

TURKISH ADAPTATION AND VALIDATION OF ROMANTIC  
PARTNER CONFLICT SCALE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY

ŞEYMA KAMA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

MAY 2015

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY  
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Name of the thesis: Turkish Adaptation and Validation of Romantic Partner  
Conflict Scale


Name/Last Name of the Student: Şeyma Kama

Date of the Defense of Thesis: 08.05.2015

The thesis has been approved by the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Assist. Prof. Burak KÜNTAY  
Graduate School Director

I certify that this thesis meets all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of  
Master of Arts.

  
Assist. Prof. İlke Sine EĞECİ  
Program Coordinator

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and we find it fully adequate in  
scope, quality and content, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Examining Committee Members

Signature

Thesis Supervisor  
Assist. Prof. İlke Sine EĞECİ



Member  
Assist. Prof. Burak Doğruyol



Member  
Dr. Mia MEDINA



**‘I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.’**

**Şeyma KAMA**

---

## **ABSTRACT**

### **TURKISH ADAPTATION AND VALIDATION OF ROMANTIC PARTNER CONFLICT SCALE**

Kama, Şeyma

M.A., Clinical Psychology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. İlke Sine EĞECİ

May 2015, 91 pages

Literature has been indicated that conflict resolution styles were very crucial in romantic relationships (Thomas, 1976; Blake & Mouton, 1964; Follet, 1940; Rahim, 1983). Conflict resolution styles include behavioral strategies that prevent escalated conflicts before they occur, diminish them while they occur, or help to diminish possible negative consequences after they occur (Cords & Killen, 1998). Measures that individuals take to reduce the prospect that a conflict will occur or escalate include avoiding each other (Kutsukake & Clutton-Brock, 2008), maintaining dominance relationships (Preuschoft & Schaik, 2000), displaying submissive or destructive conflict resolution behaviors (Bergmüller & Taborsky, 2005). The goal of the current study was to adapt Romantic Partner Conflict Scale into Turkish and to investigate the psychometric properties of the measure for Turkish culture. Romantic Partner Conflict Scale contained six different specific conflict handling behaviors of romantic partners; namely Compromise, Domination, Submission, Avoidance, Interactional Reliability and Separation. The sample of the

study consisted of two hundred twenty six individuals, twenty eight (12.4%) of participants were male and one hundred ninety eight (87.6%) of participants were female. The findings revealed that the Turkish version of The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale is a valid and reliable measure in order to determine romantic partner's conflict handling behaviors. Six factor solutions were found as in the original version of scale (Compromise, Domination, Avoidance, Submission, Interactional Reactivity, and Separation). The findings of the current study were discussed in the light of literature. To the best of our knowledge, this validation and adaptation study was attempted to contribute to measure romantic partner's conflict behaviors in Turkey.

*Keywords:* Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, conflict resolution styles.

## ÖZ

### ROMANTİK PARTNER ÇATIŞMA ÖLÇEĞİ'NİN ADAPTASYON VE VALİDASYON ÇALIŞMASI

Kama, Şeyma

Yüksek Lisans, Klinik Psikoloji

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd.Doç.Dr. İlke Sine EĞECİ

Mayıs 2015, 91 sayfa

Çatışma çözüm stratejilerinin romantik ilişkiler için çok önemli olduğu literatürde gösterilmiştir (Thomas, 1976; Blake & Mouton, 1964; Follet, 1940; Rahim, 1983). Çatışma çözüm stratejileri, çatışmaları oluşmadan önce önleyen, olduğunda çatışmayı hafifleten ya da çatışma oluşuktan sonra ortaya çıkan olumsuz sonuçlarından kaçınmaya yardımcı olan davranışları içermektedir (Cords & Killen, 1998). Kişilerin çatışma davranışlarını ölçmek; çatışmanın oluşması ya da çatışmayı tetikleyen; birbirinden kaçınma, baskın ilişkilerin sürmesi, boyun eğici ve yıkıcı çatışma çözüm davranışlarının sergilenmesi gibi durumların oluşması olasılığını azaltmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Romantik Partner Çatışma Ölçeğini Türkçeye adapte etmek ve bu ölçeğin Türk kültürü için psikometrik özelliklerini incelemektir. Romantik Partner Çatışma ölçeği altı farklı spesifik çatışma çözüm davranışını ölçmektedir. Bu davranışlar; Uzlaşma, Baskınlık, Boyun Eğme, Kaçınma, Reaktivite

ve Ayrılma olarak isimlendirilmektedir. Çalışmanın örneklemini iki yüz yirmi altı kişidir, bu katılımcıların yirmi sekizi (12,4%) erkek, yüz doksan sekizi (87,6%) kadından oluşmaktadır. Sonuçlar Romantik Partner Çatışma Ölçeği'nin romantik ilişkilerde bireylerin çatışma çözüm davranışlarını belirlemede geçerli ve güvenilir bir araç olduğunu göstermektedir. Orijinal versiyon ile aynı olarak altı faktör çözümlenmesi bulunmuştur (Uzlaşma, Baskınlık, Boyun Eğme, Kaçınma, Reaktivite ve Ayrılma). Bu çalışmanın sonuçları literatür ışığında değerlendirilmiştir. Bilgiler doğrultusunda, bu standardizasyon çalışması, Türk bireylerin ilişkideki çatışma çözüm davranışlarını ölçmede katkı sağlamayı amaçlamıştır.

*Anahtar kelimeler:* Romantik Partner Çatışma Ölçeği, çatışma çözüm stilleri.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thanks to many people who supported me to complete this thesis.

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor *Assist.*

*Prof. İlke Sine EĞECİ* for her guidance and valuable suggestions.

I want to thank to committee members for sparing their time and wisdom and help to me.

I have special thanks to *TUBİTAK (Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu)* for financial buttress.

Finally I would like to express my gratitude and love to my family and friends for their patience, belief, and trust in me.

I would like to dedicate my thesis to *TUBİTAK (Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu)*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM .....	I
ABSTRACT .....	IV
ÖZ .....	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	VIII
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	IX
LIST OF TABLES .....	XII
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Conflict .....	2
1.2. Conflict Resolution Styles .....	4
1.3. Conflict Resolution Styles and Relationship Satisfaction .....	10
1.4. Conflict Resolution Styles and Love styles .....	15
1.5. Conflict Resolution Styles and Self-Disclosure .....	19
1.6. Romantic Partner Conflict Measures in Turkey .....	21
1.7. The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale .....	22
1.7.1. History of the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale .....	22
1.8. Significance of the study .....	24
2. METHOD .....	27

2.1. Participants .....	27
2.2. Instruments .....	27
2.2.1. The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale(RPCS).....	27
2.2.1.1. Psychometric Properties of RPCS .....	28
2.2.2. Conflict Resolution Style Scale .....	31
2.2.3. The Relationship Assessment Scale .....	31
2.2.4. Love Attitudes Scale .....	32
2.2.5. Self-disclosure Questionnaire.....	33
2.2.6. Demographic Information Form.....	34
2.3. Procedure.....	34
3. RESULT.....	36
3.1. Factor Analysis.....	36
3.2. Internal Consistency .....	38
3.3. Test Retest Reliability .....	39
3.4. Interscale Correlations.....	40
3.5. Concurrent Validity.....	41
3.5.1. Correlations with Love Styles .....	41
3.5.2. Correlations with Relationship Satisfaction .....	42
3.5.3. Correlations with Self-disclosure to people .....	43
3.5.4. Correlations with Self-disclosure to topics.....	43
3.5.5. Correlations with Self-disclosure .....	44

3.6. Convergent Validity .....	45
3.6.1. Correlations with Conflict Resolution Style Scale .....	45
4.DISCUSSION .....	47
4.1. Findings related to psychometrics properties of RPCS .....	48
4.1.1. Findings related to content validity .....	48
4.1.2. Findings related to convergent validity .....	48
4.1.3. Findings related to concurrent validity .....	51
4.1.3.1. Findings related to conflict resolution styles and relationship satisfaction .....	51
4.1.3.2. Findings related to conflict resolution styles and love styles	52
4.1.3.3. Findings related to conflict resolution styles and self-disclosure .....	59
4.2. Limitations of the study.....	61
REFERENCES.....	62
APPENDICES .....	74

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Correlations between the RPCS subscales and ESCT .....	29
Table 2.2. Correlations between the RPCS subscales and relational variables .....	30
Table 3.1. Promax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the RPCS Items and Explained variance of the six factor .....	37
Table 3.2. Cronbach alpha values for subscales of RPCS .....	39
Table 3.3. Test – Retest Consistencies of Subscale Scores of RPSC .....	39
Table 3.4. Intercorrelations among the subscale scores of RPSC .....	40
Table 3.5. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and love styles .....	42
Table 3.6. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and relationship satisfaction....	42
Table 3.7. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and self-disclosure to people ...	43
Table 3.8. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and self-disclosure to topics....	44
Table 3.9. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and self-disclosure .....	44
Table 3.10. Correlations between RPCS dimensions and CRSS subscales .....	45

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Romantic relationships and conflicts between partners have been an area of interest for many years in the course of psychology both in application and theory (Shantz & Hartup, 1992). Counselors and researchers had focused on defining conflicts, conflict handling behaviors and their association with relationship satisfaction (Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Fincham, 2003; Glick & Gross, 1975; Gottman, 1993; Gottman, Markman, & Notarius, 1977; Greeff & Bruyne, 2000; Kurdek, 1994; Straus, 1979). The conflicts occurring in the couple relationships, has been a primary focus of researches and therapists because of its crucial maintenance and strong relation to marital satisfaction (Heavey, Christensen, & Malamuth, 1995; Shi, 2003). Segal and Jaffe (2007) had proposed that; disagreements could occur in any intimate relationship, and even same opinions and expectations couldn't be always shared between two individuals, and additionally such differences would play an important role in the emergence of conflict. Although, conflict was a concept that had been considered as being negative, unfavorable, unnecessary; however, conflict was entirely inevitable in romantic relationships (Bercheid & Ammazalorso, 2003). Individuals' ways of conflict resolution has become important domain from past to

present, because it was distinguished that conflicts and especially how conflicts get resolved were area of interest within two individuals. Actually as being the core part for causing the disagreements between romantic partners, conflicts gains importance for determining healthy relationships. It is important if it is solved in an integrative way that leads to reparation and improvement in romantic relationships. Resolving conflict successfully, understanding differences and being in an agreement could be essential for the preservation and development of intimate relationship between couples (Cui, Lorenz, Conger, Melby & Bryant, 2005). Using constructive conflict resolution styles would be effective in long term healthiness of relationships, on the other hand, destructive conflict resolutions styles could raise problems in romantic relationships (Segal & Jaffe, 2007). Effective conflict management occur when each individual collaborate in finding solution that meet the desire and needs of both or accept them (Crum, 1987).

### **1.1. Conflict**

Several definitions were existed in order to explain conflict. Conflicts was central part of the marriage and romantic relationships, and also of all human association, and many researchers and counselors have focused on the conflict and especially on how conflict gets resolved in relationships (Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Thomas, 1976; Fincham & Beach, 1999; Gottman, 1993; Gottman, Markman, & Notarius, 1977; Greeff & Bruyne, 2000; Kurdek, 1994). Thomas (1976), had been described that conflict as a situation that triggers struggle between romantic partners and he proposed that if conflict remains unresolved or ends with disunity, it could repeat again in later situations (Thomas, 1976). Peterson (1983) explained conflict as an ‘Interpersonal process that occurs whenever the actions of one individual interfere with the actions of another’ (Peterson, 1983, pg.148) According to Dhir and

Markman (1984), when current solutions are unsatisfied and not mutual, if partner's situation of struggle against each other lasted too long, conflictual situation occurs. Dhir and Markman (1984) put an emphasis on the interdependency between partners and that dependency could cause failure of conflict resolution strategies which were played important role to overcome the struggles of couples. Rahim (1985), defined conflict was disagreement on several issues between couples, but rather than the matter of issue, how issues were handled by partners had much more importance, in long term healthiness of romantic relationships (Rahim, 1985).

Gottman and Levenson (1992) claimed that the principal part of the essence of healthy relationships was the highly satisfied couples which had capacity to find collaborative solutions of their problems and had capacity to cope with their conflicts in a constructive way. Regardless of the fact that conflict was received as problematic in relationships for individuals, partners could be capable of handling the conflict cooperatively, and this cooperative way of resolving conflict was related with higher relationship satisfaction (Gottman, 1993). Conflict could also refer to contradiction or argument between couples (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Mackey (2000) defined conflict was a state of disagreement in romantic relationships that emerged from differences between partners. Guerro, Andersen, Afifi (2001) argued that most married couples find themselves to tie up different types of conflict throughout of their marriages. However, if those conflict issues could be discussed between partners, they would be satisfied, on the other hand dissatisfied couples were more likely to minimize or retreat disagreements in their marriages (Guerro, Andersen & Afifi, 2001). Discussing and processing issues which could cause conflict between partners was important in relationships. Especially, how partners were coping with those conflicts in their current relationships is related with how

satisfied they would be in their relationships (Erber & Erber, 2001). Wood (2007) claimed that conflictual situations effect dynamic of power between partners by forcing them to debate the extent to which they share power (Wood, 2007)

Thus, highlighting conflict in romantic relationships has essential importance in romantic relationships and marriages because; the emergence of patterns of conflict within a relationship could undermine or invigorate the well being of relationship and mental health of individuals (Gottman, 1993). Attaining romantic relationship conflict patterns of individuals, and especially, to put an emphasis on constructive way of conflict behaviors could give opportunity to reconstruct attitudes into positive way so it ensured happiness and longevity of relationships. On the other hand, if destructive style of conflict handling behaviors were used by couples to minimize their conflict, maintaining consistent relationship satisfaction in romantic relationships was become challenge for both of the partners (Stephanou, 2012). Conflict handling patterns of partners were identifier and important factors in order to predict how the romantic relationship will proceed and in order to determine relationship satisfaction between partners, couple's conflict resolution behaviors should be discussed (Birnbaum, Mikulincer & Austerlitz, 2013).

## **1.2. Conflict Resolution Styles**

When encountered with a conflictual situation, the individual could engage in different conflict resolution behaviors (Eckstein, 2011). Conflict resolution styles was referred to the conflict response patterns which contained repeated use of behaviors in order to find solution for disagreements of partners and such styles could provide chance to understand how people tend to deal with conflict (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991). According to Eckstein (2011), conflict styles of couples in the relationship were determined by different needs and opinions and conflict resolution

styles were handled by couples differently. It could change from situation to situation but which styles individuals generally used declared his/her effectiveness, healthiness or destructive way of resolution skill, and also couples could utilized one of conflict management styles or mixture of them (Eckstein, 2011). In the literature, conflict resolution strategies have been studied using a variety of different approaches and definitions (Thomas, 1976; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979; Canary & Cupach, 1988; Kurdek, 1994, Hojjat, 2000)

Primarily, Thomas (1976) had described two independent dimensions of resolution behaviors in conflictual situations which were; assertiveness and cooperativeness. Assertiveness; is a model of behavior of being self-assured and confident. Cooperativeness, on the other hand is an attribution about concerning to found appropriate solutions in the relation, not being self centered and hostile (Cloninger, Svrakic & Przybeck, 1993). According the two dimensions, Thomas (1976) defined five conflict management behaviors; competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding and accommodating. Competing; is defined (distributive) as being more concerned with own interests rather than their partner's interests. People who prefer to use competing style when encountered with conflict; s/he was raking to be assertive, uncooperative and recognizes conflicts as win or loses situations. Competing is characterized by high assertiveness, and low cooperativeness (Thomas, 1976). Compromising; means as coming together for mutual aim with partner. Compromise is characterized by high concern for others and high concern for self. Collaborating; is defined as a conflict style which focuses on cooperative problem solving for both of the partners and recognizes conflicts as win or win situations. Collaborating is identified by a high degree of concern for self and others (Thomas, 1976). Avoiding; is synonymously mean escaping or withdrawal, is characterized by

both unassertiveness and uncooperativeness. Avoiding is defined as a conflict resolution style which included withdrawal behaviors, escaping from conflictual situations. Accommodating; is known as obliging, being indirect and passive and it represents a high concern for other and a very low concern for self. Furthermore, Rahim and Bonoma (1979) identified two dimensions of romantic partner conflict resolution which were concern for self and concern for others. Concern for self is indicated the degree of individual's own attent to satisfy their needs, whereas concern for others is indicated the degree of individual's own attends to satisfy others' needs. According to the two dimensions, Rahim and Bonoma (1979) had identified five different conflict resolution behaviors; compromising, integrating, avoiding, obliging and dominating. Integrating is a style, which is included high level of concern for self and concern for others whereas avoiding is related with low levels of both dimensions. Obliging style is stated with low concern for self, but high concern for others; conversely dominating style is high in concern for self, but low in concern for others. Compromising involves equal levels of both dimensions.

Tezer (1986), identified five different conflict behaviors which were determine individuals' conflict resolution strategies, by using Thomas (1976)'s conflict behaviors definitions; as forcing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, and collaboration. Forcing represents an attempt to force one's viewpoint on the other party; avoiding represents an attempt to withdraw from the conflict; accommodating is a strategy when individual gives up his or her own needs and conforms what the other wants; compromising is based on bargaining and finding a middle ground solution; and collaborating is effective problem solving activities so that all parties can achieve mutually satisfying conclusions to the dispute.

Canary and Cupach (1988) had described three types of communication styles; those were integrative, distributive and avoidance strategies. The individual, who utilized the integrative way of communication, assumes conflict as an opportunity to integrate concerns, to negotiate and to find best solution. Integrative strategy of communication was related with compromise and collaborating conflict resolution styles. On the contrary, the individual who utilized distributive communication strategy, approached conflict as a situation which includes win-lose arguments and outcomes, anger and criticism. And finally, avoidance communication style involves withdrawal, denying and rejecting the presence of conflict.

Additionally, four types of conflict management was identified by Kurdek (1994), and namely, positive problem solving (finding proper solutions and outcomes were beneficial for both of the partners), conflict engagement (personal attacks), withdrawal (denying issues and delaying conversation on another time), and compliance (submitting to partner's demands). Moreover, Hojjat (2000) had been categorized conflict resolution styles into two dimensions, those were activity and valence. Activity dimension is related with the active or passive response of individual when encountered with a conflictual situation. Individual could prefer to behave passive and indirectly, on the other hand could prefer to behave actively and directly toward his/her partner. Valence dimension is related with the degree to which conflict behaviors differentiate on the positive-negative side. While positivity related to equal resolution of the conflict, negativity related to not being dealt with an equal resolution of the conflict. In relation with these two dimensions, Hojjat (2000) identified four conflict resolution behaviors, namely; positive/active, positive/passive, negative/active, and negative/passive. In positive/active strategy, while resolving conflict, behaviors of individual were active and s/he attempt to find

equal solutions. In positive/passive strategy, although passive behaviors occur, individual attempt to find equal solutions too. In negative/active strategy, individuals behave actively but s/he not attempt resist to find equal solutions, domination is related with this dimension. And finally, in negative/passive strategy, individuals strategies and behaviors are passive and s/he not want to find equal solutions such as avoidance, separation.

Conerly and Tripathi (2004) have stated that no one manages all conflicts by the same way and different conflict resolution styles fit different situations. They concluded that it was important to know about the various styles of coping in order to minimize disagreements. Conerly and Tripathi (2004) had also found that there are basically two dimensions that affect the way one manages conflict in a given situation. Similarly with Thomas (1976), Conerly and Tripathi (2004) described two dimensions of conflict resolutions; assertiveness and cooperativeness. First, assertiveness; is how much one cares about achieving her/his own goals-how much s/he is. Second, cooperativeness; the other is how much one cares about the relationship -how much cooperative s/he is.

In the study of Özen (2006), four type of conflict resolution strategies were utilized while developing conflict resolution style scale. Those styles were; positive conflict resolution style of individual which provided discussing the conflict issue and finding reasonable solutions for both partners, positive conflict resolution style could be use in similar sense with constructive management in current study. Negative conflict resolution style of individual which included negative interaction and outcomes of these styles were not satisfactory for partners, negative conflict resolution style could be use in similar sense with destructive management in the current study. Subordination; was concerned with not defending the one's position,

accept and compliance to the partner's requests. Retreat; was conflict resolution style which concerned with avoiding and refusing to discuss the conflict issue, to delay the discussion of the issue to a later time or staying silent. Özen (2006) identified conflict resolution strategies and the meanings of these strategies were the same as Kurdek's four conflict resolution styles.

Moreover, after reviewing literature, while discussing conflict resolution styles, in order to assess and well understand the conflict resolution styles, dividing behaviors into three categories are acceptable, explanatory and widely used; namely constructive (integrative, involves negotiating, sharing, expressing trust, positive), destructive (distributive, involves criticism, anger, negative) and avoidant (changing the focus of conversation, communicating about conflicts indirectly and ambiguously) conflict management strategies (Canary & Cupach, 1988; Kurdek, 1994; Zachilli, Hendrick&Hendrick, 2012) . In the Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012) study, there were six types of conflict resolution styles which were compromise, domination, interactional reactivity, submission, avoidance and separation. Compromise which is a constructive conflict resolution style is a search for a solution acceptable to both partners. Domination is an attempt to reconcile the partner into accepting own side and idea, coerce partner to accept. Interactional Reactivity is conflict management strategy which named by Hendrick & Zachilli (2012), it is characterized by verbal aggression, emotional violatiy and lack of trust between partners. It is discussed in the destructive way of handling conflict. Submission is characterized by one partner giving in to the his/her partner's demands in order to please the partner. Submission is generally assumed as destructive, but in some situations it can be constructive. Avoidance; includes withdrawal conflict situations before they occur. Separation; utilized in the meaning of taking cooling off

period with the intention of returning to the issue at a later time. Avoidance and Separation were not clearly constructive or destructive, how they function could depend on contextual factors (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012)

Within a couple, individuals' ability to resolve conflict and attempt to behave in constructively might be indicative of their overall success in initiating and maintaining their relationships (Weber & Khan, 2005).

### **1.3. Conflict Resolution Styles and Relationship Satisfaction**

Relationship satisfaction is defined as personal assessment of the degree of satisfied feelings for individuals' partner and happiness in the relationship (Rusbult & Zembrodt, 1993). The attempt to realize that contribute to relationship harmony has clear relevance to people in relationships and practitioners who seek to address these issues, such as counselors and family and marriage therapists (Horowitz, McLaughlin, & White, 1998). One of the main reasons for this is that perceived relationship satisfaction was found to be one of the strongest predictors of relationship stability as well as a robust predictor of psychological and physical health (Horowitz, McLaughlin, & White, 1998). The high relationship satisfaction stipulates happiness and longevity and provides to satisfy the need for positive long term couple bonds (Stephanou, 2012). As individuals, they entered into coupling bonds and strong relational bonds and intimacy have significance for individuals. Romantic relationships could be fragile and the emergence of patterns of conflict resolution within a relationship could undermine or invigorate the well being of relationship, relationship satisfaction and mental health of individual (Birnbaum, Mikulincer & Austerlitz, 2013).

The importance of the role of relationship satisfaction of individuals prompt attention on this issue and variables which were related with relationship satisfaction was determined by researchers. One of the important variable which is related with relationship satisfaction is conflict resolution strategies. In addition, how couples behave while encountered with conflict was the best indicator of the long-term relationship success (Gottman, 1994; Notarius, Lashley, & Sullivan, 1997; Notarius & Markman, 1993; Neff & Karney, 2007). Conflict handling patterns of partners were determining factors to how the romantic relationship will proceed and in order to improve relationship satisfaction, couple's conflict resolution behaviors should be discussed (Birnbaum, Mikulincer & Austerlitz, 2013). Attaining romantic relationship patterns of individuals, and to put an emphasis on constructive way of conflict behaviors could give opportunity to reconstruct attitudes into positive way so it ensured happiness and longevity of relationships. Evidence indicated that effects of unequal association and distributive way of solving problems between couple relationship, could increase breakdown and unrecoverable outcomes (Ely, Richards, Wadsworth, & Elliott, 1999; Gruber, 2004; Sigle-Rushton, Hobcraft, & Kiernan, 2005). In fact, there was a strong evidence base research findings, suggested that if conflicts are dissolved in constructive ways, they could serve as protective factors (Amato, 2000; Coleman & Glenn, 2009; Dunn, 2008). The use of mutually constructive communication and conflict resolution strategies may enhance intimacy among partners (Christensen & Shenk, 1991). Individuals who have strong skills in resolving intracouple conflict may increase the longevity of the relationship. There have been many researches and theories formulated concerning the many distinct areas that contain the romantic relationship and how conflict behavior present in the relationship relate to and predict overall relationship satisfaction (Kurdek, 1994;

Coleman & Glenn, 2009; Lashley, & Sullivan, 1997). Research has indicated that conflict resolution strategies can influence stability and longevity of romantic relationships in the future (Crockett & Randall, 2006). It is related with the reason that couples who can successfully resolve conflicts in mutually beneficial ways have a strong motivation for maintaining their relationship. Researches indicated that constructive interaction styles enhance the marital satisfaction (Canary & Cupach, 1988; Canary & Spitzberg, 1989; Cartensen et.al, 1995; Christensen & Shenk, 1991; Sprecher, 2004; Meeks, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1998; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1990). By contrast, couples who become mired in arguments could have obstacles (Bergman & Surrey, 1994; Fishbane, 2001; Gottman, Krakoff, 1989). Less adaptive strategies can lead to relationship unhappiness (Feeney, 2002).

Thomas (1976) resulted that collaborating and compromise conflict resolution behavior was related with higher relationship satisfaction, whereas avoidance was related negatively with satisfaction (Thomas, 1976).

Gottman and Krokoff (1989) conducted a longitudinal study of marital interaction to demonstrate communication patterns in conflictual situation. They proposed that although some interaction patterns, like disagreement of spouses, conflict engagement, and expressions of anger were related negatively with relationship satisfaction. Canary and Spitzberg (1989) added that relation between conflict messages and relational satisfaction was cooperate by competence perceptions. These researchers also claimed that integrative strategies were positively related to competence, on the other hand distributive and avoidant strategies were negatively related with competence. After reviewing the literature related with the conflict interactions, Kurdek (1994) also studied the relationship between conflict and relationship satisfaction with a sample of gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples.

Kurdek claimed that both of the partner's relationship satisfaction was negatively related with the frequency and degree of arguing. Indeed, arguments including power and intimacy were more diminishes to the relationship satisfaction than were arguments including personal plans, social issues, and distrust. It was indicated that issues which were related with domination cause lower relationship satisfaction than other issues (Kurdek, 1994).

Gottman, Coan, Carrere, and Swanson (1998) gave importance on the conflict management styles of newlywed couples. They found that divorce could be predicted by the behaviors which were wives anger to their husbands, husbands deny wives' ideas and influence, a negative start-up by wives in which anger is placed at the center stage when encountering with their husbands; in response, a disavow by husbands in accepting influence from their wives; mutual negativity by wives and the absence of responses which may prevent the increment of negative responses from the husbands. Conversely, happiness in the marriages is provided by wives capacity to initiate constructive communication and affect and husbands response to this affect in a constructive way (listening, accepting). Finally, it was found that positive affect, even if conflicts occur, were related with long term stability and happiness in marriages (Gottman, Coan, Carrere, and Swanson, 1998). In conclusion, both cross-sectional and longitudinal findings demonstrated that conflict resolution interactions may predict marital satisfaction and stability in different way (Karney & Bradbury, 1995).

Cramer (2000) conducted a study to determine the effect of frequency of conflict and the relation between relationship satisfaction and a negative conflict style in romantic relationships. He found that, relationship satisfaction was

negatively correlated with conflict, with negative conflict style and with unresolved conflict.

Greeff and Bruyne (2000) studied with using the conflict management styles of Thomas (1976) and found that when couples or one of the partners used the destructive conflict resolution style, the lowest marital satisfaction was determined. Additionally, collaborative conflict management style had correlation with the relationship satisfaction, for both males and females. Greeff and Bruyne (2000) also had suggested that partners in the marriage utilized the different conflict management styles. However, in marriages where collaboration management style was used, generally both of partners were reported using this constructive conflict management style and reported to have higher relationship satisfaction.

Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012) suggested that there was a significant positive correlation between compromise (constructive conflict resolution behavior) and relationship satisfaction. On the other hand, interactional reactivity and domination which are assumed as destructive conflict strategies were negatively related with relationship satisfaction. Additionally, submission was negatively related with relationship satisfaction.

According to Turkish researches, there was a significant relationship between marital compromise and conflict management styles. According to Tezer (1986), the perception of partners to conflicts and relationship satisfaction were significantly related. It was found that wives perception that there were less amount of conflict in her present relationship, and men perception that there were no conflict in his present relationship, and less frequent of unresolved conflict in the marriages were related positively with marital satisfaction. Consistent with the literature, low adjustment couples use more destructive communication styles than high adjustment couples

(Malkoç, 2001). Thus, there was two sided interaction between relationship satisfaction and conflict resolution strategies. Perceived relationship quality effect the conflict resolution style and reversely utilized conflict resolution strategies effect relationship quality.

In the study of Özen (2006), the relation between conflict resolution of couples, both wives and husbands and marital satisfaction was assessed. The results of this Turkish study revealed that it was found negative conflict resolution styles of wives and husbands negatively predicted marital satisfaction of couples. Additionally, it was found that, spouses high in positive conflict resolution style and low in negative conflict resolution style had higher scores on marital adjustment than spouses low in positive conflict resolution style and high in negative conflict resolution style (Özen, 2006).

#### **1.4. Conflict Resolution Styles and Love Styles**

Love is unavoidable concept which could be appraised in correlation manner within relationships, while examining relationship conflicts. In daily life, romantic relationships are crucial for intimacy and in intimate relations love was important issue and factor (Schwartz, 2006). Love in marriage or romantic relationships is related with relational conflict and also related with relationship satisfaction (Friker & Moore, 2002). Lee (1973) identified the six love styles; namely Eros, Storge, Agape, Pragma, Ludus and Mania. Eros (passionate love); is a passionate love and involves high intimacy, highly sensual and intense, provide sexual satisfaction, and suitable and mutual enjoyment. Individual who have Eros type of love more likely to tell s/he fell in love at first sight when encounter with her/his partner. There is a phenomenon that romantic love is thought to be passionate and exciting (Riela,

Rodriguez, Xu & Acevedo, 2010). Storge (companionate love) ; is based more on friendship, includes similar desires, interests and mutual goals, being in a commitment is much more important rather than passion .Agape(selfless love); is style of love which one partner being altruistic and having unconditional commitment to other's interests, demands and ideas and acting according to partner. The partner take more pleasure being selfless than from receiving pleasure and is willing to tolerate difficulty that result from the partner's affair (Lee, 1988). Pragma (practical love); is based on the perceptions of purposive and like business. People who prefer pragma style of love want to choose partner who share common and mutual goals with herself/himself and want to strive with their partner to reach a mutual aim. In friendship love (storge) partners give importance to shared opinions and being similar, on the other hand in practical love (pragma) individuals prefer to choose partner who shared similar logic of thinking with his/her ideas (Hovardoğlu & Büyüksahin, 2004).Ludus (game-playing love); is love style which is used by individual who want to have fun in love and want to do activities outdoor generally, to play good natured teasing on each other. Love assumed as the part of game and ludic lovers have tendency to have more than one partner at the same time. Mania (possessive, dependent love); is a love style which includes reinforcement of value and one partner dependent to other and generally individual have feelings like needed to his/her partner (Lee,1973).

Sternberg (1986) had determined three components of love, namely; passion, commitment and intimacy. Passion provides intense emotions, commitment (which is described as more involving in relationship) provides attachment and self-disclosure and intimacy (which is described as close ,familiar affectionate love) includes falling

in love in first sight, in short term; in long term, it includes the stability of maintaining relationship.

Meeks, Hendrick and Hendrick (1998) had proposed that there was a correlation between conflict resolution styles and love styles of individuals. In their study, the result have yielded that eros and agape love attitudes were related with constructive conflict behaviors especially compromise, because partners who had eros type and agape type of love attitude were over invested to their relationship and gave importance to their partners' happiness, they were attempt to behave more constructively. On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between ludus and destructive conflict strategies, because individuals who have ludus love style were not interested in resolution, they have tendency to prefer to resolve conflict with avoidance, rejecting and separation. Meeks, Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) were used love styles in expanded theoretical area and in their research the six basic love styles were utilized in order to attempt to predict couples relationship qualities. Eros and agape were found positively related to individual reports of relationship qualities, and ludus was negatively related.

Additionally, conflict strategies were found significantly correlated with love styles in the study of Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012). Eros, Pragma and Agape love styles were positively related with compromise and compromise was negatively correlated with ludus and mania. Avoidance conflict resolution behavior was positively related with pragma. Interactional Reactivity was negatively related with eros and storge, positively related with mania. Domination was negatively correlated with eros and agape, positively related with ludus. Submission was positively related with mania and agape (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012).

The research suggested that inter-partner conflict within relationships occur in a frequent manner and the source of disagreements could be possessiveness and partner's love attitude, and they were related with conflictual situations and relationship success (Guerrero, 2001). Richardson, Medvin and Hammock (1988), had proposed that individuals who prefer to have ludus love attitudes were change their partners often whereas pragmatic lovers have more long term relationships and relationship satisfaction.

According to Turkish studies, in the study which was performed by Hovardoğlu and Büyükşahin (2004), the analyses have yielded that, women display agape love style in their relationships more than men, while there is no difference between men and women with regard to other love styles. Furthermore, the results showed that the love styles were differentiating according to the type of the relationship or being married. It was found that dating couples display mania and eros love style more than engaged/married couples. It was revealed that relationship satisfaction was positively correlated with agape and eros love styles while relationship satisfaction was negatively correlated with ludus love styles. In their study, it was found that there was a negative correlation between having trouble with relationship and agape and eros love style while there was a positive correlation between having trouble with relationship and ludus and mania love style. In contrast with Meeks, Hendrick and Hendrick (1998), it was found that there was no positive relation between relationship satisfaction and storge in their study. In the study of Beştav (2007); it was proposed that there was correlation between love styles and relationship satisfaction. Eros and storge love styles were positively related with relationship satisfaction. It was found also agape love style and ludus love style was negatively related with relationship satisfaction.

### **1.5. Conflict Resolution Styles and Self-disclosure**

Self-disclosure is described as the act of revealing personal information to the others and disclosing may involve everything an individual chooses to state to other person about herself/himself (Jourard and Jaffe, 1970). What type of information and feelings do people disclose about themselves, what are the effects of disclosure on the relationship individual with the person disclosed to, and which people individual preferred to disclosed are main questions that argued in several approaches in theoretical frame (Rubin, 1973). While revealing personal issues, there are people important in life that individual prefers to disclose. Those people could be mother, father, friends, teachers or counselor. Furthermore, the information which people prefer to disclose about self could be descriptive or evaluative and could include thoughts, goals, issues that might be about school, family, sexuality, personality and demands (Emmi & Kokkonen, 2007)

According to Tolstedt and Stokes (1984) there are two dimensions of self-disclosure: breadth and depth. Depth and breadth are important while developing intimate relationship. Breadth of disclosure is defined by the variety of topics discussed by two individuals. Depth of disclosure is the level of information which person wants to share with others and includes private statements. In the beginning of the relationships it is easier to increase breadth because topics include general information rather than private information. Depth is not easier to expand because it includes more private ideas, hided and inner feelings. This is why individual disclose widest range of topics with their partners. Breadth and depth is higher in romantic relationships (Betys & Stokes, 1984) According to Altman (1973) self-disclosure occurs early in relational interactions, but more intimate self-disclosure occurs later. There were layers in order to develop intimacy. First layer include little talk and

conversations contains not personal and private information. The next layer is degree which the couple improves the breadth and depth and reveal more personal attainment where private information is shared (Altman, 1973).

Self-disclosure is used as a method of relationship maintenance and significant positive relationships had been found between relationship satisfaction and the range of spouses' disclosure (Rehman, Rellini & Fallis, 2011). According to literature less intimacy disclosures serves more negative relationship satisfaction between partners (Tolstedt & Stokes, 1984). Using separation (utilized in the meaning of taking cooling off period with the intention of returning to the issue at a later time) conflict management style could be correlated with less self-disclosure and having a break from telling inner thoughts, not continuing conflict is opposite to disclosing own ideas to the partner (Tolstedt & Stokes, 1984).

Self-disclosure between partners is functioned through sharing needs and expectations. Self-disclosure offers opportunity to reduce emotional distance, marital stress via being direct, being visible. Furthermore, it helps partners to obtain emotional support and validation from each other (Rosenfeld & Bowen, 1991). Self-disclosure capacity is related with directness, clarity, assertiveness issues and those issues and the ability to argue well are essential skills in conflict management. Such emphasis on assertiveness and direct communication may further promote the use of active tactics in managing conflict (Hooker & Wilmot, 1995). According to study of Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012) results revealed that self-disclosure was significant positively correlated with compromise (constructive conflict management style) and negatively correlated with domination and submission which are destructive ways of conflict management style. Individuals' explanations of happy marriages have ultimate form of intimacy and involve high capacity to handle

conflict in integrative ways of management and comprised high capacity to disclose about self (Laurencaeu, Barrett& Rovine, 2005).

### **1.6. Romantic Partner Conflict Measures in Turkey**

There is less amount of evaluative scale which attempt to measure the conflict resolution styles of romantic partners. One of the scales which measure conflict management style is Conflict Behavior Questionnaire developed by Tezer (1986) and it consists of five statements defining five different conflict resolution behaviors. Forcing (impose other to sanctify own idea or demand), Avoiding (withdrawal from conflictual situations), Accommodating (obliging and being passive), Compromising (finding mutual solutions for each party, and Collaboration (both partner could achieve mutually satisfying conclusion to dispute). Conflict Behavior Questionnaire is assessed five different conflict resolution behaviors but it consisted of just 5 items and it is not valid and reliable measurement.

Secondly, Conflict Resolution Style Scale is another measurement of conflict management strategies of romantic partners which is developed by Özen (2006). Four conflict resolution styles are measured for each spouses; Positive conflict resolution style (is integrative, involves sharing, expressing trust), Negative conflict resolution style (is distributive, involves criticism, anger expressions), Subordination (accept and compliance to the partner's requests) and Retreat (avoiding and refusing to discuss the conflict issue or staying silent and to postpone the discussion of the issue to a later time). Cronbach's Alpha for the positive, negative, retreat, and subordination conflict resolution styles were .80, .82, .74, and .73. In the Özen's study (2006), findings yielded that reliability analysis was satisfactory, but the criterion validity analysis of the scale were performed by new scale (Conflict Resolution Styles Inventory which was developed by Özen in the same study, using

Kurdek' conflict resolution patterns). Moreover, conflict resolution behavior patterns of this scale are not distinct and not discriminative (general definitions of resolution behaviors are included; such as positive or negative conflict resolution style). However, in the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, six different, discriminate and distinct conflict resolution behavior are attempt to obtain and it brings new conflict resolution behaviors into literature ; such as Separation and Interactional Reactivity.

Consequently, there is necessity to utilized standardized, new, valid and reliable scale which is attempt to assess specific and different conflict resolution styles, and the main goal of the current study is fulfill this space and to conduct validation and adaptation study of Romantic Partner Conflict Scale into Turkish.

## **1.7. The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS)**

### **1.7.1. History of Romantic Partner Conflict Scale**

Zachilli, Hendrick and Henrick (2012) had developed a new scale to measure relationship conflict and items of the scale were developed based on existing researches and theories while developing RPCS. Straus, Hamby, Boney- McCoy, and Sugarman's (1996) Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, Marital Agendas Protocol which identifies the degree of issues which are sources of conflict in the couple's marriage (Notarius & Vanzetti, 1983), 17-item Conflict Management Questionnaire which includes conflict concepts; positivity/negativity and activity/passivity (Hojjat, 2000), and The Episode-Specific Conflict Tactics Scale (ESCT) which assess integrative, distributive and avoidance conflict strategies (Canary, Cunningham, & Cody, 1988) were used in order to perform validity analysis of the RPCS. In their study, different variables which were considered as in relational with conflict were utilized and namely variables were communication, love, sexuality, relationship satisfaction, respect and sex differences (Zachilli, Hendrick & Henrick, 2012)

While developing Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, three studies were conducted. In the first study; scale items were formulated related with past theories and scales. According to factor analyses there were six-factor solutions was found and the names of factors (subscales) were compromise, domination, submission, separation, avoidance, and interactional Reactivity. After, the findings of correlations between conflict and relational variables were determined. Significant correlations between conflict and relationship satisfactions and respect were; compromise was significantly positively related to higher relationship satisfaction and respect. Domination and interactional reactivity were negatively related with relationship satisfaction and respect. Submission was negatively related to relationship satisfaction. Avoidance and separation had not any correlations with relationship satisfaction and respect.

In study 2, after performing confirmatory factor analysis, correlations between RPCS and ESCT (Canary, Cunningham & Cody 1988) and love styles, self-disclosure, sexual communication and sexual attitudes were demonstrated. Moreover, the subscales representing constructive conflict strategies (especially Compromise) were positively related to sexual communication, higher relationship satisfaction, respect, self-disclosure. Eros, pragma and agape love styles were positively related with compromise and it was negatively correlated with ludus and mania. Avoidance was positively related with pragma. Interactional Reactivity was negatively related with eros and storge, positively related with mania. Domination was negatively correlated with eros and agape, positively related with ludus. Submission was positively related with mania and agape. The subscales representing destructive strategies (Interactional Reactivity, Domination and Submission) were negatively

related to relationship satisfaction, respect, sexual communication and self-disclosure. Domination and submission were negatively related with self-disclosure.

In study 3, test–retest reliability analyses for the six subscales of the RPCS were conducted and test- retest analysis for an interval of one month was obtained for a subset of the sample.

### **1.8. Significance of the study**

Literature indicated that conflict resolution strategies were very crucial in romantic relationships (Thomas, 1976; Blake & Mouton, 1964; Follet, 1940; Rahim, 1983). Determining management strategies of couples could give opportunity to evaluate those patterns quantitatively in researches and practice. There are two scales which designated to register partner's conflict resolution behavior in Turkey. Conflict Resolution Style Scale was reliable scale, but validity analysis of this scale was performed by new measurement. Also, it was consisted four conflict resolution behavior (positive conflict resolution style, negative conflict resolution style, subordination and retreat) which were extensive, nebulous and not specifically measure different conflict behavior style. Another scale was Conflict Resolution Questionnaire; had 5 items to attempt to measure conflict behavior and number of items was not satisfactory to register. Adaptation study of Romantic Partner Conflict Scale implemented newest, reliable and valid measure into psychological practice in Turkey and attempt to assess six different, explanatory, distinct and specific conflict behaviors. The main aim of the current study was to translate and adapt Romantic Partner Conflict Scale in Turkish and perform the reliability and validity analysis of this measure.

Based on existing researches, literature and the original study, the following hypotheses were proposed in the current study:

H1 Consistent with the original study of the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, factor analysis should confirm the six factor model, including subscales; compromise, avoidance, separation, domination, submission and interactional reactivity.

H2 While assessing convergent validity, it was hypothesized that constructive conflict resolution style (compromise) of RPCS would be positively related to positive conflict resolution style of CRSS. Destructive conflict resolution behaviors (interactional reactivity and domination) of RPCS would be positively related to negative conflict resolution of CRSS.

H3 Consistent with previous literature, researches and original study, it was hypothesized that relationship satisfaction would be positively correlated to constructive conflict behavior, namely; compromise.

H4 Consistent with previous literature, researches and original study, it was hypothesized that relationship satisfaction would be negatively related to destructive conflict strategies, namely; domination, interactional reactivity and additionally submission.

H5 Consistent with original study, previous researches and literature, it was hypothesized that eros (passionate love), and agape (altruistic love) should be positively related with constructive conflict resolution behavior (compromise) and negatively related with destructive conflict resolution behaviors (interactional reactivity, domination)

H6 Consistent with original study, previous researches and literature, it was hypothesized that ludus (game-playing love) love attitudes should be positively related to destructive conflict behaviors and negatively related to constructive conflict behaviors.

H7 The relationship between conflict resolution behaviors and self-disclosure had received little attention in the literature but findings of original study had demonstrated that a significant correlations between self-disclosure and conflict resolution behaviors. Consistent with original study, it was hypothesized that self-disclosure should be positively related to constructive conflict strategy (compromise) and should be negatively related to destructive conflict behaviors (interactional reactivity, domination and submission)

Based on existing researches, literature and the original study, the following research questions were proposed in the current study:

R1 How do submission, separation and avoidance subscales of RPCS correlate with CRSS subscales and on the other hand how do subordination and retreat subscales of CRSS correlate with subscales of RPCS?

R2 How do avoidance and separation subscales of RPCS correlate with relationship satisfaction?

R3 How do submission, avoidance and separation subscales of RPCS correlate with love styles?

R4 How do avoidance and separation subscales of RPCS correlate with self-disclosure?

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **METHOD**

#### **2.1. Participants**

The sample of the current study consisted of 226 university students, with male 28 (12.4%) and with female 198 (87.6%). The ages were varied from 19 to 29, with a mean age of 23.12 ( $SD = 1.97$ ) years. Marital and relationship status of sample were; 96 (42.5%) of the participants who were in a romantic relationship, 82 (36.3) of the sample was singles who were not currently in a relationship, whereas 43 (19.0%) of the participants who never had a romantic relationship and finally 5 (2.2%) participants were married. Furthermore, the length of relationship of the participants who were in a romantic relationship was ranged from 3 months to 7 years ( $M=25$ ,  $SD=20.97$ ). Moreover, retest data was recruited 73 university students (32.3%) from sample.

#### **2.2. Instruments**

##### **2.2.1. The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale**

Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS) is a 39 items self-report instrument developed by Zacchili, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012). The scale assesses everyday conflicts between romantic partners, and consist of 6 subscales; Compromise, Domination, Submission, Separation, Avoidance and Interactional Reactivity. The scale is 5 point Likert type measurement. Higher scores indicate that the individual

uses this conflict style mostly. Total RPCS score was not measured. Items 1-14 belong to compromise, items 15-17 belong to avoidance, items 18-23 belongs to interactional reactivity, items 24- 28 belongs to separation, items 29-34 belongs to domination and items 35-39 related with submission subscales.

#### **2.2.1.1. Psychometric Properties of the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale**

Psychometric properties of the RPCS were conducted by Zacchili, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012) in a community sample of undergraduates. The exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood with promax rotation was calculated for the factor structure. The results supported the six factors the RPCS.

Reliability of the RPCS was evaluated by examining the Cronbach alpha values. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the subscales are as follows: Compromise (.95), Domination (.87), Avoidance (.82), Submission (.82), Separation (.83), and Interactional Reactivity (.82). The test-retest correlations of RPCS are assessed after one month periods. Test-retest correlations were between .70 and .85 (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012).

Convergent validity of the RPCS was assessed by Zacchili, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012) by comparing it with the Episode-Specific Conflict Tactics Scale (ESCT) (Canary & Cupach, 1988) which measure the conflict, Scores from the SDQ and CBCL were found to be correlated and they were approximately able to evaluate conflict in same way. In order to indicate convergent validity, correlation between RPCS and ESCT (Conflict measure) was assessed (shown in table 1). In the current study, one conflict scale for convergent validity analysis were used; CRSS (Conflict Resolution Style Scale (analyses findings shown in Chapter 3; Result).

**Table 2.1. Correlations between subscales of RPCS (original version) and ESCT**

	<b>Integrative</b>	<b>Avoidance</b>	<b>Distributive</b>
<b>Compromise</b>	,51**	-,38**	-,37**
<b>Avoidance</b>	,18**	,16**	-,11**
<b>Interactional_Reactivity</b>	-,35**	,42**	,63**
<b>Separation</b>	-,39**	,39**	,60**
<b>Domination</b>	-,11*	,36**	,25**
<b>Submission</b>	-,05	,18*	,15**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

In the original study the correlations between RPCS subscales and relationship satisfaction, love styles, respect, sexual communication and self-disclosure were obtained, in order to perform concurrent validity analysis (shown in Table 2). The correlation between RPCS subscales and Relationship Satisfaction in the original form of RPCS study were follows: Compromise was significantly positively related to relationship satisfaction. Domination was significantly negatively related to relationship satisfaction. Interactional reactivity was significantly negatively related to relationship satisfaction. Submission was significantly negatively related to relationship satisfaction. Thus, there were no significant findings for avoidance or separation. Compromise was related to the positive relationship qualities of satisfaction. Domination and interactional reactivity were related negatively to relationship satisfaction. Submission was negatively related to satisfaction. Avoidance and separation were unrelated to satisfaction. The correlation between RPCS subscales and Love Attitudes in the original form of RPCS study was follows: Eros was significantly positively related to compromise and significantly negatively related to interactional reactivity and domination. Agape was significantly positively related to compromise and significantly negatively

related to domination. Ludus was significantly positively related to domination and interactional reactivity and significantly negatively related to compromise. Storge (friendship love) was significantly positively related to compromise and significantly negatively related to interactional Reactivity; pragma (practical love) was significantly positively related to compromise and avoidance; and ludus was significantly positively related to submission. The correlations between RPCS subscales and Self-disclosure; domination and submission were negatively related to self-disclosure. Compromise was significantly related with self-disclosure (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012).

**Table 2.2. Correlations between the RPCS (original) and relational variables**

Variable	RPCS subscales					
	Interactional					
	Compromise	Avoidance	reactivity	Separation	Domination	Submission
RAS	.51**	.03	-.37**	-.08	-.16**	-.24**
Self-disclosure	.43**	-.01	-.10	.00	-.12*	-.15**
<i>Love styles</i>						
Eros	.48**	.03	-.23**	-.08	-.17**	-.13
Ludus	-.27**	.01	.36**	.09	.39**	.09
Storge	.23**	.05	-.14**	-.01	-.08	-.08
Pragma	.19**	.12*	-.03	.01	-.06	.02
Mania	-.10	-.06	.35**	.04	.30**	.28**
Agape	.25**	.09	-.01	-.02	-.15**	.20**

RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

### **2.2.2. Conflict Resolution Style Scale**

The Conflict Resolution Styles Scale (CRSS; Özen, 2006) consist of 25 items, and it is 6 point Likert type scale which measures four conflict resolution styles; positive conflict resolution style; resolving conflict in constructive way, negative conflict resolution style; resolving conflict in constructive way, subordination; is concerned with not defending the one's position, accept and compliance to the partner's requests, and retreat; was conflict resolution style which concerned with avoiding and refusing to discuss the conflict issue, to delay the discussion of the issue to a later time or staying silent. Criterion validity analysis of CRSS was performed with Kurdek's Conflict Resolution Styles Inventory (CRSI) and the Turkish version of this inventory is new scale, developed by Özen also in the same study and there was not standardization study of CRSI in order to assess conflict resolution. Reliability analysis of CRSS; Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of for the positive, negative, retreat, and subordination conflict resolution styles were .80, .82, .74, and .73 respectively and indicating appropriate internal consistencies. Findings demonstrate that the Turkish version of the scale is reliable and valid instrument to measure conflict resolution (Özen, 2006). In order to perform convergent validity analysis, the CRSS was utilized, in the current study.

### **2.2.3. The Relationship Assessment Scale**

The Relationship Satisfaction Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988) was developed in order to measure general satisfaction degree of romantic relationship and consist of 7-items. Scale was both reliable and valid measure in order to evaluate relationship satisfaction having proper internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha: .87) Participants

responds for each item by 5 point scale ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 5 (high satisfaction). The higher the score, the more satisfied the respondent is in his/her relationship (Hendrick, 1988). The Turkish version of Relationship Assessment Scale is standardized by Yalçındağ (2009), resulted with proper internal consistency (Cronbach alpha: .86). In the present study, in order to assess concurrent validity analysis, The Relationship Assessment Scale was used and correlations between relationship satisfaction and romantic partners' conflict were performed.

#### **2.2.4. Love Attitudes Scale**

The Love Attitude Scale (LAS; Hendrick, Hendrick & Dicke, 1998) is a 24-item questionnaire which measures attitudes of love. The scale is divided into 6 subscales (7 items each) that each represent a different love styles: Eros (passionate love); is a passionate love and involves high intimacy, highly sensual and intense, provide sexual satisfaction, and suitable and mutual enjoyment. Storge (companionate love) ; is based more on friendship, includes similar desires, interests and mutual goals, being in a commitment is much more important rather than passion .Agape(selfless love); is style of love which one partner being altruistic and having unconditional commitment to other's interests, demands and ideas and acting according to partner. The partner take more pleasure being selfless than from receiving pleasure and is willing to tolerate difficulty that result from the partner's affair (Lee, 1988). Pragma (practical love); is based on the perceptions of purposive and like business. People who prefer pragma style of love want to choose partner who share common and mutual goals with herself/himself and want to strive with their partner to reach a mutual aim. Mania (dependent love) is a love style which means of reinforcement of value and one partner dependent to other and generally individual have feelings like needed to his/her partner. Each item is answered using a

5-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Internal consistency scores of LAS scale ranged between .62 to .88. The Turkish version of Love Attitudes Scale was conducted by Büyükşahin and Hovardoğlu (2004), showing consistent results with the originals scale regarding its factor structure and number of items. Internal consistency scores of subscales ranges between .51 and .80, in the Turkish version. Findings demonstrate that the Turkish version of the scale is a reliable and valid instrument to measure love attitudes (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2004). In the present study, in order to assess concurrent validity analysis, The Love Attitude Scale was utilized and correlations between love styles and romantic partners' conflict were performed.

#### **2.2.5. Self-disclosure Questionnaire**

The Self-disclosure Questionnaire (SDQ; Selçuk, 1988) consists of 48 items and it includes self-disclosure to 6 topics; opinions, school, family, sexuality, personality, interests and self-disclosure to 6 people; mother, father, same-sex friend, opposite-sex friend, teacher, psychological counselor. It is 3 point Likert type scale which measures three type of self-disclosure; those were; self-disclosure to people, self-disclosure to topics and self-disclosure total. Questionnaire was developed by Selçuk (1988), with using the contents of Self-disclosure Questionnaire of Jourard (1958) and Inventory of Self-disclosure of Flanders (1976). The mean value of reliability analysis of SDQ was found .84 and re-test correlations scores of SDQ were ranged between .79-.91. In order to invigorate the validity analysis of SDQ, the Self-disclosure Inventory (Baymur, 1977) was utilized, and a validity analysis value was .68. In order to invigorate concurrent validity analysis, the SDQ was used.

### **2.2.6. Demographic Information Form**

Demographic Information Form (see appendix H) was developed by the researcher in order to collect information regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants, such as; age, gender, education level, marital status, duration of relationship and future plan of relationship. The form has been prepared with multiple choice and open-ended questions format.

### **2.3 Procedure**

Firstly, in order to perform adaptation study of Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS) into Turkish, the permission was taken from Tammy L. Zacchilli and Clyde Hendrick and Susan S. Hendrick. Then, the ethical permission was obtained. The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale was first translated by two professionals (one from Modern Language Department and the other from Psychology Department) who are fluent in both English and Turkish. In the second step, both forms were presented to three Psychologists, who are also fluent in both languages, and they were asked to compare the similarities of translations regarding their wording, sentence structure, meaning, and relevance and to choose one of the translations or provide alternative suggestions. In the final step, all suggestions of these professionals were taken into account and the translations with high consensus were selected for the final version of the translation.

In order to collect the data, two ways were implemented; the online survey and paper-based data collection. For paper-based data collection, instruments were administered by students from Fatih University and Bahçeşehir University. To obtain test-retest data, a subset of participants were randomly selected from only those two universities and test- retest analysis for an interval of two weeks was obtained for a subset of the sample. Besides, an information form was attached at the beginning of

the instruments, which contained necessary information regarding the researcher, aim of the study, random sampling, and important points in filling in the instruments. The total administration time of the instruments was approximately 45 minutes for each individual.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULT

#### 3.1. Factor Analysis

A Principal Component Factor Analysis with the promax rotation was performed to determine the number of the factor analysis. Initially, to verify the suitability of the data, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was checked and found to be .87. Additionally, the Barlett's Test of Sphericity value was found to be significant ( $p < .001$ ); indicating that the data was appropriate for factor analysis. A factor loading greater than .40 was required in order for an item to be included in the related factor.

The initial analysis revealed eight-factor structure with eigenvalues above 1 (9.72, 5.42, 3.71, 2.37, 1.63, 1.31), which explained a total of 67.32 % of the variance. However, factors which loaded on the seventh and eight components cross-loaded on other factors. The examination of loadings yielded that loadings were higher on the first factors and additionally, considering the interpretability, the analysis repeated by forcing 7-factor solutions. The seven-factor structure explained a total of 64.70% of the variance. Because of the same findings with eight factor structure were revealed, the analysis repeated by 6-factors solution. The six-factor

structure explained a total of 61.93% of the variance. The examination of item loadings revealed that all items, except for one (item 7), had loadings under their original factors. However, item 7 was loaded to factor five in the current study had loading below .40, and therefore omitted from the scale. Results of the factor analysis are presented in Table 3.

In summary, factor analysis of the items resulted in six subscales consistent with the original study; and therefore labeled as Compromise, Domination, Submission, Separation, Interactional Reactivity, and Avoidance. In relation with original study total scores of the subscales are generated by calculating the mean as in the original form. Factor structure and factor's names are same with the original form (see appendix for item scored on each of the RPCS of the Turkish version)

**Table 3.1. Promax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the RPCS Items and Explained Variance of the Six Factors**

	<b>Factors</b>					
	<b>1</b> <b>Compromise</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Domination</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Submission</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Separation</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Interactional Reactivity</b>	<b>6</b> <b>Avoidance</b>
<b>% of Variance</b>	24.92	13.90	9.51	6.08	4.17	3.35
<b>Eigenvalues</b>	9.72	5.42	3.71	2.37	1.63	1.31
<b>Items</b>						
1	<b>.77</b>	-.10	.00	-.07	.10	-.00
2	<b>.69</b>	-.12	-.04	-.10	.19	-.09
3	<b>.71</b>	.05	.02	-.02	-.03	-.15
4	<b>.73</b>	-.01	.06	-.07	-.09	-.10
5	<b>.78</b>	.01	.03	.06	-.10	-.08
6	<b>.68</b>	.08	.05	-.04	-.14	.06
8	<b>.66</b>	-.03	.23	.09	-.10	.07
9	<b>.69</b>	-.04	.10	.17	-.12	.04
10	<b>.86</b>	-.02	-.02	.04	.09	-.01
11	<b>.85</b>	.06	-.02	.03	.06	.03
12	<b>.85</b>	.03	-.10	-.04	.04	.07
13	<b>.88</b>	.04	-.09	.01	.10	.08

14	<b>.82</b>	.06	-.13	-.03	.05	.11
29	-.00	<b>.88</b>	.03	.03	-.05	-.06
30	.00	<b>.86</b>	-.10	-.02	.01	.03
31	.01	<b>.80</b>	-.05	-.07	.13	.01
32	-.05	<b>.84</b>	.14	.03	-.16	-.03
33	.01	<b>.70</b>	.01	-.12	.20	.07
34	.11	<b>.59</b>	.02	.22	-.01	-.00
35	-.05	.01	<b>.88</b>	.03	-.04	.01
36	-.00	-.02	<b>.88</b>	-.03	.10	.02
37	.05	.13	<b>.77</b>	-.10	.05	.02
38	.09	-.03	<b>.85</b>	-.05	.03	-.02
39	.12	-.04	<b>.84</b>	.07	-.04	.03
24	-.06	.04	-.06	<b>.80</b>	.16	.03
25	-.07	.09	-.16	<b>.89</b>	-.02	.08
26	.20	-.16	.03	<b>.60</b>	-.18	-.10
27	.02	-.01	.13	<b>.72</b>	-.00	-.08
28	-.02	.04	.00	<b>.73</b>	.09	-.02
18	.07	-.10	-.08	-.05	<b>.86</b>	-.09
19	-.12	.07	.04	.05	<b>.67</b>	.09
20	.02	.08	.13	.05	<b>.74</b>	-.13
21	-.10	-.17	-.00	.13	<b>.43</b>	.37
22	.05	.13	-.02	.02	<b>.63</b>	-.05
23	-.09	.13	.10	.06	<b>.45</b>	-.10
15	.08	.03	-.05	.01	-.18	<b>.80</b>
16	-.03	.11	.01	-.01	-.01	<b>.84</b>
17	-.01	-.11	.10	-.06	.01	<b>.79</b>

### 3.2. Internal Consistency

The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients calculated according to the six factor structure are presented in Table 4. It was found that the internal consistency for all subscales were satisfactory.

**Table 3.2. Cronbach Alpha Values for Subscales of RPCS**

	# of items	Cronbach Alpha Coefficients
<b>Compromise</b>	13	.94
<b>Domination</b>	6	.88
<b>Submission</b>	5	.90
<b>Separation</b>	5	.81
<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>	5	.77
<b>Avoidance</b>	3	.77

### 3.3. Test – Retest Reliability

Test- retest correlation coefficient for an interval of two weeks was obtained for a subset of the sample. Analysis of data showed that test-retest correlation coefficients of all the six sub scales are at significant levels, all at  $p < .001$  level (see Table 5)

**Table 3.3. Test – Retest Consistencies of Subscale Scores of RPSC**

	Compromis e	Avoidanc e	Interactional reactivity	Separation	Dominatio n	Submission
<b>Compromise</b>	.73*					
<b>Avoidance</b>		.67*				
<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>			.59*			
<b>Separation</b>				.61*		
<b>Domination</b>					.74*	
<b>Submission</b>						.56*

\* $p < .001$

### 3.4. Interscale Correlations

An evidence for content validity is the significant intercorrelations among the subscales of RPCS. Scale intercorrelations are presented in Table 6. According to these results, Compromise positively correlated with Avoidance at  $r=.16, p<.001$ , and negatively correlated with Interactional reactivity at  $r=-.29, p <.001$ , with Domination at  $r = -.18, p <.001$  and with Submission at  $r = -.20, p <.001$ . Avoidance positively correlated with Separation at  $r = .19, p <.001$  and Submission at  $r = .36, p <.001$ . Interactional reactivity positively correlated with Separation at  $r = .20, p <.001$ , Domination at  $r =.56, p <.001$  and Submission at  $r = .34, p <.001$ . Separation positively correlated with Domination at  $r = .16, p<.001$  and with Submission at  $r = .23, p <.001$ . Domination positively correlated with Submission at  $r = .19, p <.001$  (see Table 6).

**Table 3.4. Intercorrelations among the Subscale scores of RPSC**

	Compromise	Avoidance	Interactional Reactivity	Separation	Domination	Submission
<b>Compromise</b>	M=2.86 SD=.82	.10	-.31**	.05	-.24**	-.24**
<b>Avoidance</b>		M=2.13 SD=1.00	.06	.15**	-.01	.33**
<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>			M=1.69 SD=.86	.25**	.60**	.36**
<b>Separation</b>				M=2.07 SD=.93	.17**	.23**
<b>Domination</b>					M=1.75 SD=.98	.22**
<b>Submission</b>						M=1.31 SD=1.00

\* $p<.01$  \*\* $p<.001$

### 3.5. Concurrent Validity

#### 3.5.1. Correlations with love styles

In order to investigate concurrent validity, the correlations between romantic partner conflict and love styles scores were analyzed. The correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and six subscales of LAS were presented in Table 7. The correlations ranged from  $-.28$  to  $.41$ . Compromise subscale is significantly correlated with Eros at  $r=.33, p<.001$ , and negatively correlated with Ludus at  $r =-.20, p <.05$  and with Mania at  $r=-.18, p <.05$  subscales of LAS. Avoidance is significantly correlated with Agape at  $r =.19, p <.001$ , Agape at  $r =.18, p <.01$ , Ludus at  $r =.26, p <.001$ , Mania at  $r =.34, p <.001$  subscales are significantly positively correlated with interactional reactivity and Eros at  $r =-.28, p <.001$  subscale of LAS is negatively correlated with Interactional Reactivity. Pragma at  $r =.14, p <.05$ , Mania at  $r=.15, p <.05$  are correlated significantly with Separation dimension of RPCS and Separation also negatively correlated with Eros at  $r =-.25, p <.05$ . Domination is significantly correlated with Pragma at  $r =.21, p <.001$ , Ludus at  $r =.30, p <.001$  and Mania at  $r =.29, p <.001$  and negatively correlated with Eros at  $r =-.19, p <.05$ . Submission dimension is significantly correlated with Agape at  $r =.41, p <.001$ , Storge at  $r=.13, p <.05$ , Ludus at  $r =.32, p <.001$  and Mania at  $r =.30, p <.001$  dimensions of LAS and negatively correlated with Eros at  $r =-.18, p <.05$ .

**Table 3.5. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and LAS Subscales**

	<b>Agape</b>	<b>Storge</b>	<b>Eros</b>	<b>Pragma</b>	<b>Ludus</b>	<b>Mania</b>
<b>Compromise</b>	-.07	.01	.33***	-.01	-.20**	-.18**
<b>Avoidance</b>	.19***	.06	.03	.11	.07	.03
<b>Interactional_Reactivity</b>	.18**	-.01	-.28***	.15*	.26***	.34***
<b>Separation</b>	.05	.10	-.25**	.14*	.13	.15*
<b>Domination</b>	.06	-.00	-.19**	.21***	.30***	.29***
<b>Submission</b>	.41***	.13*	-.18**	.02	.32***	.30***

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

[*Eros (passionate love), ludus (game-playing love), storge (friendship love), pragma (practical love), mania (possessive, dependent love), agape (altruistic love)*]

### 3.5.2. Correlations with relationship satisfaction

In order to investigate the concurrent validity, the correlations between conflict and relationship satisfaction scores were analyzed. The correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and total scores of RAS were presented in Table 8. The correlations ranged from  $-.47$  to  $.47$ . The significant correlations were between RAS total and Compromise at  $r = .47, p < .01$ , negative correlations were between RAS total and Interactional Reactivity at  $r = -.47, p < .01$ , Separation at  $r = -.25, p < .01$ , Domination at  $r = -.43, p < .01$  and Submission at  $r = -.25, p < .01$ .

**Table 3.6. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and RAS total score.**

	<b>Compromise</b>	<b>Avoidance</b>	<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>	<b>Separation</b>	<b>Domination</b>	<b>Submission</b>
<b>RAS total</b>	.47**	.04	-.47**	-.25**	-.43**	-.25**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

### 3.5.3. Correlations with self-disclosure to people

In order to investigate the concurrent validity, the correlations between conflict and self-disclosure to people scores were analyzed. The correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and six dimensions of SDQ-people were presented in Table 10. The correlations ranged from -.23 to .13. The significant negative correlations were between Self-disclosure to mother and Domination at  $r = -.17, p < .05$ , self-disclosure to father and submission at  $r = -.16, p < .05$ , self-disclosure to same-sex friend and separation at  $r = -.16, p < .05$ , self-disclosure to opposite-sex friend and separation at  $r = -.23, p < .01$ , and self-disclosure to psychological counselor and avoidance at  $r = -.16, p < .05$ .

**Table 3.7. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and SDQ-People**

	<b>Mother</b>	<b>Father</b>	<b>Friend (same sex)</b>	<b>Friend (opposite)</b>	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Psychological Counselor</b>
<b>Compromise</b>	.07	.13	-.04	-.03	-.11	.03
<b>Avoidance</b>	.04	-.09	-.15	-.15	-.08	-.16*
<b>Interactional_Reactivity</b>	-.08	-.06	-.03	-.05	.05	-.03
<b>Separation</b>	-.04	.01	-.16*	-.23**	-.14	-.13
<b>Domination</b>	-.17*	-.09	-.05	-.05	.03	-.05
<b>Submission</b>	-.04	-.16*	-.11	-.11	-.05	-.14

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

### 3.5.4. Correlations with Self-disclosure to topics

In order to investigate the concurrent validity, the correlations between conflict and self-disclosure to topics scores were analyzed. The correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and six dimensions of SDQ-topics were presented in Table 10. The correlations ranged from -.26 to .16. The significant negative correlations were between Self-disclosure about family and avoidance at  $r = -.17, p < .05$ , self-

disclosure about sexuality and separation at  $r = -.26, p < .01$  and submission at  $r = -.21, p < .05$ .

**Table 3.8. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and SDQ-Topics**

	<b>Opinions</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Sexuality</b>	<b>Personality</b>	<b>Interests</b>
<b>Compromise</b>	.04	.09	.07	.10	-.05	.05
<b>Avoidance</b>	-.16	-.06	-.17*	-.09	.08	-.03
<b>Interactional_Reactivity</b>	-.10	-.05	.09	-.07	.05	.11
<b>Separation</b>	-.05	-.13	-.09	-.26**	-.17	-.07
<b>Domination</b>	-.19	-.06	.02	-.07	.16	-.03
<b>Submission</b>	-.12	-.11	-.11	-.21*	.01	-.10

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

### 3.5.5. Correlations with self-disclosure

In order to investigate concurrent validity, romantic partner conflict and self-disclosure scores were analyzed. The correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and SDQ-total were presented in Table 11. The correlations ranged from  $-.18$  to  $-.01$ . The significant negative correlation was between self-disclosure total and separation at  $r = -.18, p < .05$ .

**Table 3.9. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and SDQ-Total**

	<b>Compromise</b>	<b>Avoidance</b>	<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>	<b>Separation</b>	<b>Domination</b>	<b>Submission</b>
<b>SD total</b>	-.01	-.11	-.08	-.18*	-.14	-.13

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

### 3.6. Convergent Validity

#### 3.6.1. Correlations with Conflict Resolution Style Scale

In order to investigate the convergent validity, the correlations between six dimensions of RPCS and four subscales of CRSS were analyzed, and presented in Table 12. The correlations ranged from -.30 to .66. Compromise is significantly correlated with Positive conflict resolution at  $r = .41$ ,  $p < .01$ , and negatively correlated with Negative conflict resolution at  $r = -.26$ ,  $p < .01$ . Avoidance is significantly correlated with Subordination at  $r = .32$ ,  $p < .01$ . Positive conflict resolution at  $r = -.30$ ,  $p < .01$  is negatively correlated, and Negative conflict resolution at  $r = .65$ ,  $p < .01$  is positively correlated with Interactional Reactivity. Separation dimension of RPCS is significantly correlated with Negative conflict resolution at  $r = .18$ ,  $p < .01$ , Subordination at  $r = .21$ ,  $p < .01$  and Retreat at  $r = .50$ ,  $p < .01$ . Domination is negatively correlated with Positive conflict resolution at  $r = -.28$ ,  $p < .01$ , positively correlated with Negative conflict resolution at  $r = .66$ ,  $p < .01$ . Finally, Submission is significantly correlated with Negative conflict resolution at  $r = .19$ ,  $p < .01$ , Subordination at  $r = .52$ ,  $p < .01$ , and Retreat at  $r = .16$ ,  $p < .05$  and negatively correlated with Positive conflict resolution at  $r = -.20$ ,  $p < .01$ .

**Table 3.10. Correlations between RPCS Dimension and CRSS Subscales**

	Crss_Positive	Crss_Negative	Crss_Subordination	Crss_Retreat
<b>Compromise</b>	.41**	-.26**	.09	.04
<b>Avoidance</b>	-.09	-.08	.32**	.13
<b>Interactional Reactivity</b>	-.30**	.65**	-.06	.06
<b>Separation</b>	-.05	.18**	.21**	.52**
<b>Domination</b>	-.28**	.66**	-.11	-.03
<b>Submission</b>	-.20**	.19**	.52**	.16*

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

According to factor analysis, present study has parallel factor structure with the original form of Romantic Partner Conflict study. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients according to the six factor structure are ranged between .77 and .94. As a result of the reliability and validity analysis, the Turkish version of the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale is reliable and valid scale in order to measure romantic partner's conflict.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DISCUSSION**

The main purpose of the current study was to translate and adapt Romantic Partner Conflict Scale into Turkish and examine the reliability and validity of these measures. There was necessity to adapt and validate standardized, new, valid and reliable scale which assesses specific and different conflict resolution styles, and the main goal of the current study was to fulfill this space and to conduct standardization study of Romantic Partner Conflict Scale into Turkish. First, the factor structures of the scale was examined, followed by concurrent and convergent validity measures. Reliability analyses were also run for the six factor structure of the RPCS and findings were indicated very high internal consistencies. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for all subscales were appeared to be satisfactory. In this chapter, findings of the present study will be discussed in the light of the current literature. Moreover, the limitations and suggestions for future research will be presented.

## **4.1. Findings related to Psychometric Properties of RPCS**

### **4.1.1. Findings related to content validity**

The factor structure of the RPCS came out to be exactly same to the original scale indicating its content validity. More specifically, the Turkish version of the scale also ended with 6 factors. When the item loadings were examined all items except one (item 7) got high loadings under the same construct as in original scale. Therefore, this item has been omitted from the scale, the scale resulting with 38 items. Item 7 was 'My partner and I negotiate to resolve our disagreements' and translation of this item into Turkish was 'Fikir ayrılıklarımızı çözmek için pazarlık ederiz'. In the original version of RPCS, item 7 regarding in the compromise subscale which was identifies as a constructive conflict resolution style, however in Turkish the translation of 'negotiation' had more adverse meanings and generally used as a negative way of conflict management. Therefore, the item might have resulted with low cross loadings.

### **4.1.2. Findings related to convergent validity**

One other aim of the study was to investigate the convergent validity of RPCS. For this aim, correlational analyses were conducted with another conflict resolution measures, namely CRSS. The results yielded that compromise was positively correlated with positive conflict resolution style, whereas domination, interactional reactivity and submission were positively related with negative resolution styles. Compromise is a conflict resolution strategy which is characterized by high concern for others and self, and compromise enable individuals to strive for mutual solution for current conflict and it gives happiness to partners because of the satisfaction of both of two (Thomas, 1976). Thus, compromise may increase the happiness and longevity of relationships and the positive correlation between

compromise and positive conflict resolution style subscale (CRSS) is evidence for high convergent validity. On the other hand, domination, interactional reactivity and submission are evaluated under the destructive conflict resolution styles which can cause anger, more conflicts between partners, disagreements and unhappiness in romantic relationships and the positive correlation between the negative conflict resolution style subscale of the other conflict scale (CRSS) and domination, interactional reactivity and submission subscales of RPCS is the evidence of the convergent validity.

Furthermore, avoidance was found to be positively related with subordination, however not with retreat. When the definitions of these behaviors are examined closely, it was expected to find significant correlations between avoidance and retreat. More specifically, avoidance is defined as withdrawing or escaping from conflictual situations (Thomas, 1976; Conrad, 2009); whereas retreating is avoiding and refusing to discuss, or to delay the discussion of the issue to a later time (Özen, 2006). However, the results of the current study was failed to find a relation between avoidance and retreat. Since conflict is a process (Peterson, 1983) this finding could be explained with both behaviors being at different phases of this process. More specifically, avoidance could be assumed to occur before the actual conflict starts, whereas retreat involves a withdrawal after the conflict begins. In other words, in avoidance the individual prefers not to discuss the issue, however in retreat the discussion starts, but could not be solved effectively. The lack of relation might be related with the differences of the phases that these behaviors correspond to.

On the other hand, subordination and avoidance revealed a significant correlation. Subordination could be assumed as a way of avoiding conflicts as it is defined as unconditionally accepting the partner's requests and complying with

his/her wishes (Özen, 2006). More specifically, it could be assumed that in order to prevent any conflict from occurring, the individual might be complying with the partner's wishes, which could be seen as a type of avoidance behavior. Therefore, the positive correlation between these styles could be considered as evidence of convergent validity.

Furthermore, in the current study, separation was found to be positively related with negative conflict resolution style. Separation is a conflict resolution style that includes a break time to conflictual situations and delaying issue to handle another time of period (Zachilli, 2012) . Unlike avoidance and retreating, separation occurs after the couple starts to discuss the issues and this might lead to disappointment and/or frustration of one or both the couples, and therefore might serve as a destructive conflict resolution behavior.

Another findings revealed that submission was positively related with subordination and retreat subscales. Submission means that submitting to the power of others (Thomas, 1976). Furthermore, individuals, who utilize submission conflict management style, attempt to satisfy partner's demands (Conrad, 2009). Submissive partners can prefer to avoid from conflicts because of the reason that in every conflictual situation they can feel that they should accept and behave according to others' demands, and every conflicts can recognizes them to 'lose' situation. In the current study, because of the nearly similar contents and extent of each conflict resolution behaviors (submission, subordination, retreat, avoidance), the correlational findings were acceptable and appropriate, consistent with the original study and the evidence of convergent validity. Additionally, findings were found consistent with the convergent validity analysis of original study (Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick, 2012). In the current study it was found that separation was positively related with

negative conflict resolution style, subordination and retreat, and avoidance was positively related with subordination also. When the definitions of these behaviors are examined closely, it becomes apparent that avoiding and retreating have similar meanings with slight differences. More specifically, avoidance is defined as withdrawing or escaping from conflictual situations (Thomas, 1976) whereas retreating is avoiding and refusing to discuss, or to delay the discussion of the issue to a later time (Özen, 2006).

#### **4.1.3. Findings related to concurrent validity**

In order to investigate the concurrent validity, correlation analyses were conducted between conflict resolution subscales of RPCS and other variables that are suggested to be closely related with conflict resolution behaviors. Relational variables are; relationship satisfaction, love attitudes and self-disclosure. Primary goal of the concurrent validity analyses were strived to find significant and meaningful correlations (parallel with previous literature and original study) between the related variables and conflict resolution behaviors of the RPCS.

##### **4.1.3.1. Findings related to conflict resolution styles and relationship satisfaction**

The correlation analysis was conducted in order to investigate the concurrent validity of RPCS and relationship satisfaction. The way in which relationship disagreements are handled is one of the strongest predictors of the relationship satisfaction in romantic partners and married couples (Karney & Bradburry, 1995). Holmes and Murray (1996) had proposed that which type of conflict resolution behaviors were used mostly have much more importance related with satisfaction in the current relationship rather than the frequency of the conflict. The correlational analysis was conducted in order to investigate concurrent validity of RPCS and

relationship satisfaction. According to previous research findings and literature, it was suggested that high relationship satisfaction was significantly related with constructive conflict resolution style and negatively related with distributive conflict resolution styles (Thomas, 1976; Gotmann & Krakoff, 1989; Spitzberg, 1989; Cramer, 2004). Similarly in Turkish culture, Malkoç (2001) found that spouses high in marital adjustment use more constructive and less destructive communication patterns than spouses low in marital adjustment. In another study, Özen (2006) found that negative conflict resolution strategies were found negatively related with relationship satisfaction, however no relationship was found between positive conflict styles and satisfaction of spouses. Additionally, it was found that, spouses high in positive conflict resolution style and low in negative conflict resolution style have higher scores on marital adjustment than spouses low in positive conflict resolution style and high in negative conflict resolution style. According to Greef and Bruyne (2000), when one of the partners handle conflict with destructive conflict resolution style, the lowest marital satisfaction was found. On the other hand, higher relationship satisfaction can be determined by collaboration conflict resolution style which is considered as constructive way of conflict management. In the current study, in line with Greef and Bruyne (2000), Özen (2006) and Malkoç's (2001) study, the results revealed that compromise was positively correlated, whereas interactional reactivity, domination and submission were negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction, as expected. To the light of knowledge from literature, findings of the current study were evidence of the concurrent validity.

#### **4.1.3.2. Findings related to conflict resolution styles and love styles**

The correlation analysis was conducted in order to investigate the concurrent validity of RPCS and love styles. Love styles are assessed with six different love

types which are mainly depends on person attribution and preference while living love. Although the concept of love differs from situations or individuals, the love attitude scale gives opportunity to researcher in order to measure the love. However the uncertain construct of love, there were some consistent findings found in the literature like the positive correlation between eros and agape and compromise and positive correlation between ludus, mania and destructive conflict styles. Additionally, in the literature there were different results found by different researchers according to love styles. Meeks, Hendrick and Hendrick (1998) had found that eros and agape love attitudes were related with constructive conflict behaviors especially compromise, because they proposed that partners who had eros type and agape type of love attitude were over invested to their relationship and gave importance to their partners' happiness, they were attempt to behave more constructively. On the other hand, in their study (Meeks, Hendrick & Hendrick, 1998), there was a positive correlation between ludus and destructive conflict strategies, because individuals who have ludus love style were not interested in resolution, they have tendency to prefer to resolve conflict with avoidance, rejecting and separation. Additionally, in their study it was found that eros, agape and storge was positively related with higher relationship satisfaction and mania and ludus were negatively related with relationship satisfaction. Similarly, Richardson, Hammock, Lubben and Mickler (1989) found that eros and agape love styles were positively correlated to constructive conflict resolution styles and ludus was positively correlated with destructive conflict strategies. They were also proposed that individuals who prefer to have ludus love style change their partners often and whereas pragmatic lovers have more long term relationships and relationship satisfaction. In the Turkish study of Hovardoğlu and Büyükşahin (2004), results

yielded that eros and mania love styles positively correlated to relationship satisfaction whereas ludus was negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction. The researchers suggested that individuals who have eros-passionate love styles have tendency to demonstrate more positive behaviors to her/his partner, the central focus of those individuals were passion and intimacy.

Hovardoğlu and Büyükşahin (2004) referred that the possessive-mania love was found positively with relationship satisfaction. As these findings contradicted with the previous research findings, the researchers suggested that lovers who have possessive type of intimacy were obsessive to their partners, and therefore reluctant to find another partner, and consequently even if they have low relationship satisfaction in current relationship, again they would report higher satisfaction, because they would considered it as satisfactory. In the current study, largely consistent with original study and literature, the conflict resolution behaviors were correlated with love styles. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that eros (passionate love), and agape (altruistic love) would be positively related with constructive conflict resolution behavior (compromise) and negatively related with destructive conflict resolution behaviors (interactional reactivity, domination and submission). Furthermore, mania (possessive love) and ludus (game-playing love) love attitudes expected to have positive correlations with destructive conflict behaviors (interactional reactivity, domination and submission) and negative correlations with constructive conflict behaviors (compromise). The findings confirmed the hypotheses. Accordingly, compromise found to be significantly correlated with eros love style, and negatively correlated with ludus and mania, whereas mania and ludus were correlated positively with interactional reactivity, domination and submission. Compromise is a conflict resolution styles which is characterized by high concern for

others and high concern for self (Tezer, 1999) and is linked with positive relationship qualities and satisfaction (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012 ). Literature suggests that as passionate (eros) lovers have higher levels of interest in their partners and therefore invest more to their relationships, they tend to collaborate more (Meeks, Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Accordingly, they prefer to use more constructive strategies when encountered with conflictual solutions, because they want to be satisfied in their relationship, finding mutual solutions increase the relationship satisfaction and diminish the negative effects of conflicts, similarly eros lovers have higher commitment and intimacy to their partners and have higher levels of relationship satisfaction when they handle their conflict in a constructive way (Richardson, Medvin & Hammock, 1988). On the other hand, ludus is a love style preferred by individuals who prefer to play game and want to have fun in relationship. Ludic lovers are more likely to get involved with more than one partner. Similarly, individuals who have mania (possessive, dependent love) love style feel like they need their partners and are usually dependent on the other partner (Lee, 1973). Thus, consistent with literature lovers who prefer to have ludus and mania style, they use more destructive strategies and have lower relationship satisfaction because of not having much more interest into relationship and more using of aggressive reactions and being coerce and dominant to their partners. The related findings were evidence of concurrent validity.

In contrast with original study and previous literature, agape was found positively correlated with avoidance and interactional reactivity in the current study, whereas in the original study agape was positively correlated with compromise, similarly with findings of the other studies (Meeks, Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Ayca & Hovardoglu, 2004). Agape is a selfless and altruistic love style and avoidance is a

conflict style which synonymously means escaping or withdrawal (Lee, 1973). Avoiding locates on the point of unassertiveness and uncooperativeness (Thomas, 1976). The results of correlation between conflict styles and agape also similar with the result that the submission (means that behaving, acting submitting to the power of others) found negatively correlated with eros and relationship satisfaction. Furthermore, in the study of Hovardoğlu and Büyükşahin (2004) agape was found related with relationship satisfaction however in the present study being altruistic was considered to being avoidant to conflicts, related with lower relationship satisfaction and destructive conflict resolution strategy (interactional reactivity) and was assumed as no attempting to find mutual solutions. Consistently, in the other Turkish study of Beştav (2007), similar with the current study, agape was found negatively related with relationship satisfaction. Although the sample characteristics (undergraduates and mean of age, gender) were similar between current study and other Turkish studies (Beştav, 2007; Ayca & Hocardoglu, 2004), findings were found different according to agape love style in Turkish population. The reason or the result that there was no positive correlation between agape and compromise can be related with the idea that compromise is a conflict resolution behavior which inspire the individuals to come up with own solution and own resolving idea for conflictual situations, however having the agape love style necessitate to respect other parties demands, so the findings that is found negative relation between compromise and agape was acceptable and appropriate. In addition, the positive relation between compromise and agape is not sufficiently strong enough to found significant. This much not enough strong relation could be demonstrated by different findings in different studies in literature. The uncertain and labile construct of love can affect the findings of different researches, and because of its construct,

accordingly between conflict styles and love styles, there were found different results in literature. According to Richardson (1989) the conflict styles were related to love attitudes in different ways and in his study; compromise was related to all love styles except ludus, but the permissiveness attitudes found positively related to destructive conflict strategies and negatively related to compromise. Correlations between conflict behaviors and love styles can be differed by several factors (for instance social factors, personality, individualism- collectivism, and age) but in ways not hypothesized in the current study and the difference between different studies deserves attention in the further researches.

In the current study the correlation was maintained between submission, avoidance and separation subscales of RPCS and love styles. In the original study it was not hypothesized but was found that there would be positive correlations between compromise and pragma, and storge. However, in the present study, the results yielded that there were no significant correlations between compromise and pragma and storge, but in fact, pragma showed apposite correlation with domination. Furthermore separation and storge found to be positively correlated with submission. Specifically, submission issue had different meanings and effected in relation with love style from altruism issues. However, according to relationship satisfaction being in situation which individual resolve conflict by submitting partner's desire significantly correlated with destructive conflict behaviors and less satisfied couples. Those results could demonstrated that being altruistic could be recommend by society to individuals especially women in order to resolve conflictual situations, but on the other hand according to findings between conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction, partners who behave submissively had lower relationship satisfaction in their romantic relationships. Consequently, storge could

be determined related with submission but, also ludus and mania was significantly related with submission so both of the love styles could be determined significantly related with submission. Moreover, following with the findings in the current study, it was revealed that there were positive correlations between pragma and domination and separation. According to different researchers, there were different results were found, and the pragma was generally correlated with constructive conflict resolutions and higher relationship satisfaction. In the Turkish studies (Ayça & Hovardoğlu, 2004; Beştav, 2007), there was no correlation between pragma and conflict styles, relationship satisfaction. This result was unexpected and inconsistent with the previous researches and original study, and deserves attention in the further researches. Furthermore, there were also no predictions were proposed about separation and love styles, but according to concurrent validity results of the present study, separation was found positively related to mania (possessive love) and negatively correlated to eros (passionate love) , whereas in the original study there was no correlation between separation and love styles. Separation is a conflict strategy can be a constructive or destructive, depending on how it is used by partners. If there is a conflictual situation which includes unsolvable and unchangeable situation, ignoring and separated from conflict can be healthy solution for partners, on the other hand rather than using collaboration management and finding mutual solution, being separated from situation can cause distributive communication between partners. According to Zachilli, Hendrick and Hendrick (2012), it was proposed that avoidance and separation are ambiguous and not easily categorized depending on context, intent and individual differences for their constructiveness or destructiveness. Separation, in the current study, considered to be related with destructive conflict resolutions (related with negative conflict resolution styles) and

avoidance, destructive functions of separation was seen, so it was acceptable that it was related with mania and negatively related with eros. These different findings were not hypothesized but searched and according to content of the separation itself, these findings were acceptable, and evidence for concurrent validity but how separation process differently (constructive or destructive or no relation) in different sample should deserve attention in further researches.

#### **4.1.3.3 Findings related to conflict resolution styles and self-disclosure**

The correlation analysis was conducted in order to investigate the concurrent validity of RPCS and self-disclosure. The relationship between conflict resolution behaviors and self-disclosure had received little attention in the literature but in the original study it was demonstrated that self-disclosure was positively correlated with compromise and negatively related with domination and submission (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012). Self-disclosure is described as the act of revealing personal information to the others, and disclosing may involve everything an individual chooses to state to other person about herself/himself (Jourard and Jaffe, 1970). Rehman, Fallini & Fellis (2011) found that there was positive correlation between relationships satisfaction and the range of self-disclosure. Less intimacy disclosures serves more negative relationship between partners (Tolstedt & Stokes, 1984). It was hypothesized that compromise positively related with self-disclosure and self-disclosure negatively related with domination, submission and interactional reactivity. Consistent with the literature and parallel with the original study, current results revealed that self-disclosure to mother was negatively related with domination and submission were negatively correlated with self-disclosure about sexuality issues. Destructive conflict resolution style (domination) cause one partner not to want any demand from other partner. Apparently, individuals willing to share

intimate information (including sexual issues) with their partners were more willing to find common ground, mutual solutions when encountered with conflict. Individuals willing to disclose herself/himself with their partners were less likely to become verbally abusive, dominant, avoid discussing conflict or separate from issue when dealing with conflictual situations (Zachilli, Hendrick & Hendrick, 2012). There were no predictions were made for avoidance and separation and conflict behaviors, the relationship between separation, avoidance and self-disclosure was researched, in the current results it was found that avoidance was negatively related with self-disclosure about family issues and separation. Self-disclosure to mother was negatively related with domination, and separation was negatively related with self-disclosure to friends (both gender) and self-disclosure (total). Avoidance was negatively related with self-disclosure to psychological counselor. Avoidance and separation are conflict resolution strategies includes not liking of confronting to conflict, believing that time and withdrawal from issue would be better than handling and talking about conflict. People who prefer to disclose own ideas and feelings to one another, s/he couldn't use the avoidance and separation that means taking cooling off period which cause no talk and alienation. Additionally, finding negative correlations but not positive correlations could be the result of the idea that people have strong motivation to define negative and destructive side of issue rather than the report of satisfaction and positive side of issue. Gaelick, Bodenhouse and Wayer (1985) suggested that negative behaviors were more easily declared and remembered than positive behaviors, and the reason provided for this selective attention was that individuals were more sensitive to variations in the negative feelings of their partners and interpreted these feelings accurately, however they were not correct in

perceiving expression of positive feelings of their partners. Findings about self-disclosure and conflict styles are appropriate and the evidence for concurrent validity.

The consistency of these findings with original study and previous research demonstrated that the RPCS offers appropriate content, concurrent and convergent validity as well as psychometric strength.

#### **4.2. Limitations of the Study**

The current study has some limitations. Firstly, the female participants outnumbered male participants, and therefore the results mostly represent women's responses. A future study could be conducted with a homogenous sample which consists both genders.

Secondly, as in the original study, the sample of the present study also included participants with different relationship statuses (e.g. participants who were in a romantic relationship, singles that were not currently in a romantic relationship and singles that never had a romantic relationship). On the other hand, in the current study, primary analyses showed that there were no statistically significant differences while removing participants; who are single and never had relationship. Future research could examine whether and under what conditions participants with different relationship status behave similarly or differently.

However, even with these cautionary limitations, the current results of the Romantic Partner conflict scale revealed that the scale was reliable and valid measurement in order to assess conflict resolution behaviors.

## REFERENCES

- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Amato, P. R. (2000). Consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1269–1287.
- Arias, I., Samios, M., & O’Leary, K.D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 82-90.
- Arnold, M. E., & Thompson, B. (1996). Love style perceptions in relation to Personality function. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 11 (3), 1-9.
- Barelds, D.P.H.& Dijkstra, P. (2007). Love at first sight or friends first? Ties among Partner personality trait similarity, relationship onset, relationship quality, and love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 479-496.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R. (1988). Relational and episodic characteristics Associated With conflict tactics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 305–325.
- Bergman, S. J., & Surrey, J. L. (1994). *Couples therapy: A relational approach*. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Work in Progress.
- Bergmüller, R., & Taborsky, M. (2005). Experimental manipulation of helping in a cooperative breeder: helpers ‘pay-to-stay’ by pre-emptive appeasement. *Animal Behaviour*, 69, 19-28.

- Berscheid, E., & Ammazalorso, H. (2004). Emotional experience in close relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology, Interpersonal processes, 19*: 308–330.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Mikulincer, M., & Austerlitz, M. (2013). A fiery conflict: Attachment orientations and the effects of relational conflict on sexual motivation. *Personal Relationships, 20*, 294-310
- Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R. (1988). Relational and episodic characteristics associated with conflict tactics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5*, 305–325.
- Canary, D.J., Cunningham, E.M. & Cody, M.J. (1988). Goal types, gender and locus of control in managing interpersonal conflict. *Communication Research, 15*, 426-446.
- Cartensen, L. L., Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1995). Emotional behavior in long term marriage. *Psychology and Aging, 10*(1), 140-149.
- Caughlin, J.P. & Vangelisti, L.A. (2000). An individual difference explanation of why Married couples engage in the demand/withdraw pattern of conflict. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 523-551.
- Christensen, A., & Heavey, C. L. (1990). Gender and social structure in the demand/withdraw pattern of marital conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(1), 73-81.
- Christensen, A., & Shenk, J. L. (1991). Communication, conflict, and psychological Distance in non distressed, clinic, and divorcing couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 458-463.

- Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 975-990.
- Colmenares, F., Hofer, H., & East, M. L. (2000). Greeting ceremonies in baboons And hyenas. *Natural conflict resolution* (pp. 94-96). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Coleman, L. & Glenn, F. (2009). When couples part: Understanding the consequences For adults and children. *One plus one Marriage and Partnership Research*, 1087994.
- Cramer, D. (2004). Emotional support, conflict, depression, and relationship satisfaction in a romantic partner. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138, 532–542.
- Cramer, D. (2000). Relationship satisfaction and conflict style in romantic relationships. *Journal of Psychology*, 134(3), 337-341.
- Crum, T. F. (1987). *The magic of conflict*. NY: Touchstone.
- Crockett, L. J., & Randall, B. A. (2006). Linking adolescent family and peer relationships to the quality of young adult romantic relationships: The mediating role of conflict tactics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 761–780.
- Conerly, Keith, and Tripathi, Arvind. (2004). What is Your Conflict Style? Understanding and Dealing With Your Conflict Style. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 27(2), 16-21.
- Conrad, C. (2009) Communication in conflict: Style-strategy relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 58:135-155

- Cords, M., & Killen, M. (1998). Conflict resolution in human and nonhuman primates. In J. Langer, & M. Killen (Eds.). *Piaget, evolution, and development* (pp.193-219). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Cui, M., Lorenz, O.F., Conger, D.R., Melby, N.J. & Bryant, M.C. (2005). Observer, Self-, and Partner Reports of Hostile Behaviors in Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Marriage And Family*, 67, 1169-1181.
- Davies, M. F. (2001). Socially desirable responding and impression management in The endorsement of love styles. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135 (5), 562-570.
- Dhir, K. S., & Markman, H. J. (1984). Application of social judgment theory to Understanding and treating marital conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 597-610.
- Dunn, E.W. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687-1688.
- Eckstein, D. (2011). , The Couple's Personality Preferences Questionnaire. *The Family Journal* , 19: 322-327
- Ely, M., Richards, M. P. M., Wadsworth, M. E. J., & Elliott, B. J. (1999). Secular changes in the association of parental divorce and children's educational attainment: Evidence from three British cohorts. *Journal of Social Policy*, 28, 437-455.
- Erber, R., & Erber, M. W. (2001). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and research*.
- Ely, M., Richards, M. P. M., Wadsworth, M. E. J., & Elliott, B. J. (1999). Secular changes in the association of parental divorce and children's educational attainment: Evidence from three British cohorts. *Journal of Social Policy*, 28, 437-455.

- Emmi, I. & Kokkonen, M. (2007). Factors contributing to verbal self-disclosure. *Nordic Psychology, 59* (4), 362-391.
- Feeney, J. A. (2002). Attachment, marital interaction and relationship satisfaction: A Diary study. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 39-55
- Fincham, F. D. (2003). Marital conflict: Correlates, structure, and context. *Current Direction in Psychology Science, 12*, 23-27.
- Fishbane, M. D. (2001). Relational narratives of the self. *Family Process, 40*, 41-58.
- Frey, K., & Mahzad, H. (1998). Are love styles related to sexual styles? *Journal of Sex Research, 35* (3), 1-12.
- Fricker J, Moore S (2002). Relationship Satisfaction: The role of love styles and Attachment styles. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 7*, 11.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). Constructive conflict. *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett*.
- Gaelick, L., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Wyer, R. S. (1985). Emotional communication in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(5), 1246-1265.
- Gao, G. (2001). Intimacy, passion and commitment in Chinese and USA romantic relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25* (3), 329-342.
- Glick, B. R., & Gross, S. J. (1975). Marital interaction and marital conflict: A critical evaluation of current research strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37*(3), 505-512.
- Gruber, J. (2004). Is making divorce easier bad for children? The long run implications of unilateral divorce. *Journal of Labor Economics, 22*, 799-812.

- Gottman, J.M.(1994). What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and Marital outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 12*,120-136
- Gottman, J. M. (1993). The roles of conflict engagement, escalation, and avoidance In Marital interaction: A longitudinal view of five types of couples. *Journal Of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 6-15.
- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: Behavior, psychology and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*,221-233.
- Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A Longitudinal view. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*(1), 47-52.
- Gottman, J., Markman, H., & Notarius, C. (1977). The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39*(3), 461-477.
- Greeff, A. P., & Bruyne, T. (2000). Conflict management style and marital Satisfaction *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 26*, 321-334.
- Guerrero, Laura K., Andersen, Peter A., and Afifi, Walid A. (2001). Close Encounters: *Communicating in Close Relationships*. Mountain View, CA.
- Heavey, C. L., Christensen, A., & Malamuth, N. M. (1995). The longitudinal impact Of demand and withdrawal during marital conflict. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 797-801.
- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. S., & Dicke, A. (1998). The Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 147–159.

- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93–98.
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sexual attitudes, self-disclosure and Sensation seeking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4, 281-297.
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (2002). Love. In C.R. Snyder, S. J. Lopez (Eds). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*.
- Hocker, J. L., & Wilmot, W. W. (1991). *Interpersonal conflict*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Hojjat, M. (2000). Sex differences and perceptions of conflict in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 598–617.
- Horowitz AV, McLaughlin J, White H.R.(1998). How the negative and positive aspects of Partner relationships affect the mental health of young married people. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*,39,124–136.
- Hovardođlu,S.&Büyükşahin, A. (2004).Çiftlerin aşka ilişkin tutumlarının Lee'nin çok boyutlu Aşk biçimleri kapsamında incelenmesi.Türk Psikoloji Dergisi,19(54),59-72.
- Jourard,S.M. & Jaffe, P.E.( 1970). Influence of an interviewers' disclosure on the Self disclosing behavior of interviewers.*Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18,595-597.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Areas of conflict for gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples: What couples argue about influences relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 923-934.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1995). Predicting change in marital satisfaction from husbands' and wives' conflict resolution styles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57(1), 153-164.

- Kutsukake, N., & Clutton-Brock, T. H. (2008). Do meerkats engage in conflict Management following aggression? Reconciliation, submission and avoidance. *Animal Behaviour*, 75, 1441-1453.
- Laurencaeu, Jean-Philippe; Lisa Feldman Barrett & Michael J. Rovine (2005). The interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage: a daily diary and multilevel modeling approach. *Journal of Family Psychology* 19 (2): 314-323.
- Laursen, B. and Collins, A. (1994). Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115( 2), 197-209.
- Lee, J. A. The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving. New Press, Toronto, 1973
- Lee, J. A. (1988). Love-styles. In R.J. Sternberg, M. L. Barnes (Eds), The Psychology of Love. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mackey, R. A., Diemer, M. A., & O'Brien, B. A. (2000). Conflict-management styles of spouses in lasting marriages. *Psychotherapy*, 37, 134-148.
- Malkoç, B. (2001). The relationship between communication patterns and marital adjustment. *Unpublished master thesis*, ODTÜ Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Medora, N. P., Larson, J. H., Hortaçsu, N., & Dave, P. (2002). Perceived attitudes Towards romanticism: A Cross cultural study of American, Asian - Indian, and Turkish young Adults. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33 (2), 155-178.

- Meeks, B. S., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1998). Communication, love, and Relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 755–773.
- Messman, S. J., & Canary, D. J. (1998). Conflict patterns. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The darkside of interpersonal relationships*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2007). Stress crossover in newlywed marriage: A Longitudinal and dyadic perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*, 594-607.
- Noller, P., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Marital communication in the eighties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 832-843.
- Notarius, C. I., Lashley, S. L., & Sullivan, D. J. (1997). Angry at your partner? Think again. In R. J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp. 219-248).
- Notarius, C., & Markman, H. (1993). *We can work it out: Making sense in marital conflict*. New York: Putman.
- Özen, A. (2006). Value similarities of wives and husbands and conflict resolution styles of spouses as predictors of marital adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Payne, M., & Vandewiele, M. (1987). Attitudes toward love in the Caribbean. *Psychological Reports, 60*, 715-721.
- Peterson, D. R. (1983). Conflict. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Pines, A.M. (2005). *Falling in love : Why we choose the lovers we choose*. Newyork: Routledge.

- Preuschoft, S., & van Schaik, C. P. (2000). Dominance and communication: conflict management in various social settings. *Natural conflict resolution* (pp. 77-105). Berkeley, CA: University of California
- Philbrick, J. L., & Stones, C. (1988). Love attitudes of white South African Adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 17-18.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). Measurement of organizational conflict. *Journal of General Psychology*, 109, 189-199.
- Rahim, M. A. (1985). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflicts. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 79-86.
- Rahim, A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports*, 44(3), 1323-1344.
- Rehman, U. S., Rellini, A. H., & Fallis, E. (2011). The importance of sexual self-disclosure to sexual satisfaction and functioning in committed relationships. *Journal Of Sexual Medicine*, 8(11), 3108-3115.
- Reese-Weber, M., & Kahn, J. H. (2005). Familial predictors of sibling and romantic Partner conflict resolution: Comparing late adolescents from intact and divorced families. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 479-493.
- Richardson, D.R., Hammock, G.S., Lubben, T.&Mickler, S.(1989). The relationship Between Love attitudes and conflict responses. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*,8, 430-441
- Riela, S., Rogriguez, G., Aron, A., Xu, X & Acevedo, B.P. (2014). Experiences of Falling in love: Investigating culture, ethnicity, gender, and speed. *Journal of Social Personal Relationships*, 27, 473-493.

- Richardson, D. R., Medvin, N., & Hammock, G. (1988). Love styles, relationship experience, and sensation seeking: A test of validity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 9* (3), 645-651.
- Rosenfeld, L.B. & Bowen, G.L. (1991). Marital disclosure and marital satisfaction: Direct effect versus interaction effect models. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55*, 69-84.
- Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and loving. *An invitation to social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Zembrodt, I. M. (1983). Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 274-293.
- Schwartz, S.H. (2006). Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, & G. Eva (Eds.), *Measuring attitudes cross nationally – lessons from the European Social Survey*. London: Sage.
- Segal, J & Jaffe, J. (2007). Conflict Resolution skills, *Mental Guide*, 6-14.
- Shantz, C. U., & Hartup, W. W. (1992). Conflict and development: An introduction. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development* (pp. 1-11). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict Resolution In romantic relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 31*, 143-157.
- Sigle-Rushton, W., Hobcraft, J., & Kiernan, K. (2005). Parental divorce and Subsequence disadvantage: A cross cohort comparison. *Demography, 42*, 427-446.

- Sprecher, S. (2004). Self-Disclosure in Intimate Relationships: Associations With Individual and Relationship Characteristics Over Time..*Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* , 6 ,857–877
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(1), 75-88.
- Stephanou, G.(2012).Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood:Perception Partner Ideal Discrepancies, Attributions, and Expectations.*Scientific Research*, 3,150-160.
- Tezer, E. (1986). Evli esler arasındaki çatışma davranışları: Algılama ve doyum. Unpublished doctorate thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Tezer, E. (1999). The functionality of conflict behaviors and the popularity of those who engage in them. *Adolescence*, 34, 409-416.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. Dunnette (Ed.)
- Tolstedt, B.E.&Stokes, J.P.(1984).Self-disclosure, intimacy, and the deepening process.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46 (1): 84–90.
- Wood, Julia T. (2007). *Communication, Gender, and Culture: Gendered Lives*. United States: Thomson Wadsworth
- Zachilli, T., Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (2012). The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale: A new scale to measure relationship conflict. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26(8);1073-1096.

## APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji yüksek lisans programı dahilinde, yürütmekte olduğum tez çalışmasını oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın amacı, romantik ilişkilerde karşılaşılan sorunları çözmek için başvurulan yolları incelemektir.

Anketlerde isminiz sorulmamakta ya da kimliğinizi ortaya çıkaran herhangi bir soru yer almamaktadır. **Bu ankette vereceğiniz her tür bilgi tamamen gizli kalacaktır.** Araştırmanın objektif olması ve elde edilecek sonuçların güvenilirliği açısından soruları içtenlikle yanıtlamanız; anketi, sizi ve birlikte olduğunuz kişi ile yaşadığınız ilişkiyi tam olarak yansıtacak şekilde doldurmanız çok önemlidir.

Araştırmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Şayet, cevaplamak istemediğiniz sorularla karşılaşırsanız bunları atlayabilir veya anketi doldurmayı bırakabilirsiniz. Ancak, yarım kalmış ya da çoğu soruların cevapsız bırakıldığı anketlerden elde edilen verilerin kullanılması mümkün olmadığından, anketi **mümkün olduğunca boş bırakmadan** tamamlamanız çok önemlidir.

Araştırma ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa bize **seyma.kama89@hotmail.com** ve **ilkesine.egeci@bahcesehir.edu.tr** (tez danışmanı) adreslerinden ulaşabilirsiniz. Gösterdiğiniz ilgiden ötürü teşekkür ederiz.

**Eğer bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorsanız, lütfen aşağıdaki formu imzalayınız:**

Bilgilendirme metnini okudum ve çalışmanın amacını, benden beklenenleri ve çalışmayı istediğim zaman, herhangi bir neden belirtmek zorunda kalmadan bırakabileceğimi anladım. Bu koşullarda, söz konusu araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Ad-Soyad:

Tarih:

İmza

Araştırmada yer alan anketlerde, romantik ilişkilere yönelik bazı sorular yer almaktadır. Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul etmeniz halinde, lütfen anketleri:

**a. Şu anda romantik bir ilişkiniz varsa, bu kişiyi göz önüne alarak;**

**b. Şu anda romantik bir ilişkiniz yoksa, en son romantik ilişki yaşadığınız kişiyi göz önüne alarak** (bu seçeneğin geçerli olması halinde, bu kişi ile ilişkinizin devam ettiği dönemi göz önüne alınız);

**c. Daha önce hiç romantik ilişkiniz olmadıysa, idealinizdeki partneri düşünerek** doldurun. Hangi seçeneği sizin için uygun olduğunu, uygun seçeneği yuvarlak içine alarak belirtiniz.

## APPENDIX B: THE ROMANTIC PARTNER CONFLICT SCALE

Partnerinizle (birlikte olduğunuzu kişi ile) çatışmaları nasıl ele aldığınızı düşünün. Özellikle, partnerinizle son zamanlarda anlaşmazlık yaşadığınız önemli bir çatışma konusunu düşünün. Aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak, çatışmayı ele alırken kullandığınız davranışınıza göre en uygun olan cevabı seçin. Eğer şu anda partneriniz yoksa, soruları en yakın geçmişteki partnerinizi düşünerek cevaplayın. Eğer, şimdiye kadar hiç romantik bir ilişkiniz olmadıysa, olsaydı nasıl davranacağınızı hayal ederek en uygun olan yanıtı işaretleyin.

	0: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	1: Katılmıyorum	2: Bir fikrim yok	3: Katılıyorum	4: Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. İkimizin de kabul edebileceği çözümler bulmaya çalışırız.					
2. Çatışmayı çoğunlukla sorunun üzerinde konuşarak çözeriz.					
3. Çatışmalarımız genellikle bir uzlaşmaya vardığımız zaman biter.					
4. Partnerimle fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, tartışmanın her iki yönünü de göz önünde bulundururuz.					
5. Çatışmaları çözmek için bir uzlaşmaya varmaya çalışırız.					
6. Uzlaşmaya varmak, aramızdaki çatışmayı çözenin en iyi yoludur.					
7. Fikir ayrılıklarımızı çözmek için pazarlık ederiz.					
8. Fikir ayrılığımızı sonlandırmak için partnerimle orta yolda buluşmaya çalışırım.					
9. Aramızdaki çatışmayı çözenin en iyi yolu, orta yolu bulmaktır.					
10. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, ikimizi de memnun edecek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırız.					
11. Partnerimle çatışma yaşadığımızda, her ikimizi de mutlu edecek kararı almak için işbirliği yaparız.					

	0: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	1: Katılmıyorum	2: Bir fikrim yok	3: Katılıyorum	4: Kesinlikle katılıyorum
12. Aramızdaki problemleri çözmek adına, işbirliği içinde ortak bir zemin bulmaya çalışırız.					
13. Bir problemimiz olduğunda, ikimiz için de en iyi olan çözüme ulaşmak adına işbirliği yaparız.					
14. Yaşadığımız çatışmada ortak bir çözüme ulaşmak için işbirliği yapmaya çalışırız					
15. Partnerim de ben de tartışmalardan kaçınmaya çalışırız.					
16. Partnerimle fikir ayrılığına düşmemeye çalışırım.					
17. Partnerimle aramda çatışma yaşanmasından kaçınırım.					
18. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, yüksek sesle tartışırız.					
19. Çatışmalarımız genellikle epey uzun sürer.					
20. Partnerim ve ben sık sık çatışma yaşarız.					
21. Partnerimle çatışma yaşamak beni perişan eder.					
22. Çatışma yaşadığımızda partnerime sözlü saldırıda bulunurum.					
23. Partnerime güvenmemem nedeniyle sürekli tartışırız.					
24. Çatışma yaşadığımızda, "sakinleşmek" için bir süre birbirimizden uzaklaşırız.					
25. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, tartışmanın her iki tarafını da değerlendirebilmek için ikimiz de bir süre yalnız kalmaya çalışırız.					
26. Çatışma yaşarken, tartışma ilerlemeden önce sakinleşmek için birbirimize olanak tanırız.					
27. Çatışma yaşadığımızda, konuyu daha sonra halletmek üzere ara veririz.					
28. Bir süre birbirimizden ayrı kalmak, çatışmalarımızın yatışmasında çok işe yarayabilir.					
29. Tartıştığımızda veya kavgaya çıktığımızda, ben kazanmaya çalışırım.					

	<b>0: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</b>	<b>1: Katılmıyorum</b>	<b>2: Bir fikrim yok</b>	<b>3: Katılıyorum</b>	<b>4: Kesinlikle katılıyorum</b>
30. Tartıştığımızda, kontrolü ele almaya çalışırım.					
31. Partnerimin bir tartışmayı kazanmasına nadiren izin veririm.					
32. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda amacım, partnerimi haklı olduğuma ikna etmektir.					
33. Tartıştığımızda, patronun kim olduğunu ona gösteririm.					
34. Çatışma yaşadığımızda partnerimin, bana göre en iyi olan çözümü seçmesini sağlamaya çalışırım.					
35. Çatışma yaşadığımızda genellikle partnerimin dediğine razı olurum.					
36. Tartışmaları, partnerimin şartlarına göre sonlandırmak adına partnerimin isteklerine razı olurum.					
37. Bazen sırf çatışma sona ersin diye partnerimin fikrine katılırım.					
38. Tartışırken, genellikle kendi ihtiyaçlarımdan çok, partnerimin ihtiyaçlarını tatmin etmeye çalışırım.					
39. Bir konuda fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, pes eden ben olurum.					

## APPENDIX C: CONFLICT RESOLUTION STYLE SCALE

Aşağıda, evlilik ilişkilerinde yaşanan sorunların genel olarak nasıl çözümlendiği ile ilgili ifadeler yer almaktadır. Lütfen eşinizle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak, aşağıdaki ifadelerden her birine ne derece katıldığınızı belirtiniz. Size uygun olanı işaretleyiniz.

	0: Hiç Katılmıyorum	1: Oldukça Katılmıyorum	2: Birazcık Katılmıyorum	3: Birazcık Katılıyorum	4: Oldukça Katılıyorum	5: Çok Katılıyorum
1. Tartışma esnasında konuyla ilgisiz de olsa zayıflıklarını yüzüne vururum.						
2. Kavganın büyümemesi için onun istediği şeyleri yaparım.						
3. Çok sinirlenmişsem konuşmayı ertelerim.						
4. Sorun durumunda pek çok şeyi içime atabilirim.						
5. Sorunun uzamadan çözülebilmesi için kaynağını bulmaya çalışırım.						
6. Sinirlendiğimde kırıcı şeyler söylerim.						
7. Problemi büyütmemek için onu sakinleştirmeye çalışırım.						
8. Sesimi yükselterek beni dinlemesini sağlamaya çalışırım.						
9. Tartışmada ortak bir çözüm noktası bulmaya çalışırım.						
10. Çok büyük sorunlar yaşadığımızda ondan uzak durmaya çalışırım.						
11. Sorun çözümlenmeden tartışmayı sonlandırmam.						
12. Bağırıp çağırarak istediğimi yaptırım.						
13. Sorunun tüm yönlerini tartışma sırasında konuşmak isterim.						

	<b>0: Hiç Katılmıyorum</b>	<b>1: Oldukça Katılmıyorum</b>	<b>2: Birazcık Katılmıyorum</b>	<b>3: Birazcık Katılıyorum</b>	<b>4: Oldukça Katılıyorum</b>	<b>5: Çok Katılıyorum</b>
14. Sevgilimi ilişkiyi bitirmekle tehdit ederim.						
15. Bana bağırdığında onun olmadığı bir odaya geçerim.						
16. Kavgalarımız sırasındaki kızgınlığımı fiziksel olarak gösteririm.						
17. İlişkide sorun yaşanmaması için kendimden ödün veririm.						
18. Sorun yaşadığımızda sevgilimin yanından uzaklaşıyorum.						
19. Sorunun çözülmesine yardımcı olacağına inanırsam durumu alttan alırım.						
20. Onun olumsuz tepkilerine karşılık vermeyerek problemin büyümemesini sağlamaya çalışırım.						
21. Çok gergin olduğumuzda susarım.						
22. Bir problem yaşandığında, konuyla ilgili düşündüğüm her şeyi açıklarım.						
23. Eğer çok sinirlenmişsem, sınırim geçene kadar konuşmayı reddederim.						
24. Bir problem yaşandığında, kendimi sevgilimin yerine koyarak onun ne düşündüğünü anlamaya çalışırım.						
25. Sürekli imalarda bulunurum.						

## APPENDIX D: CONFLICT BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Kişiler arası yaşanan anlaşmazlıklarda genel olarak gösterilebilecek davranışlar aşağıda tanımlanmıştır. Şu anda duygusal/ romantik ilişkide olduğunuz kişiyle aranızda anlaşmazlık çıktığında bu davranışları ne ölçüde gösterdiğinizizi uygun seçeneğin altındaki kutuya işaret koyarak belirtiniz.

**Bu davranışları ne ölçüde gösteriyorsunuz?**

	<b>Çok Az</b>	<b>Az</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Fazla</b>	<b>Çok Fazla</b>
<b>A.</b> Kendi isteğimi kabul ettirinceye kadar tartışmayı sürdürürüm.					
<b>B.</b> Konuyu hiç açmamaya veya değiştirmeye çalışırım.					
<b>C.</b> Tam olarak onaylamasam bile onun görüş ve isteklerini kabul ederim.					
<b>D.</b> Kendi isteklerimden biraz ödün veririm, onun da biraz ödün vermesini isterim ve uzlaşacak bir orta yol bulmaya çalışırım.					
<b>E.</b> Onu da isteklerinden tamamen vazgeçirecek ve ikimizi de mutlu edecek üçüncü bir yol bulmaya çalışırım.					

## APPENDIX E: THE RELATIONSHIP ASSESMENT SCALE

**Lütfen aşağıdaki her soru için size en uygun olan harfi daire içine alınız.** Soruları erkek/kız arkadaşınız, nişanınız veya eşinizle olan ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak cevaplayınız. Eğer hayatınızda romantik olarak hoşlandığınız bir erkek/kadın varsa, fakat o kişiyle aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayacak derecede bir ilişkiniz yoksa, bu kutuyu  işaretleyip aşağıdaki soruları atlayarak bir sonraki sayfadan devam ediniz. Eğer şu an için romantik olarak hoşlandığınız veya ilişki olduğunuz bir erkek/kadın yoksa aşağıdaki soruları atlayarak bir sonraki sayfadan devam ediniz.

1. Eşiniz ihtiyaçlarınızı ne ölçüde karşılıyor?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Zayıf* *Orta* *Çok iyi*
2. Genelde ilişkinizden ne kadar memnunsunuz?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Memnun değilim* *Orta* *Çok memnunum*
3. Başkalarinkine kıyasla ilişkiniz ne kadar iyi?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Zayıf* *Orta* *Çok iyi*
4. Bu ilişkiye girmemiş olmayı ne sıklıkta aklınızdan geçiriyorsunuz?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Hiç bir zaman* *Bazen* *Çok sık*
5. İlişkiniz başlangıçtaki beklentinizi ne ölçüde karşıladı?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Hemen hemen hiç* *Orta* *Tamamen*
6. Eşinizi ne kadar seviyorsunuz?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Fazla değil* *Orta* *Çok fazla*
7. İlişkiniz ne kadar sorunlu?  
A.....B.....C.....D.....E  
*Çok az* *Orta* *Çok fazla*

## APPENDIX F: LOVE ATTITUDES SCALE

Sizden genel olarak, birlikte olduğunuz kişiyi düşünerek her ifadeyi değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir. Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup ilişkilerinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne derece yansıttığını, her ifadenin karşısında bulunan ve sizin için en uygun olan boşluğu işaretleyin.

	Kesinlikle yanlış	Yanlış	Kararsızım	Doğru	Kesinlikle doğru
1. Birlikte olduğum kişi bana ilgi göstermediğinde, kendimi baştan aşağıya hasta hissederim.					
2. Birlikte olduğum kişi diğer insanlarla yaptığım bazı şeyleri bilseydi, bozulurdu.					
3. Onun benimle ilgili bilmediği şeylerin onu incitmeyeceğine inanıyorum.					
4. Birlikte olduğum kişi için her şeye katlanırım.					
5. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken göz önünde bulundurduğum temel şey, ailem üzerinde nasıl bir etki bırakacağıdır.					
6. Birlikte olduğum kişinin başka biriyle de birlikte olduğundan kuşkulanırsam, rahat edemem.					
7. Arkadaşlığımız zamanla aşka dönüştü.					
8. Birlikte olduğum kişi ve ben fiziksel olarak tam bir uyum içerisindeyiz.					
9. Birlikte olduğum kişinin mutluluğunu kendi mutluluğumun önüne koymadıkça mutlu olamam.					
10. Ona aşık olduğumdan beri başka herhangi bir şey üzerinde yoğunlaşmakta güçlük çekiyorum.					
11. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken dikkate aldığım faktörlerden biri, mesleki yaşantım üzerinde nasıl bir etkisi olacağı idi.					
12. Birlikte olduğum kişi ideal fiziksel güzellik/ yakışıklılık standartlarıma uygun.					

	Kesinlikle yanlış	Yanlış	Kararsızım	Doğru	Kesinlikle doğru
13. Birlikte olduğum kişinin isteklerini yerine getirebilmesi için genellikle kendi isteklerimden özveride bulanmaya hazırım.					
14. Aşk ilişkimiz iyi bir arkadaşlıktan doğduğu için çok doyum vericidir.					
15. Birlikte olduğum kişi bir süre bana ilgi göstermezse bazen ilgisini tekrar çekmek için aptalca şeyler yaparım.					
16. Birbirimizi gerçekten anlıyoruz.					
17. Birlikte olduğum kişi ve çok sayıda başkalarıyla 'aşk oyunu' oynamaktan hoşlanırım.					
18. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle yoğun bir ilişkiye girmeden önce çocuk sahibi olmamız durumunda onun kalıtsal özellikleri ile benimkinin ne kadar uyumlu olduğunu bulmaya çalışırım.					
19. Bazen onun öteki sevgililerim hakkında bilgi edinmesini engellemek zorunda kalırım.					
20. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken en önemli faktör, onun iyi bir anababa olup olamayacağı idi.					
21. Birlikte olduğum kişiye acı çektirmektense kendim acı çekmeyi tercih ederim.					
22. Uzun süreli bir arkadaşlıktan doğduğu için aşkımız aşkların en iyisidir.					
23. Birbirimiz için yaratıldığımızı düşünüyorum.					
24. Aşkımız gizemli, mistik bir duygu değil, gerçek bir arkadaşlıktır.					

## APPENDIX G:SELF-DISCLOSURE INVENTORY

Aşağıda yer alan ifadeleri dikkatle okuyun. Bu ifadelerde belirtilen konularda annenize, öğretmeninize ve psikoloji danışma uzmanınıza v.b. kişilere ne ölçüde içinizi dökebileceğinizi, düşünce ve duygularınızı açıklayabileceğinizi düşünün. Eğer bir konuyu bu bireylerden herhangi birine olduğu gibi rahatlıkla anlatabiliyorsanız ilgili boşluğa “2” rakamını yazın. Eğer aynı konuyu rahatlıkla anlatamıyor ve yüzeysel olarak geçiştiriyorsanız ilgili boşluğa “1” rakamını yazın. Yine aynı konuyu o bireyle hiç konuşmuyorsanız, ona bu konuda açılmış olsanız bu boşluğa “0” rakamını yazın. Lütfen bu işlemi her bir ifade ve her bir birey için yapın.

- 0.0. Kadın – erkek eşitliği ile ilgili düşüncelerim.
- 0.1. Günlük siyasal konularda ilgili düşüncelerim.
- 0.2. Paranın insan hayatındaki yerine ilişkin görüşelim.
- 0.3. Yeni ve değişik yollara karşı tavrım.
- 0.4. Çevremizdeki insanlar hakkındaki düşüncelerim.
- 0.5. Günlük hayatında dinin yeri.
- 0.6. Ana-baba, çocuk ilişkilerinin nasıl olması gerektiğine ilişkin görüşelim.
- 0.7. İnsanların nasıl daha mutlu olacağına ilişkin görüşelim.
- 1.0. Sınavlardaki başarımlarım.
- 1.1. Derslerin hoşuma giden ve gitmeyen yanları.
- 1.2. Öğretmenlerimle olan ilişkilerimdeki problemlerim.
- 1.3. Aldığım kırık notlar.
- 1.4. Sınıf arkadaşlarımla olan ilişkilerimdeki problemlerim.
- 1.5. Okullardaki kuralların gerekliliği veya gereksizliği.
- 1.6. Sınav zamanlarına ilişkin problemlerim.

- 1.7. Ailenin sosyal ve kültürel özellikleri.
- 2.0. Annemle olan ilişkilerimin iyi ve kötü yanları.
- 2.1. Babamla olan ilişkilerimin iyi ve kötü yanları.
- 2.2. Ailemin maddi durumu.
- 2.3. Kardeşlerimle olan ilişkilerim.
- 2.4. Ailemin beni desteklediği konular.
- 2.5. Ailemin beni engellediği konular.
- 2.6. Anne veya babamın benimle ilgili düşünce ve isteklerim.
- 2.7. Ailemin sosyal ve kültürel özellikleri.
- 3.0. Toplumumuzdaki cinsel davranış standartları konusundaki görüşleri.
- 3.1. Karşıt cinsten biri ile olan arkadaşlık ilişkilerin.
- 3.2. Karşıt cinsten bireylere nasıl davrandığım.
- 3.3. Kız- erkek arkadaşlığının sınırları konusundaki düşüncelerim.
- 3.4. Karşıt cinsle ilgili güzellik veya yakışıklılık standartları.
- 3.5. Cinsel yaşamla ilgili konular.
- 3.6. Karşıt cinsten ilgi duyduğum bireyle ilgili düşünce ve duygularım.
- 3.7. Cinsel problemlerim.
- 4.0. Beğendiğim kişilik özelliklerim.
- 4.1. Huylarım ve alışkanlıklarım.
- 4.2. Kişiliğimin beni kaygılandıran yanları.
- 4.3. Kendimi suçladığım konular.
- 4.4. İnsanların beğenisini kazanmak için neler yaptığım.
- 4.5. Günlük duygusal değişimlerim.

- 4.5. Gnlk duygusal deęiřimlerin.
- 4.6. Gizli sırlarım.
- 4.7. Bařka insanların beni nasıl grdkleri.
- 5.0. Okuduęum kitaplar.
- 5.1. Hořlandıęım mzik tr.
- 5.2. Sevdięim sinema, tiyatro eserleri ve televizyon programları.
- 5.3. Giyimle ilgili zevklerim.
- 5.4. Boř zaman uęrařlarım.
- 5.5. Ne tr arkadařlardan hořlandıęım.
- 5.6. Hořlandıęım sportif faaliyetler.
- 5.7. İlgimi eken insanlar ve olaylar.

## APPENDIX H: THE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

### -----Demografik Bilgiler-----

1. Doğum Tarihiniz:

2. Cinsiyetiniz:

a. Kadın

b. Erkek

4. Medeni durumunuz:

a. Evli

b.Boşanmış

c. Dul (vefat nedeniyle)

d. Bekar, ilişkim var

e. Bekar, şu anda ilişkim yok

f. Bekar; hiç ilişkim olmadı

### -----İlişki ile İlgili Bilgiler-----

Aşağıdaki soruları şu anda birlikte olduğunuz kişi ile yaşadığımız ilişkiyi düşünerek cevaplayınız. Eğer şu anda ilişkiniz yoksa, en yakın geçmişinizdeki kişiyle olan ilişkinize göre yanıt veriniz. **Daha önce hiç ilişkiniz olmadıysa, lütfen bu bölümü boş bırakınız.**

1. Ne kadar zamandır birliktesiniz? -----Yıl-----Ay

2. Birlikte olmaya başlamadan önce tanışıyor muydunuz?

a. Hayır, tanışır tanışmaz birlikte olmaya başladık.

b. Evet, -----Yıl-----Aydır tanışıyorduk.

3. Aşağıdakilerden size uygun olan seçeneği işaretleyiniz:

a. Birlikte olduğum kişi ile evlenmeyi planlıyoruz.

b. Birlikte olduğum kişi ile birlikte yaşamayı planlıyoruz.

c. Nişanlıyız.

d. Sözlüüz.

e. Geleceğe yönelik planlarımız yok.

f. Diğer (Belirtiniz-----)

**APPENDIX I: ITEMS SCORED ON EACH OF THE RPCS OF THE  
TURKISH VERSION**

**Items Scored on Each of the RPCS of the Turkish Version**

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Compromise</b>						
1. İkimizin de kabul edebileceği çözümler bulmaya çalışırız.	<b>0.77</b>					
2. Çatışmayı çoğunlukla sorunun üzerinde konuşarak çözeriz.	<b>0.69</b>					
3. Çatışmalarımız genellikle bir uzlaşmaya vardığımız zaman biter.	<b>0.71</b>					
4. Partnerimle fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, tartışmanın her iki yönünü de göz önünde bulundururuz.	<b>0.73</b>					
5.Çatışmaları çözmek için bir uzlaşmaya varmaya çalışırız.	<b>0.78</b>					
6. Uzlaşmaya varmak, aramızdaki çatışmayı çözmenin en iyi yoludur.	<b>0.68</b>					
8. Fikir ayrılığımızı sonlandırmak için partnerimle orta yolda buluşmaya çalışırım.	<b>0.67</b>					
9. Aramızdaki çatışmayı çözmenin en iyi yolu, orta yolu bulmaktır.	<b>0.69</b>					
10. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, ikimizi de memnun edecek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırız	<b>0.86</b>					
11. Partnerimle çatışma yaşadığımızda, her ikimizi de mutlu edecek kararı almak için işbirliği yaparız.	<b>0.85</b>					
12. Aramızdaki problemleri çözmek adına, işbirliği içinde ortak bir zemin bulmaya çalışırız.	<b>0.85</b>					
13. Bir problemimiz olduğunda, ikimiz için de en iyi olan çözüme ulaşmak adına işbirliği yaparız.	<b>0.88</b>					
14. Yaşadığımız çatışmada ortak bir çözüme ulaşmak için işbirliği yapmaya çalışırız	<b>0.82</b>					

### **Domination**

29. Tartıştığımızda veya kavga ettiğimizde, ben kazanmaya çalışırım. **0.88**
30. Tartıştığımızda, kontrolü ele almaya çalışırım. **0.86**
31. Partnerimin bir tartışmayı kazanmasına nadiren izin veririm. **0.80**
32. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda amacım, partnerimi haklı olduğuma ikna etmektir. **0.84**
33. Tartıştığımızda, patronun kim olduğunu ona gösteririm. **0.70**
34. Çatışma yaşadığımızda partnerimin, bana göre en iyi olan çözümü seçmesini sağlamaya çalışırım. **0.59**

### **Submission**

35. Çatışma yaşadığımızda genellikle partnerimin dediğine razı olurum. **0.88**
36. Tartışmaları, partnerimin şartlarına göre sonlandırmak adına partnerimin isteklerine razı olurum. **0.88**
37. Bazen sırf çatışma sona ersin diye partnerimin fikrine katılırım. **0.77**
38. Tartışırken, genellikle kendi ihtiyaçlarımdan çok, partnerimin ihtiyaçlarını tatmin etmeye çalışırım. **0.85**
39. Bir konuda fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, pes eden ben olurum. **0.84**

### **Separation**

24. Çatışma yaşadığımızda, "sakinleşmek" için bir süre birbirimizden uzaklaşırız. **0.80**
25. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, tartışmanın her iki tarafını da değerlendirebilmek için ikimiz de bir süre yalnız kalmaya çalışırız. **0.89**
26. Çatışma yaşarken, tartışma ilerlemeden önce sakinleşmek için birbirimize olanak tanırız. **0.60**
27. Çatışma yaşadığımızda, konuyu daha sonra halletmek üzere ara veririz. **0.72**
28. Bir süre birbirimizden ayrı kalmak, çatışmalarımızın yatışmasında çok işe yarayabilir. **0.73**

### **Interactional Reactivity**

18. Fikir ayrılığı yaşadığımızda, yüksek sesle tartışırız.	<b>0.86</b>
19. Çatışmalarımız genellikle epey uzun sürer.	<b>0.67</b>
20. Partnerim ve ben sık sık çatışma yaşarız.	<b>0.74</b>
21. Partnerimle çatışma yaşamak beni perişan eder.	<b>0.43</b>
22. Çatışma yaşadığımızda partnerime sözlü saldırıda bulunurum.	<b>0.63</b>
23. Partnerime güvenmemem nedeniyle sürekli tartışırız.	<b>0.45</b>

### **Avoidance**

15. Partnerim de ben de tartışmalardan kaçınmaya çalışırız	<b>0.80</b>
16. Partnerimle fikir ayrılığına düşmemeye çalışırım.	<b>0.84</b>
17. Partnerimle aramda çatışma yaşanmasından kaçınırım.	<b>0.79</b>

---

<b>Eigen Value</b>	<b>9.72</b>	<b>5.42</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>1.31</b>
<b>% Variance</b>	<b>24.92</b>	<b>13.90</b>	<b>9.51</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>3.35</b>

---