. The failure schema refers to the belief that one is unable to be successful, untalented and have lower status compared to others; therefore, has been inadequate and will always fail and be unsuccessful (Young et al., 2003).

Impaired Limits schema domain refers to low internal limits and orientation to long-term goals, inadequate respect to and cooperation with others. People in this schema domain typically have families that are excessively tolerant and overindulgent lacking direction, guidance and boundary setting. This schema domain consists of 1) entitlement/grandiosity and 2) insufficient self-control/self-discipline schemas. With the entitlement/grandiosity schema, one feels and believes that he/she is superior to others and has privileged rights. In order to gain power and control, one thinks it is possible to do whatever he/she wants without realistic or reasonable consideration without empathy or concern for others’ needs or feelings. Individuals with insufficient self-control/self-discipline have difficulties in practicing necessary self-control and tolerance to frustration, and limiting their impulses or emotions to accomplish their goals (Young et al., 2003).

Another schema domain is Other-Directedness, meaning that at the cost of one’s own needs and feelings, people with this schema domain focuses extremely on others’ desires, responses and expectations in other to gain their love and approval. Conditional acceptance is dominant in their family of origin, expecting that the child must suppress his/her own needs or feelings to get the approval and love of others, valuing the social acceptance and status more than the child’s emotions and desires. Schemas in this domain are 1) subjugation, 2) self-sacrifice, and 3) approval-seeking/recognition-seeking. The schema subjugation involves the belief that one’s own needs or emotions are not important to others, so he/she excessively gives control to others because of feeling trapped and pressurized, and avoiding anger, retaliation and rejection. On the other hand, individuals with self-sacrifice schema voluntarily focus on others’ needs at the expense of their own desires in order to prevent causing harm to others, avert feelings of selfishness, and sustain the
connection with others. Lastly, people with high approval-seeking/recognition-seeking schema give extreme significance to gaining approval, appreciation, or attentiveness from others, at the cost of individuated, true sense of self. Other than their own natural dispositions, the individuals’ self-esteem depends on the reaction of others, motivated to improve their social status, appearance, acceptance, income or achievements (Young et al., 2003).

The last schema domain in the Schema Model is Overvigilance and Inhibition. Individuals in this domain focus extremely on following rigid, internalized rules about the “right” performance or the “right” behavior so that they inhibit their spontaneous emotions, desires and preferences, and neglect their gratification, relaxation, close relationships and well-being. People with this schema domain typically have parents that are demanding, rigid and punitive, overly emphasizing the importance of performance, responsibilities, suppressing emotions, obeying rules and avoiding mistakes. This domain includes 1) negativity/pessimism, 2) emotional inhibition, 3) unrelenting standards/hypercriticalness, and 4) punitiveness schemas. Negativity/pessimism refers to the exaggerated emphasis on negative aspects of life and the expectation that things will ultimately go wrong and their life will fall apart, which leads to the fear of making any mistakes because of catastrophizing their outcomes. People with emotional inhibition schema suppress their feelings (negative emotions or positive impulses) and give importance to rationality over emotions in order to avoid disapproval, feeling shameful or losing control of their urges. When unrelenting standards/hypercriticalness is prominent, one believes that meeting high standards of performance is essential to avoid criticism, resulting in feeling pressured, being critical toward self and others, and neglecting pleasure, health, satisfying relationships. People with this schema are characterized by perfectionism, strict rules, and fixation on competence. Lastly, the punitiveness schema is defined as the principle that mistakes should result in harsh punishment, having no room for human imperfection or empathy. People with this schema tend to be intolerant and punitive towards self and others when their expectations and standards are not met faultlessly (Young et al., 2003).
2.3.2. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Individual Variables

Differences in early maladaptive schema scores were firstly examined in terms of gender. Gender difference among early maladaptive schemas was investigated by various studies (Stiles, 2004; Alfafos, 2009; Shorey, Anderson, & Stuart, 2012; Camara & Calvete, 2012). Firstly, in the study of Alfafos (2009) among Palestinian young adults, women have been found to be having more early maladaptive schemas than men in 11 out of the 18 schemas namely; emotional deprivation, failure, vulnerability to harm and illness, enmeshment, subjugation, self-sacrifice, approval-seeking, negativity/pessimism, punitiveness, abandonment/instability, and unrelenting standards. The study of Shorey et al. (2012) in USA also revealed that women presented more early maladaptive schemas than men, outscoring in 14 schemas namely; emotional deprivation, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, defectiveness/shame, failure, dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm and illness, enmeshment, insufficient self-control, self-sacrifice, approval seeking, and negativity/pessimism. In Camara and Calvete (2012)’s study among Spanish university students, women expressed higher schema scores than men in abandonment/instability and failure schemas while men had higher scores in emotional deprivation schema. On the other hand, the study of Stiles (2004) among university students involved in a romantic relationship found gender difference only for the entitlement schema, men scoring higher than women. Gender difference in early maladaptive schema domains was also investigated in Turkey. Dissimilarly with the findings above, both Gök (2012) and Ünal (2012) found that among Turkish university students, males reported higher scores in Disconnection/Rejection schema domain than females.

Another individual variable whose connection with early maladaptive schemas was studied is attachment styles. Simard, Moss, and Pascuzza (2011) conducted a 15-year longitudinal study that investigated the relationship among childhood attachment styles, adulthood attachment styles and early maladaptive schemas. According to the outcomes, it was stated that children who showed ambivalent
attachment style at the age of 6 had more schema scores in adulthood than ones with secure childhood attachment style in the early maladaptive schemas of emotional deprivation, abandonment/instability, mistrust/abuse, defectiveness/shame, failure, enmeshment, subjugation, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, approval seeking, and punitiveness. The study (Simard et al., 2011) also revealed that participants who showed characteristics of preoccupied attachment style at the age of 21 had higher schema scores than their peers with secure attachment style in the schemas of abandonment/instability, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, defectiveness/shame, failure, dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm and illness, subjugation, insufficient self-control, negativity/pessimism.

Furthermore, personality traits can be mentioned as another individual correlate of early maladaptive schemas. Thimm (2010b) investigated early maladaptive schemas’ link with personality according to the big five personality traits. It was demonstrated that the personality trait of neuroticism was related to the higher scores in the schemas of mistrust/abuse, abandonment/instability, social isolation, defectiveness/shame, failure, dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm and illness, approval-seeking, unrelenting standards, enmeshment/undeveloped self, insufficient self-control, subjugation, negativity/pessimism, and punitiveness. The study (Thimm, 2010b) also revealed the schema connections with other personality traits: extraversion with lower social isolation and emotional inhibition, agreeableness with lower insufficient self-control and entitlement, and conscientiousness with higher unrelenting standards and lower insufficient self-control. In Turkey, Ünal (2012)’s study among university students also investigated the relationship between early maladaptive schema domains and big five personality traits. According to the study, it was concluded that neuroticism was related to higher impaired limits/exaggerated standards, extraversion was connected with lower disconnection/rejection and higher impaired limits/exaggerated standards, conscientiousness was linked with lower disconnection/rejection, and openness to experience was correlated with lower disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy/other directedness and higher impaired limits/exaggerated standards.

Early maladaptive schemas’ relationship with mental health has also been
studied in terms of various psychological disorders. While as a result of the study conducted by Harris and Curtin (2002) among university students, depressive symptomology was found to be associated with defectiveness/shame, vulnerability to harm and illness, insufficient self-control, and incompetence schemas, Camara and Calvete (2012)’s study revealed that only emotional deprivation schema was related to depression. When schemas’ link with anxiety was investigated, Camara and Calvete (2012) found that higher scores in vulnerability to harm and illness and dependence schemas were related to an increase in anxiety level. Another study by Pinto-Gouveia, Castilho, Galhardo, and Cunha (2006) investigating early maladaptive schemas relationship with anxiety disorders concluded that individuals with social phobia had higher early maladaptive schema scores than people with panic disorder or obsessive-compulsive disorder, whose schema scores were higher than participants’ with no psychological condition. Cockram et al. (2010) studied early maladaptive schemas’ connection with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among Vietnam veterans. Veterans with PTSD diagnosis got higher scores than non-diagnosed veterans in the schemas of vulnerability to harm and illness, emotional inhibition, social isolation, insufficient self-control, mistrust/abuse, negativity/pessimism, and abandonment. In addition, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD)’s link with early maladaptive schemas was investigated in the study of Kim, Lee, and Lee (2014) and resulted that individuals with OCD had higher schema scores than non-clinical participants in defectiveness/shame, social isolation, and failure schemas. Lastly, examining how early maladaptive schemas are related to personality disorders, Jovev and Jackson (2004) revealed that while borderline personality disorder was related to higher dependency, abandonment/instability, and subjugation schemas, obsessive-compulsive personality disorder linked with unrelenting standards schema, and avoidant personality disorder was associated with abandonment/instability and subjugation schemas. Moreover, Gilbert and Daffern (2013) studied offenders with personality disorders and their related schemas and concluded that offenders with borderline personality disorder had higher scores in the schema domains of disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, impaired limits, and overvigilance whereas offenders with antisocial personality disorders had
prominent schema domains of impaired limits, disconnection/rejection, and impaired autonomy.

The connection between early maladaptive schemas and psychological wellbeing has been investigated in Turkey, as well. The study conducted by Lapsekili and Ak (2012) among patients with unipolar and bipolar depression revealed that the schemas of defectiveness/shame, incompetence, failure, undeveloped self, and vulnerability to harm and illness were related to low self-perception. Gök (2012) investigated early maladaptive schemas’ link with depression among university students, and found that disconnection/rejection and impaired autonomy/other directedness schema domains predicted higher depressive symptomatology. Moreover, the study of Eldoğan (2012) resulted that individuals with high social phobia symptoms had higher scores in the schema domains of disconnection/rejection, impaired limits, and impaired autonomy.

Lastly, the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and parental acceptance-rejection will be mentioned. Thimm (2010a)’s study among individuals with personality disorders revealed that while paternal rejection was correlated to all of the five schema domains, maternal rejection was linked to all schema domains but impaired limits. In Turkey, the study of Sarıtaş (2007) among adolescents revealed that maternal acceptance-rejection was related to all schema domains. However, similarly with Thimm (2010a)’s study, Sarıtaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press)’s study investigating the relationship among university students’ maternal acceptance-rejection, early maladaptive schemas, and psychological adjustment revealed that maternal rejection was associated with all schema domains except impaired limits/exaggerated standards. The study conducted by Sarıtaş-Atalar and Gençöz (2014) additionally investigated the mediating role of schema domains in the relationship between maternal rejection and psychological adjustment. Results demonstrated that impaired autonomy-other directedness and disconnection/rejection schema domains mediated the relationship between maternal rejection and anxiety. On the other hand, the association between maternal rejection and depression was only mediated by impaired autonomy-other directedness domain. These results of Sarıtaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press) indicated the important role of cognitive
structures in the link between childhood parental relationships and adulthood psychological adjustment.

2.3.3. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Relationship Variables

When relationship variables of early maladaptive schemas are concerned, intimacy in close relationships can be evaluated, to begin with. Stiles (2004) examined early maladaptive schemas’ role in relationship intimacy. It was reported that higher scores in defectiveness/shame, emotional deprivation, abandonment/instability, and entitlement schemas predicted lower relationship intimacy. On the other hand, interestingly, unrelenting standards schema was found to be related with higher relationship intimacy levels.

Besides intimacy, relationship satisfaction is another variable related with early maladaptive schemas. Dumitrescu and Rusu (2012)’s study showed that abandonment/instability, emotional deprivation, defectiveness/shame, social isolation, dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm or illness, subjugation, self sacrifice, approval seeking, pessimism predicted lower relationship satisfaction. However, Freeman’s (1998) study among married individuals reported that the schemas of emotional deprivation, abandonment/instability, social isolation, subjugation and defectiveness/shame predicted lower levels of marital satisfaction for only women, not men.

Another relationship construct of early maladaptive schemas to assess is romantic jealousy. Dobrenski (2001)’s study of early maladaptive schemas’ connection with a relationship romantic jealousy concluded that as early maladaptive schema scores increase, jealousy level in romantic relationships increases. When results were examined in terms of specific schemas, higher scores in abandonment/instability, defectiveness/shame, and subjugation schemas linked with higher jealousy levels.

Schemas’ predictive role on divorce is also an examined topic. Yoosefi et al.’s (2010) study found that as early maladaptive schema scores increased, the susceptibility to divorce also increased. Moreover, specific schemas’ connection with
divorce was also examined in the study. The results revealed that participants with higher abandonment/instability, mistrust/abuse, defectiveness/shame, and emotional deprivation schemas were more susceptible to divorce (2010).

Finally, relationship variables of early maladaptive schemas were also studied in Turkey. The study of Gök (2012) among Turkish university students examined the differences among schema domain scores in terms of relationship status of the participants. According to the results, single participants reflected higher early maladaptive schema scores. More specifically, single participants’ scores in disconnection/rejection and impaired autonomy/other directedness schema domains were higher than romantically involved participants. The study conducted by Gorial-Alkan (2010) among 178 cohabiting couples revealed that the schema domains of “unrelenting standards” and “impaired autonomy” predicted higher romantic jealousy scores. Moreover, as a result of the same study (Gorial-Alkan, 2010), it was stated that the schema domain of disconnection/rejection was related to lower levels of relationship satisfaction.

2.4. The Connection between Variables of the Study and Purpose of the Study

The review of the literature demonstrates that individuals’ perceived intimate partner acceptance-rejection is related to remembered parental acceptance-rejection in childhood. Hence, continuity of remembered parental acceptance-rejection in childhood to perceived acceptance-rejection from the intimate partner can be suggested. Although both PARTheory and Schema Model propose that extension of childhood relationships with parents into adulthood close relationships occur through cognitive structures formed in childhood, no study up to this point tested their role in this suggested continuity. Therefore, present study aims to investigate the relationship remembered rejection from parents and perceived rejection from intimate partner, and the mediator role of maladaptive schema domains in this relationship among Turkish married individuals.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this section, firstly, characteristics of the participants in the study were presented. Secondly, instruments used in the study were elaborated in terms of their content and psychometric properties. Thirdly, the procedure of data gathering and data analysis was described.

3.1. Participants

A total of 228 individuals participated in the study. Purposive sampling method was used in order to gather only married individuals. 39.9 % (N = 91) of the sample were females and 60.1% (N = 137) of them were males. Participants were between the ages of 23 to 75 (M = 41.71, SD = 13.26). All participants were married. The participants’ length of marriage changed between 0.16 years (2 months) to 53 years (M = 15.22, SD = 13.17). A great majority, 95.6 % (N = 218), of the participants reported that their current marriage is their first marriage. 3.1 % (N = 7) of them answered that they are in their second marriage, and 1.3 % (N = 3) were in their third marriage.

Most of the participants with the ratio of 64.9 % (N = 148) had university or 2-year higher education degree. 19.3 % (N = 44) of them had graduate education, and 14.9 % (N = 34) of them were high school graduates. The participants included only one individual (0.4 %) with primary school degree, and one individual (0.4 %) with elementary school degree. When the participants were asked where had they mostly lived in through their lifespan, 45.2 % (N = 103) of them reported they had mostly lived in a metropolitan city, 43.9 % (N = 100) of them answered “city”, 9.6 % (N = 22) mostly lived in a town, and 1.3 % (N = 3) of participants reported that they had mostly lived in a village.

71.5 % (N = 163) of the participants reported that they had a child/children. %52.1 (N = 85) of the participants who are parents had 2 children, 38.7 % (N = 63)
had one child, 7.3 % (N = 12) had 3 children, and 1.9 % (N = 3) had 4 children. 28.5 % (N = 65) of total participants reported that they did not have any children.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N (228 participants)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Total: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td>Total: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/2-year Higher Education</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Mostly Lived in</strong></td>
<td>Total: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan City</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenthood Status</strong></td>
<td>Total: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td>Total: 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Marriage</strong></td>
<td>Total: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations and Minimum-Maximum Scores of Participants’ Ages and Length of Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum-Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.71</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>23-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of marriage (years)</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>0.16-53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Instruments

After presenting the informed consent form (see Appendix A), a demographic data form was administered to participants for gathering information of gender, age, education level, residence, length and number of their marriage, parenthood status and number of their children (see Appendix B). In order to get the information regarding measures of the study, participants filled out three different questionnaires namely Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) (filled out both mother and father separately), Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (IPARQ), and Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form 3 (YSQ-SF3).

3.2.1. Adult Version of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ)

In order to measure remembered childhood experiences with parents and their consequences as acceptance-rejection levels, adult version for Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) was developed by Rohner, Saavedra, and Granum in 1978 (as cited in Rohner & Khaeque, 2005). The questionnaire has mother and father forms, each consisting the same 60 items, rated on a 4-point likert-type scale from (1) almost never true to (4) almost always true. Participants are instructed to consider their early years of life, and when assessing the relationship between them and their parents (see Appendix C).

Originally, the scale consists of four subscales namely 1) warmth/affection, 2) aggression/hostility, 3) neglect/indifference, and 4) undifferentiated rejection. After
reverse coding all items of warmth/affection subscale and seven items of neglect/indifference subscale, all scores are summed up for overall rejection score, ranging from 60 to 240. Higher overall score from the questionnaire indicates greater rejection. Rohner and Khaleque (2002) investigated the psychometric properties of the scales. Coefficient alphas of the scale were found to be ranging from .86 and .95. In addition, the test-retest reliability of the scale was .93.

Turkish adaptation of the PARQ was conducted by Varan (2003) among both clinical and nonclinical samples including 1700 people between the ages of 17 and 78. According to the results, coefficient alphas for four subscales of both mother and father scales were found to be ranging from .86 to .96. Moreover, the overall internal consistency of the scale was .97. In the Turkish adapted scale, two factors were found namely “acceptance” and “rejection”, the correlation score between them being .55. Therefore, it can be inferred that “acceptance” and “rejection” are not two completely different factors, but two ends of the same dimension.

3.2.2. Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (IPARQ)

Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, developed by Rohner in 2001, aims to measure one’s perceived acceptance or rejection from his/her intimate partner. The questionnaire is 60-item 4-point likert-type scale, which includes the same items as PARQ’s but referring to one’s intimate partner instead of the mother or the father. The scoring is ranged from (1) almost never true to (4) almost always true (see Appendix D). Similar to PARQ, the overall score can be ranged from 60 to 240, higher scores indicating greater rejection. Rohner (2001)’s study evaluating the psychometric qualities of the scale in USA revealed that IPARQ is a reliable and valid questionnaire.

Turkish adaptation, and reliability and validity measurement of the scale was conducted by Varan in 2003. The scale’s adaptation study was conducted with 1700 people, ages ranging from 17 to 78, including both clinical and non-clinical samples. The overall internal consistency Cronbach alpha score of the scale was found to be .97. According to the factor analysis, in Turkish adaptation, two factors were found
namely “acceptance” and “rejection”. According to the results, the IPARQ was found to be a reliable and valid scale, measuring acceptance-rejection from the intimate partner in Turkey (Varan, 2003).

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

In order to assess early maladaptive schemas, Young Schema Questionnaire – Short Form 3 (YSQ-SF3) was used in the study. The original long form of the scale consisted of 205 items measuring 16 schemas (Schmidt, Joiner, Young, & Telch, 1995). Young (1990) developed a short version of that form, consisting of 75 items assessing 15 schemas. This scale of YSQ-SF3 measures 18 early maladaptive schemas, grouped into five domains with 90 items (Young, 1999; Young et al., 2003). The scale is a 6-point likert-type scale ranging from (1) completely untrue to (6) it describes me perfectly (see Appendix E). Studies investigating the psychometric qualities of the scale found that the scale high test-retest reliability and internal consistency values. (Schmidt et al.,1995).

Turkish adaptation of YSQ-SF3 was conducted by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, and Çakır (2009) among university students. According to this study, 14 factors of early maladaptive schemas, grouping into original five schema domains, were found. The five schema domains were namely; 1) disconnection/rejection (emotional deprivation, abandonment, defectiveness, and social isolation/mistrust schemas), 2) impaired autonomy and performance (vulnerability to harm or illness, enmeshment/dependence, and failure schemas), 3) impaired limits (entitlement/insufficient self-control schema), 4) other directedness (self-sacrifice, and approval seeking schemas), and 5) unrelenting standards (pessimism, emotional inhibition, unrelenting standards, and punishment schemas). The Turkish adaptation preserved the 90-item, 6-point likert-type structure of the scale.

Assessing the reliability and the validity of YSQ-SF3, Soygüt et al. (2009) found that test-retest reliability values ranged from .66 to .83 for five schema domains, and ranged from .66 to .88 for early maladaptive schemas. Moreover, internal consistency Cronbach alpha coefficients were found to be ranging from .53
to .81 for schema domains, and ranging from .63 to .80 for early maladaptive schemas.

Convergent validity measurement of the scale was also conducted by Soygüt et al. (2009), using Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R)’s subscales. YSQ-SF3’s schema domains were revealed to be having significant convergent validity with depression subscale (for schema domains ranging between $r = .55 - .68$, $p < .01$), anxiety subscale (for schema domains ranging between $r = .18 - .54$, $p < .01$), and interpersonal sensitivity subscale (for schema domains ranging between $r = .20 - .60$, $p < .01$).

3.3. Procedure

Before gathering data from participants, the required permission for research with human participants was taken from The Applied Ethics Research Center of Middle East Technical University. Then, an online survey was developed on www.surveymonkey.com consisted of demographic information form, and scales of the study measures. Participants were gathered through snowball sampling by asking them to invite their married friends or relatives to participate in the study in order to reach more married individuals. Individuals who agreed to participate in the study signed an informed consent form before they were presented scales of the measures.

Statistical analyses of gathered data was conducted via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After data cleaning, descriptive analyses of demographic variables and study variables were conducted. While gender differences for measures of the study were examined through one-way ANOVAs and MANOVA, participants’ ages’ and length of the marriage’s relationship with study variables were tested by using bivariate correlations. Later on, a zero-order correlation analysis was conducted in order to evaluate the relationship among measures of the study. Lastly, in order to investigate schema domains’ mediator role in the relationship between parental (maternal and paternal) rejection and intimate partner rejection, mediation analyses via Bootstrap sampling method were employed.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this section, data screening and descriptive statistics of study variables were presented, to begin with. Following, influences of demographic variables on study variables were stated. After displaying inter-correlations among study variables, results of mediation analyses were given finally.

4.1. Data Screening Prior to Analyses

All variables were examined for accuracy of data entry, outliers, multicollinearity, normality, and linearity. Six univariate outliers with extreme z scores, and three multivariate outliers identified through Mahalonobis distance were deleted. Therefore, 228 cases remained for main analyses. Afterwards, normality assumption, controlling skewness and kurtosis values for all variables, and linearity assumption, through normal and detrended probability plots were checked. Lastly multicollinearity assumption was tested through controlling the tolerance and VIF in linear regression analysis. All variables’ tolerance and VIF scores were in the normal range; therefore, no multicollinearity was detected among variables.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

For Maternal Acceptance-Rejection, Paternal Acceptance-Rejection, and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection, after required reverse scoring, sum of all scores were calculated to reach the overall rejection scores of mother, father, and intimate partner. On the other hand, for Schema Domains, mean scores of each five domain (disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy/performance, impaired limits, other directedness, and unrelenting standards) were used in the analysis. As can be seen in Table 3, means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum score ranges
were calculated for descriptive information of study variables.

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Minimum-Maximum Scores of Study Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum-Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Acceptance-Rejection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Maternal Rejection</td>
<td>100.40</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>64-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Paternal Rejection</td>
<td>104.76</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>67-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intimate Partner Rejection</td>
<td>93.15</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>63-168.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Maladaptive Schema Domains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection/Rejection</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00-3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Autonomy and Performance</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00-3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Limits</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00-5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Directedness</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.18-5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelenting Standards</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.11-4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Influences of Demographic Variables on Study Variables

To begin with, gender differences in maternal, paternal, and intimate partner rejection scores were examined through separate one-way ANOVAs. Afterwards, in order to investigate gender influence on early maladaptive schema domains,
Multivariate Analysis (MANOVA) was conducted. Lastly, relationships between study variables and demographic variables of age and length of marriage were assessed through Pearson Correlation analyses.

In order to examine gender difference for Maternal Acceptance-Rejection, Paternal Acceptance-Rejection and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection three separate one-way ANOVA’s were conducted. As can be seen in table 4, results did not reveal a significant main effect of gender on neither Overall Maternal Rejection \( F(1,226) = 0.18, p > .05 \) nor Overall Intimate Partner Rejection \( F(1,226) = 3.12, p > .05 \). On the other hand, gender was found to be having a significant main effect on Overall Paternal Rejection \( F(1,226) = 6.58, p < .05 \) (see Table 4). When each gender’s means were compared, males \((M = 108.64)\) scored significantly higher on Overall Father Rejection than females \((M = 98.91)\). In other words, males perceived higher rejection from their fathers than females did.

Table 4. Gender Influence on Overall Maternal Acceptance, Overall Paternal Acceptance, and Overall Intimate Partner Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Maternal Rejection</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Paternal Rejection</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>6.58*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intimate Partner Rejection</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .05 \)

The gender differences for five schema domains were measured by using Multivariate Analysis. As can be seen in Table 5, MANOVA results displayed a significant main effect for gender on Early Maladaptive Schemas \( F(5,222) = 4.72, p < .001; \) Wilk’s Lambda = .90; partial \( \eta^2 = .09 \). Following, univariate analyses were conducted for significant main effect of gender on Schema Domains with application of Bonferroni adjustment. Alpha values lower than .01
(i.e. .05/5) were considered significant. Results revealed a significant main effect of gender only on the schema domain of Disconnection/Rejection \(F(1,226) = 6.80, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02\) (see Table 5). When gender’s means are compared, males \((M = 1.91)\) revealed significantly higher disconnection/rejection schema domain scores than females \((M = 1.70)\). On the other hand, according to univariate analyses, gender main effects on Impaired Autonomy and Performance Domain \(F(1,226) = 0.43, p > .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .002\), Impaired Limits Domain \(F(1,226) = 0.11, p > .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001\), Other Directedness Domain \(F(1,226) = 1.57, p > .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .007\), and Unrelenting Standards Domain \(F(1,226) = 3.43, p > .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .01\) were not significant (see Table 5).

Table 5. Gender Influence on Early Maladaptive Schema Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>Multivariate F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Multivariate (\eta^2)</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>Univariate (\eta^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schema</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.72***</td>
<td>5,222</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D./R.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.80*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.L.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.D.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; *p < .01


Measuring the relationship between participants’ ages and study variables were conducted using Pearson Correlation analyses. According to the results, age was not found to be significantly correlated to any of the study measures; Overall Maternal Rejection \([r = .11, p > .05]\), Overall Paternal Rejection \([r = .02, p > .05]\), Overall Intimate Partner Rejection \([r = .13, p > .05]\), and Schema Domains of
Disconnection/Rejection \( r = .02, \ p > .05 \), Impaired Autonomy and Performance \( r = -.05, \ p > .05 \), Impaired Limits \( r = -.05, \ p > .05 \), Other Directedness \( r = -.04, \ p > .05 \), and Unrelenting Standards \( r = .09, \ p > .05 \).

The length of the marriage’s relationship with study measures was also examined by using Pearson Correlation analyses. The results revealed that the length of the marriage was not significantly correlated to any of the study variables; Overall Maternal Rejection \( r = .07, \ p > .05 \), Overall Paternal Rejection \( r = -.05, \ p > .05 \), Overall Intimate Partner Rejection \( r = .10, \ p > .05 \), and Schema Domains of Disconnection/Rejection \( r = -.04, \ p > .05 \), Impaired Autonomy and Performance \( r = -.12, \ p > .05 \), Impaired Limits \( r = -.08, \ p > .05 \), Other Directedness \( r = -.05, \ p > .05 \), and Unrelenting Standards \( r = .043, \ p > .05 \).

The relationship between demographic variables and dependent variable of the study was not significant. Therefore, demographic variables were not included in further analyses.

Table 6. Correlation Coefficients among Age, Length of Marriage, and Study Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Maternal Rejection</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Paternal Rejection</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intimate Partner Rejection</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection/Rejection</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Autonomy</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Limits</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Directedness</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelenting Standards</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Inter-Correlations among Study Variables

In order to evaluate relationships among the study variables of Overall Maternal Rejection, Overall Paternal Rejection, Overall Intimate Partner Rejection, and Early Maladaptive Schema Domains, bivariate Pearson Correlation analyses were conducted. Correlations are given in Table 7.

As can be seen in Table 7, Overall Maternal Rejection was significantly correlated to Overall Intimate Partner Rejection ($r = .38, p < .001$). Overall Paternal Rejection was also significantly correlated to Overall Intimate Partner ($r = .29, p < .001$). Therefore, it can be concluded that as remembered rejection in childhood from either mother or father increased, perceived rejection from intimate partner also increased, as hypothesized.

In addition, the results revealed a significant positive correlation between Overall Maternal Rejection and all schema domains namely Disconnection/Rejection ($r = .47, p < .001$), Impaired Autonomy and Performance ($r = .43, p < .001$), Impaired Limits ($r = .14, p < .05$), Other Directedness ($r = .20, p < .01$), and Unrelenting Standards ($r = .30, p < .001$). There were also significant positive correlations between Overall Paternal Rejection and all Schema Domains namely Disconnection/Rejection ($r = .45, p < .001$), Impaired Autonomy and Performance ($r = .42, p < .001$), Impaired Limits ($r = .15, p < .05$), Other Directedness ($r = .13, p < .05$), and Unrelenting Standards ($r = .25, p < .001$) (see Table 7). As a result, same as hypothesized, when remembered rejection from mother or father escalated, early maladaptive schema domain scores also escalated.

When schema domains’ correlation with overall intimate partner rejection is concerned, the Pearson Correlation analyses showed that the schema domains of Disconnection/Rejection ($r = .50, p < .001$), Impaired Autonomy and Performance ($r = .44, p < .001$), and Unrelenting Standards ($r = .21, p < .01$) had significant positive correlation with Overall Intimate Partner Rejection (see Table 7). In other words, as the schema domain scores of Disconnection/Rejection, Impaired Autonomy and Performance, or Unrelenting Standards increased, intimate partner rejection also increased.
Table 7. Inter-correlations among Variables of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>D./R.</th>
<th>I. A.</th>
<th>I. L.</th>
<th>O. D.</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D./R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. L.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05

4.5. Mediation Analyses

Aiming to test the hypothesis that early maladaptive schema domains would mediate the relationship between parental (both maternal and paternal) acceptance-rejection and intimate partner acceptance rejection in married individuals, mediation analyses were conducted. Because it is suggested for more powerful and accurate estimates, and allows employing a multiple mediator model, mediation analyses were conducted by using Bootstrap sampling method (Preacher & Hayes, 2004), rather than the traditional path analyses proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). Analyses were conducted via “indirect custom dialog” for SPSS (Preacher & Hayes, 2008), which are present on the website www.afhayes.com.

In order to examine the significance of indirect effects in mediation model, by Bootstrapped sampling, 5000 resamples were generated from the original data set, and confidence intervals (CI) of the indirect effects were evaluated. Indirect effects whose 95% CI did not include zero were considered to be statistically significant. Two separate mediation analyses for the two predictors of the model, overall maternal rejection and overall paternal rejection, were conducted. Criterion was overall intimate partner rejection, and tested mediators were five schema domains (disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, impaired limits, other directedness, and unrelenting standards).

4.5.1. Mediator Role of Early Maladaptive Schema Domains between Overall Maternal Rejection and Overall Intimate Partner Rejection

According to the results of mediation analysis through Bootstrapping method, total effect (path c) of overall maternal rejection on overall intimate partner rejection was significant ($B = .33, SE = .05, p < .001$). In other words, maternal rejection significantly predicted rejection from intimate partner, meaning that married individuals perceiving rejection from their mothers were more likely to perceive rejection from their intimate partners. Additionally, overall maternal rejection significantly predicted all schema domains namely; disconnection/rejection (path $a_{1}$)
When direct effects of schema domains on intimate partner rejection (b paths) were investigated, results revealed that only disconnection/rejection schema domain had a significant direct effect on overall intimate partner rejection (path b_1) \((B = 16.87, SE = 4.42, p < .001)\). Other schema domains; impaired autonomy (path b_2) \((B = 5.37, SE = 3.89, p > .05)\), impaired limits (path b_3) \((B = -1.82, SE = 1.82, p > .05)\), other directedness (path b_4) \((B = -1.45, SE = 2.37, p > .05)\), and unrelenting standards (path b_5) \((B = -3.67, SE = 3.65, p > .05)\) did not display a significant direct effect on overall intimate partner rejection. Moreover, direct effect of overall maternal rejection on overall intimate partner rejection (path c’) significant \((B = .16, SE = .05, p < .01)\), indicating a partial mediation (See Figure 1).

In order to investigate whether Early Maladaptive Schema Domains mediated the relationship between rejection from mother and rejection from intimate partner, indirect effects were examined via Bootstrapping method. The indirect effect of overall maternal rejection on intimate partner rejection through disconnection/rejection schema domain was significant because the confidence interval did not include zero; \(B = .16, SE = .04, 95\% CI [.07, .29]\). On the other hand, indirect effects of maternal rejection on intimate partner rejection through impaired autonomy; \(B = .04, SE = .05, 95\% CI [-.03, .15]\), impaired limits; \(B = -.008, SE = .008, 95\% CI [-.03, .004]\), other directedness; \(B = -.008, SE = .01, 95\% CI [-.04, .01]\), and unrelenting standards; \(B = -.02, SE = .02, 95\% CI [-.07, .01]\) were not significant since their confidence intervals included zero. In brief, only disconnection/rejection schema domain partially mediated the relationship between maternal rejection and intimate partner rejection. Lastly, the overall model explained 28% of the variance; adjusted \(R^2 = .28, F (6, 221) = 16.01, p < .001\).
4.5.2. Mediator Role of Early Maladaptive Schema Domains between Overall Paternal Rejection and Overall Intimate Partner Rejection

Mediation analysis through Bootstrap sampling method was conducted, and paternal rejection’s total effect on intimate partner rejection (path c) was found to be significant \((B = .27, SE = .05, p < .001)\). In other words, paternal rejection significantly predicted rejection from intimate partner, meaning that married individuals perceiving rejection from their fathers were more likely to perceive rejection from their intimate partners. Overall paternal rejection also had significant direct effects on all schema domains namely; disconnection/rejection (path a₁) \((B = .009, SE = .001, p < .001)\), impaired autonomy (path a₂) \((B = .009, SE = .001, p < .001)\), impaired limits (path a₃) \((B = .005, SE = .002, p < .001)\), other directedness (path a₄) \((B = .004, SE = .001, p < .005)\), and unrelenting standards (path a₅) \((B = .006, SE = .001, p < .001)\). Moreover, direct effects of schema domains on intimate partner rejection were examined. While it was found that disconnection/rejection had a significant direct effect on rejection from intimate partner (path b₁) \((B = 18.73, SE = 4.47, p < .001)\), all the other schema domains; impaired autonomy (path b₂) \((B = 5.37, SE = 3.89, p > .05)\), impaired limits (path b₃) \((B = -1.82, SE = 1.82, p > .05)\), other directedness (path b₄) \((B = -1.45, SE = 2.37, p > .05)\), and unrelenting standards (path b₅) \((B = -3.67, SE = 3.65, p > .05)\) did not reveal a significant direct effect on overall intimate partner rejection. In addition, direct effect of overall paternal rejection on overall intimate partner rejection was not significant (path c’) \((B = .06, SE = .05, p > .05)\), indicating a full mediation (See Figure 2).

Mediation analysis through Bootstrapping method was used in order to investigate whether schema domains mediated the relationship between parental rejection and rejection from intimate partner. The indirect effect of overall paternal rejection on intimate partner rejection through disconnection/rejection schema domain was significant because the confidence interval did not include zero; \(B = .18, SE = .05, 95\% CI [.08, .32]\). However, indirect effects of paternal rejection on intimate partner rejection through impaired autonomy; \(B = .05, SE = .06, 95\% CI [-.03, .15]\), impaired limits; \(B = -.009, SE = .009, 95\% CI [-.03, .003]\), other
directedness; \( B = -0.04, SE = 0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.03, 0.01] \), and unrelenting standards; \( B = -0.02, SE = 0.02, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.07, 0.01] \) were not significant since their confidence intervals included zero. Therefore, only disconnection/rejection schema domain significantly mediated the relationship between paternal rejection and intimate partner rejection. Lastly, the overall model explained 26% of the variance; adjusted \( R^2 = .26, F (6, 221) = 14.41, p < .001 \)
**Figure 1.** Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship between Overall Maternal Rejection and Overall Intimate Partner Rejection, Mediated by Early Maladaptive Schema Domains

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Figure 2. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship between Overall Paternal Rejection and Overall Intimate Partner Rejection, Mediated by Early Maladaptive Schema Domains

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this section, findings gained through statistical analyses were evaluated in the light of both previous findings and theoretical views. Afterwards, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research were presented. Finally, clinical implications and general conclusion of the findings were stated.

5.1. Evaluation of the Findings

5.1.1 Discussion of Findings Regarding the Relationship between Demographic Variables and Study Variables

5.1.1.1 Discussion of Findings Regarding the Relationship between Demographic Variables and Parental Acceptance-Rejection

Firstly, findings regarding gender influence on parental rejection scores were discussed. It was revealed that while gender did not have a significant effect on maternal rejection, its’ influence on overall paternal rejection was significant. More specifically, while there was no gender difference in rejection from mother, males reported higher paternal rejection than females did. Although meta-analyses carried out by Khaleque and Rohner (2002), and Rohner and Khaleque (2010) found no significant gender difference, this finding is consistent with Chyung and Lee (2008)’s study among Korean young adults, Rohner et al. (2008)’s study among Japanese adults, and Kazarian et al. (2010)’s study among Lebanese individuals, which also found that although there is no difference of gender in perceived maternal warmth or rejection, men evaluated their fathers to be more rejecting than women
did. When Turkish studies are evaluated, Varan (2005) found no gender difference in either maternal or paternal rejection. On the other hand, similarly with the finding of the current study, both İşik (2010) and Yakın (2011) resulted that men perceived higher rejection from their father than women did; however, there were no gender difference for maternal rejection.

The fact that males perceiving themselves more rejected by their fathers than females can be explained the discrepancies in gender-specific relationships between parents and their offspring in Turkey. Turkish mothers are emotionally close and expressive to both their daughters and sons. However, fathers communicate more formally and rigidly towards their sons (Kiray, 1976) while being more emotionally involved and tolerant to their daughters (Sunar, 2002). Although Turkish daughters are more closely controlled and limited in their acts during childhood and adolescence compared to sons (Ataca, 1992), for Turkish families control in childrearing does not mean lack of warmth, like it does for Western cultures (Kağıtçibaşı & Sunar, 1992). Therefore, although they are given more autonomy and independence in their actions, Turkish males perceive less emotional acceptance from their fathers than females did.

According to findings, both age and length of marriage was not significantly related to maternal or paternal rejection. This finding is consistent with Rohner (1986)’s suggestion that damaging experiences and feelings of rejection in childhood extends into adulthood, and remains stable. Therefore, it can be suggested that throughout the adulthood, remembered parental rejection level from parents is fairly persistent over time.

5.1.2. Discussion of Findings Regarding the Relationship between Demographic Variables and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection.

The first demographic variable to evaluate in terms of intimate partner rejection is gender. Results found no significant difference between males and females in terms of perceived rejection from intimate partner. This finding is consistent with Ripoll-Nuñez and Alvarez (2008)’s study among Colombian and
Puerto Rican individuals, and Turkish studies conducted by Varan (2005), Eryüksel (2006), and Varan et al. (2008), which all found no gender difference in perceived intimate partner rejection. Only Chyung and Lee (2008)’s study among Korean college students revealed a gender difference, men perceiving their partners more rejecting than women perceived theirs. This discrepancy may be causing from the cultural differences, since other Turkish studies’ also did not find a gender difference.

Moreover, the relationship between intimate partner rejection and demographic variables of age and length of marriage was examined. The results demonstrated that age and marriage length were not significantly related to overall intimate partner rejection. In other words, it can be suggested that married individuals’ perceiving themselves as accepted or rejected by their intimate partners des not change according to their ages or their marriage duration.

5.1.1.3. Discussion of Findings Regarding the Relationship between Demographic Variables and Early Maladaptive Schemas

To begin with, gender influence on early maladaptive schema domains was examined. According to current study’s findings, a significant gender difference was only revealed for disconnection/rejection schema domain. Males scored higher than females in disconnection/rejection schema domain, which refers to insecure and unsatisfying attachment to others, and the belief that one’s emotional needs for warmth, acceptance, empathy, and care will remain unmet (Young et al., 2003). Dissimilar to current finding, studies of Camara and Calvete (2012) among Spanish youths, and Shorey et al. (2012) among American individuals resulted that women presented higher early maladaptive schema scores than men, including most schemas from disconnection/rejection domain. However, studies of Gök (2012) and Ünal (2012) among Turkish individuals both concluded that males had higher disconnection/rejection domain scores than females, similarly with the finding of this study. Therefore, sociocultural differences might have caused this difference among findings. In Turkish culture, males are not encouraged for expressing their emotions,
and when they show their emotional sides, they are prejudiced for not being “men enough” (Atabek, 1998). Hence, men in Turkey may be disconnected from their parts that have emotional needs of affection, warmth, and care, resulting in not being able to meeting those needs.

Findings did not display a relationship between schema domains and either age or length of marriage. That is to say maladaptive schema levels did not change according to age of the participants or duration of their marriages. Thus, this finding reassured Young et al. (2003)’s definition of early maladaptive schemas that they are extremely firm and persistent cognitive structures, carried out by the individual throughout the lifespan.

5.1.2. Discussion of Findings Regarding Inter-Correlations among Measures of the Study

This section evaluates the inter-relationships among study variables. Firstly, the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection (including overall maternal rejection and overall paternal rejection) and intimate partner acceptance-rejection was evaluated. Later on, parental acceptance-rejection’s link with early maladaptive schema domains was assessed. Lastly, the correlation between schema domains and intimate partner acceptance-rejection was examined.

5.1.2.1. Discussion of the Correlations between Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection

According to results, both overall maternal and overall paternal rejection was positively correlated to overall intimate partner rejection. In other words, as remembered rejection in childhood from either mother or father increase, perceived rejection from intimate partner in adulthood also increase for married individuals, as hypothesized. This result is consistent with findings of Chyung and Lee (2008)’s study among Korean college students, Parmar and Rohner (2008)’s research among Indian married adults, Parmar et al. (2008)’s study among married individuals from
Kuwait, and Turkish studies conducted by Varan (2005), Eryavuz (2006), Varan et al. (2008), and Karpat (2010), which all revealed that rejection from either mother or father is related to rejection from intimate partner.

The continuity of parent-child relationship to adulthood intimate relationships is a focused topic by attachment theorists (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, 1990), and it was suggested that one’s attachment style towards his/her parents reveals itself in intimate relationships in adulthood. Likewise in PARTheory, Rohner (1986) also emphasized the important effects of feeling rejected by parents and lack of warmth and affection in early years of life, which extend into adulthood social, especially intimate, relationships, as current study’s findings suggests. PARTheory (Rohner, 1986) explains this relationship between childhood and adulthood through mental representations, which are cognitive structures formed during childhood and affect individuals’ perception of themselves, others, and world around them. The mediator role of these persistent mental representations in the relationship between remember childhood rejection from parents and perceived rejection from intimate partner will be evaluated through discussion of the mediation analyses in detail.

5.1.2.2. Discussion of the Correlations between Parental Rejection and Early Maladaptive Schema Domains

Perceived parental rejection’s link with early maladaptive schemas was also investigated in this study. Consistently with study’s hypothesis, as perceived rejection from either mother or father escalated, all schema domain (disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, impaired limits, other directedness, and unrelenting standards) scores also increased. This finding is in line with existing literature: Early maladaptive schemas were found to be related with remembered negative parenting practices in earlier studies (Harris & Curtin, 2002; Cecero, Nelson & Gillie, 2004; Gök, 2012). Moreover, the connection between early maladaptive schemas and remembered rejection in childhood was also specifically investigated. Thimm (2010a) revealed that while paternal rejection was significantly related to all schema domains, maternal rejection was significantly correlated to all domains but
impaired limits. Similarly, SarTaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press) examined the connection between maternal rejection and schema domains in university students, and found that maternal rejection was significantly related to all domains but impaired limits-unrelenting standards. Therefore, a slight dissimilarity between current findings and the findings of Thimm (2010a) and SarTaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press) can be detected.

Current finding of parental rejection’s relationship with early maladaptive schemas can be explained through Schema Model. Schema Theory suggests, primarily toxic childhood experiences with parents develops the roots of early maladaptive schemas (Young, 1999). Parents not meeting core emotional needs of the child results in construction of these rigid, persistent, and maladaptive cognitive structures, which are carried by the individual through the lifespan and create the cognitive templates of one’s view about the world around him/her (Young et al., 2003). Similarly, Rohner (1986) also mentions this concept as mental representations. Therefore, current finding is consistent with both Schema Theory’s and PARTheory’s suggestions.

This relationship between parental rejection in childhood and early maladaptive schemas can also be considered specifically for each schema domain. People with prominent disconnection/rejection schema domain are typically raised by cold, unaffectionate, rejecting, abusive, and unstable parents (Young et al., 2003). However, as Rohner (1986) and Young et al. (2003) suggests, all individuals have a need for warmth, care, affection, and empathy. When this need for stability, care, affection, and acceptance is not met in early years of life, one may develop a persistent belief that their emotional needs will never be met. Therefore, this finding that parental rejection is related to disconnection/rejection domain is understandable. Impaired autonomy domain refers to the belief that one is unable to function and survive independently, without others’ involvement (Young et al., 2003). Rejection from parents by neglecting the child’s successes and belittling his/her independent performance, therefore, may be related to this schema domains’ development, as findings of this study suggests. Impaired limits schema domain is characterized by one’s describing him/herself as superior than others, and not following
responsibilities to others or committing with long-term goals. Typically parents of individuals with impaired limits schema domain are overindulgent, lack of directing the child in a discipline (Young, 1999). Current study’s finding that parental rejection is significantly linked with impaired limits domain may be explained in a way that schemas in this domain can also be rooted from child being neglected or extremely focused on his/her defects. Consequently, the child develops a sense of superiority and entitlement as compensating the feeling of defectiveness and rejection (Young et al., 2003). People with other directedness schema domain extremely focus on gaining others’ approval and avoiding their rejection at the expense of their own feelings, thoughts, and desires, and their family of origin is usually show conditional acceptance to them (Young et al., 2003). Therefore, when revealing the child’s own feelings or desires are discouraged and his/her authentic self is rejected and suppressed by parents, one can acquire a maladaptive belief that he/she should live through other people’s responses and approval to gain love and acceptance from them. Lastly, the unrelenting standards schema domain refers to inhibiting one’s spontaneity and impulses in order to reach the extremely rigid and internalized standards and high performance (Young et al., 2003). Parental rejection’s relationship with unrelenting standards domain is reasonable because rejecting the child as who he/she is and demanding more from him/her may be linked with one’s developing these rigid and high standards.

5.1.2.3. Discussion of the Correlations between Early Maladaptive Schemas and Intimate Partner Rejection

Results displayed that the schema domains of disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy, and unrelenting standards are significantly correlated with perceived intimate partner rejection. In other words, as scores of disconnection/rejection, impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards increase, perceived rejection from spouse also increased among married individuals. There is no research to this point investigating the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and perceived rejection from intimate partner. However, consistently with current findings, earlier
research reached significant associations between schemas and some relationship constructs, such as intimacy (Stiles, 2004), jealousy (Dobrenski, 2001; Göral-Alkan, 2010), and relationship satisfaction (Göral-Alkan, 2010; Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012).

The relationship between early maladaptive schemas and perceived rejection from intimate partner can be evaluated specific to schema domains. People with disconnection/rejection schema domain, to begin with, are defined as having difficulties in forming secure attachment to others and feeling connectedness in close relationships (Young, 1999). Moreover, because this schema domain is also related with the belief that others will not be able to meet their emotional needs of love, warmth, affection, stability etc., individuals may carry on this rigid belief by selecting partners that are cold, unstable, criticizing, and rejecting, or perceive their partners in these ways. On the other hand, because impaired autonomy schema domain is characterized by one’s maladaptive expectation that he/she will not perform, survive, and function independently (Young et al., 2003), individuals with schemas in this domain may be unable stand to be separated from their partners even if their partners are triggering their schemas; therefore, they may be stuck in relationships in which they feel rejected. Finally, unrelenting standards schema domain’s significant correlation with intimate partner rejection may be coming from the fact that people in this domain have excessive and rigid expectations from others as well as themselves (Young & Kolosko, 1994). In other words, individuals with unrelenting standards schema domain may have extreme and unrealistic criteria of how an intimate, loving partner should be; consequently, they may perceive their partners rejecting because of not meeting their standards.

5.1.3. Discussion of Mediating Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas in the Relationship between Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection

The main hypothesis of the study was that early maladaptive schemas would mediate the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and intimate partner acceptance-rejection. Following research question was that which schema domain(s)
would play the mediating role in this relationship. Accordingly, findings displayed that disconnection/rejection schema domain partially mediated the relationship between overall maternal rejection and overall intimate partner rejection. Moreover, disconnection/rejection schema domain fully mediated the relationship between overall paternal rejection and overall intimate partner rejection. Therefore, it can be suggested that disconnection/rejection domain played a significant mediator role in the connection between remembered parental rejection in childhood and perceived intimate partner rejection in adulthood for married individuals. This model has not been investigated in existing literature. However, although not about the intimate relationships, Sarıtaş-Atalar and Gençöz (in press)’s study found a significant mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in the relationship between perceived maternal rejection in childhood and psychological adjustment in adulthood. In addition, Thimm (2010a) also revealed a mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in the relationship between parental rejection and personality disorder symptoms. Thus, both studies indicate the significant mediating role of these persistent mental representations in the relationship between childhood and adulthood, consistently with present findings. As mentioned above, although this model has not been examined in the literature, both PARTheory and Schema Model have suggested its theoretical background.

To begin with, this result is consistent with PARTheory’s explanation for extension of childhood into adulthood. Rohner (1986) stated that perceived rejection in childhood shows its’ harmful effects in adult life, and this continuity occurs through mental representations. Individuals who feel rejected by their parents develop distorted mental representations, similar to internal working models mentioned in attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973), about themselves, others and the world around them, which in turn results in damaging effects in their psychological adjustment and close relationships (Rohner, 2004). Current finding of disconnection/rejection schema domain’s mediating role, thus, fit with this theoretical background because early maladaptive schemas are rigid, persistent, and repetitive cognitive structures formed in childhood, and later experiences are evaluated through the glasses of these maladaptive cognitive patterns (Young, 1999),
just like PARTheory’s definition of mental representations.

According to Schema Model, disconnection/rejection schema domain refers to insecure attachment to others, and lack of connection, safety, affection, and stability in interpersonal relationships, especially intimate relationships. In fact, earlier research also presented disconnection/rejection domains’ and consisting schemas predictive role on relationship dissatisfaction (Göral-Alkan, 2010; Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012). Furthermore, people with schemas in disconnection/rejection domain are generally the most traumatized and exposed to toxic childhood experiences in early years of their lives (Young et al., 2003). Therefore, mediator role of this domain in present study’s findings can be evaluated as rejecting parenting by being distant, neglecting or abusive from either mother or father in childhood predicts the formation of the belief that others will not be trustworthy, caring, loving, and secure enough to meet one’s need for acceptance, stability, security, and affection, because these core emotional needs were not met by parents in childhood. Schema domain of disconnection/rejection’s development, in turn, predicts perceiving rejection, and lack of warmth, and affection from one’s intimate partner, such as the experiences with rejecting parents among married individuals.

This result can be explained through the concept of “schema chemistry” Young et al. (2003) proposed. This concept states that because of schemas’ self-maintaining nature, individuals choose partners that will trigger and strengthen their early maladaptive schemas (Young & Gluhoski, 1997), which are emotional and mental representations of childhood unmet needs of stability, nurturance, affection, and secure attachment (Atkinson, 2012). Another explanation may be that because of the rigid and distorted belief, formed as a result of rejecting parenting, that one’s emotional needs will remain unmet, married individuals with this schema domain may perceive their partners as more rejecting than they really are.

Finally, different outcomes in the model according to gender of the parents can be discussed. Disconnection/rejection schema domain fully mediated the relationship between paternal rejection and intimate partner rejection. Hence, it can be suggested that the association between married individuals’ remembered rejection from their fathers and perceived rejection from their wives/husbands occurred through the
schema domain of disconnection/rejection. On the other hand, disconnection/rejection domain partially mediated the relationship between maternal rejection and intimate partner rejection. Therefore, part of the relationship between maternal rejection in childhood and perceived rejection from the spouse in adulthood can be more directly formed. In addition, mothers in Turkish culture are more emotionally involved with their children, expressing more openly their both positive and negative emotions than fathers (Kağıtçıbaşı, Sunar, & Bekman, 1988). Therefore, it can also be suggested that there might be other affectional factors mediating or moderating the relationship between perceived parenting from mother, which is emotionally enriched, and intimate partner rejection.

5.2. Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

The first limitation of the study concerns sample characteristics. Most of the participants having higher education (from high school, university and graduate school) and coming from cities and metropolitan cities decreases generalizability of the findings to married populations with dissimilar characteristics living in Turkey. Therefore, increased focus on individuals from more rural parts or participants with lower education levels is needed in future research for more generalizable results to Turkish population.

Secondly, using self-report measures might have resulted in some drawbacks to the study, as well. Subjective perceptions for evaluation of parental rejection and partner rejection are given much more importance than objective evaluations in PARTheory. However, early maladaptive schemas are rather implicit cognitive structures. Therefore, individuals might have not been able to utterly reveal their prominent schemas with a self-report questionnaire.

Another limitation is retrospective feature of the study. Although participants were instructed to consider their relationships with parents during childhood, present relationships might have affected the way they perceive their parents, as well. For further research, longitudinal studies may bring richer information about both how individuals’ perception about parents changes over the years, and the development of
early maladaptive schemas over time can be assessed.

Moreover, assessing married individuals, but not couples can be mentioned as a limitation of the study. Besides individual dynamics, examining how each partner’s own schemas, parental remembrances and partner perceptions interact with each other would contribute more information about couples’ and each gender’s dynamics in marriage. Therefore, it is recommended for future studies for investigating the topic on couple basis.

5.3. Clinical Implications of the Study

First clinical implication of the study regards the role of early maladaptive schemas in the connection between past experiences with parents and current relationship with one’s partner. Problems of married individuals who feel that their emotional needs are not met by their partner can be comprehended through examining both remembered childhood experiences with their parents and their maladaptive schemas formed accordingly with these past experiences. Married individuals also can realize origins and schema related processes of current emotional problems with their partners. Furthermore, because disconnection/rejection domain revealed to be mediating schema domain in the relationship between past parental and present intimate relationships, clinicians can investigate and offer specific treatments for relationship problems by focusing mostly on healing schemas in this domain.

Moreover, current empirical findings revealed the importance of childhood parental relationships on current mental representations about the world and close relationships. Therefore, intervention programs for parents may be developed in order to educate both mothers and father about the significance of childhood acceptance and core emotional needs on their children’s social development and adulthood intimate relationships.
5.5. Conclusion

Present study aimed to investigate the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and intimate partner acceptance-rejection for married individuals, and mediating role of early maladaptive schemas in this connection. Results revealed that, among married individuals, remembered rejection from mother or father was significantly related to perceived rejection from intimate partner. Moreover, disconnection/schema domain significantly mediated the relationship between parental (both maternal and paternal) rejection and intimate partner rejection.

Although its theoretical background has been proposed earlier by PARTheory (Rohner, 1986), current study is the first research to test and demonstrate the important mediating role of persistent cognitive constructs in the connection between remembered parental acceptance-rejection and perceived intimate partner rejection among married individuals. Therefore, bringing more light to the hypothesized continuity between childhood parental relations and adulthood feelings of acceptance-rejection in marriage, findings of this study presented an empirical support for the suggested mediating role of mental representations.
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APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT/GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM/DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

1. Cinsiyetiniz:
   ( ) Kadın
   ( ) Erkek
2. Doğum yılınız: .................
3. Eğitim düzeyiniz
   ( ) İlkokul
   ( ) Ortaokul
   ( ) Lise
   ( ) Üniversite/Yüksekokul
   ( ) Lisansüstü
4. Yaşamınızı çoğu geçirdiğiniz yer:
   ( ) Köy
   ( ) İlçe
   ( ) Şehir
   ( ) Büyükşehir
5. Ne zamandır evlisiniz?
   ..................... yıl ............. ay
6. Şu anki evliliğiniz kaçncı evliliğiniz?
   ............... 
7. Çocuğunuz var mı?
   ( ) Evet (sayınızı yazınız .......
   ( ) Hayır
APPENDIX C

PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION QUESTIONNAIRE/EBEVEYN KABUL-RED ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda anne ve babaların çocuklarına karşı sergiledikleri davranışlarla ilgili bazı cümleler var. Her cümleyi dikkatlice okuyun ve okuduğunuz cümlenin "siz çocukken", annenizin ve babanızın size karşı göstermiş olduğu davranışları ne kadar iyi anladığını düşünün.


Cümledeki davranışın anne veya babanız için ne kadar doğru olduğunu aşağıdaki yönergeye göre puanlandırınız:

1 - Hiçbir zaman doğru değil
2 - Nadiren doğru
3 - Bazen doğru
4 - Hemen hemen her zaman doğru

Anne  Baba
1. ___ ___ Benim hakkında güzel şeyler söylerdi.
2. ___ ___ Kötü davranışımda bana söylenir veya beni azarladı.
3. ___ ___ Sanki ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranırdı.
4. ___ ___ Beni gerçekten sevmezdi.
5. ___ ___ Planlarımız hakkında benimle konuşur ve benim söyleyeceklerimi de dinlerdi.
6. ___ ___ Onun sözünü dinlememiğim zaman beni başкалaraına şikayet ederdi.
7. ___ ___ Benimle yakından ilgilenirdi.
8. ___ ___ Arkadaşlarınımlı eve çağırırmam için beni cesaretlendirir ve onların güzel vakit geçirmesi için elinden geleni yapardı.
9. ___ ___ Benimle alay eder ve dalga geçerdi.
10. ___ ___ Onu rahatsız ediyorum, size benimle ilgilenmeyeceğim.
11. ___ ___ Onunla konuş consulateydım, benimle ilgilenmedi.
12. ___ ___ Onu rahatsız etmiyoruz, benimle ilgilenmeyeceğim.
13. ___ ___ Bana karşı sert davranırdı.
14. ___ ___ Onun etrafında olmadan hoşlandığımda.
15. ___ ___ Bir şeyi iyi yapıp olduğunun, kendimle şaka ederdi.
16. ___ ___ Hak ettiği zaman bile bana vururdu.
17. ___ ___ Benim için yapması gereken şeyleri unuturdu.
18. ___ ___ Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görüyordu.
19. ___ ___ Beni başkalarına överdi.
20. ___ ___ Kızdığı zaman beni çok kötü cezalandırdı.
21. ___ ___ Sağlıklı ve doğru şeyler yememe çok dikkat ederdi.
22. ___ ___ Benimle sıcak ve sevgi dolu bir şekilde konuşurdu.
23. ___ ___ Bana hemen kızırdı.
24. ___ ___ Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldü.
25. ___ ___ Benden hoşlanmıyorum gibi diyor.
26. ___ ___ Hak ettiği zaman bana güzel şeyler söylerdi.
27. ___ ___ Çabuk parlar ve öfkesini benden çıkarırdı.
28. ___ ___ Arkadaşlarının kim olduğuyla yakından ilgilenir.
29. ___ ___ Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir.
30. ___ ___ Ben aile veryol nousk ve nekshunun benimle alay eder.
31. ___ ___ Ondan yardım istediğimde benimle ilgilenmezdi.
32. ___ ___ Başım derde girdiğinde, hatanın beni olduğu düşünüyordu.
33. ___ ___ Bana istenen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğuunu hissettirirdi.
34. ___ ___ Onun sinirine dokunduğunu söylerdi.
35. ___ ___ Bana çok ilgi gösterirdi.
36. ___ ___ İyi davrandığım zaman benimle ne kadar kurşun duyguları söyler
37. ___ ___ Beni küçük için elinden geleni yapardı.
38. ___ ___ Hatırlaması gerekli diye düşünęmgim önemli şeylerı unuturdu.
39. ___ ___ Şayet kötü davranışışam, beni artık sevmediğini hissettirirdi.
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40. ___ ___ Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirirdi
41. ___ ___ Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda beni korkutur veya tehdit ederdi.
42. ___ ___ Benimle zaman geçirmekten hoşlanırdı.
43. ___ ___ Korktuğumda ya da bir şeye canım sıkıldığında, bana yardım etmeye çalışırdı.
44. ___ ___ Kötü davranındaki zaman beni arkadaşlarının önünde utandırırdı.
45. ___ ___ Benden uzak durmaya çalışırdı.
46. ___ ___ Benden şikayet ederdi.
47. ___ ___ Benim ne düşünüğümüze önem verir ve düşünüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanırdı.
48. ___ ___ Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer çocukların benden daha iyi olduğunu düşündü
49. ___ ___ Bir plan yaparken benim de ne istediğime önem verirdi.
50. ___ ___ Benim için önemli olan şeyleri, kendisine zorluk çıkarsa da, yapmama izin verirdi.
51. ___ ___ Diğer çocukların benden daha akıllı ve uslu olduğunu düşünürdü.
52. ___ ___ Bakmaları için beni hep başkalarına bırakırdı.
53. ___ ___ Bana istenmediğimi belli ederdi.
54. ___ ___ Yaptığım şeylerle ilgilenirdi.
55. ___ ___ Canım yandığında veya hasta olduğumda kendimi daha iyi hissetmem için elinden geleni yapardı.
56. ___ ___ Kötü davranındaki zaman benden ne kadar utandığını söylerdi.
57. ___ ___ Beni sevdiğini belli ederdi.
58. ___ ___ Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalpliydi.
59. ___ ___ Kötü davranındaki zaman beni utandırır veya suçlu hissettirirdi
60. ___ ___ Beni mutlu etmeye çalışırdı.
APPENDIX D

YOUNG SCHEMA QUESTIONNAIRE - SHORT FORM 3/
YOUNG ŞEMA ÖLÇEĞİ – KISA FORM3

Aşağıda, kişilerin kendilerini tanımlarken kullandıkları ifadeler sıralanmıştır. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi okuyun ve sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığınıza karar verin. Emin olamadığınız sorularda neyin doğru olabileceğinden çok, sizin duygusal olarak ne hissettüğinize dayanarak cevap verin.

Birkaç soru, anne babanızla ilişkiniz hakkındadır. Eğer biri veya her ikisi şu anda yaşamıyorlarsa, bu soruları o veya onlar hayatta iken ilişkini göz önüne alarak cevaplandırın.

1 den 6’ya kadar olan seçeneklerden sizi tanımlayan en yüksek şıkkı seçerek her sorudan önce yer alan boşluğa yazın.

Derecelendirme:

1- Benim için tamamıyla yanlış
2- Benim için büyük ölçüde yanlış
3- Bana uyan tarafı uymayan tarafından biraz fazla
4- Benim için orta derecede doğru
5- Benim için çoğunlukla doğru
6- Beni mükemmel şekilde tanımlıyor

1. _____ Bana bakan, benimle zaman geçiren, başıma gelen olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenen kimsem olmadı.
2. _____ Beni terk edeceklerinden korktuğum için yakın olduğum insanların peşini bırakmam.
3. _____ İnsanların beni kullandıklarını hissediyorum
4. _____ Benim için tamamıyla yanlış
5. _____ Beğendiğim hiçbir erkek/kadın, kusurlarını görüürse beni sevmez.
6. _____ İş (veya okul) hayatımında neredeyse hiçbir şeyi diğer insanlar kadar iyi
yapamıyorum
7. _____ Günlük yaşamımı tek başına idare edebilme becerisine sahip olduğumu hissetmiyorum.
8. _____ Kötü bir şey olacağı duygusundan kurtulamıyorum.
9. _____ Anne babamdan ayrılmayı, bağımsız hareket edebilme, yaştlarım kadar, başaramadım.
10. _____ Eğer istediğini yaparsam, bağımlılıktan kurtulamıyorum.
11. _____ Genellikle yakınlarına ilgi gösteren ve bakan ben olurum.
12. _____ Olumlu duyugularımı diğerlerine göstermekten utanıyorum (sevdiğim, önemsediyimi göstermek gibi).
13. _____ Yapıcı çok şey de etkisi olmuştur; ikinci olmayı kabul etmemişim.
14. _____ Diğer insanların bir şeyler istediğinde bana “hayır” denmesini çok zor kabul etmemişim.
15. _____ Kendimi sıradan ve sıkıcı işleri yapmaya zorlamam.
16. _____ Paramın olması ve onlarla tanışmak beni değerli yapar.
17. _____ Her şeye yolculuk ederek, bunun bozulacağını hissetmem.
18. _____ Eğer bir yanlış yaparsam, cezalandırılamamak hak ederim.
19. _____ Çevre bana sıcaklık, koruma ve duygusal yakınlık gösteren kimse yok.
20. _____ Diğer insanlara o kadar muhtacım ki onları kaybedeceğini düşünmekte zorlanıyorum.
21. _____ İnsanlara karşı tedbirlerini elden bırakamam ya da onları zarar vermek istemez.
22. _____ Temel olarak diğer insanlardan farklıyım.
23. _____ Gerçek beni tanırlara beğenmeme hiç kimse bana yakın olmayacak istemez.
24. _____ İşleri halletmede son derece yetersizim.
25. _____ Gündelik işlerde kendini başkalarına bağlı biri olarak görüyoruz.
26. _____ Her an bir felaket (doğal, adli, mali veya tıbbi) olabilir diye hayrete düşmem.
27. _____ Annem, babam ve ben birbirimizin hayatı ve sorunlarıyla aşırı ilgili olmaya eğilimliyiz.
28. _____ Diğer insanların isteklerine uymaktan başka yolum yokmuş gibi
hissediyorum; eğer böyle yapmazsam bir şekilde beni reddederler veya intikam alırlar.

29. _____ Başkalarını kendimden daha fazla düşünüğüm için ben iyi bir insanım.

30. _____ Duygularımı diğerlerine açmayı utanç verici bulurum.

31. _____ En iyisini yapmalıyım, “yeterince iyi” ile yetinemem.

32. _____ Ben özel biriyim ve diğer insanlar için konulmuş olan kısıtlamaları veya sınırları kabul etmek zorunda değilim.

33. _____ Eğer hedefime ulaşamazsam kolaylığıyla y活下去 düştüğüm için ben iyi bir insanım.

34. _____ Başkalarının da farkında olduğu başarılardan benim için en değerlisidir.

35. _____ İyi bir şey olursa, bunu kötü bir şeyin izleyecesinden endişe ederim.

36. _____ Eğer yanlış yaparsam, bunun özrü yoktur.

37. _____ Birisi için özel olduğunu hissetmeyim.

38. _____ Yakınların beni terk etmesi ya da ayrılığında endişe duyarım.

39. _____ Herhangi bir anda birleri beni aldatmaya kalkışabilir.

40. _____ Bir yere ait değilim, yalnızım.

41. _____ Başkalarının sevgisine, ilgisine ve saygısına değer bir insan değilim.

42. _____ İş ve başarı alanlarında birçok insan benden daha yeterli.

43. _____ Doğru ile yanlışı birbirinden ayırmakta zorlanırız.

44. _____ Fiziksel bir saldırıya uğramaktan endişe duyarım.

45. _____ Annem, babam ve ben özel hayatımız birbirimizden saklanmadan birbirimizi aldatmamız olmaz.

46. _____ İlişkilerimde, diğer kişinin yönendiricisi olmasını izin veririm.

47. _____ Yakınlarına o kadar meşgulüm ki kendime çok az zaman kalıyor.

48. _____ İnsanlarla beraberken içten ve cana yakın olmak benim için zordur.

49. _____ Tüm sorumluluklarımı yerine getirmek zorundayım.

50. _____ İstediğimi yapmaktan alt konulmaktan veya kısıtlanmaktan nefret ederim.

51. _____ Uzun vadeli amaçlara ulaşabilmek için şu andaki zevklerimden fedakârlık etmekte zorlanırım.

52. _____ Başkalarından yoğun bir ilgi görmezsem kendimi daha az önemli hissediyorum.

53. _____ Yeterince dikkatli olmazsanız, neredeyse her zaman bir şeyler ters gider.
54. _____ Eğer işimi doğru yapmazsam sonuçlara katlanmam gerekir.
55. _____ Beni gerçekten dinleyen, anlayan veya benim gerçek ihtiyaçlarını ve duygularımı önemseyen kimse olmadı.
56. _____ Önem verdiğim birisinin benden uzaklaştığını sezersem çok kötü hissederim.
57. _____ Diğer insanların niyetleriyle ilgili oldukça şüpheciyimdir.
58. _____ Kendimi diğer insanlara uzak veya kopmuş hissediyorum.
59. _____ Kendimi sevilebilecek biri gibi hissetmiyorum.
60. _____ İş (okul) hayatında diğer insanlar kadar yetenekli değilim.
61. _____ Gündelik işler için benim kararlarına güvenilemez.
62. _____ Tüm paramı kaybedip çok fakir veya zavallı duruma düşmekten endişe duyarım.
63. _____ Çokumluyla annem ve babamın benimle iç içe yaşadığı hissediyorum - Benim kendime ait bir hayatım yok.
64. _____ Kendim için ne istediğini bilmedik için daima benim adına diğer insanların karar vermesine izin veririm.
65. _____ Ben hep başkalarının sorunlarını dinleyen kişi oldum.
66. _____ Kendimi o kadar kontrol ederim ki insanlar beni duygusuz veya hissiz bulurlar.
67. _____ Başarmak ve bir şey yapmak için sürekli bir baskı altındaım.
68. _____ Diğer insanların uyduğu kurallara ve geleneklere uymak zorunda oldugum hissediyorum.
69. _____ Benim yararına olduğunu bilmem bile hoşuma gitmeyen şeylerı yapmaya kendimi zorlayamam.
70. _____ Bir toplantıda fikrimi söylediğinde veya bir topluluga tanıtıldığında onaylanmayı ve takdir görmeyi isterim.
71. _____ Ne kadar çok çalışırsam çalışayım, maddi olarak iflas edeceğimden ve neredeyse her şeyimi kaybedeceğimden endişe ederim.
72. _____ Neden yanlış yaptığım önemini yok; eğer hata yaptysam sonucuna da katlanmam gerekir.
73. _____ Hayatında ne yapacağını bilmediğim zamanlarda uygun bir öneride
bulunacak veya beni yönlendirecek kimsem olmadı.
74. _____ İnsanların beni terk edeceği endişesiyle bazen onları kendimden uzaklaştırırım.
75. _____ Genellikle insanların asl veya art niyetlerini araştırırım.
76. _____ Kendimi hep grupların dışında hissederim.
77. _____ Kabul edilemeyecek pek çok özelliğim yüzünden insanlara kendimi açamıyorum veya beni tam olarak tanımalara izin vermiyorum.
78. _____ İş (okul) hayatında diğer insanlar kadar zeki değilim.
79. _____ Günlük yaşamımı tek başına idare edebilme becerisine sahip olduğumu hissetmiyorum.
80. _____ Bir doktor tarafından herhangi bir ciddi hastalık bulunmamasına rağmen bende ciddi bir hastalığın gelişmesine endişe altımı.
81. _____ Sık sık annemden babamdan ya da eşimden ayrı bir kimliğinin olmadığını hissediyorum.
82. _____ Haklarına saygı duylunması ve duygularının hesaba katılması istemekte çok zorlanıyorum.
83. _____ Başkaları beni, diğerleri için çok, kendim için az şey yapan birey olarak görürler.
84. _____ Diğerleri beni duygusal olarak soğuk bulurlar.
85. _____ Kendimi sorumluluktan koldan çürütmeyorum veya hatalarım için gerekçe bulmıyorum.
86. _____ Benim yaptıklarımın, diğer insanların katkılarından daha önemli olduğunu hissediyorum.
87. _____ Kararlarına nadiren sadık kalabilirim.
88. _____ Bir dolu övgü ve ilıfitat almam kendimi değerli birisi olarak hissetmemi sağlar.
89. _____ Yanlış bir kararın bir felakete yol açabileceğinden endişe ederim.
90. _____ Ben cezalandırılmayı hak eden, kötü bir insanım.
APPENDIX E
INTIMATE PARTNER ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION QUESTIONNAIRE/EŞ KABUL-RED ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda, yetişkin kişilerin, yakın bir ilişki içerisindeki davranışlarıyla ilgili bazı cümleler var. Her cümleyi dikkatlice okuyun ve okuduğunuz cümlenin eşinizin size karşı davranışlarını ne kadar iyi anlattığını düşünün.

Testi, cümleler üzerinde fazla oyalanmadan, size ilk doğru gelen cevapları işaretleyerek doldurun. Cevaplarınızı eşinizden beklediğiniz davranışlara göre değil, bu kişinin size gerçek olarak gösterdiği davranışlara göre verin ve cümleleri aşağıdaki derecelendirmeye göre puanlandırın:

1 - Hiçbir zaman doğru değil
2 - Nadiren doğru
3 - Bazen doğru
4 - Hemen hemen her zaman doğru

EŞİM...
1. Benim hakkında güzel şeyler söyler.
2. Bana söylenir veya beni azarlar.
5. Benimle planlarımız hakkında konuşur ve benim fikirlerimi de dinler.
8. Arkadaşlarınımda çağırılmam için beni cesaretlendirir ve onların güzel vakit geçirmesi için elinden geleni yapar.
10. Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece benimle
11. Kızdığını zaman bana bağırır
15. Bir şeyi iyi yaptığımda, kendimle gurur duymamı sağlar.
16. Bana vurur.
17. Benim için yapması gereken şeylerı unutur.
18. Beni büyük bir bela olarak görür.
19. Beni başkalaraña över
21. Yiyecek konusunda, benim isteklerimi de dikkate alır.
22. Benimle sıcak ve sevgi dolu bir şekilde konuşur
23. Bana hemen kızar.
24. Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldür
25. Benden hoşlanmıyor gibi.
26. Hak ettiği zaman bana güzel şeyler söyler.
27. Çabuk parlar ve öfkesini benden çıkarır.
28. Arkadaşlarının kim olduğunu bilmek ister.
29. Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir.
30. Bana bir sürü kırıcı şey söyler.
31. Ondan yardım istedüğimde benimle ilgilenmez.
32. Başım derde girdiğinde, hatanın bende olduğunu düşünür.
33. Bana istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğunu hissettirir.
34. Onun sinirine dokunduğunu söyler.
35. Bana çok ilgi gösterir.
36. Bir şeyi iyi yaptığımda, benimle ne kadar gurur duyduğunu söyler.
37. Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapar
38. Hatıralaması gerekir diye düşünüğüm önemli şeylerı unutur.
39. Bana kendimi artık sevilmiyormuşum gibi hissettirir.
40. Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirir.
41. Onaylamadığı bir şey yaptığında, beni korkutur veya tehdit eder.
42. Benimle zaman geçirmekten hoşlanır.
43. Korktuğumda ya da bir şeye canım sıkıldığıında bana yardımcı etmeye çalışır.
44. Beni arkadaşlarının önünde utandırır.
45. Benden uzak durmaya çalışır.
46. Benden şikayet eder.
47. Benim ne düşündüğümé önem verir ve düşündüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanır.
48. Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer kadınların/erkeklerin benden daha iyi olduğunu düşünür.
49. Bir plan yaparken benim de ne istediğime önem verir.
51. Diğer insanların benden daha iyi davranışlarını düşünür.
52. Beni başkalarına yollayıp, başından atar.
53. Bana istenmediğimi belir.
54. Yaptığım şeylerle ilgilenir.
55. Canım yandığında veya hasta olduğumda, kendimi daha iyi hissetmem için elinden geleni yapar.
56. Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda benden ne kadar utandığını söyler.
57. Beni sevdiğini belir.
58. Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalplidir.
59. Onun hoşuna gitmeyen bir şey yaptığında, beni utandırır veya suçlu hissettir.
60. Beni mutlu etmeye çalışır.
APPENDIX F

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü  X
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü
Enformatik Enstitüsü
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı: Babuşcu
Adı: Begüm
Bölümü: Klinik Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): The Relationship between Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection among Married Individuals: Mediating Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas.

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans  X  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.  X
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:
Birçok kuramsal görüş (e.g. Freud, 1910; Bowlby, 1973; Rohner, 1986; Young, 1999), birbirlerinden farklı açıklamalarına rağmen çocukluk yaşantılarının kişinin yetişkinliğinde çeşitli etkilere sahip olduğunda hemfikirdir. Özellikle ebeveyn-çocuk ilişkisinin bireyin psikolojik uyumunun yanı sıra, yetişkinlikte kurulan yakın ilişkilerde de kendini gösterdiği belirtilmiştir (Klein, 1984; Hendrix, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Ebeveyn-çocuk ilişkisinin yetişkinlik ile bağlılıklarını çalışan kuramlardan biri de Rohner (1975, 1986) tarafından geliştirilen Ebeveyn Kabul-Red (EKAR) Kuramıdır. EKAR Kuramı, çocukluk sırasında ebeveyden algılanan kabul ve reddin nedenleri, hem çocuk hem de yetişkinlerin üzerindeki davranışsal, bilişsel ve duygusal sonuçlarını ampirik verilerle destekleyerek açıklamaya ve yordamaya çalışan kültürler arası bir sosyalizasyon kuramıdır (Rohner, 2004).


Şema Modeli‘ne göre çocuklukta yaşanan zarar verici ailesel ve çevresel deneyimler bireyin temel duygusal ihtiyaçlarının karşılanmamasına neden olarak erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların oluşumuna yol açar. Erken dönem uyumsuz şemalar, çocukluk yıllarda oluşmuş son derece katı, sürekli, yetişkinliğe uzanan ve
öz-yıkımcı duyguşal ve bilişsel şablonlardır (Young, Kolosko, & Weishaar, 2003). Şema Modeli’nde beş ayrı şema alanından bahsedilmektedir; bunlar 1) kopukluk/reddedilme, 2) zedelenmiş otonomi, 3) zedelenmiş sınırlar, 4) diğerleri yönelimlilik, ve 5) yüksek standartlardır.


Çalışmanın Amacı

Şimdiye kadar yapılan çalışmalar çocuklukta ebeveynlerden algılanan kabul reddinin yetişkinlikte esen algılanan kabul-red ile alakalı olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu nedenle, EKAR Kuramı’nda da bahsedildiği gibi, ebeveyn kabul-reddi ile eş kabul-reddi arasında bir devamlılık önerilebilir. Hem EKAR Kuramı’nda hem de Şema Modeli’nde çocukluk yaşantlarının yetişkinlik romantisik ilişkilerine devamlılığının çocuklukta oluşan katı bilişsel yapılmalar sayesinde gerçekleştiği önerilmiş olsa da
şimdiye kadar zihinsel tasarmların ebeveyn kabul-reddi ve eş kabul-reddi arasındaki ilişkideki bu rolünü araştıran bir çalışma yapılmamıştır. Bunun için, bu çalışma evli bireylerde ebeveyn kabul-reddi ve eş kabul reddi arasında erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanlarının aracı rolünü araştırmayı amaçlamıştır.

Çalışmanın Hipotezleri ve Araştırma Sorusu

Evlı bireylerde ebeveyn kabul-reddi, eş kabul-reddi ve erken dönem uyumsuz şemalar arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırılan bu çalışmada aşağıdaki hipotezler kurulmuştur:

1) Ebeveynlerden algılanan red arttıkça eşten algılan red de artacaktır.

5) Ebeveyden algılanan red arttıkça kişinin erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanları puanları da artacaktır.

6) Eşten algılanan red arttıkça kişinin erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanları puanları da artacaktır.

7) Erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanları ebeveyn kabul-reddi ve eş kabul-reddi arasındaki ilişkide aracı bir rol oynayacaktır.

- Ebeveyden çocukluğa algılanmış olan red arttıkça kişinin şema alanları puanları da artacak, ve bu da eşten algılanan reddin de artmasına sebep olacaktır.

Ek olarak, çalışma aşağıdaki araştırma sorusunu da yanıtlamayı amaçlamıştır:

- Hangi şema alanı/alanları ebeveyn kabul-reddi ve eş kabul-reddi arasındaki ilişkide aracı rol oynamaktadır?

Çalışmanın Yöntemi

Katılımcılar

Toplamda 228 evli birey çalışmaya katılmıştır. Katılımcıların 91’i (% 39.9) kadın, 137’si (% 60.1) erkektr. 23-75 yaş aralığında olan bu katılımcıların evlilik süreleri 2 ay dan 53 yıl’a kadar değişim göstermektedir. 218 katılımcı (% 95.6) ilk evliliklerini, 7 katılımcı (% 3.1) ikinci evliliklerini, 3 katılımcı ise (% 1.3) ise üçüncü evliliklerini yaşadıklarını belirtmişlerdir.

148 (% 64.9) kişi eğitim seviyesini üniversite veya yüksek okul olarak belirtmiş, 44 (%19.3) kişi lisansüstü eğitim seviyesine sahip olduğunu, 34 (% 14.9) kişi ise lise mezunu olduğunu ifade etmiştir. Sadece bir katılımcı (% 0.4) ilkokul
mezunu olduğunu, ve yine bir katılımcı (% 0.4) da ortaokul mezunu olduğunu söylemiştir. Katılımcılara hayatlarının çoğunun geçirdikleri yerleşim yerleri sorulduğunda, 103’ü (% 45.2) çoğunlukla büyük şehirde, 100’ü (% 43.9) şehirde, 22’si (% 9.6) ilçede, 3’ü (% 1.3) ise köyde yaşadığı belirtmiştir.

163 (% 71.5) katılımcı çocuğu olduğunu, bunların 85’i (% 52.1) iki çocuğu olduğunu, 63’ü (% 38.7) tek çocuk sahibi olduğunu, 12’si (% 7.3) üç çocuğu olduğunu, 3’ü (% 1.9) ise dört çocuğu olduğunu belirtmiştir. 65 (% 28.5) katılımcı ise çocuk sahibi olmadığını ifade etmiştir.

**Veri Toplama Araçları**

Katılımcılara Gönüllü Katılm Formu sunulup imzalamaları sağlandıktan sonra cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim düzeyi, yaşadıkları yer, evlilik süreleri ve sayıları, ve ebeveynlik durumları ile ilgili bilgi almak için hazırlanmış demografik bilgi formu bu kişilere verilmiştir. Sonrasında, çalışmanın değişkenleri ile ilgili verileri toplamak amacıyla katılımcılara Ebeveyn Kabul-Red Ölçeği (EKRÖ), Eş Kabul-Red Ölçeği (EŞKRÖ), ve Young Şema Ölçeği-Kısa Form 3 (YSÖ-KF3) sunulmuştur.


İşlem


Bulgular

Çalışmanın Değişkenleri aralarındaki Korelasyon Analizleri

Toplam Anne Reddi ile Toplam Eş Reddi arasındaki korelasyon olumu düzeyde anımsı bulunmuştur \((r = .38, p < .001)\). Toplam Baba Reddi ile Toplam Eş Reddi arasındaki ilişki de olumu düzeyde anımsı bulunmaktadır \((r = .29, p < .001)\). Sonuç olarak, hipotez edildiği gibi, çocukluktan hatırlanan anne veya baba reddi arttıkça eşten algılanan red de artmaktadır.
İlaveten Toplam Anne Reddi ile bütün şema alanları (Kopukluk/Reddedilme: \( r = .47, p < .001 \), Zedelenmiş Otonomi: \( r = .43, p < .001 \), Zedelenmiş Sınırlar: \( r = .14, p < .05 \), Diğerleri Yönetimilik: \( r = .20, p < .01 \), Yüksek Standartlar: \( r = .30, p < .001 \)) anlamlı derece ilişkili bulunmaktadır. Toplam Baba Reddi de bütün şema alanları (Kopukluk/Reddedilme: \( r = .45, p < .001 \), Zedelenmiş Otonomi: \( r = .42, p < .001 \), Zedelenmiş Sınırlar: \( r = .15, p < .05 \), Diğerleri Yönetimilik: \( r = .13, p < .05 \), Yüksek Standartlar: \( r = .25, p < .001 \)) anlamlı derecede ilişkili bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada da hipotez edildiği gibi, sonuç olarak, anneden veya babadan algılanan red arttıkça erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanları da güçlenmektedir.

Şema alanları ile Toplam Eş Reddi arasındaki korelasyon incelendiğinde, Kopukluk/Reddedilme (\( r = .50, p < .001 \)), Zedelenmiş Otonomi (\( r = .44, p < .001 \)) ve Yüksek Standartlar (\( r = .21, p < .01 \)) şema alanları ile Toplam Eş Reddi arasında anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Başka bir deyişle, kişinin Kopukluk/Reddedilme, Zedelenmiş Otonomi ve Yüksek Standartlar şema alanları güçlendikçe algılanan eş reddi de artmaktadır.

**Aracı Değişken Analizleri**

Erken dönem uyumsuz şema alanlarının ebeveyn kabul reddi ve eş kabul reddi arasındaki aracı değişken rolü Bootstrap yoluyla (Preacher & Hayes, 2004) orijinal datadan yeniden elde edilen 5000 yeni örneklemle ve aracı değişken rollerinin güven aralıklarının değerlendirilmesiyle incelenmiştir. Bunlara göre anne reddinin eş reddi üzerinde anlamlı bir toplam etkisi (\( B = .33, SE = .05, p < .001 \)) olduğu belirlenmiştir. Anne reddinin eş reddi üzerindeki doğrudan etkisinin (\( B = .16, SE = .05, p < .01 \)) de anlamlı olduğu görülmüştür. Bu ilişki de anlamlı bir şekilde aracı değişken rolü oynayan tek şema alanı ise kopukluk/reddedilme şema alanı, \( B = .16, SE = .04, 95\% CI [.07, .29] \), olarak saptanmıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, anne reddi ve eş reddi arasındaki ilişkiye kopukluk/reddedilme şema alanı kısmi olarak aracılık etmektedir. Bütün model ise varyansın % 28’ini açıklamıştır; adjusted \( R^2 = .28 \), \( F (6, 221) = 16.01, p < .001 \). Baba reddinin eş reddi üzerinde de anlamlı bir toplam etkisi (\( B = .27, SE = .05, p < .001 \)) bulunduğu gözlenmiştir, fakat baba reddinin eş reddi üzerindeki doğrudan etkisinin anlamsız olduğu (\( B = .06, SE = .05, p > .05 \)) saptanmıştır. Baba reddi ile eş reddi arasındaki ilişkiye ise anlamlı olarak aracılık
eden tek şema alanı kopukluk/reddedilme şema alanı, \( B = .18, \ SE = .05, \) 95% CI [.08, .32], olarak bulunmuştur. Diğer bir deyişle, kopukluk/reddedilme şema alanı baba reddi ve eş reddi arasındaki ilişkide tam olarak arac bir rol oynamaktadır. Bütün model ise varyansın % 26'sını açıklamaktadır; adjusted \( R^2 = .26, F (6, 221) = 14.41, \) \( p < .001. \)

**Tartışma**


temsiller olarak bahseder, ve çocugun erken dönemlerde ebevelerinden algıladığı reddin zihinsel temsiller oluşturduğunu ve bu temsillerin de kişinin kendisine, diğerlerine ve dünyaya bakışını olumsuz yönde etkilediğini öne sürmüştür.Sonuç olarak, çalışmanın bu bulgusu hem literature ile hem de kuramsal bakış açıları ile tutarlılık göstermektedir.


Çalışmanın Klinik Doğurguları


Bunun yanında, çalışmanın bulguları çocuklukta ebeveynlerle ilişkinin yetişkinlikte oluşan çarptılmış bilişsel temsillerle ve evlilikte algılanan red ile bağımı ortaya koymuştur. Bu nedenle, müdahale programları oluşturlarak ebeveynler ebeveyn-cocuk ilişkisinde kabulün kişinin duygusal ve sosyal gelişiminde ve evliliğindeki önemli etkisine dair eğitilebilirler.