

The Predictive Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas and Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships

By

Hüdayar Cihan Güngör

Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of Psychology, Çankaya-Ankara-Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not the attachment styles in close relationships and early maladaptive schemas predicted psychological tendencies associated with the romantic relationships. 408 university students, with a history of involvement in an romantic relationship at present or in past, participated in the study. As a result it was found that the focus on relationship extremely was predicted by preoccupied attachment and unrelenting standards as positive; by dismissing and fearful attachment as negative. The relationship satisfaction was predicted by fearful and dismissing attachment, disconnection schema domain as negative, impaired limits and secure attachment as positive. The fact that impaired autonomy, fearful attachment, disconnection and unrelenting standards schema domains predicted fear of relationship as positive, impaired limits predicted as negative was found. It was found that impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards schema domains predicted relational monitoring as positive; impaired limits predicted as negative. It was found that relational esteem was predicted by secure attachment, impaired limits and unrelenting standards as positive; fearful and dismissing attachment, disconnection as negative. External relational control was predicted by impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards as positive. The fact that fearful attachment and disconnection schema domain as negative; impaired limits as positive predicted relational assertiveness was found. It was found that internal relational control was predicted by impaired limits and secure attachment as positive, by impaired autonomy as negative.

Keywords: *Romantic relationship, early maladaptive schema, attachment style, young adult*

1. Introduction

It is considered that establishing a romantic relationship and continuing it are the basic developmental tasks of young adulthood (Conger, Cui, Bryant and Elder, 2000). Snell, Schicke and Arbeiter (2002), who studied multidimensional aspects of intimate relationships, defined psychological predispositions in intimate relationships as relational esteem, relational preoccupation, internal relationship control, relational awareness, relational motivation, relational anxiety, relational assertiveness, relationship depression, external relationship control, relational monitoring, fear of relationship and relational satisfaction. While relational esteem means the tendency to positively evaluate one's capacity to relate intimately with another partner, relational preoccupation is defined as the tendency to become obsessed and be preoccupied with the aspects of intimate relationships in one's life. Internal relationship control refers to belief that the intimate aspects of their life are determined by their own personal behaviors and control. Relational awareness is defined as understanding the positive or negative aspects of one's intimate relationships. Relational motivation refers to the desire to pursue intimate relationship in one's life while relational anxiety means having anxiety about being intimately involved with a person of opposite sex. Relational assertiveness is defined as being assertive in intimate relationships. Relational depression refers to the negative feelings such as unhappiness, disappointment and frustration about the status of one's intimate relationship. External relationship control is defined as the belief that intimate relationships are determined by chance and influences outside of personal control or destiny. Relational monitoring refers to valuing other people's reactions and evaluations about one's intimate relationships. While fear of relationship means the fear of engaging in an intimate relationship with another individual, relational satisfaction refers to the satisfaction and happiness one has from their intimate relationships.

Consequent to a literature review, it is observed that one of the elements that influence intimate relationships is attachment styles. Hazan and Shaver (1987) indicated in their studies that attachment had a significant role in romantic relationships which also included adulthood. They defined three attachment styles one of which was secure attachment style and two of which were insecure, dismissive and anxious/preoccupied attachment styles. Their study indicated that adults with secure attachment style could easily be involved in satisfactory intimate relationships. Meanwhile, adults with dismissive attachment style were unwilling to engage in an intimate relationship and if they did, they put a distance between themselves and their partners. Adults with anxious/preoccupied attachment style tended to have an anxiety that their intimate partners would leave them or their spouses would refuse them. As shown in the model with four categories by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), individuals with fearful attachment style attempted to protect themselves from the possibility of refusal by avoiding intimate relationships. Individuals with dismissive attachment style were indifferent to intimacy and believed that intimate relationships were unneeded. While preoccupied individuals did not deem themselves as worth being loved, they valued others quite positively. They were obsessed with their relationships. If individuals had a positive self model both for themselves and others, then it was defined as a secure attachment style.

The studies about attachment styles and romantic relationships indicated a significant relation between attachment and relational satisfaction (Lehnart and Neyer, 2006; Madey and Rodgers, 2009; Monteoliva and Garcia-Martinez, 2005). It is also stated that secure attachment predicted relational motivation, satisfaction, prize and dedication (Duemmler and Kobak, 2001; Keelen and Dion, 1998; Pistole, Clark and Tubbs, 1995; Sandra and Kobak 2001). Similar findings are acquired through couple studies which examined the effects of an individual's secure attachment on relational satisfaction and quality (Collins and Read, 1990; Jones and Cunningham, 1996; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994; Mikulincer and Erev, 1991; Simpson 1990). It is also referred in the studies that individuals with dismissive and anxious attachment styles did not display coherence in terms of their feelings towards their partners and showed a limited interest in learning their partners' ideas and emotions (Alfasi, Gramzow and Carnelley, 2010; Rholes et al., 2007). While relational satisfaction of individuals with insecure attachment styles, i.e. anxious/preoccupied or dismissive, were low; individuals with secure attachment style had a higher relational satisfaction (Rodrigues, 2009; Stackert and Bursik, 2003). Besides, individuals with secure attachment style had satisfaction in their intimate relationships while the studies show that relational monitoring had an intermediary role between preoccupied attachment and depression (Altın and Terzi, 2010). In a study which intended to determine the factors that influenced the multidimensional relationships of university students, it was found out that subjective well-being, the existence/non-existence of a relationship, number of days without a relationship were the variables that best predicted the multidimensional relationship subscale scores while they had a moderate significance in predicting the subscale scores of the perfectionism scale (Bilge et al., 2010). Meanwhile, Büyüksahin (2006) found out that individuals with dismissive attachment style scored higher than individuals with preoccupied attachment style on the scope of the focus on the relationship extremely. It is also found out that individuals with secure attachment got a higher score on relational satisfaction subscale in relation to the other three groups. Individuals with fearful attachment constituted the group with the highest score on the subscales of relational fear/anxiety and relational monitoring. In relational esteem subscale, individuals with both secure and preoccupied attachment scored higher than individuals with fearful and dismissive attachment styles. In external relationship control subscale, individuals with fearful attachment style scored higher than individuals with secure attachment style. Considering the scores from the subscale of relational assertiveness, it is found out that firstly the individuals with secure attachment style, secondly the individuals with preoccupied attachment and finally individuals with fearful attachment style desired to establish a relationship, respectively.

Similar to attachment styles, in the literature review, the effects of early maladaptive schemas on intimate romantic relationships are presented. Young, Klosko and Weishaar (2009) defined early maladaptive schemas as destructive emotional and cognitive patterns that started in early developmental periods and repeated throughout life. The formation of early maladaptive schemas originated from not satisfying basic

emotional needs, especially of childhood, such as secure attachment to others, the freedom to express needs and emotions, autonomy, competence, positive sense of identity and spontaneity. Young et al. mentioned types of early maladaptive schemas as disconnection and rejection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, claiming and insufficient self-control, hypervigilance and suppression. In studies which examined the correlation between early maladaptive schemas and romantic relationships of university students, abandoning, emotional deprivation, and imperfection/shame which included disconnection schema domain predicted intimacy in romantic relationships negatively, while unrelenting standards schema domain predicted intimacy in romantic relationships positively (Clifton, 1995; Stiles, 2004). Along with studies that explained the correlation between early maladaptive schemas and romantic relationships, studies about the effects of attachment styles on early maladaptive schemas indicated that young adults with preoccupied and fearful attachment styles scored higher on every domain of early maladaptive schemas compared to individuals with secure attachment styles (Cecero, Nelson and Gillie, 2004; Mason, Platts and Tyson, 2005; Simard, Moss and Pascuzzo, 2011).

Due to the significant role they have in the community, it is highly important to put forward the factors that affect the young adult university students' relationships with the opposite sex. When the studies so far are reviewed, it is observed that the respective effects of attachment styles and early maladaptive schemas on romantic relationships were examined. Although there are studies that examined the effects of attachment styles on early maladaptive schemas (Cecero et al., 2004; Mason et al., 2005; Simard et al., 2011), studies about the effects of both of these on the psychological tendencies about romantic relationships are not encountered either among domestic or foreign literature. Therefore, it is believed that the present study will provide a significant contribution to the literature. The main aim of the present study is to examine to what extent the attachment styles in intimate relationships and early maladaptive schemas predict the psychological tendencies about romantic relationships. In line with this aim, an answer to the question "Do the attachment styles in intimate relationships and early maladaptive schemas predict the psychological tendencies about romantic relationships?" was sought to answer.

2. Method

Participants

408 university students, who either have an intimate relationship during the study or had an intimate relationship in the past, constituted the participants of this study. In the research group, students attended various departments in the Faculty of Education and the teaching department of the College of Physical Education and Sports at Erciyes University. Of these students, 224 were female (54.9%), and 183 were male (44.9%). The gender was not indicated by one student. The average of age was 21. 151 of students were freshman (25.7%), 98 were sophomore (24%), 129 were junior (31.6%), and 73 were senior students (17.9%). Three students did not indicate their year. Research group was determined by using an appropriate sampling method.

Data Collection Tools

Relationship Questionnaire (RQ): RQ which was developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) and adapted to Turkish by Sümer and Güngör (1999) consisted of four short paragraphs corresponding four attachment styles. The participants were asked to evaluate to what extent the paragraphs defined themselves on a scale of 7 (1=does not define me, 7=defines me completely). In the factor analysis, the first factor explained 46 % of the variance while the second factor explained 28 % of the variance. While the first factor included secure (-.84), fearful (.81) and preoccupied (.69) attachment styles, the second factor contained dismissive (.94) and preoccupied attachment styles (-.32). Test retest reliability coefficients varied between .58 and .72.

Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ): It was developed by Snell, Schicke and Arbeiter (2002). It was answered on a 5-point Likert scale which measured multidimensional aspects of intimate relationships. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Büyüksahin (2005). MRQ consisted of 53 items.

These were the focus on relationship extremely (12 items), relational satisfaction (9 items), fear/anxiety of relationship (10 items), relational monitoring (5 items), relational esteem (5 items), external relationship control (4 items), relational assertiveness (4 items) and internal relationship control (4 items). The five items in the scale were reverse scored. The scale provided 8 different scores and the increase in the score meant the increase in the related domain. All of the factors explained 57.67 % of the variance. The correlation coefficient for test validity of MSQ and Relational Satisfaction Scale varied between -.41 and .69. Test retest reliability of the scale was .80. Internal consistency coefficients Cronbach's Alpha of every subscale varied between .73 and .91 while split-half reliability coefficients varied between .72 and .90. In addition, test retest reliability coefficients varied between .63 and .86.

Young Schema Questionnaire- Short Form 3 (YSQ-SF3): In the short form with 90 items that Young developed in order to evaluate early maladaptive schemas on the basis of schema therapy, every item was answered on a six-point Likert scale (1=Completely untrue of me, 6=Describes me perfectly). The reliability and validity research of the questionnaire was carried out in Turkey with a sample of university students by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu and Çakır (2009). An entity consisting of 14 factors which was conducted by Principal Components Analysis with Equamax rotation was observed. These factors were as follows: Emotional Deprivation, Failure, Pessimism, Social Isolation/Mistrust, Emotional Inhibition, Approval Seeking, Telescoping/Addiction, Enmeshment/Insufficient Self-control, Self-sacrifice, Abandonment, Being Punished, Defectiveness, Vulnerability, and Unrelenting Standards. Conducting higher-order factor analysis on these factors resulted in 5 schema domains, i.e. Impaired autonomy, Unrelenting standards, Other-directedness, and Impaired limits. In the context of concurrent validity, the correlation between the schema sizes of YSQ-SF3 and the General Symptom Index (GSI) of SCL-90-R was meaningful ($r=.19-.62$, $p<.01$) while the correlation among Depression sub factors was found as $r=.34-.64$ ($p < .01$). Meanwhile, a meaningful correlation was observed among the Anxiety sub factor of the questionnaire the range being $r=.13-.52$ ($p < .01$) while the range of correlations of the Sensitivity sub factor varied between .15 and .58 ($p < .01$).

Correlations between the schema domains of YSQ-SF3 and GSI of SCL-90-R were statistically meaningful (r =between .30-.65, $p<.01$). There were statistically meaningful relations between the schema domains of YSQ-SF3 and the subscales of SCL-90-R, the first being Depression in the range of $r = .55-.68$ ($p < .01$), the second being Anxiety in the range of $r = .18-.54$ ($p < .01$) and finally Interpersonal Sensitivity in the range of $r = .20-.60$ ($p < .01$). In the study of distinctive validity, statistically meaningful differences were found between clinical and normal groups in terms of Emotional Deprivation, Failure, Pessimism, Social Isolation/Mistrust, Emotional Inhibition, Enmeshment /Addiction, Defectiveness, and Vulnerability sub dimensions of YSQ-SF3 ($t= 2.27- 16.64$, $p < .05-.01$). In the test retest method to calculate reliability, Pearson correlation coefficients for schema dimensions ranged from .66 to .82 ($p<.01$) while Pearson correlation coefficients for schema domains ranged from .66 to .83 ($p<.01$). Internal consistency coefficient (α) of YSQ-SF3 subscales varied between .63 and .80. Meanwhile, internal consistency coefficient Cronbach Alpha (α) of YSQ-SF3 subscales varied between .53 and .81.

Personal Data Form

In this form, there are questions related to participants' gender, age and year at the university. The questionnaires were conducted by the researcher in the class hours of the volunteered participants subsequent to notifying them about the aim of the research and the important aspects they should consider during the application. Meanwhile, identification was not requested from the participants. The application was carried out in approximately 45-50 minutes.

Data Analysis

In the process of data analysis, primarily the data set was reviewed. 419 individuals participated in the application, yet 11 participants were ruled out from the data set due to inappropriate and insufficient filling of the questionnaire. Following this procedure, a review was carried out to ascertain whether there were any inconsistent values, and as a result no inconsistent values were found. As a result, the data of

The Predictive Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas and Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships

408 participants were analyzed. Moreover, the premises of multiple regression analysis were checked and the conditions of normality, linearity and homogeneity of the variances of residual values were ensured. To check the existence of multiple correlation among the variables, the values were reviewed (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007; Leech, Barrett and Morgan, 2005). In this study, VIF values which were more than 5 were not observed. Durbin-Watson (D-W) statistics were used to check the autocorrelation among the variables. Durbin-Watson values varying between 1.870 and 2.140 indicated that in the study autocorrelation could be controlled in eight models.

To measure psychological tendencies related to romantic relationships, the subscale scores of Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire were put to the equality of regression as a dependent variable. The sub domains of Early Maladaptive Schemas scales and Relationship Questionnaire (secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissive attachment styles) were put to the regression as an independent variable. To determine the correlation among variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. Furthermore, multiple regression analysis was applied to the study to determine the predictive power of independent variables on dependent variables. Moreover, to choose the variables, backward elimination method was employed. The significance level of the study was accepted as 0.05. Statistical analysis was conducted by means of SPSS 15.

3. Results

The correlations, means and standard deviations of the variables in the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Pearson Correlation Coefficient among variables, Means and Standard Deviations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.FORE	-																
2.RS	.24**	-															
3.FOR	.11*	-.41**	-														
4.RM	.18**	-.27**	.51**	-													
5.RE	.35**	.50**	-.26**	-.04	-												
6.ERC	.07	-.16**	.22**	.26**	-.08	-											
7.RA	.18**	.45**	-.32**	-.19**	.40**	-.01	-										
8.IRC	.11*	.34**	-.00	-.01	.39**	-.00	.41**	-									
9.IA	.15**	-.37**	.52**	.38**	-.21**	.20**	-.26**	-.16**	-								
10.DIS	.10*	-.44**	.47**	.28**	-.24**	.13*	-.29**	-.13**	.73**	-							
11.US	.27**	-.12*	.29**	.33**	.08	.19**	-.02	.10*	.38**	.28**	-						
12.IL	.09	.10	.04	.07	.17**	.09	.20**	.21**	.21**	.16**	.46**	-					
13.OD	.19**	-.10*	.24**	.24**	.05	.08	-.04	.03	.42**	.32**	.45**	.28**	-				
14.SA	.04	.33**	-.20**	-.15**	.33**	-.08	.27**	.18**	.29**	.33**	-.04	.12*	-.01	-			
15.FA	-.06	-.43**	.44**	.23**	-.30**	.13**	-.31**	-.14**	.41**	.36**	.25**	-.02	.21**	.39**	-		
16.PA	.26**	-.23**	.23**	.20**	-.05	.14**	-.12*	-.09	.39**	.31**	.30**	.04	.22**	.21**	.24**	-	
17.DA	.18**	-.14**	.05	.03	-.12*	.01	.02	.03	.08	.15**	.06	.16**	.05	.03	.11*	.03	-
X	36.8	29.7	25.0	13.5	18.3	11.2	13.8	13.8	66.3	48.8	34.2	26.5	39.6	4.8	3.8	3.5	2.8
SD	9.9	8.9	7.3	5.3	4.4	4.0	4.1	3.2	22.3	16.2	7.4	6.1	8.8	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8

FORE: Focus on the relationship extremely, FOR: fear of relationship, RM: relational monitoring, RE: relational esteem, ERC: External Relationship control, RS: relational satisfaction, RA: relational assertiveness, IRC: Internal Relationship control, IA: Impaired Autonomy, DIS: Disconnection, US: Unrelenting Standards, IL: Impaired Limits, OD: Other-directedness, SA: Secure attachment, FA: Fearful attachment, PA: Preoccupied attachment, DA: Dismissive attachment, ** p<.001, * p<.05

In Table 1, the correlation coefficients vary between .10 and .73.

Table 2. The results of multiple regression

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	SE	β	t	VIF	D-W	F	R ²	Revised R ²
Focus on the relationship extremely	Stable	25.49	2.52	-	10.10***	-				
	Unrelenting Standards	.27	.07	.21	3.89***	1.347	1.870	16.732***	.17	.16
	Other-directedness	.11	.06	.10	1.85	1.280				
	Fearful attachment	-.91	.26	-.17	-3.52***	1.122				
	Preoccupied attachment	1.21	.26	.22	4.58***	1.145				
	Dismissive attachment	-1.03	.26	-.18	-3.97***	1.013				
Relational Satisfaction	Stable	36.06	2.47	-	14.63***	-				
	Disconnection	-.18	.03	-.32	-6.74***	1.280	1.885	35.995***	.31	.30
	Impaired limits	.21	.06	.14	3.29**	1.082				
	Secure attachment	.59	.26	.11	2.30*	1.288				
	Fearful attachment	-1.25	.23	-.26	-5.48***	1.282				
	Dismissive attachment	-.47	.22	-.09	-2.14*	1.055				
Fear of Relationship	Stable	10.57	1.67	-	6.34***	-				
	Impaired Autonomy	.09	.02	.27	4.31***	2.406	2.140	43.500***	.35	.35
	Disconnection	.08	.03	.17	2.90**	2.178				
	Unrelenting Standards	.12	.05	.13	2.55*	1.470				
	Impaired Limits	-.11	.06	-.09	-1.98*	1.320				
	Fearful attachment	.92	.18	.23	5.11***	1.264				
Relational Monitoring	Stable	4.86	1.30	-	3.75***	-				
	Impaired Autonomy	.07	.01	.30	6.19***	1.168	1.909	31.877***	.19	.19
	Unrelenting Standards	.19	.04	.27	4.98***	1.423				
	Impaired Limits	-.09	.04	-.11	-2.15*	1.277				
Relational Esteem	Stable	15.22	1.37	-	11.12***	-				
	Disconnection	-.04	.01	-.15	-2.87**	1.314	1.875	16.639***	.20	.19
	Unrelenting Standards	.07	.03	.12	2.19*	1.431				
	Impaired Limits	.10	.04	.14	2.56*	1.370				
	Secure Attachment	.53	.14	.20	3.88***	1.291				
	Fearful Attachment	-.44	.13	-.18	-3.49**	1.353				
	Dismissive Attachment	-.28	.12	-.11	-2.40*	1.061				

The Predictive Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas and Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships

External Relationship Control	Stable	6.92	.95	-	7.26***	-				
	Impaired Autonomy	.03	.10	.14	2.72**	1.166	2.00	11.652***	.06	.06
	Unrelenting Standards	.08	.03	.14	2.67**	1.166				
Relational Assertiveness	Stable	13.22	1.21	-	10.93***	-				
	Disconnecti on	-.06	.01	-.23	-4.59***	1.265	1.93	24.436***	.20	.20
	Impaired Limits	.15	.03	.22	4.77***	1.063				
	Secure Attachment	.23	.13	.10	1.87	1.279				
	Fearful Attachment	-.41	.11	-.19	-3.70***	1.271				
Internal Relationship Control	Stable	11.24	.90	-	12.54***	-				
	Impaired Autonomy	-.03	.01	-.18	-3.52***	1.170	1.92	14.648***	.10	.10
	Impaired Limits	.13	.03	.24	4.85***	1.088				
	Secure Attachment	.20	.10	.10	2.01*	1.135				

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Table 2 shows the results of multiple regression analysis which aimed to identify the variables that predicted the subscale of the MSQ. According to this;

Regression analysis for the subscale of focus on the relationship extremely: To predict the scores of this subscale, unrelenting standards, other-directedness, and fearful, preoccupied and dismissive attachment styles were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that preoccupied attachment had the most important predictive power ($\beta = .22$), the second most important was unrelenting standards ($\beta = .20$), and dismissive and fearful attachment had a negative correlation with the dependent variable ($\beta = -.17$). In addition, other-directedness was found to have an insignificant contribution to the equality ($\beta = .09$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .16 and the 16 % of the variance of the focus on the relationship extremely subscale could be predicted by the independent variables of unrelenting standards, fearful attachment, preoccupied attachment, and dismissive attachment styles.

Regression analysis for the relational satisfaction subscale: To predict relational satisfaction, variables of disconnection, impaired limits, secure attachment, fearful attachment and dismissive attachment were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that disconnection, which had a negative correlation with the dependent variable, had the most important predictive power ($\beta = -.32$), the second was fearful attachment ($\beta = -.26$), and the others were impaired limits ($\beta = .14$) and secure attachment ($\beta = .11$). Dismissive attachment was found to provide a negative contribution to the equality ($\beta = -.09$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .30, and 30% of the variance of relational satisfaction subscale could be predicted by the independent variables of disconnection, impaired limits, secure attachment, fearful attachment and dismissive attachment.

Regression analysis for the fear of relationship subscale: To predict the fear of relationship subscale, variables of impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, disconnection, impaired limits and fearful

attachment were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that impaired autonomy had the most important predictive power ($\beta=.27$), and the second important was fearful attachment ($\beta=.23$). Disconnection ($\beta=.17$), and unrelenting standards ($\beta=.13$) were found out to provide a positive contribution to the equality while impaired autonomy had a negative contribution to the equality ($\beta=-.09$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .35, and 35 % of the relational satisfaction variance could be predicted by the independent variables of impaired autonomy, disconnection, unrelenting standards, impaired limits and fearful attachment.

Regression analysis for relational monitoring subscale: To predict relational monitoring, variables of impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, and impaired limits were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that impaired autonomy had the most important predictive power ($\beta=.30$), and the second was unrelenting standards ($\beta=.27$). Meanwhile, impaired limits, which had a negative correlation with the dependent variable, provided a negative contribution to the equality ($\beta=-.11$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .19, and 19 % of relational monitoring variance could be predicted by the independent variables of impaired autonomy, unrelenting standards, impaired limits.

Regression analysis for relational esteem subscale: To predict relational esteem, variables of disconnection, unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and secure, fearful and dismissive attachment styles were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that secure attachment had the most important predictive power ($\beta=.20$), and the second important predictive powers were fearful attachment ($\beta=-.18$), which had a negative correlation with the dependent variable, disconnection ($\beta=-.15$), impaired limits ($\beta=.14$), and unrelenting standards ($\beta=.12$). Dismissive attachment was found to contribute negatively to the equality ($\beta=-.11$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .19, and 19 % of the relational esteem variance could be predicted by the independent variables of disconnection, unrelenting standards, impaired limits, secure attachment, fearful attachment, and dismissive attachment.

Regression analysis for external relationship control subscale: To predict external relationship control, variables of impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that impaired autonomy, which had a positive correlation with the dependent variable, and unrelenting standards contributed to the equality equally ($\beta=.14$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .06, and 06 % of the external relationship control variance could be predicted by the independent variables impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards.

Regression analysis for relational assertiveness subscale: to predict relational assertiveness, variables of disconnection, impaired limits, secure attachment, and fearful attachment were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that disconnection, which had a negative correlation with the dependent variable, had the most important predictive power ($\beta=-.23$), and the second was impaired limits ($\beta=.22$). Moreover, fearful attachment was found to have a negative correlation ($\beta=-.19$). Besides, secure attachment was discovered to have a positive correlation with the dependent variable ($\beta=.10$), yet it was found to have an insignificant amount of contribution to the equality. Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .20, and 20 % of the relational assertiveness variance could be predicted by the independent variables of disconnection, impaired limits, and fearful attachment.

Regression analysis for internal relationship control subscale: To predict internal relationship control, variables of impaired limits, secure attachment, and impaired autonomy were included in the equality. When the standardized beta coefficients were examined, it was found out that impaired limits had the most important predictive power ($\beta=.24$), and the second was impaired autonomy, which had a negative

correlation with the dependent variable ($\beta = -.18$). Moreover, secure attachment contributed to the equation by having a positive correlation with the dependent variable ($\beta = .10$). Other variables were not significant predictors for the sub scores of this subscale. The revised R^2 was found .10, and 10 % of the internal relationship control variance could be predicted by the independent variables of impaired limits, secure attachment, and impaired autonomy.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether attachment styles in intimate relationships and early maladaptive schemas predict psychological tendencies about romantic relationships. As a result of regression analysis in line with this purpose, dismissive and fearful attachment styles decreased focus on the relationship extremely while preoccupied attachment style and unrelenting standards increased focus on the relationship extremely. Studies which indicated the significant correlation between attachment and relational satisfaction were conducted (Lehnart and Neyer, 2006; Madey and Rodgers, 2009; Monteoliva and Garcia-Martinez, 2005). Individuals with fearful attachment style tried to protect themselves from the possibility of refusal by avoiding intimate relationships whereas individuals with dismissive attachment style were indifferent to intimacy and believed that intimate relationships were unnecessary (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). In yet another study, preoccupied individuals were discovered to be preoccupied with their relationship and constituted the group that liked being alone the least (Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Pistole et al., 1995; Sümer and Güngör, 1999). In his study, Büyükşahin (2006) found out that in the domain of focus on the relationship extremely, individuals with preoccupied attachment style scored higher than individuals with dismissive attachment style. Meanwhile, individuals within unrelenting standards schema domain valued other people's approval and recognition rather than developing a trustful and real self (Young et al., 2009). Hence, it could be stated that the result of this study supported the results of the studies encountered in the literature review.

Fearful and dismissive attachment styles and disconnection decreased relational satisfaction whereas secure attachment and impaired limits increased relational satisfaction. In relation to fearful and dismissive attachment styles, individuals with secure attachment constituted the group that had the most relational satisfaction. As a result of literature review, a number of studies indicated a lower relational satisfaction for the individuals with insecure attachment than individuals with secure attachment (Büyükşahin, 2006; Collins and Read, 1990; Jones and Cunningham, 1996; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994; Mikulincer and Erev, 1991; Pistole et al., 1995; Simpson, 1990; Stackert and Bursik, 2003). On the other hand, as Young et al. pointed out, individuals within disconnection schema domain could not establish a trustful and satisfactory relationship. This, in return, decreased relational satisfaction. Hence, it could be stated that the results of this study supported the results of the present study. The outcome that individuals with impaired limits had high relational satisfaction was unexpected. As Young et al. pointed out these individuals found it hard to respect and cooperate with others, to keep their promises or achieve long-term aims. These individuals usually presented selfish, irresponsible, non-emphatic, demanding, dominant and narcissistic behaviors. Likewise, Soygüt et al. found out in his study that interpersonal sensitivity and impaired limits had a low correlation. It is observed with the help of literature review that while individuals with impaired limits were expected to have lower relational satisfaction, the results of the study proved the contrary. This could merely be due to the aspects of the research group. Studying couple relationship would explain more about this notion.

Impaired limits, unrelenting standards, disconnection and fearful attachment increased fear of relationship while impaired limits decreased fear of relationship. The result that individuals with fearful attachment had fear of relationship was also supported by the studies of Bartholomew and later by Büyükşahin (1990,2006). These individuals tried to protect themselves from the possibility of refusal by means of avoiding social environments that they considered risky for their relationship. The result that impaired limits decreased fear of relationship shows parallelism with the results of other studies (Bilge et al., 2010; Young et al., 2009). Moreover, the result that impaired limits increased relational satisfaction supports the

results of former studies. As is pointed out by Young et al., individuals with disconnection schema domain could not establish a trustful and satisfactory attachment with others, and they believed that their needs such as love, belonging, empathy, recognition and transferring of emotions would not be satisfied. Hence, it could be stated that it was normal for individuals within this schema domain to have fear in their relationships. Individuals within impaired limits schema domain believed they were inadequate not only for relationships but also for other areas of life. Moreover, individuals within unrelenting standards schema domain treated both themselves and others with excessive criticism (Young et al., 2009). The result of the present study which indicated that individuals within impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards had fear of relationship was not parallel to the results of studies by Young et al.

While impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards increased relational monitoring, impaired limits decreased monitoring. According to Snell et al., individuals within this schema domain highly valued how their intimate relationships were evaluated by others. It could be expressed that the results of this study support the results of former studies (Soygüt et al., 2009; Young et al., 2009).

While fearful and dismissed attachment styles, and disconnection schema domain decreased relational esteem; secure attachment, unrelenting standards and impaired limits increased relational esteem. These results of the present study supported the results of former studies which found out that individuals with fearful and dismissed attachment styles avoided social interactions and intimate relationships to protect themselves while individuals with secure attachment had more relational esteem (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; Büyüksahin, 2006; Hazan and Shaver, 1987) and individuals with disconnection schema domain did not evaluate their capacity in intimate relationships positively (Young et al., 2009). Individuals with impaired limits schema domain displayed egocentric, irresponsible and narcissistic behaviors due to their traits of self-righteousness and disrespect for other individuals' rights (Young et al., 2009). Taking into consideration these traits, it could be presumed that they have a sense of unrealistic relational esteem in their intimate relationships. The result that unrelenting standards schema domain increased relational esteem in romantic relationships showed parallelism with other studies that revealed the result that this schema domain predicted relational intimacy (Clifton, 1995; Stiles, 2004).

It was also revealed that unrelenting standards and impaired autonomy increased external relationship control. According to Snell et al., external relationship control could be defined as the belief that intimate relationships established outside one's control or by events depending on luck. According to Young et al., individuals with impaired autonomy schema domain believed they were incompetent to establish intimate relationships along with other fields of life and they would inevitably fail. It could be expressed that the results of the present study supported these individuals' belief that intimate relationships established outside one's control or by events depending on luck. Likewise, individuals with unrelenting standards treated both themselves and others with excessive criticism to achieve the high standards they internalized with which they aimed to avoid embarrassment and being unapproved. These individuals, who had traits of excessive criticism towards themselves and others, strict rules and perfectionism, experienced significant deterioration in desires, relaxation, self-esteem and relationships (Young et al., 2009). The belief that intimate relationships established outside their control could be owing to the fact that they could not evaluate their attempts and contributions in their intimate relationships in a healthy way which originated from their traits.

Fearful attachment and disconnection decreased relational assertiveness while impaired limits schema domain was found out to increase relational assertiveness. Former studies which confirmed that disconnection schema domain affected relational intimacy in a negative manner (Clifton, 1995; Stiles, 2004) supported the results of the present study. Individuals with fearful attachment style attempted to protect themselves by means of avoiding close interaction with others as they believed that they themselves had no value and others were untrustworthy and rejective (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). Due to this characteristic, the result that individuals with fearful attachment style were the least assertive group in a relationship was consistent with the expectations. As Young et al. pointed out, individuals with

impaired limits schema domain displayed egocentric, irresponsible and narcissistic behaviors due to their traits of self-righteousness, the insistence that they could do as they wish without respecting other individuals' rights, and the idea that they could dominate over others. Owing to these traits, it could be considered that these individuals would be more assertive in relationships in order to procure their own needs and their own interests.

Secure attachment style and impaired limits were found out to increase internal relationship control while impaired autonomy decreased internal relationship control. According to Snell et al., internal relationship control was the belief that the intimate relationships aspect of these people's lives stemmed mainly from their own behaviors and personal control. The result that individuals with impaired limits schema domain had more internal relationship control was in parallel with the results of Young et al.'s schema domain studies. Hazan and Shaver's study (1987) which found out that the individuals with secure attachment style established more satisfactory intimate relationships with ease supported the results of the present study. On the other hand, as pointed out by Young et al., individuals with impaired autonomy believed that they were more insufficient in establishing relationships and would inevitably fail in their relationships; hence their schemas contained data about inability, insufficiency and failure. Owing to these traits, it could be considered that the result that the intimate relationships aspect of these people's lives did not stem from their own behaviors and personal control showed parallelism with the results of the present study.

Based on the results of the present study, while evaluating young adults' intimate relationships, it could be suggested that educational programs could be prepared to enable young adults to establish healthy intimate relationships by bearing in mind the attachment styles and early maladaptive schemas. Moreover, psychological counseling practices for individuals, especially with a group, would be useful to assist the individuals identify their own traits in intimate relationships. While evaluating young adults' intimate relationships, the therapists that practice in the fields of schema-focused and attachment therapies could profit from the results of the present study. Researchers could be suggested to conduct a similar research on individuals who are still married and the correlation between these variables and marital satisfaction. Meanwhile, the participants of the present study consisted of nonclinical university students, and future studies could be conducted with clinical or nonclinical participants of different age group or demographic characteristics. Moreover, the researchers could examine the intermediary role of the attachment styles between early maladaptive schemas and multidimensional relationships.

5. Conclusion

By means of the present study, which aimed to predict the psychological tendencies about romantic relationships, fearful attachment was found out to increase fear of relationship while decreasing focus on the relationship extremely, relational satisfaction, relational esteem, and relational assertiveness. Dismissive attachment was found out to decrease focus on relationship extremely, relational satisfaction and relational esteem. Preoccupied attachment increased merely focus on relationship extremely. Moreover, individuals with secure attachment were revealed to have higher relational satisfaction, relational esteem, focus on relationship extremely, relational assertiveness and internal relationship control. Unrelenting standards schema domain was found out to increase focus on relationship extremely, relational monitoring, external relationship control and fear of relationship. While disconnection decreased relational satisfaction, relational esteem and relational assertiveness, it increased fear of relationship. Impaired limits decreased fear of relationship and relational monitoring while it increased relational satisfaction, relational esteem, relational assertiveness and internal relationship control. While impaired autonomy was found out to increase fear of relationship, relational monitoring, and external relationship control, it decreased internal relationship control. In this scope, it could be deduced that taking into consideration these characteristics to develop healthy romantic relationship in their young adulthood, to prepare programs and to plan future research is crucial.

References

- Alfasi Y, Gramzow RH, Carnelley KB(2010). Adult Attachment Patterns and Stability in Esteem for Romantic Partners. *Personality and Individual Difference*, 48: 607–611.
- Altın M, Terzi Ş(2010). How Does Attachment Styles Relate to Intimate Relationship to Aggravate the Depressive Symptoms?. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1008-1015.
- Bartholomew K(1990). Avoidance of Intimacy: An Attachment Perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 7: 147-178.
- Bartholomew K, Horowitz LM(1991). Attachment Styles Among Young Adults: A Test of A Four-Category Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61(2): 226-244.
- Bilge F, Doğan N, Gençtanırım D, Arıcıoğlu A, Yalçın İ, Baydan Y, Tagay Ö, Sarı T(2010). A Study on Multidimensional Relationships. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research* 41: 37-53.
- Büyükşahin A(2001). “Yakın İlişki Kuran ve Kurmayan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çeşitli Sosyal Psikolojik Etkenler Yönünden Karşılaştırılması.” Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Büyükşahin A(2005). Çok Boyutlu İlişki Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması (The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire: A Study of Reliability and Validity). *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi* 16: 97-105.
- Büyükşahin A(2006). “Yakın İlişkilerde Bağlanım: Yatırım Modelinin Bağlanma Stilleri ve Bazı İlişkisel Değişkenler Yönünden İncelenmesi.” Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Cecero JJ, Nelson JD, Gillie JM (2004). Tools and Tenets of Schema Therapy: Toward the Construct Validity of Early Maladaptive Schema Questionnaire-Research Version (EMSQ-R). *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy* 11: 344-357.
- Conger R, Cui M, Bryant C, Elder G (2009). Competence In Early Adult Romantic Relationships: A Developmental Perspective on Family Influences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 7: 224-237.
- Clifton JA(1995). The Effects of Parenting Style, Attachment and Early Maladaptive Schemas on Adult Romantic Relationships. University of Georgia, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 141p. (Online) Retrieved on 12-April-2010, at URL: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304207837?accountid=15875> .
- Collins NL, Read SJ(1990). Adult Attachment, Working Models, and Relationship Quality in Dating Couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 58: 644-663.
- Duemmler SL, Kobak R(2001). The Development of Commitment and Attachment in Dating Relationships: Attachment Security As Relationship Construct. *Journal of Adolescence* 24: 401–415.
- Jones JT, Cunningham JD(1996). Attachment Styles and Other Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction in Dating Couples. *Personal Relationships* 3(4): 387-399.
- Keelan JPR, Dion KK, Dion KL(1998). Attachment Style and Relationship Satisfaction: Test of a Self Disclosure Explanation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science* 30 (1): 24-35.
- Kirkpatrick LA, Davis KE(1994). Attachment Style, Gender, and Relationship Stability: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66: 502–512.
- Hazan C, Shaver P(1987). Romantic Love Conceptualized As an Attachment Process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52: 511-524.

The Predictive Role of Early Maladaptive Schemas and Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships

- Leech NL, Barrett KC, Morgan GA (2005). *SPSS For Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation*. Second Edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah.
- Lehnart J, Neyer FJ (2006). Should I Stay or Should I Go? Attachment and Personality in Stable and Instable Romantic Relationships. *European Journal of Personality* 20: 475–495.
- Mason O, Platts H, Tyson M (2005). Early Maladaptive Schemas and Adult Attachment in a UK Clinical Population. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice* 78: 549-564.
- Madey SF, Rodgers L(2009). The Effect of Attachment and Sternberg’s Triangular Theory of Love on Relationship Satisfaction. *Individual Differences Research* 7 (2): 76-84.
- Mikulincer M, Erev I (1991). Attachment Style and the Structure of Romantic Love. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30: 273–291.
- Monteoliva A, Garcia-Martinez JMA(2005). Adult Attachment Style and Its Effect on The Quality of Romantic Relationships in Spanish Students. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 145 (6): 745-747.
- Pistole MC, Clark EM, Tubbs AL(1995). Love Relationships: Attachment Style and the Investment Model. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 17(2): 199-209.
- Rodrigues J(2009). “Attachment Style and Intimacy Satisfaction: Does Attachment Style Predict Satisfaction Level in Romantic Relationships?,” Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Kean University.
- Rholes W, Simpson J, Tran S, Martin AM, Friedman M(2007). Attachment and Information Seeking in Romantic Relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33 (3): 422-438.
- Sandra LD, Kobak R(2001). The Development of Commitment and Attachment in Dating Relationships: Attachment Security as Relationship Contract. *Journal of Adolescence* 2: 401-415.
- Selçuk E, Günaydın G, Sümer N, Uysal A(2005). Yetişkin Bağlanma Boyutları İçin Yeni Bir Ölçüm: Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II'nin Türk Örnekleminde Psikometrik Açından Değerlendirilmesi (A New Scale Developed to Measure Adult Attachment Dimensions: Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) - Psychometric Evaluation in a Turkish Sample). *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları* 8 (16): 1-11.
- Simpson JA(1990). Influence of Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5): 971-980.
- Simard V, Moss E, Pascuzzo K(2011). Early Maladaptive Schemas and Child and Adult Attachment: A 15-year Longitudinal Study. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice* 84(4): 349-366.
- Sümer N, Güngör D(1999). Yetişkin Bağlanma Stilleri Ölçeklerinin Türk Örneklemini Üzerinde Psikometrik Değerlendirmesi ve Kültürlerarası Bir Karşılaştırma (Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish samples and a cross-cultural comparison). *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi* 14 (43): 71-109.
- Soygüt G, Karaosmanoğlu A, Çakır Z(2009). Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemaların Değerlendirilmesi: Young Şema Ölçeği Kısa Form-3’ün Psikometrik Özelliklerine İlişkin Bir İnceleme (Assessment of Early Maladaptive Schemas: A Psychometric Study of the Turkish Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3). *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi* 20(1): 75-84.
- Stackert RA, Bursik K(2003). Why Am I Unsatisfied? Adult Attachment Style, Gendered Irrational Relationship Beliefs, and Young Adult Romantic Relationship Satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences* 34: 1419-1429.
- Stiles OE(2004). *Early Maladaptive Schemas and Intimacy in Young Adult’s Romantic Relationships*. Alliant International University, San Francisco. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 112p. (Online)

Retrieved on 12-April-2010, at URL: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305043438?accountid=15875>.

Snell WE, Schicke M, Arbeiter T(2002). Chapter 4: The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire: Psychological Dispositions Associated with Intimate Relations. In W. E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *New Directions In the Psychology of Intimate Relations: Research and Theory*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications. (Online) Retrieved on 12-April-2010, URL: <http://cstl-cla.semo.edu/snell/books/intimate/intimate.htm>.

Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Pearson Education Inc., Fifth edition, Boston.

Young JE, Klosko JS, Weishaar ME(2009). *Şema Terapi (Çev.:Tuğrul Veli Soylu)*, Litera Yayıncılık, İstanbul (Original work published 2003).