# ATTACHMENT STYLES AND CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS AS PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

CEYDA ÖZTEKİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

FEBRUARY 2016

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. EsinTezer
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir | (METU, EDS) | _____ |
| Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer | (METU, EDS) | _____ |
| Assoc. Prof. Dr. Türker Özkan | (METU, PSY) | _____ |
| Assist. Prof. Dr. Mana Ece Tuna | (TEDU, EDS) | _____ |
| Assist. Prof. Dr. Müge Çelik Örücü | (TEDU, EDS) | _____ |

**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.**

Name, Last name : Ceyda Öztekin

Signature :

# ABSTRACT

ATTACHMENT STYLES AND CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS AS PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Öztekin, Ceyda

Ph.D., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

February 2016, 118 pages

The present study investigated the role of attachment and close relationship beliefs in predicting commitment in romantic relationships. The participants were volunteered university students from different faculties of Middle East Technical University (*n* = 485). The data were collected by administering Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Revised, Close Relationship Belief Scale and the Revised Commitment Inventory. Two separate pilot studies were conducted to carry out the adaptation studies of Close Relationship Belief Scale (*n* = 385) and the Revised Commitment Inventory (*n* = 263). Results of the path analysis revealed that the proposed predictors explained the 47% of the variance in commitment in romantic relationships. Intimacy belief was the strongest predictor of commitment followed by the attachment avoidance. Attachment avoidance had a direct significant negative effect on commitment while the direct effect of anxiety was not significant. The indirect effect of attachment anxiety on commitment was significant and positive via close relationship beliefs although its direct effect on commitment was negative and non-significant. And three of the close relationship beliefs; namely, intimacy, individuality, and passion, mediated the relationship between attachment avoidance and commitment. Findings of the

study are discussed in the light of the attachment, relationship beliefs and commitment literature.

**Keywords:** attachment, close relationship beliefs, commitment, romantic relationships.

# ÖZ

ROMANTİK İLİŞKİLERDE BAĞLILIĞIN YORDAYICILARI OLARAK BAĞLANMA STİLLERİ VE YAKIN İLİŞKİ İNANÇLARI

Öztekin, Ceyda
Doktora, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

Şubat 2016, 118 sayfa

Bu araştırmada bağlanma ve yakın ilişki inançlarının romantik ilişkilerdeki bağlılığı açıklamadaki rolü araştırılmıştır. Araştırmaya Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nin farklı fakültelerinden 485 üniversite öğrencisi gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. Veri toplama sürecinde katılımcılara Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II, Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği ve Bağlılık Envanteri uygulanmıştır. Ana çalışmanın öncesinde, 2 farklı pilot çalışma gerçekleştirilerek Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği ($n$ = 385) ve Bağlılık Envanteri ($n$ = 263) Türkçeye çevrilmiş ve ölçeklerin uyarlanma çalışması yapılmıştır. Yol analizlerinin sonuçları bu çalışmanın yordayıcı değişkenleri olan bağlanma ve yakın ilişki inançlarının, romantik ilişkilerde bağlılığın % 47'sini açıkladığını göstermiştir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre yakınlık inancı ilişkilerde bağlılığın en güçlü yordayıcısı olarak öne çıkmıştır ve bu değişkeni 2. önemli yordayıcı olarak bağlanma kaçınması takip etmiştir. Analizlerin bulguları, bağlanma kaçınmasının bağlılık üzerinde doğrudan bir olumsuz etkisi olduğunu ancak bağlanma kaygısının bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisinin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olmadığını göstermiştir. Bağlanma kaygısının bağlılık üzerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir doğrudan etkisi yokken, yakın ilişki inançları üzerinden anlamlı ve pozitif yönde bir dolaylı

etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur. Ayrıca araştırmada incelenen dört yakın ilişki inancından üçünün; yakınlık, bireysellik ve tutku inançları, bağlanma kaçınması ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiyi açıklamada ara değişken olarak anlamlı etkisi olduğu görülmüştür. Çalışmanın bulguları, bağlanma, yakın ilişki inançları ve bağlılığa ilişkin literatürün ışığında tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** bağlanma, yakın ilişki inançları, bağlılık, romantik ilişkiler.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

No success is achieved alone, which is what I believe in life. And, this thesis was also written with the help and support of several people on so many levels.

First of all, I should thank to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer not only because of her guidance throughout this thesis procedure but also because she was such an important role model for me in my career as a counselor. She has invested enormous amount of time into making me a good counselor and a researcher for the last 10 years. Although thesis process is usually a very stressful period for both the student and the supervisor, it was so precious and valuable to know that my supervisor had faith in me overall even at times when I lost my faith in myself. She always believed in me and spent a great deal of time to guide my career in the right path, encouraging me to be a researcher as well as a practitioner. You are an *ecole* Hocam and I am proud to be your last PhD student...

As the second, I would like to thank to all my thesis committee members each of whom made a significant contribution. I would like to thank to Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir for his contribution to my education as a counselor by sharing his knowledge and expertise throughout my master and Ph.D years and also for helping me narrow and clarify my thesis topic for the current study. I would like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Türker Özkan not only for his precious help during this thesis procedure but also for encouraging me to turn back to academic life years ago, which was a significant junction in my life. I owe him a debt of gratitude for my decision to go on with my graduate education and academic life. What is more, I will never forget his providing me with the chance to go to USA in 2008 to become a certified parent trainer, which created a significant base for my later work in the field. You are a cornerstone in my life Hocam... And very special thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Mana Ece Tuna for her being a very encouraging and supporting member of my thesis committee, giving practical help and sharing her wisdom for the pilot study I conducted and always having a kind smile even when I made mistakes. She is also an invaluable role model for me as

being a researcher and a practitioner simultaneously. Last but not the least, I would like to express my gratefulness to Assist. Prof. Dr. Müge Çelik Örücü for being a valuable part of this thesis process and always seeing the silver lining in the gray cloud, which I appreciate by heart.

The support I received from my Professors of course is not limited to the thesis committee members. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Hatipoğlu Sümer for her help with the translations when I was lost within the words. She is always a great help when a sharp mind is needed for details. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Oya Yerin Güneri for her being a very kind and encouraging role model during my graduate education years and believing in me. I should also thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Yeşim Çapa Aydın for her warm support during my graduate years.

In addition to the professors who guided me, I should mention my friends as well. Some of them helped me with the data collection, some helped me with other details, some shared their own experiences with me, which made my life much easier, and some of them were always there when I felt exhausted, frustrated, lost my courage and wanted to complain and grumble. Since each of them is so unique for me the name order here is just arbitrary. To begin with, I would like to thank Burcu Dayıoğlu Başaran for her enormous help at all steps of the work and more important than that the encouragement she provided at difficult times. Every lucky person should have a friend like you... I would like to thank my friend Zeynep Dinçer, who helped with the translations of the adapted scales in the study, which was a great brain work. It is not easy to find people with such good English skills, thank you. Also I would like to thank Fevziye Dolunay Çuğ. Without her, doing some parts of the work would feel like digging with a needle. Thanks by heart for not letting me to be burnout in the details and helping me to keep the track of the big picture. And similarly, special thanks to Ezgi Toplu Demirtaş, İbrahim Tanrıkulu, and Gökçe Sancak Aydın, who were very supportive, giving practical help when I needed and sharing their own experiences with me. In addition, I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Funda Kutlu, Assist. Prof. Dr. Meltem Anafarta Şendağ and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem Bozo for their kind support during the data collection phase and for encouraging me at times when things were taking more time and effort than I assumed.

I have my extra special thanks to Bahar Öz, my therapist, for being my friend for the last couple of difficult years. Thanks for being a friend even when I was unbearable. And special thanks to Funda Kutlu, who sometimes believes in me more than I believe in myself and for always encouraging me like an elder sister.

I have my thanks to CananYıldırım, Tuğba Özbay and Özgür Kirazcı for being valuable friends even though they live in different cities and countries. Our hearts do not mind the distance, I love you...

PhD is already a very difficult experience for everybody but I believe that it may somehow become extra stressful if one is working outside of the university, doing a different job out there. Working as a practitioner in the field during my PhD years, concentrating on different tasks and learning new knowledge and skills for that job, there were several times when I felt frustrated, exhausted, divided, confused and lost. During those times, it is invaluable if you have people who support you in work life. At this point, I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Levent Sütçigil M.D., for encouraging and supporting me at times when I lost my confidence while struggling with balancing the demands of two different worlds, university and work life. I would also like to mention specialized psychologist Betül Gündoğdu and Prof. Dr. Runa Uslu M.D. for their generous support and mentoring and giving me a strong hand when I had difficulty in sorting out how to handle my responsibilities towards clients. I am so grateful that I had the great chance to do my job with the help and guidance of these valuable mentors.

I should also thank my friends from Hacettepe University Child Psychiatry Clinique; namely, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ebru Kültür M.D., Assist. Prof. Dr. Tuna Çak M.D., and specialized child psychologist Şeniz Özusta for believing in me as a practitioner and supporting me with their enormous knowledge, experience and wisdom, and also many thanks to Dr. Can Kültür, who always encouraged me as a parent trainer and guided me with his great experience in education. I learned a lot from each of you...

Last but not the least, I have the biggest debt of gratitude to my family who have supported me throughout my education life which took more than 25 years... I should thank them for their unconditional positive regard, emotional support, tolerance, patience, empathy and faith. I was lucky to feel their love and

compassion even when I was unbearable. I owe them not just my achievements, but who I am as a person... I fall short of words, THANK YOU by heart...

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM..... iii
ABSTRACT..... iv
ÖZ..... vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS..... xii
LIST OF TABLES..... xvi
LIST OF FIGURES..... xvii
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION..... 1
1.1 Background of the Study..... 1
1.2 Purpose of the Study..... 7
1.3 Significance of the Study..... 10
1.4 Definition of Terms..... 12
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... 13
2.1 History Regarding the Conceptualization of Commitment..... 13
2.2 Studies on Commitment..... 16
2.3 Attachment and Commitment..... 19
2.3.1 Conceptualization of Adult Attachment..... 19
2.3.2 Studies on Attachment and Commitment..... 24
2.3.2.1 Attachment Avoidance and Commitment..... 26
2.3.2.2 Attachment Anxiety and Commitment..... 28
2.4 Studies on Relationship Beliefs and Commitment..... 29
2.5 Culture and Gender Issues Regarding Relationship Beliefs..... 36
3. METHOD..... 39
3.1 Participants..... 39
3.2 Data Collection Instruments..... 40
3.2.1 Demographic Information Form (DIF)..... 40
3.2.2 Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised (ECR-R)..... 41
3.2.2.1 Reliability of ECR-R for the Present Study..... 41
3.2.3 Close Relationship Belief Scale (CRB)..... 42

3.2.3.1 Validity and Reliability Studies of CRB..... 42
3.2.3.2 Translation Studies of the CRB for the Present Study..... 43
3.2.3.3 Pilot Study 1 - Validity and Reliability Studies of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study..... 43
3.2.3.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study..... 44
3.2.3.3.2 Convergent Validity of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study..... 45
3.2.3.3.3 Reliability of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study..... 46
3.2.4 The Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI)..... 47
3.2.4.1 Validity and Reliability Studies of RCI..... 48
3.2.4.2 Translation Studies of the RCI for the Present Study..... 48
3.2.4.3 Pilot Study 2 -Validity and Reliability Studies of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study..... 48
3.2.4.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study..... 49
3.2.4.3.2 Convergent Validity of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study..... 50
3.2.4.3.3 Reliability of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study..... 53
3.3 Procedure..... 53
3.4 Data Analysis..... 54
3.5 Limitations..... 55
4. RESULTS..... 56
4.1 Preliminary Analyses..... 56
4.1.1 Missing Value Analysis..... 56
4.1.2 Checking Assumptions..... 56
4.1.2.1 Independent Observer..... 56
4.1.2.2 Sample Size..... 56
4.1.2.3 Outlier Analysis..... 57
4.1.2.4 Test of Normality..... 57
4.1.2.5 Linearity and Homoscedasticity..... 58

4.2 Descriptive Statistics..... 58
4.2.1 Multicollinearity and Correlation Analysis..... 59
4.3 Full Mediation Path Analysis: Effects of Attachment Anxiety And Attachment Avoidance on Commitment via Close Relationship Beliefs…….…… 61
4.3.1 Direct and Indirect Relationships..... 63
4.4 Summary of the Results..... 67
5. DISCUSSION..... 69
5.1 Discussion of the Findings..... 69
5.2 Implications..... 75
5.3 Recommendations..... 77
REFERENCES..... 79
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Demographic Information Form (DIF)..... 90
APPENDIX B: Sample Items of Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised Scale (ECR-R)..... 91
APPENDIX C: Sample Items of Close Relationship Beliefs Scale (CRB)..... 92
APPENDIX D: The CFA Model of Close Relationship Belief Scale (CRB) with Standardized Estimates in This Study..... 93
APPENDIX E: Sample Items of the Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI)……..….. 94
APPENDIX F: The CFA Model of Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI) with Standardized Estimates in This Study..... 95
APPENDIX G: Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee Approval Letter..... 96
APPENDIX H: Turkish Summary..... 97
APPENDIX I: Curriculum Vitae..... 116

APPENDIX J: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu..... 118

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 3.1 The Distribution of Participants In Terms of Faculty and Gender..... 39
Table 3.2 The Distribution of Participants In Terms of Grade and Gender..... 40
Table 3.3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Intercorrelations of the Turkish Version of CRB..... 45
Table 3.4 Correlations Between CRB Subscales, FTORR, and LAS Subscales..... 46
Table 3.5 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Dedication Subscale of RCI, ED, ITI and Dedication DbR..... 51
Table 3.6 Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Intercorrelations of Constraint Subscales of RCI..... 51
Table 3.7 Correlations Between Constraint Subscales of RCI, ED, ITI, and Constraint DbR 1-6..... 52
Table 4.1 Indices of Normality for the Variables of the Study..... 57
Table 4.2 Means and Standard Deviations for the Variables of the Study..... 58
Table 4.3 Correlation Matrix for the Study Variables..... 60
Table 4.4 Correlations between the Study Variables and the Demographic Variables ..... 61
Table 4.5 Squared Multiple Correlations for the Study Variables..... 63
Table 4.6 Results of Path Coefficients..... 64

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES

Figure 1.1 The conceptual diagram of the hypothesized path model..... 9
Figure 4.1 Standardized estimation values of the full mediation path model..... ..... 62

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the Study

Understanding the nature of commitment has been considered to be one of the critical issues in every types of close romantic relationships including marriage, engaged, cohabitating or dating relationships (Kelley, as stated in Kelley et. al., 2002). As it was also proposed by Erikson (1968), to establish and sustain a committed romantic relationship is one of the crucial developmental tasks for those who are about to enter into adulthood. Erikson further suggested that overcoming these tasks help the individuals to proceed further developmental stages, establishing more mature adult relationships, and promoting mental health throughout the life span. Thus, based on these theoretical emphases, a bulk of studies has been carried out in enhancing the knowledge of the construct of commitment by both developing theoretical approaches for the conceptualization of the construct and by conducting research concerning the patterns and antecedents of commitment in romantic relationships.

Regarding the conceptualization of the construct, several attempts have been made to find a comprehensive definition of the commitment in close relationships. When these definitions are examined, the most common components are the future orientation and the belief for the continuation of the relationship. In other words, partners experiencing committed romantic relationship believe that their relationship has a future and that their relationship is likely to continue over the long run (see Arriaga & Agnew, 2001 for a review). A person committed to a relationship is expected to stay in that relationship "through thick and thin" or "for better or worse" (Kelley et. al., 2002). That is, commitment represents an *intention* to maintain a relationship in the future, whatever its costs or benefits, and despite the ups and downs, and has been used to account for why relationships remain stable despite fluctuations in positive feelings. Therefore, as it was implied by the concept of intention and emphasized by some researchers (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Duemmler & Kobak, 2001), commitment is not just an

act or behavior but it is primarily a mindset, a cognitive construct, characterized by a "decision" to continue the relationship.

Based on these theoretical and conceptual concern over the construct of commitment, Stanley and Markman (1992) proposed an operational definition of the construct and developed an instrument with its two components: *a) Dedication* (personal commitment) and *b) Constraints* (structural commitment).Dedication refers to the individual's desire for the relationship to be long-term, to have an identity as a couple, and to make the relationship a priority. While dedication is an intrinsic desire to be with one's partner and defines why the person wants to stay in the relationship, constraints define the reasons why the person does not want to leave the relationship, such as certain obligations and pressures regardless of their personal dedication to their relationship (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004).

Although constraint commitment seem to rely more on extrinsic pressures, it can also motivate partners to stay together and work through difficult times. However, constraint commitment alone is not sufficient to maintain a healthy relationship. As it was postulated by Owen and colleagues (2011), constraint commitment is more related to the decision to stay together but it has historically been far less associated with relationship quality than dedication is. On the other hand, *dedication* is more associated with interpersonal commitment, i.e., related with the couples' feeling about their relationships and their behaviors within that relationship independent of obligations. Researchers (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004) suggested that there are strong links between dedication and both the healthy exchange of positive behavior in relationships and the inhibition of negative behaviors which in turn predicts the quality of the relationship. In addition to be a weak predictor of relationship quality, most of the time constraints are not that relevant to dating relationships, either. They are more important in marriages and cohabitations. In the light of all these theoretical arguments about the definition of commitment, *the present study operationally defines and measures the concept of interpersonal commitment as "dedication".*

In the literature, a large number of studies has been conducted to examine the correlates of commitment in romantic relationships. Findings of these studies generally revealed that commitment increases relationship satisfaction (Stanley, Markman, & Whitton, 2002) and the lack of commitment was found to be the

number one reason for break-up (Scott et. al., 2013).The results of several other studies yielded that greater commitment was associated with greater couple consensus, successful affective expression, cohesion, couple well-being and healthier functioning within the relationship, more intimacy, healthier sexuality, more effective problem solving (Rodrigues & Lopes, 2014), greater trust (Drigotas, Rusbult, &Verette, 1999), more sacrifice (Agnew et al., 1998; Stanley et. al., 2006; Whitton, Stanley, & Markman, 2007), more forgiveness (Finkel & Campbell, 2001; Finkel et. al., 2002), less violence (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004), less self-interest, greater interdependence and more constructive response to stress and dissatisfaction in the relationship (Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn, 1982; Wieselquist et. al., 1999; Ragsdale, Brandau-Brown, & Bello, 2010), less likelihood of infidelity and more derogation of attractive alternative others (Allen et. al., 2008; Maddox-Shaw et. al., 2013). In sum, commitment is a significant multidimensional construct associated with several important dimensions of close relationships.

With the awareness of importance and necessity of commitment in adult romantic relationships, several individual and relational variables were examined to explain commitment. Being one of the earliest schemas about self and others, attachment styles, comprehensively conceptualized in attachment theory, has been considered as one of the most promising individual and interpersonal factor in relation to commitment in romantic relationships. Indeed, as it was well-documented in the meta-analysis of Le and colleagues (2010), both the theory and the research, provided strong support regarding the role of attachment styles in understanding relationship formation, stability, and quality.

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969; Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991), which initially focused on understanding the infant-mother attachment, has been extended to the study of adolescent and adult functioning in their romantic relationships assuming that perceived trustworthiness, availability of others and the perceived worthiness of self, developed in childhood affects later adult relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987)**.**In the end, four different adult attachment categories were defined as secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Underlying these categories or styles, two dimensions were identified: Anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver,

1998). Researchers (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Selçuk et.al., 2005; Sümer, 2006) have recently argued that anxiety and avoidance experienced in close relationships are two fundamental dimensions of attachment and that attachment is better defined with dimensions rather than categories. To explain these two dimensions, *avoidance* refers to the extent to which individuals desire limited intimacy and prefer to remain psychologically and emotionally independent whereas *anxiety* is defined as the extent to which individuals worry that relationship partners may not be available or could abandon them. Following these more recent and widely accepted two dimensional attachment approach, in the present study, anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment were assumed as the individual's *working model* of attachment, which guides cognition and behavior within adult relationships.

Research findings regarding the relationship between these two attachment dimensions and commitment rather consistently showed that attachment anxiety is related to hyperactivating attachment strategies such as continuously seeking reassurance regarding partner's love and commitment whereas avoidant attachment is related to deactivating the attachment strategies such as displaying high levels of self-sufficiency, the dismissal of attachment threats and desires, and the demonstration of cold and detached behaviors in an attempt to avoid high level of closeness(see Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011 for review; Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013). The literature also suggests consistently that high avoidance is predictive of lower commitment, less trust and feeling less invested in one's partner, which corresponds with avoidant individuals' discomfort with closeness and intimacy (Schindler, Fagundes, & Murdock, 2010). Although there seems to be a direct negative relationship between avoidance and commitment, the relationship between anxious attachment and commitment is less clear. Some researchers suggest that anxious attachment is related to higher commitment. For example, anxious attachment in married men was associated with shorter length of courtship before marriage, suggesting that anxiously attached individuals commit to their romantic relationships more quickly (cited in Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011). In some other studies, on the contrary, it was reported that anxious attachment was correlated with shorter relationship duration and it was significantly and negatively correlated

with global commitment (Feeney & Noller, 1990). To summarize, it is proposed that anxiously attached people often enter relationships too quickly, over-self-disclose to maintain relationships, and sometimes show a preoccupation with commitment. Nevertheless, anxious attachment is generally related to shorter relationship duration which imply a negative relationship with commitment.

Based on these rather inconsistent findings, particularly found between anxious attachment and commitment, researchers proposed some variables that might play a mediating role between attachment and commitment such as satisfaction (Fraley & Shaver, 2000), availability of alternatives (Carter et al., 2013), conflicts (Li& Chan, 2012), love (Feeney & Noller, 1990), and irrational beliefs (Kilmann et al., 2013; Stackert & Bursik, 2003).

In the present study, close relationship beliefs were included as mediators in examining the association between attachment and commitment. In identifying the mediator, both theory and research were taken as a base. As the attachment theory assumes, a person's attachment-related memories, beliefs, expectations, needs, and strategies for meeting attachment needs form one's *working model* of attachment, which guides cognition and behavior within adult relationships. As Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) stated, people do not enter into relationships as "tabula rasa", like an empty paper but they bring some sort of beliefs, knowledge structures and schemas together with themselves. Besides, several research findings yielded that relationship beliefs has a predictive power in explaining commitment. To exemplify some of the theoretical arguments and study findings, Cox and his friends (1997) stated that the individual's belief regarding that the relationships should continue determines their commitment in their close relationships; and Sprecher and Metts (1999) stated that general positive beliefs about relationships has a positive relation with commitment. Another study about relationship beliefs and commitment was conducted by Knee and his colleagues (2004) in which close relationship beliefs were examined under two factors: destiny and growth beliefs. In their study, it was found that the growth belief was a mediator between conflict and commitment; in other words, if individuals have growth belief about close relationships, conflicts were less related to reduced commitment in their relationships. Whereas, when people are high in the destiny belief, if they do not have a high relationship satisfaction at the beginning of the

relationship, they tend to prefer to leave the relationship rather than committing or investing more into the relationship when confronted with adversaries/ difficulties. Another group of researcher reported that irrational relationship beliefs were related to more conflicts and negative problem solving styles and therefore they are detrimental to commitment in relationships (Hamamcı 2005; Kaygusuz, 2013). A study including both attachment orientation and irrational beliefs found that people with anxious or avoidant attachment orientation tend to endorse more relationship-specific irrational beliefs and more irrational beliefs predicted reduced satisfaction (Stacker & Bursik, 2003). Therefore, both attachment insecurity and irrational beliefs were found to be negatively associated with satisfaction implying a negative association with commitment as well.

Thus, based on these theoretical arguments and research findings, in the present study, relational beliefs were thought to be a relevant mediator in investigating the relationship between attachment and commitment. More specifically, individuals enter into relationships with pre-existing beliefs about what relationships should be like, what features make them satisfying and rewarding, what rules should guide the behaviors of relational partners, and so forth. These generalized relationship expectations are known as *relational schemata*, *implicit theories of relationships*, and *relationship beliefs* (Sprecher & Metts, 1999). These relationship beliefs are chronically accessible constructs that permanently influence the way relationship behaviors and information are encoded, stored, and retrieved (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992).

Although studies provided support regarding the roles of some mediators between attachment and commitment, investigating the role of relationship beliefs as a mediator is rather limited. This may be due to the fact that there are some arguments regarding the definition and measurement of relationship beliefs. As can be seen in the literature, several studies have used different relationship belief scales such as future time orientation in romantic relationships (Öner, 2002); love attitude scale of Hendrick and Hendrick (1986); implicit theories of relationships scale of Knee (1998) in which destiny and growth beliefs are measured; and relationship belief inventory (RBI) developed by Eidelson and Epstein (1982) to measure five dysfunctional relationship beliefs, and close relationship beliefs scales (CRB) developed by Fletcher and Kinninmonth (1992).

In the present study, close relationship beliefs scales (CRB) developed by Fletcher and Kinninmonth (1992) with its four dimensions; namely, intimacy, individuality, passion, and external factors, was chosen as the mediator. Compared to other measures, Close Relationship Beliefs Scale (CRB) is composed of wide range of beliefs concerning what makes close relationships successful; it is applicable to both marital and nonmarital/dating relationships and it mainly measures general relationship beliefs without confusing it with specific beliefs about a particular relationship (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992). Since the present study aims to find what enhances commitment, relationship beliefs are operationalized as close relationship beliefs that enhances the romantic relationships.

In conclusion, separate studies on attachment and relationship beliefs revealed that they are both important in explaining commitment in romantic relationships. It is also supported in the literature that attachment affects the formation of romantic relationship beliefs being one of the earliest belief/schema about relationships. Considering these theoretical arguments and research findings, the present study aims to examine the joint role of attachment and close relationship beliefs in explaining commitment.

### 1.2 Purpose of the Study

Purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationships of adult attachment style, close relationship beliefs, and commitment in romantic relationships among male and female university students. More specifically, the predictive powers of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance; and close relationship beliefs of intimacy, individuality, passion, and external factors on commitment (dedication) were examined.

Research Question:

To what extent commitment in romantic relationships is explained by the proposed path model which consist of attachment styles (anxiety and avoidance) as predictors and close relationship beliefs (intimacy, individuality, passion, and external factors)as mediators. See Figure 1.1 for the conceptual diagram of the proposed path model.

It was expected that both attachment style and relationship beliefs had a predictive power for relationship commitment. It was expected that when taken

together, attachment style and relationship beliefs would have more predictive power for commitment than they have alone. It was also expected that the predictive power of attachment style on commitment would change via the mediation of relationship beliefs.

*Figure 1.1 The conceptual diagram of the hypothesized path model*

## 1.3 Significance of the Study

The present study aims at investigating the role of attachment and close relationship beliefs in predicting commitment in romantic relationships. The importance of the study is twofold: research and counseling practices.

In the theoretical part of the research, the conceptualizations and measurements of the constructs of attachment, relationship beliefs, and commitment might be considered as a significance of the present study. First of all, in the definition and measurement of commitment, several arguments were taken into account. As stated by the researchers (Arriaga & Agnew, 2001) the term of commitment should not be reduced to the mere state of persisting in a relationship but rather it should be defined as a psychological state with affective, cognitive and conative components. As Stanley, Whitton and Markman (2004)stated, couples can have happy and stable relationships if they have strong interpersonal commitment but weak institutional commitment; however, if interpersonal commitment is lacking, that would reduce the resiliency of the relationship. When it comes to the components of the interpersonal commitment, Arriaga and Agnew (2001) reported that although these three dimensions (affective, cognitive and conative) were all very important, they found that long-term orientation (cognitive component) accounted for unique variance in predicting persistence in dating relationships. Therefore, this study focused on *interpersonal commitment* rather than structural commitment and defined commitment as *dedication* to the current romantic relationship. This is also more appropriate for this study's sample, since structural commitment would be more relevant to marriages and cohabitations but rather irrelevant for the university students' dating relationships. Besides, in present study, commitment was measured with a robust and appropriate instrument which was developed for unmarried couples and can be reliably used with dating university students (Owen et. al. 2011).

Regarding the conceptualization of close relationship beliefs, in the current study relationship beliefs are defined as general close relationship beliefs about what makes relationships successful and enhance the quality of the relationship rather than irrational beliefs or beliefs referring to specific relationships. Hence,

the measurements used in the present study solely includes items about general beliefs without referring to the current romantic relationships.

As for the significance of measurement, two instruments, namely, Close Relationship Belief Scale and the Revised Commitment Inventory were translated and adapted into Turkish which might be considered as an important contribution to the close relationship literature in Turkey.

For the counseling practices, this study was conducted with the sample of young adults which adds to the significance of the study. To explain, it is known that university students apply to university counseling centers mostly for the difficulties that they experience in their romantic relationships (Creasey, Kershaw, & Boston, 1999). Romantic relationships form the core of the life of young adults (Demir, 2008) and it is the most important psycho-social task of university students aged between 18-26 (Erikson, 1968; Kuttler & Greca, 2004 as stated by Küçükarslan & Gizir, 2014). Because the perceptions and expectations that are produced by first romantic relationships provide perspectives for future relationships, these relations determine both the quality of intimate relationships that will be established during adulthood and an individual's partner choice throughout the marriage process (Furman, 2002; Le et. al., 2010).

In the light of the findings of this study, preventive work can be done with the university students to form their relationship beliefs so that they can have more committed and healthier relationships which constitute an important part of being a psychologically healthy adult (Coie et. al., 1993; Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1993; Beach, Smith, & Fincham, 1994; Forthofer et. al., 1996; Sinclair, & Nelson, 1998; Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013).

In a study about marriage education (Scott et. al., 2013) people who took the training but got divorced after it stated that they wish they had the given marriage education before making a commitment. Developmentally university students are quiet curious and willing to learn about close relationships which makes this time period especially effective to conduct psycho-education groups about relationships (Küçükarslan & Gizir, 2014).

Beliefs are things that we bring into the relationship independent of our partners (DeBord, Romans, & Krishok, 1996). And we know that some relationship beliefs can be changed with psycho-education (Mazaheri & Mousavi,

2011). If this study can determine the belief structure that enhances the commitment tendency of individuals, these kind of trainings can be given at the university counseling centers at the right time and with the right content.

### 1.4 Definition of Terms

In this section, operational definition of the key terms of the current study are presented. In this study, the predictor variable was *attachment* (anxiety and avoidance), the mediator variable was *close relationship beliefs* (intimacy, individuality, passion, and external factors) and the criterion variable was *commitment* all of which are defined below.

*Attachment anxiety* is defined as a preoccupation with the partner's accessibility and excessive worry about rejection and abandonment.

*Attachment avoidance* is defined as being uncomfortable with closeness and a preference to remain highly independent and self-reliant.

*Intimacy belief* is a cluster of the following close relationship beliefs: trust, respect, communication, coping, support, acceptance, love, friendship, and compromise.

*Individuality belief* is a cluster of the following close relationship beliefs: independence and equity.

*Passion belief* is a cluster of the following close relationship beliefs: sex and vitality.

*External factors belief* is a cluster of the following close relationship beliefs: personal security, important others, finance, commonality, and children.

*Commitment* is defined as dedication to one's romantic relationship, the individual's desire for the relationship to be long-term, to have an identity as a couple, and to make the relationship a priority.

# CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter summarizes the literature related to the variables of the present study, namely commitment and its proposed predictor variables of attachment and relationship beliefs. First section describes the history of the commitment as a concept. Second section summarizes studies on commitment with different variables. The third and fourth sections summarize the literature related to attachment and relationship beliefs respectively, and their relation to commitment in romantic relationships. And the fifth section focuses on gender and cultural differences in terms of relationship beliefs.

## 2.1 History Regarding the Conceptualization of Commitment

Commitment is a complex phenomena defined and measured differently by several researchers at different studies in the history of the concept. This section aims to summarize all these different definitions used in the literature.

One of the earliest definitions were made by Kelly (1979, as cited in Agnew et. al., 1998). According to his interdependence theory, dependence is greater to the degree that a relationship provides good outcomes and to the degree that the outcomes available in alternative relationships are poor. Hence, commitment was mainly defined as dependence.

An extension of this definition was made by Rusbult, Johnson, and Morrow (1986) and it is known as investment model of commitment. They specifically defined commitment as having high satisfaction, low alternative quality, and high investment size in the relationship. Hence, they proposed three bases of dependence rather than two. In fact, in a meta-analysis of 52 studies, Le and Agnew (2003) reported that satisfaction, investments, and quality of alternatives accounted for 61% of the variance in commitment.

This definition was widely accepted in the literature for years and it was used in research at several different areas like marriage, romantic relationships, friendships, and commitment on the job and the workplace for a great variety of age groups.

Although this approach, which is basically known as investment model, was used extensively in the literature, several following researchers challenged the model and argued that these three components may constitute dependence in the relationship, however, being dependent does not necessarily mean commitment (Agnew et. al., 1998). They claimed that dependence is a structural property whereas commitment is a subjective experience that dependent individuals experience on a daily basis. Therefore, although commitment develops as a result of high satisfaction, poor alternatives, and high investments, commitment is more than a simple numerical summary of dependence. In sum, Rusbult's definition of commitment -investment model- was criticized as being very structural and mechanical. It was proposed that couples' feeling that they have to stay in the relationship may not mean that they are psychologically committed to their relationship.

With the claim that dependence produces some sort of commitment but commitment cannot be reduced to dependence, Agnew and colleagues (1998) defined commitment as a psychological state which is beyond structural dependence. According to their definition, commitment has three components: *a) Conative component* (defined as intent to persist and being intrinsically motivated to continue the relationship in the future) *b) Cognitive component* (long term orientation - strong assumption that in the distant future the relationship will remain intact) *c) Affective component* (psychological attachment to each other - one's well being is affected by the other's well being).

Another definition of commitment was proposed by Johnson (1991; cited in Adams & Jones, 1997; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001). He defined commitment as causes of relationship persistence and listed his categories as follows: *a) Personal commitment* (the person stays in the relationship because he wants to do so), *b) Moral commitment* (ought to do so), *c) Structural commitment* (have no choice but to do so).

Having a similar standing to Johnson (1991, cited in Adams & Jones, 1997; Arriaga & Agnew, 2001), Adams and Jones (1997) also recommended the same three primary dimensions for defining commitment with slightly different subtitles: *(a) Attraction component* based on devotion, satisfaction, and love; *(b) Moral-normative component* based on a sense of personal responsibility for

maintaining the marriage and on the belief that marriage is an important social and religious institution; and *(c) Constraining component* based on the fear of social, financial, and emotional costs of relationship termination.

A simplified and an equally comprehensive definition of commitment was proposed by Stanley and Markman (1992). In their definition, commitment has two components: *a) Dedication* (personal commitment)*b) Constraints* (structural commitment). As they were introduced in the Introduction Section, dedication refers to the individual's desire for the relationship to be long-term, to have an identity as a couple, and to make the relationship a priority (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004). While dedication defines why the person wants to stay in the relationship, constraints define the reasons why the person does not want to leave his relationship because of certain obligations and pressures (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004). In the original theory (Stanley & Markman, 1992), constraints were divided into three in itself: i) perceived constraints (e.g. social pressure), ii) material constraints (e.g. owning a pet, gym membership, owning a house together), iii) felt constraints (feeling trapped). Their later studies showed that high dedication, high perceived constraint, high material constraints and less felt constraint predicted higher commitment, each of these four factors having a unique effect in predicting relationship break-up (Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2010).

To summarize the definitions of commitment in the literature, Arriaga and Agnew (2001) states that:

> "A committed couple member has been described as a person who (a) has a strong personal intention to continue the relationship (Johnson, 1973; Levinger, 1965; Rusbult and Buunk, 1993), (b) feels attached or linked to the partner (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Stanley & Markman, 1992), (c) feels morally obligated to continue the relationship (Johnson, 1991; Lydon, Pierce, & O'Regan, 1997), (d) imagines being with the partner in the long term future (Rusbult & Buunk,1993), (e) places primacy in a relationship over other aspects of life (Stanley & Markman, 1992), (f) has overcome challenges to the relationship (Brickman, Dunkel-Schetter, & Abbey, 1987; Lydon & Zanna, 1990), (g) has relatively poor alternatives to the current relationship (Thibaut & Kelly, 1959), (h) has many tangible and intangible resources that would be lost if the relationship were to end (Hinde, 1979; Johnson, 1973; Lund, 1985; Rosenblatt, 1977), and (i) confronts difficulties in ending (or strong pressure to continue) a relationship (Johnson, 1991; Levinger, 1965; Rosenblatt, 1977)."

As suggested by this extensive list, it can be inferred that commitment is a multifaceted concept. Despite the variety of definitions, romantic commitment is

principally and largely conceptualized as a cognitive construct, as the intention to maintain a couple relationship in the future, despite its costs or benefits and possible fluctuations in positive feelings (Dandurand, Bouaziz, & LaFontaine, 2013). Actually Surra and Hughes (1997) found that in relationships with high interpersonal commitment, the partners' commitment reaches a high level and stay there consistently over time. Whereas in a relatively uncommitted relationship (or in event-driven commitments rather than interpersonal commitment), the level of commitment can reach high levels but may fluctuate dramatically over time with sharp downturns.

In addition to the difficulty of choosing the best theoretical definition of commitment, another key problem is the measurement of the construct since commitment is not clearly separated from the factors theorized to affect it (Surra & Hughes, 1997). And this lack of a clear distinction between commitment and its causes has resulted in measurement that confounds or confuses commitment with its predictors. To maintain this distinction, it is argued that marital commitment should be defined as the partners' estimates of likelihood that they will be together in the long run or as culturally accepted norms of long-term dedication to monogamous intimate partnerships (Saucedo-Coy & McInnes-Miller, 2014).

**2.2 Studies on Commitment**

Because of the importance of the concept for close relationships, there is a vast literature on predictors of commitment which is also the scope of this study. Many studies have investigated a range of variables including individual difference dimensions and interdependence processes as predictors of commitment (Etcheverry et. al., 2013). Aim of this section is to give a sample of these studies before going into the details of the predictors chosen for this study.

First variable that should be mentioned while displaying studies on commitment is relationship satisfaction. Although they are highly correlated, and although some of the theories like investment model takes satisfaction as part of the commitment construct, the literature distinguishes between these two concepts as satisfaction being positivity of affect or attraction to one's relationship and commitment being the tendency to maintain a relationship and to feel psychologically attached to it (Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986). The literature is quite consistent in the finding that commitment is positively associated with

satisfaction though some studies revealed that satisfaction is sometimes largely irrelevant to commitment for certain kinds of relationships (e.g., in abusive relationships) (Rusbult & Martz,1995). However, in general it is mostly argued that satisfaction (quality) and commitment (strength and stability), although conceptually distinct, are highly positively correlated both within persons and between couples (Le & Agnew, 2003) suggesting that they may be part of the same latent variable (Givertz et. al., 2013).

A second group of studies focused on obligations rather than satisfaction to predict commitment in close relationships. To exemplify one of those studies, Cox and colleagues (1997) studied the effects of different forms of "obligation to persist" on commitment. In their study they defined *personal prescription* as beliefs that support persisting in a relationship and *social prescription* as the belief that significant network members support persisting, for either moral or pragmatic reasons. Their results revealed that social prescription accounted for unique variance in commitment. The authors argue that one explanation of personal prescription for not having a significant effect may be due to measurement limitations since they measured this concept with a single item rather than a comprehensive scale.

A third group of studies focused on the relationship style to predict commitment in close relationships. Actually, there are several studies showing that commitment is associated with relationship types. An example study of a national sample in USA conducted with couples who lived together before marriage revealed that they had a lower commitment than couples who are married without cohabitating before marriage and that their commitment level was still lower after getting married when compared with their counterparts who never cohabited before getting married (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004). In the literature, this fact is known as *cohabitation effect*. The researchers further underline that both current cohabitation and having cohabited before marriage were associated with more alternative monitoring and less dedication, it other words less commitment. There may be several mechanisms to explain this cohabitation effect. First of all, as the authors stated, it is already an old finding that people who have less commitment to marriage institution tend to choose cohabitation. Also, constraints are much less in a cohabitation relationship, so it

may be easier to break up. This study also revealed that both premarital cohabitation and nonmarital cohabitation were associated with lower levels of interpersonal commitment to partners. Married partners were more dedicated even after controlling for relationship satisfaction. Most significant finding of the study is that the level of the male partner's dedication was significantly lower in married couples who lived together prior to marriage than those who did not. These man who fear commitment may choose to cohabit before marrying, perhaps as a way to delay the greater obligation of marriage. In sum, cohabitation effect can simply be defined as the fact that living together prior to marriage is associated with lower marital satisfaction, poorer quality communication, lower levels of interpersonal commitment especially for men, and greater marital instability than those who did not cohabit premaritally (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004; Rhoades et. al., 2006; Stanley et. al., 2010).

Another group of researchers (Stanley, Rhoades, & Whitton, 2010) focused on remarriages as another sort of relationship type. It is already known that individuals with a strong commitment to marriage view couple problems as solvable, believe that they can and should work to solve them, and generally behave in ways that promote marital health and longevity. However, a recent finding yielded that remarried adults are more likely to take steps toward divorce when experiencing marital distress when compared with adults in their first marriages, possibly reflecting a weaker commitment to marriage (Whitton et. al., 2013).

As it can be inferred from the given literature, predictors of commitment were mostly sought amongst relational variables such as satisfaction, obligations in the given relationship and relationship style. But the literature on individual factors are much less comprehensive and the relationships seem to be weaker. To start with a comprehensive summary, in a meta-analysis of 52 studies, Lee and Agnew (2003) reported that the components of the investment model showed little variation as a function of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or relationship length.

There used to be a little controversy about gender in the literature. To explain, there are some study findings yielding that women were more committed than men in dating relationships (Fitzpatrick & Sollie, 1999). It was reported that

women were higher in investments. Nevertheless, a more recent study conducted with engaged, married or cohabitating couples showed that females did not rate themselves more highly in commitment than males (Stanley, Markman, & Whitton, 2002). Actually, there was a trend for males to score higher. These data suggest that men, on average, feel as committed in their marriages as do women. However, this does not mean that males and females act out their felt commitment in similar ways. For instance, there is clear evidence that male commitment dynamics are far more associated with their attitudes about sacrificing for their partners than are females' commitment levels (Stanley, Markman, & Whitton, 2002).

Another individual factor that is studied to explain commitment is parental divorce and there is a strong research supporting the intergenerational transmission of divorce (Adams & Jones, 1997; Amato & Deboer, 2001; Segrin, Taylor, & Altman, 2005). Whitton and colleagues (2008) found that women's, but not men's parental divorce was associated with lower relationship commitment, even when controlling for the influence of recalled inter-parental conflict and premarital relationship adjustment. Their finding indicated that parental divorce, but not parental conflict, is linked with lower commitment. This was consistent with earlier research stating stronger impact of parental divorce on daughters' than sons' risk for divorce (Amato, 1996). A more recent research about parents' marital status compared three different parental marital status; namely, married, divorced and parents who have never married and found that children of the parents who have never married had the lowest commitment in their own adult unmarried dating relationships (Rhoades et. al., 2012).

The problem with these individual factors are either they have very little explanatory power over commitment or they are stable characteristics which are not possible to alter. The predictors used to explain commitment in the present study are adult attachment styles and close relationship beliefs, and the literature related to them will be summarized below respectively.

## 2.3 Attachment and Commitment

### 2.3.1 Conceptualization of Adult Attachment

This section, after starting with a basic definition of the construct, aims to summarize the debates on gender differences in attachment, stability of

attachment as a trait and different conceptualizations of attachment in the literature.

To begin with the basics of the construct, adult attachment theory specifies three attachment styles: anxious, avoidant, and secure attachment. Although attachment styles used to be described and measured with these categories, most recent research tend to define two continuous attachment dimensions; namely, anxiety and avoidance (Fraley & Shaver, 2000). Secure attachment has been operationally defined as low scores on both dimensions. People who are securely attached to their romantic partner tend to feel emotionally close and intimate with their partner, and believe that their closeness and intimacy is and will be adequately reciprocated by their partner (Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014). They find it easy to trust and rely on others, and they engage in more adaptive, constructive relationship strategies (Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011).

Insecure attachment (high anxiety and/or high avoidance) in general is believed to result from experiences with emotionally unavailable attachment figures in early life which is transferred to adult relationships via cognitive schemas about self and others (Etcheverry et. al., 2013). However, the dynamics of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance are quite different from each other which will be explained below.

Anxious attachment develops from inconsistent responsiveness, and thus an uncertainty that others can be trusted or relied on. Anxious individuals tend to be extra alert to signs of distress or separation from partners (Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014). In adult life, the anxiety dimension is characterized by a preoccupation with the partner's accessibility and excessive worry about rejection and abandonment; a lack of confidence in one's own value as a relationship partner and in one' capacity to regulate a partnership effectively (Morgan & Shaver, 1999; Fraley & Shaver, 2000). And anxious attachment is associated with chronic rumination, worry, and doubt about the availability of one's romantic partner and anxious individuals are prone to more emotional highs and lows, conflicts of greater frequency and severity, and lower levels of trust (Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011).

Avoidant attachment develops from neglect or consistent unresponsive attachment figures. Avoidant people believe that their partners cannot be relied

on, and show a disinterest in relationships, along with a heightened desire for self-reliance (Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014). In adult life, the avoidance dimension is characterized by being uncomfortable with closeness and interdependence; and a preference to remain highly independent, self-contained and self-reliant. (Morgan & Shaver, 1999; Fraley & Shaver, 2000). Their romantic relationships are vested with less interdependency, less intimacy, less self-disclosure and less trust (Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011).

Regarding gender differences in attachment, earlier research report that with the exception of a dismissive attachment style where men tend to score higher than women, attachment style is not associated with sex, age, or relationship status (Ross, McKim, & DiTommaso, 2006). However, in a more comprehensive recent study Guidice (2011) conducting a meta-analysis of sex differences in the avoidance and anxiety dimensions of adult romantic attachment based on 113 samples from 100 studies found that overall, males showed higher avoidance and lower anxiety than females. Sex differences were much larger in community samples than in college samples. Sex differences in anxiety peaked in young adulthood, whereas those in avoidance increased through the life course.

Apart from the possible gender differences in attachment styles, another area of debate in the literature is the stability of the attachment style as a trait. Mikulincer and Shaver (2007; as stated in Ehrenberg, Robertson, & Pringle, 2012) suggested that attachment style is relatively stable because people tend to look for behavior that confirms their beliefs and expectations, which then serves to perpetuate those beliefs, including beliefs or views on marital commitment. However, there are also some researchers (Wittenborn, Keiley, & Sprenkle, 2012; Wittenborn, Faber, & Keiley, 2012) in this area claiming that attachment can be changed.

To summarize some of the main studies about the stability of the concept, in a review, Hadden, Smith and Webster, (2014) reported that there is little evidence for genetic correlates of adult attachment aside from some modest support for a gene (HTR2A rs6313) x environment (maternal sensitivity over time) interaction for avoidant attachment. Also, they report small associations between parent-child attachment security and later adult attachment. It was

concluded that the link between childhood and adulthood attachment is modest at best, and thus fairly mutable over time.

When changes do occur in adult attachment, they are likely to be the result of important relationship experiences (Wittenborn, Keiley, & Sprenkle, 2012), updating from prior adult romantic relationships. Attachment can also change within the same relationship either through changes in relationship conditions, such as the transition to parenthood, or through learning. There are studies showing that attachment can change within the same relationship via some sort of relationship education programs that are given at times of transition to marriage or commitment (Wittenborn, Faber, & Keiley, 2012; Wittenborn, Keiley, & Sprenkle, 2012).

Some of the debate about the stability of the attachment results from the fact that adult attachment has been conceptualized in two different ways in the literature; attachment style as a trait (attachment orientation), or attachment that develops in the current adult relationship (normative attachment development).

To begin with the first one, most of the studies consider attachment as a permanent trait factor that people bring into the relationship. Actually, this is the origin of the attachment theory assuming that the schemas we develop about self and others during early childhood years become our general cognitive schemas and determine our behavioral tendencies as it was explained before. The present study conceptualizes attachment style as a trait factor consistent with the majority of the literature.

However, there are also studies, although relatively much fewer in number, which define attachment as something that is created within the given adult relationship. To explain this normative process of attachment, some longitudinal studies showed that in adulthood, romantic partners typically take over the role of primary attachment figures for all attachment components in the following sequence; first they utilize their partner for proximity, then as a safe haven and finally as a secure base (Fagundes & Schindler, 2012).

In fact, studies show that the way attachment is defined changes the direction of the relationship between attachment and commitment. When attachment is defined as a normative process rather than a trait, the development of attachment security is more dependent on commitment than commitment is

dependent on attachment security, though there is always a reciprocal relationship (Duemmler & Kobak, 2001).

In a longitudinal study about normative attachment process and commitment, Fagundes and Schindler (2012) found that people showed the greatest increase in their preference for their romantic partner for proximity seeking and safe heaven functions before commitment while they preferred their romantic partners as a secure base only after they committed to them. Hence, they argued that there is a developmental nature of attachment in the relationships. In the same study, they also reported that more anxiously attached people preferred their partner for proximity earlier than less anxiously attached people. Avoidant people reported less preference for their romantic partner for all attachment components at the time of initial commitment compared to less avoidant people. In other words, they were reluctant to adopt new people as attachment figures. And those who more quickly represented their romantic partner as a secure base were less likely to subsequently break up.

Although trait attachment and normative attachment development within the adult relationship may seem too independent of each other, some studies reveal that there is an interaction between trait attachment, normative attachment and commitment. For instance, Duemmler and Kobak (2001) reported that trait attachment security predicted relationship stability after 1 year of graduation. And increased relationship duration and commitment resulted in an increase in attachment security as a normative process. It is argued that greater commitment may serve as a buffer against the negative effects of attachment insecurities, diminishing feelings of rejection, enhancing feelings of acceptance especially when there is attachment anxiety as a trait (Tran & Simpson, 2009). Highly committed partners can diminish an individual's insecurity over time by consistently providing a "secure base".

In sum, when attachment is defined as a normative process, then commitment becomes an antecedent of it. But when attachment is defined as a trait, then it becomes a predictor of commitment. Since this study aims to find the predictors of commitment, attachment was conceptualized as attachment orientation.

### 2.3.2 Studies on Attachment and Commitment

Research on attachment and satisfaction are quite clear in that both attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance is associated with lower satisfaction and higher break-up rate while people low on both dimensions - securely attached individuals - are more successful in their relationships (Fraley & Shaver, 2000; Etcheverry et. al., 2013).

Although both anxiety and avoidance reduces satisfaction, they do it through different paths. As Hadden, Smith, and Webster (2014) stated, people high in anxious attachment tend to overinvest in the relationship and are highly sensitive to indications that their partner might not be available in times of need which in turn reduces their satisfaction. People high in avoidant attachment, however, tend to experience lower relationship satisfaction because they are disengaged in their relationship and reject intimacy and closeness.

Some studies indicate that attachment insecurity decreases satisfaction by decreasing commitment (Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013). However, research on relationship between attachment and commitment is less extensive and more complicated than that on attachment and satisfaction. It is relatively clear that secure attachment is associated with higher commitment in romantic relationships (Simpson, 1990), marriages and remarriages (Ehrenberg, Robertson, & Pringle, 2012). Studying specifically with young adults, Keelan, Dion and Dion (1994) examined the fluctuations in commitment over a four month period and even in this comparatively short period of time, insecure participants recorded decreases in commitment while secure participants showed almost no such decreases.

Several studies report that insecure attachment in general is associated with lower commitment (Givertz et. al., 2013) and these associations are stronger (more negative) for avoidance than for anxiety (Hadden, Smith, &Webster, 2014). But the unique dynamics of attachment anxiety and avoidance requires more investigation.

In earlier studies, it was roughly reported that attachment anxiety is associated with strong willingness for commitment while attachment avoidance is associated with less willingness for commitment (Morgan & Shaver, 1999). In a later work, Schindler, Fagundes, and Murdock (2010) stated that attachment

avoidance, but not anxiety was predictive of not entering into committed dating relationships. However it is also known that avoidant individuals are perceived as less desirable partners than both anxious and secure individuals (Klohnen & Luo, 2003). Hence the findings should be interpreted cautiously. Avoidance was associated with less likelihood to commit, but it was not associated to the likelihood to date. Actually it was already found out that avoidant individuals are more likely to have promiscuous sexual relations with multiple partners (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998).

Li and Chan (2012) had a meta-analytic review on adult attachment and relationship quality based on 73 previous studies. Their findings revealed that both anxiety and avoidance were detrimental to the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects of relationship quality. Compared with anxiety, avoidance was more negatively associated with general commitment. In contrast, anxiety was more positively associated with general conflict in relationships. Anxiety was not significantly related to commitment which was theoretically expected by the researchers considering their mixed feelings about connectedness in romantic relationships.

Since the studies on global commitment reveals mixed findings, there are several studies specifically focusing on different components of commitment. In a recent study on adult attachment and commitment (Ho et. al., 2012), it was found that attachment anxiety was positively linked to structural commitment (staying in the relationship considering the costs of break-up), whereas attachment avoidance was negatively related to personal commitment (choice to be in the relationship because of relational rewards).

In another recent study attempting to show the mediating role of commitment between attachment and satisfaction, the results revealed that anxious attachment was related with higher dedication and constraint commitment while avoidant attachment was negatively linked with dedication and no relation with constraint commitment; and dedication but not constraint commitment predicted satisfaction (Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013).

In one study examining the relation between attachment and the investment model, Etcheverry and colleagues (2013) reported that satisfaction, alternatives, and investments mediated the associations between attachment

insecurity and relationship commitment. Specifically, the prediction of commitment by avoidance was mediated by satisfaction, alternatives, and investments, and the prediction of commitment by anxiety was mediated by satisfaction and investments. This mediated model was supported for men and women, proximal and long-distance relationships, and college student and community samples. For directs effects, avoidance significantly and negatively predicted relationship commitment while anxiety directly predicted relationship termination. Researchers also reported that attachment avoidance predicts investments (structural commitments) better for the community sample than the college sample (Etcheverry et. al., 2013).

In examining the relationships of attachment, social rewards, threats and the investment model of commitment, Gere and colleagues (2013) found that attachment avoidance was uniquely associated with lower perceptions of social rewards (i.e., connection and intimacy) whereas attachment anxiety was uniquely associated with stronger perceptions of social threat (i.e., rejection and negative evaluation). Stronger reward perceptions were associated with higher commitment, investment, and satisfaction, as well as lower quality of alternatives. Stronger threat perceptions were related to lower satisfaction and higher investment but not necessarily with overall commitment. The researchers speculate that the unique association between attachment anxiety and higher threat perceptions imply that attachment anxiety may be particularly important in the establishment of trust between relationship partners. In contrast, the unique association between attachment avoidance and lower reward perceptions imply that attachment avoidance may play an important role in inhibiting the development of relationship commitment.

Independent of how studies define the global commitment in romantic relationships, it seems pretty clear that there are different mechanisms for anxiety and avoidance to effect commitment. Therefore, several studies focus specifically on only one of these dimensions of attachment insecurity; namely, they focus on either anxiety or avoidance. These specific studies will be summarized below.

#### *2.3.2.1 Attachment Avoidance and Commitment*

To begin with the findings regarding attachment avoidance, there is a strong literature indicating that avoidance is associated with commitment aversion

(Ho et. al., 2012). It is postulated by several researchers that avoidant people tend to reject intimacy or closeness, and protect themselves from disappointments and rejection by others, maintaining a sense of independence and invulnerability (Saucedo-Coy, & McInnes-Miller, 2014). They may struggle to trust partners, often expecting future hurt and abandonment. And they are likely to make destructive choices in intimate partnerships and struggle with relationship commitment in general.

In a specific study on attachment avoidance and commitment, Birnie and colleagues (2009) theorized that avoidant individuals have developed an interpersonal script to avert the pain of others' inevitably proving to be unreliable and undependable. As they defined, scripts are hypothesized cognitive structures for the sequence of events that are typically performed in a specific situation. In this study, commitment aversion was operationally defined as an absence of positive commitment-related acts, such as moving in together, as well as the presence of negative acts that undermine commitment, such as becoming interested in someone else. Results of the study revealed that; attachment avoidance was associated with expectation of relationship failure and commitment aversion; commitment aversion was associated with expected relationship failure, and it was a significant unique predictor of relationship failure even after accounting for avoidance; and it mediated the association between avoidance and expected relationship failure.

Another recent study on attachment avoidance, infidelity and commitment found that people with high levels of avoidance had more permissive attitudes towards infidelity, expressed greater daily interest in meeting alternatives to their current relationship partner, perceived the alternatives more positively, and engaged in more fidelity over time (DeWall et. al., 2011). This effect was mediated by lower levels of commitment (neither satisfaction nor closeness mediated this relationship). Hence the researchers argued that personal commitment is so important that the avoidant people's infidelity was independent of relationship satisfaction. However, the authors add that these findings do not suggest that avoidant individuals are at risk for engaging infidelity out of a desire to hurt their partners. Instead, people high in attachment avoidance appear to be deficient in an inhibitory force since they lack strong interpersonal commitment.

#### *2.3.2.2 Attachment Anxiety and Commitment*

As there are studies mainly focusing on attachment avoidance as summarized above, there are also several studies specifically focusing on attachment anxiety which tends to give more mixed results than attachment avoidance in terms of its effect on commitment. Adding more confusion to the findings, some of these studies define commitment as simply staying in the relationship while some others define break-up (relationship termination) as a lack of commitment both of which contribute to the lack of clarity in the attachment anxiety and commitment literature. Therefore the findings in the literature should be interpreted carefully.

Studies focusing on attachment anxiety and satisfaction claim that anxiously attached individuals invest more to secure their relationship. They perceive a higher cost for quitting their relationship and more likely to feel "trapped" in their relationship and thus have lower satisfaction (Ho et. al., 2012). However, findings about their reactions to this reduced satisfaction is unclear.

Some researchers claim that anxious individuals stay in relationships even when their needs are not met since being in any relationship, regardless of its quality, may be preferable to being alone for them (Slotter & Finkel, 2009). On the contrary, some others argue that although anxious individuals are more emotionally dependent on their partners, they typically have the shortest relationship (Feeney & Noller, 1990).

As an attempt to explain their having the shortest relationships, it was speculated that anxiously attached individuals tend to perceive harmless relationship events as negative, and actual negative events as downright catastrophic (Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011). From a risk-regulation perspective, this should make committing to one's romantic relationships difficult, despite a desire for such commitment.

Joel, MacDonald and Shimotomai (2011) summarizing the literature in their review postulated that anxiously attached individuals remain characteristically ambivalent throughout adulthood and they define ambivalence as holding strong positive and negative views on an issue simultaneously. They further added that anxiously attached individuals are particularly likely to break up and get back together with the same romantic partner implying that they are

ambivalent about commitment. To speculate more on this ambivalence, it is argued that anxious attachment was associated with greater insecurity in partners' affections and lower satisfaction with relationships each of which appeared to place downward pressure on levels of commitment. On the other hand, anxiously attached individuals were more likely to feel they need their partners which appeared to create an upward force on commitment.

There are also studies focusing on strategies that people with high attachment anxiety use in their relationships and how their partners react to these. Overall and colleagues (2014) had an observational study and they found that anxious individuals were rated by objective coders as exhibiting more guilt-induction strategies during conflict, which led to increased partner guilt. In this way, anxious individuals experienced more stable perceptions of their partner's commitment. Unfortunately, these benefits were accompanied by significant declines in the partner's relationship satisfaction. To explain their findings, researchers state that individuals high in attachment anxiety yearn for closeness and acceptance but they have deep-seated fears that they will be rejected or abandoned. Such fears create hypersensitivity to rejection and undermine coping when faced with relationship challenges. Anxious individuals experience more intense and prolonged distress and behave in less constructive ways during conflict. In the end, such destructive reactions tend to elicit aggressive and rejecting responses in the partner, which prevents desired closeness and is likely to foster dissatisfaction in both partners.

### 2.4 Studies on Relationship Beliefs and Commitment

For many people the development of one or more satisfactory intimate relationships is a dominating theme in life. And relationship beliefs, being stable knowledge structures, seems to play a central role in determining close relationship experiences (Fletcher, Rosanowski, & Fitness, 1994). For the direction of the relationship, researchers argue that the relationship between relationship beliefs and close relationship experiences are two sided: beliefs effect relationships but also certain relationships in life can alter the individual's relationship beliefs. Therefore, it can be assumed that the relationship between relationship beliefs and commitment is also two sided. However it is more common in the literature to assume that beliefs effect relationship experiences.

In an experimental study (Fletcher, Rosanowski, & Fitness, 1994) conducted by using close relationship belief scale and mainly focusing on beliefs of *passion* and *intimacy*, it was found that subjects who had strong beliefs of passion and intimacy had developed chronically accessible judgments concerning the extent to which such aspects are characteristics of their relationship. In the experiment, their response time was quicker while judging their relationships and remembering behaviors related with these beliefs. In contrast, for those who weakly hold such beliefs, processing belief-relevant information involved more exhaustive and controlled memory searches. In other words, it was easier for people to remember the behaviors or events in their relationship if that is consistent with their belief. The researchers claim that these knowledge structures -beliefs- influence cognition in relationship contexts at both the controlled and automatic levels. In the light of this experimental study, it can be easily deducted that relationship beliefs have a strong influence on how we perceive our close relationships and therefore how we act in the relationship.

There are too many ways of defining and clustering relationship beliefs. To start with the broadest division, there are two different forms of relationship beliefs as categorized by Bradbury and Fincham (1991; cited in Fitzpatrick & Sollie, 1999). First, the distal context represents general relationship beliefs, rules about the way relationships should function, representations of the nature of the partners/relationships, and perceptions of relationship history (i.e. gendered cognitions is an example of distal context beliefs). These can be named as general relationship beliefs. As the second, the proximal context represents relationship-specific beliefs about discrete interactional patterns and characteristics of the current relationship. In other words, these are one's beliefs about the specific current relationship that they are involved in the present. They reflect expectations about relational processes that occur with one's romantic partner, such as self-disclosure, conflict management, power or boundaries.

Since close relationship beliefs are defined and measured in several different ways in the literature, it is not easy to summarize the literature related to relationship beliefs. But it may make sense to start with the one which is most commonly used by the researchers and has the widest literature.

To begin with the irrational belief literature, Albert Ellis (1962; cited in Stackert & Bursik, 2003) defines irrational beliefs as enduring, generalized cognitive structures that are broad and philosophic in nature and can be applied to many life content areas. In the literature irrational beliefs are divided into two: general irrational beliefs as postulated by Ellis and relationship-specific irrational beliefs as developed by Eidelson and Epstein (1982). To explain, Eidelson and Epstein (1982) developed RBI-The Relationship Belief Inventory which is the most commonly used inventory in the literature to measure dysfunctional relationship beliefs. In their classification, they listed five dysfunctional beliefs; namely, "*disagreement is destructive to a relationship*", "*mindreading is expected*" (partners should be able to know each other's thoughts and feelings without overt communication), "*partners cannot change themselves or their relationship*", "*sexual perfectionism*" (one must be a perfect sexual partner), "*the sexes are different fundamentally in their personalities and needs*". These relatively stable beliefs about relationships tend to be idiosyncratic constructions generated and revised through personal experience. They are somehow related to cognitive distortions and these beliefs are thoughts that are fixed, hard to change, and incompatible with reality. The terms "dysfunctional beliefs" and "irrational beliefs" seems to be used interchangeably in the literature.

Most of the literature uses the relationship-specific irrational beliefs which was developed by Eidelson and Epstein (1982) since they are more relevant to relationship experiences than the general irrational beliefs and better predictor of marital adjustment (DeBord, Romans, & Krieshok, 1996). As Debord, Romans and Krieshok (1996) states, cognitive beliefs play a role in relationships at three different levels: a) beliefs about self, b) beliefs about others, c) beliefs about the nature of relationships. They also found in their study that belief similarity of partners was not important. In other words, the predictor of dyadic adjustment was the person's own level of adherence to relationship-specific beliefs independent of the beliefs of their partner.

In a specific study searching for the irrational relationship beliefs (RBI) and the investment model of commitment, Fitzpatrick and Sollie (1999) found that for women; gendered beliefs were associated with higher alternatives, lower rewards, and lower match to ideal comparison levels. Further, women's gendered

beliefs indirectly contributed to lower commitment, as components of the investment model mediated this association. For men, relationship-specific beliefs in general were positively related to costs and alternatives but gendered beliefs were not associated with components of the investment model and there was no mediation for relationship-specific beliefs, investment model and commitment.

Although some single studies may reveal slightly different results at micro level, it was reported by several different researchers that all of these five irrational beliefs were negatively correlated with marital adjustment, satisfaction, commitment, attachment, and thrust in general (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982; Bradbury & Fincham, 1988; DeBord, Romans, & Krieshok, 1996; James, Hunsley, & Hemsworth, 2002; Hamamcı, 2005; Hamamcı, Kapçı, & Türkçapar, 2010; Kaygusuz, 2013).

The literature about irrational beliefs and their negative effect on close relationship experiences at different levels (like satisfaction and commitment) seems relatively consistent and there is a vast amount of literature on this. However, the main problem about irrational beliefs studies from a positive psychology perspective is its negative focus. In other words, while these studies are successful in clarifying which beliefs are detrimental to relationships, they do not provide information about which relationship beliefs are constructive or has a positive effect on relationship experiences at different levels, such as commitment. There are some relationship belief scales other than RBI which defines and clusters the close relationship beliefs in a more positive way though their literature is much more limited. Some of those studies will be summarized below.

Focusing on positive beliefs, a longitudinal study of college students in long distance relationships was conducted to examine the associations of positive self-beliefs and positive relationship beliefs to general distress, relationship status at the end of the semester (together vs. broken up), adjustment to a relationship stressor (physical separation), and adjustment to break up (Helgeson, 1994). Positive self-beliefs were associated with less psychological distress but were not associated with the three relationship outcomes. However, positive relationship beliefs were associated with all of the three relationship outcomes. Although this study does not use a specific measure about commitment, it can be inferred that

since they do not break up in the end, somehow positive relationship beliefs can be positively related to commitment as well.

After RBI, a second very commonly used relationship belief definition is love styles which was first defined by Lee (1973; as stated by Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2004) and the measurement for the concept was developed by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) with the name of Love Attitudes Scale which defines and measures 6 different love styles: *eros* (passionate love), *ludus* (game-playing love), *storge* (friendship-based love), *pragma* (logical, "shopping list" love), *agape* (all-giving, selfless love) and *mania* (possessive, dependent love).

Most of the literature states that relationship satisfaction has a positive relationship with eros, agape and storge while it has a negative relationship with ludus and mania (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2004). And studies about the love style and relationship duration revealed that pragma is associated with longer relationships while ludus is associated with shorter relationships and frequent change of partners (Richardson, Medvin, & Hammock, 1988). It was argued by the authors that individuals with ludus love style tend to invest less into their relationships and do not have cognitive mindsets or decisions to continue their relationships in the long run which may indicate a lack of commitment.

Although these studies do not indicate a direct relationship between love styles and commitment, Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2004) compared committed (engaged or married couples) and uncommitted (dating) relationships in their study in terms of love styles. The findings yielded that mania was more common in dating relationships. Actually Lee (1988; cited in Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2004) states that love styles changes in time as the relationship develops. His theory postulates that people tend to see love more like ludus, eros or mania when they are young; while they tend to prefer pragma and storge as they grow in committed relationships. He also adds that the similarity between the love styles of partners increases their satisfaction since love styles effect the way couples handle problems and the meanings they attribute to relationship events.

Third commonly used belief definition and measure was developed by Sprecher and Metts, (1989). Their Romantic Beliefs Scale categorizes four different belief clusters: *love finds a way* (love can overcome barriers and challenges), *one and only* (there is only one person we can truly love),

*idealization* (the beloved will meet one' highest ideals), and *love at first sight* (love can strike without prior interaction). It was reported by the authors' later research that romanticism (which was correlated positively with eros and agape and negatively with ludus) was associated positively with love, satisfaction, and commitment (Sprecher & Metts, 1999). For men, greater romanticism at Time 1 predicted an increase in commitment at Time 2. Depending on the finding that romanticism was linked only to commitment over time (rather than love or satisfaction), the researchers speculate that romantic beliefs may be more closely tied to the cognitive domain of relationship outcomes than to the affective domain. Another interesting and important finding of their study was that romanticism decreases in time but satisfaction and commitment does not, indicating that they are going independent as the time passes.

Fourth relationship belief studied in the literature is future time orientation which is defined as a general capacity to organize and anticipate future events and is considered to be a favorable aspect of personality in terms of achievement, planning and problem solving (Öner, 2001). The extension of this concept which is named as *future time orientation in romantic relationships* was found to be related to higher selectivity in choosing a partner and higher commitment in a positive way (Öner, 2002).

Fifth relationship belief was Implicit Theories of Relationships developed by Knee (1998). In his theory, Knee identified two general types of relationship belief structures: *destiny beliefs* (relationships are either meant to be or they are not) and *growth beliefs* (good relationships are accomplished through hard work).

To explain each of these beliefs more, people high in destiny beliefs attempt to determine the compatibility of the partner based on minimal information (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003). They tend to diagnose the potential of the relationship based on specific events. High destiny belief is associated with avoidance coping strategies in dealing with relationship stressors (coping strategies that reflect disengagement and restraint from maintenance attempts in response to a negative relationship event) and taking more responsibility for ending the relationship. In other words, when people high in destiny belief feel less close at the beginning, they terminate quickly. Hence relationship survival is most closely linked to initial satisfaction for them.

People high in growth belief believe that relationships are cultivated and developed in time and relationship challenges can be overcome (Knee, 1998). They believe that relationships grow not despite the obstacles but rather because of them (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003). As it was postulated by the researchers, growth belief is associated with long-term approaches to dating, relationship maintaining coping strategies, fewer one-night stands (especially for women), dating a particular person for a longer period of time, generally optimistic evaluation of a relationship's potential. And once the relationship had ended, people high in growth belief tend to disagree that it seemed wrong from the beginning.

To summarize these two beliefs, destiny belief is linked to attempts to diagnose the status and potential success of the relationship and growth belief is linked to attempts to maintain the relationship (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003).It can also be inferred that destiny belief may be more relevant to relationship onset (and dissolution and it may be related to more abrupt endings) whereas growth belief may be more relevant to maintenance processes in relationships (e.g. coping).

According to Knee (1998), these two beliefs are uncorrelated; two independent dimensions, not the opposite poles of the same dimension. He argued that destiny belief was similar to pragma; and growth belief was similar to storge as love styles. Knee, Patrick, and Lonsbary (2003) postulate that none of these two beliefs are better. In abusive relationship destiny belief may help to quit whereas growth belief may be detrimental in such a case, but destiny belief may destroy a potentially successful relationship since they will be too diagnostical. Hence one should have both destiny and growth belief.

When it comes to the relationship between implicit theories of relationships and commitment in romantic relationships, the studies about growth belief and commitment seem more enlightening. In a study with 75 dating couples they observed that couples with higher growth belief showed less decrease in commitment after discussing their problems with their partners (Knee et. al. 2002, as stated by Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003). The researchers speculated that growth belief can buffer the negative impact of arguments, discrepancies, and differences of opinion - events that normally are associated with a decline in

satisfaction and commitment. Similarly in another study conducted with undergraduate students who are in a dating relationship, it was found that conflict was generally associated with lower commitment but less so with growth belief (Knee et. al., 2004). Moderating the relationship between conflict and commitment, growth belief had a buffering effect under adverse relationship conditions.

Growth and destiny beliefs seem to affect how people react to dissatisfaction in a relationship. Using Rusbult's exit-voice-loyalty-neglect typology of responses to dissatisfaction in relationships, studies revealed that growth belief is correlated with voicing concerns about the relationship, and being loyal to the relationship; and destiny belief is correlated with neglecting the relationship (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003).

Although studies on destiny belief and commitment is limited, Knee (1998) found that, for persons high in destiny beliefs, initial level of relationship satisfaction was a particularly salient indicator of whether the relationship continued or not affecting their decision to commit or not at the beginning of the relationship.

### 2.5 Culture and Gender Issues Regarding Relationship Beliefs

Although attachment and commitment literature seems relatively universal, there are some significant cultural differences in the way relationship beliefs work. And beliefs tend to change depending on gender as well. Some studies also reveal a culture and gender interaction. This section aims to summarize these cultural and gender differences in terms of close relationship beliefs.

To begin with the cultural differences in close relationship beliefs Möller and Zyl (1991) found significant correlations between DAS and the two subscales of RBI; namely, disagreement is destructive and sexual perfectionism in a South African sample but the findings did not give a significant relationship with the overall RBI scale as it was found in the American sample. The authors speculated that cultural differences are important in determining the effects of relationship beliefs on relationship quality and relationship related variables.

Similarly, Hamamcı (2005) studying irrational beliefs in a Turkish sample of nonclinical married individuals, found a negative correlation between mind

reading beliefs in relationships and marital conflict, especially for women. She speculated that in Turkey, traditionally wives believe they should read their husbands' minds and behave in a manner which their husbands expect in order to maintain their marriage for reasons such as economic dependence and/or social and family pressure in case of a divorce.

In addition to cultural differences seen in irrational relationship beliefs, there are also studies indicating that culture affects the love styles as well. Revealing an interaction effect between culture and gender, some researchers state that appropriate love styles for men and women differ depending on culture (Davies, 2001; Gao, 2001; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2002; Medora, Larson, Hortaçsu, & Dave, 2002).

Davies (2001) conducting a study in an sample of English university students found that ludus and eros was socially approved for men while they were not approved for women. In the same study, it was found that agape was approved by the society for women but not for men.

Gao (2001) compared American and Chinese couples in terms of the love style they value and found that American couples valued passion more than Chinese couples. In a similar vein, Medora and colleagues (2002) compared American, Turkish and Indian university students in terms of their attitudes towards romanticism. The findings yielded that American students scored higher in valuing romanticism which was followed by Turkish students and then lastly by Indian students.

When it comes to relationship beliefs and gender differences, in a study conducted with a sample of Turkish university students, Küçükarslan and Gizir (2014) translated Romantic Beliefs Scale into Turkish and studied how the beliefs change with gender, grade level and dating status. The specific beliefs measured in the Romantic Beliefs Scale were; "*love finds a way", "one and only", "love at first sight"* and *"idealization beliefs"* .The results of the study revealed that university students' romantic relationship beliefs differed significantly in terms of gender, grade level and dating status. Specifically, males were significantly more likely to have beliefs about "love finds a way" and "love at first sight" than females. When grade level considered, it was observed that freshman and sophomore students have "one and only" and "idealization" beliefs more than

senior students. Lastly, it was found that students "experiencing a romantic relationship for the first time" were significantly more likely to have beliefs on "love finds a way", "one and only" and "idealization" beliefs than the other three groups (who had a romantic relationship before but does not have one now, who had a romantic relationship before and also does have one now, who never had a romantic relationship). Revealing another gender effect on relationship beliefs, Öner (2002) studying with Turkish university students found that higher future time orientation in romantic relationships was associated with being a woman.

As there are studies indicating gender differences in relationship beliefs, there are also studies indicating that relationship beliefs do not change depending on gender. The most common finding is about irrational relationship beliefs. It was reported by several researchers that there were no differences in unrealistic beliefs - men and women endorsed both unrealistic gendered beliefs and relationship-specific beliefs to a similar degree (Fitzpatrick & Sollie, 1999). Similarly, destiny and growth beliefs are reported to be not significantly correlated with sex, age, whether one is currently in a relationship, length of relationship, number of previous relationships, current relationship satisfaction, social desirability, or self-esteem (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003).

# CHAPTER III

# METHOD

This chapter summarizes the methodological procedures of the present study. First section describes the sample of the present study. The second section introduces the data collection instruments of the study with their reliability and validity processes. The third section explains data collection procedures. The fourth section describes the procedures of data analyses. And the final section introduces the limitations of the study.

## 3.1 Participants

Convenient sampling procedure was used in the present study. Data were collected from 610 undergraduate students attending five faculties of Middle East Technical University during spring semester of 2014-2015 academic year. Firstly, data cleaning and assumption checking procedures were completed. Then, analyses were performed with a sample of 485 (287 female, 197 male, and 1 participant did not state gender) students. All the participants currently involved in romantic relationships with a mean length of 22.23 months (*SD* = 20.78).Age of the participants ranged between 18 and 31 with the mean of 21.97 (*SD* = 1.80). The distribution of the participants in terms of faculty and gender is presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

*The Distribution of Participants in Terms of Faculty and Gender*

| **Faculty** | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Architecture | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| Arts & Sciences | 73 | 29 | 102 |
| Economics & Administrative Sciences | 44 | 20 | 64 |
| Education | 85 | 20 | 105 |
| Engineering | 69 | 115 | 184 |
| Total | 279 | 190 | 469 |

*Note:* The gender of 1 participant and the faculty of 15 participants were missing.

As can be seen from Table 3.1, 14 (2.9%) participants were from Faculty of Architecture, 102 (21.8 %) participants were from Faculty of Arts and

Sciences, 64 (13.7 %) were from Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 105 (22.4 %) were from Faculty of Education and 184 (39.2 %) were from Faculty of Engineering. The distribution of the participants in terms of grade and gender is presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

*The Distribution of Participants in Terms of Grade and Gender*

| **Year** | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Freshmen | 39 | 18 | 57 |
| Sophomores | 96 | 58 | 154 |
| Juniors | 73 | 55 | 128 |
| Seniors | 79 | 64 | 143 |
| Total | 287 | 195 | 482 |

*Note:* The gender of 1 participant and the grade of 3 participants were missing.

As can be seen from the Table 3.2, the grade levels of the participants were distributed as follows: 57 (11.8 %) freshmen, 154 (32 %) sophomores, 128 (26.6 %) juniors, 143 (29.7 %) seniors participated in the study.

## 3.2 Data Collection Instruments

In the present study four instruments were used. These instruments are: Demographic Information Form developed by the researcher to obtain demographic data about the participants; Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised to measure adult attachment dimensions; Close Relationship Belief Scale to measure relationship beliefs; and the Revised Commitment Inventory to measure commitment in romantic relationships.

### 3.2.1 Demographic Information Form (DIF)

The researcher developed a demographic information form (DIF; *see* Appendix A)to gather basic demographic information from the participants. The form included demographic questions regarding age, gender, faculty, grade level, romantic relationship status (whether they are currently involved in a romantic relationship or not) and length of the current relationship as measured by months.

### 3.2.2 Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R)

The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Scale (ECR-R; see Appendix B) was developed by Fraley and colleagues (2000) to measure adult attachment dimensions. ECR-R consists of 36 items with a 7 point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree)to 7 (strongly agree). The scale has 2 subscales: anxiety (e.g. " I fear to lose the love of the person that I am with") and avoidance (e.g. " It is difficult for me to trust and believe in the person that I am involved in romantic relationship"). Each subscale is composed of 18 items. For each participant a total score is calculated for each subscale. Maximum score that can be obtained from one subscale is 126 and minimum score is 18. Higher scores indicate higher anxiety and higher avoidance for each subscale. For anxiety subscale, items number 17 and 21; and for avoidance subscale items number 4, 8, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30, 32, 34, and 36 are reverse coded.

Test-retest reliability of ECR-R was reported as .93 and .95 for anxiety and avoidance subscales respectively (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000). And for the validity of the scale, the authors used item response theory to compare ECR-R with four other commonly used attachment inventories such as Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR), Adult Attachment Scales (AAS), Relationship Styles Questionnaire (RSQ), and Simpson Inventory and stated that ECR-R is a valid and reliable instrument to measure adult attachment.

The ECR-R was translated into Turkish by Selçuk and his colleagues (2005). The results of confirmatory factor analysis yielded 2 factors similar to the original scale. The CFA results were reported as a good fit for Turkish sample (*GFI* = .86; *NNFI* = .86; *CFI* = .89; *RMR* = .087).The internal consistency coefficient of Turkish form was found .90 for avoidance subscale, and .86 for anxiety subscale. The test-retest reliability value for anxiety subscale was reported as .82 and it was reported as .81 for avoidance subscale when the instrument was administered to the same sample after a 6-weeks interval.

#### *3.2.2.1 Reliability of ECR-R for the Present Study*

For the present study, reliabilities for each of the subscales of ECR-R were calculated by using Cronbach alpha coefficient formula. The internal consistency coefficient of ECR-R was found as .86 and .89 for anxiety and avoidance subscales respectively in the present data.

### 3.2.3 Close Relationship Belief Scale (CRB)

Close Relationship Belief Scale (CRB; see Appendix C) was originally developed by Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) to measure beliefs concerning what makes close relationships successful. The scale is composed of 54 items with a 6 point rating scale ranging from 1 (do not hold this belief at all) to 6 (very strongly hold this belief). In the scale, there are 18 beliefs each of which are measured with 3 items. These 18 beliefs included trust, commonality, support, communication, sex, independence, relationship vitality, love, equity, friendship, coping, compromise, respect, acceptance, children, finance, personal security, and important others. These 18 beliefs were clustered in 4 factors. These 4 belief factors/subscales were named as *intimacy* (e.g., "In successful relationships partners constantly show how much they love one another"), *external factors* (e.g., "Having friends in common cements relationships"), *passion* (e.g., "The best relationships are built on strong sexual attraction") and *individuality*(e.g., "Each partner has a right to absolute personal privacy"). There are 27 items in intimacy subscale, 15 items in external factors subscale, 6 items in individuality subscale, and 6items in passion subscale. Beliefs that are measured under the intimacy subscale are; trust, respect, communication, coping, support, acceptance, love, friendship, and compromise. Beliefs that are measured under the external factors subscale are; personal security, important others, finance, commonality, and children. Beliefs that are measured under the passion subscale are sex and vitality. Beliefs that are measured under the individuality subscale are independence and equity. Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992), in their original study, proposed the usage of 4 independent subscale scores each of which can be used separately. For each participant 4 total scores were calculated for each 4 subscale by summing up the related items and dividing them to the number of beliefs for the given subscale. Higher scores indicate higher belief for related subscale.

#### *3.2.3.1 Validity and Reliability Studies of CRB*

CRB was adapted to Turkish by the researcher for the present study. Translation procedures and results regarding validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the scale are presented in the following sections.

#### *3.2.3.2 Translation Studies of the CRB for the Present Study*

In the current study, CRB was translated and back-translated by following the described procedure: First, the necessary permission was obtained from the corresponding author (Garth J. O. Fletcher, PhD) via email. Second, three experts (1 PhD student in counseling, 1 psychologist with an MS degree in counseling and 1 English teacher) who have a good command of English translated the instrument from English to Turkish. Third, the best Turkish translation was chosen by the researcher and her supervisor. Fourth, the Turkish translation of CRB was given to 3 different experts (1 professor in counseling, 1 English teacher and 1 psychologist with and MS degree in education) for back translation. Back translations were compared by the researcher and her supervisor. Then the final version of the Turkish scale was checked by a bilingual psychologist before administering the instrument to the participants.

#### *3.2.3.3 Pilot Study 1 - Validity and Reliability Studies of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study*

A pilot study was carried out to obtain evidence for reliability and validity of the Turkish version of CRB. This initial study was conducted with 385 (263 female, 121 male, and 1 missing) undergraduate students of METU who were volunteered to participate in the study. These students were not the participants of the main study. The students represented the 5 faculties of the university: 9 students (2.4%) were in Architecture, 102 students (24.4%) were in Arts and Sciences, 34 students (9.1%) were in Economic and Administrative Sciences, 136 students (36.6%) were in Education, and 91 students (24.5%) were in Engineering. 13 students did not report their department. Grade level distributions were as follows: 16 (4.3 %) freshmen, 123 (33.3 %) sophomores, 112 (30.4 %) juniors, and 118 (32 %) seniors. 16 students did not report their grade level. Age of the students ranged from 19 to 34, with a mean of 22.17 years (*SD* = 1.74). After obtaining the necessary permissions from the ethic committees of the university, the questionnaires were administered to volunteered students in the service courses of psychology department, "guidance" service course of the education faculty and "economy" service course of the faculty of economics and administrative sciences. Anonymity was assured.

In the present study, factor structure of CRB was examined by using confirmatory factor analysis. In order to assess the convergent validity of the Turkish version, CRB was administered to the participants together with Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) (Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998), and Future Time Orientation in Romantic Relationships Scale (FTORR) (Öner, 2000). Finally, internal consistency coefficients and split half correlations were computed to obtain reliability evidence.

*3.2.3.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study*

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to provide evidence of construct validity and to test the factor structure of the Turkish version of CRB. AMOS version 18.0 was used as the software to test CFA. Maximum likelihood was the estimation method and covariance matrices were analyzed in order to test the original four-factor of the Turkish version of CRB. All the criteria for the goodness-of-fit statistics of the model (Chi-Square, df ratio ($\chi^2$/df), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) were reported in this study. The following criteria were used to indicate goodness of fit: CFI .90 or higher, RMSEA .08 or lower, and chi-square/df ratio 3 or lower (Bentler, 1990). Since the sample was non-normal, bollen-stine corrected p value was used instead of Maximum Likelihood (ML) based p value to assess model fit (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999). The number of bootstrap samples was set to 500. CFA yielded the following results:[$\chi^2$ (1371) =4311.886, bollen-stine corrected $p$ =.00;$\chi^2/df$- *ratio* = 3.15; CFI= .55, SRMR = .11, RMSEA = .08].These results indicated poor fit for the Turkish version of CRB for the current sample (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).Therefore, modification indices (e.g. error covariance) of errors were checked, and the ones with high values were detected (Arbuckle, 2009). The pairs with high covariances were e47-e48, e8-e9, and e19-e20. These related error pairs were connected in the model and the analysis was run again. After these modifications, which are suggested by the program, were done the results of CFI were as follows:[$\chi^2$ (1368) = 3862.917, bollen-stine corrected $p$ = .00; $\chi^2/df$- *ratio* = 2.82; CFI = .62, SRMR = .10, RMSEA = .07]which indicates mediocre fit for the current sample (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996) with the exception

of CFI and SRMR values. CFI value was lower than expected (.90). However, it is argued that good RMSEA with low CFI caused by low correlations among variables (items, in this case) (Muthen & Muthen, 2007). And SRMR .10 is an acceptable value according to Kline (2005). Based on these results, the construct validity of Turkish version of CRB was considered to be confirmed for the present data. Appendix D shows the standardized coefficients of the model. As can be seen in the Appendix D, the coefficient in standardized values ranged between .20 and .85 for the scale. The results indicate that four-factor structure of CRB was confirmed for the current sample providing evidence for the construct validity of the Turkish version of CRB.

*3.2.3.3.2 Convergent Validity of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study*

Before assessing the validity of the Turkish version of CRB, correlations between the subscales were inspected by computing Pearson correlation coefficients. The intercorrelations of subscales are presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3. *Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Intercorrelations of the Turkish Version of CRB*

| Variables | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Intimacy | 14.58 | 1.51 | - | | | |
| 2.Individuality | 15.03 | 2.07 | .40** | - | | |
| 3.Passion | 13.34 | 2.51 | .37** | .35** | - | |
| 4.External Factors | 11.99 | 1.84 | .46** | .18** | .30** | - |

***p< .01 (two-tailed)*

As can be seen from the Table 3.3, the coefficient values changed between .18 and .46 and all the correlation coefficients among the subscales were significant (all $p< 0.01$).

In order to assess the validity of the Turkish version, CRB was administered to the participants together with Turkish version of Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) (Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998), which measures 6 different love styles; namely, agape, storge, eros, pragma, ludus, and mania and was translated into Turkish by Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2004); and Future Time Orientation in Romantic Relationships Scale (FTORR) (Öner, 2000) originally

developed in Turkish. FTORR is a unidimensional scale consisting of 11 items with 4-point rating scale. The results of the correlations between CRB subscales, LAS subscales, and FTORR scores are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4

*Correlations Between CRB Subscales, FTORR and LAS Subscales*

| Variables | FTORR | Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) Subscales | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Eros | Ludus | Mania | Agape | Storge | Pragma |
| Intimacy | .30** | .28** | -.11* | .21** | .25** | .15** | .17** |
| Individuality | -.02 | .02 | -.06 | -.09 | -.14** | -.01 | -.02 |
| Passion | -.13* | .16** | .15** | .17** | .03 | .04 | .05 |
| External Factors | .23** | .10 | .22** | .23** | .16** | .14** | .49** |

** p< .05 (two-tailed), ** p< .01 (two-tailed)*

As can be seen from the Table 3.4, FTORR was significantly and positively correlated with Intimacy ($r$ = .30, $p$< .01) and External Factors ($r$ = .23, $p$< .01) whereas significantly and negatively correlated with Passion ($r$ = -.13, $p$< .05). Regarding correlations between CRB and LAS subscales, Intimacy was significantly and negatively correlated with Ludus (game-playing love) ($r$ = -.11, $p$< .05) but significantly and positively correlated with all other LAS subscale scores namely; Eros(passionate love)($r$ = .28, $p$< .01), Mania (possessive love) ($r$ = .21, $p$< .01), Agape (selfless love) ($r$ = .25, $p$< .01), Storge (friendship love) ($r$ = .15, $p$< .01), and Pragma (logical love) ($r$ = .17, $p$< .01). Individuality subscale was found to be significantly and negatively correlated only with Agape (selfless love) ($r$ = -.14, $p$< .01). Significant positive correlations were found between Passion subscale and Eros (passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), and Mania (possessive, dependent love); $r$ = .16; $r$ = .15; $r$= .17, respectively (all $p$< .01). External Factors subscale scores, with the exception of Eros(passionate love), were found to be significantly positively correlated with all the subscale scores of LAS and coefficients changed between $r$ = .14 (Storge; friendship love) and $r$ = .49 (Pragma; logical love) (all $p$< .01).

*3.2.3.3.3 Reliability of the Turkish Version of CRB for the Present Study*

Internal consistency and split half correlations were computed to obtain reliability evidence. The Cronbach alpha values were found as.87 for intimacy

subscale, .69 for individuality subscale, .74 for passion subscale, .76 for external factors subscale. Guttman split-half was also computed for each subscale. Guttman split-half coefficients were .80 for intimacy subscale, .72 for individuality subscale, .75 for passion subscale, and .74 for external factors subscale.

### 3.2.4 The Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI)

The revised commitment inventory (RCI; see Appendix E)was reevaluated and revised by Owen and colleagues (2011) based on the measures of Commitment Inventory (CI) originally developed by Stanley and Markman (1992) for the purpose of measuring commitment in adult romantic relationships. The RCI consists of 25 items with a 7 point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Similar to original CI, RCI has 2 dimensions; constraint (defined as reasons why a person does not want to leave the relationship such as obligations and pressures) and dedication (defined as the intrinsic desire to be with one's partner). That is, while dedication refers to the reasons people stay together, constraint commitment refers to factors that make it difficult to break up or reasons for not leaving the relationship. Constraint dimension is a multidimensional scale which consists of six subscales; social pressure subscale has 4 items (e.g. item "my family really wants this relationship to work"), financial alternatives subscale has 3 items (e.g. item "I would not have trouble supporting myself should this relationship end"), termination procedure subscale has 3 items (e.g. item "the steps I would need to take to end this relationship would require a great deal of time and effort"), concern for partner's welfare subscale has 2 items (e.g. item "I could not bear the pain it would cause my partner to leave him or her even if I really wanted to"), availability of other partners subscale has 3 items (e.g. item "I would have trouble finding a suitable partner if this relationship ended") and structural investments subscale has 2 items (e.g. item "I have put a number of tangible, valuable resources into this relationship"). A score can be calculated for each subscale and can also be used independently depending on the purpose of the studies or by calculating a total score (by adding all the constraint subscale scores).

Dedication is a unidimensional scale and has 8 items (e.g. item "my relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything in my

life"). In the present study only the *Dedication Subscale* was used since the aim of the study is to measure whether the participants are intrinsically motivated to stay with their partner, independent of the obligations and necessities. In the scale, 4 items are reverse coded. Higher scores indicate higher dedication.

#### *3.2.4.1 Validity and Reliability Studies of RCI*

RCI was adapted to Turkish by the researcher for the present study. Translation procedures and results regarding validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the scale are presented in the following sections.

#### *3.2.4.2 Translation Studies of the RCI for the Present Study*

In the current study, RCI was translated and back-translated by following the described procedure: First, the necessary permission was obtained from the corresponding author (Jesse Owen, PhD) via email. Second, three experts (1 PhD student in counseling, 1 psychologist with an MS degree in counseling and 1 English teacher) who have a good command of English translated the instrument from English to Turkish. Third, the best Turkish translation was chosen by the researcher and her supervisor. Fourth, the Turkish translation of RCI was given to 3 different experts (1 professor in counseling, 1 English teacher and 1 psychologist with and MS degree in education) for back translation. Back translations were compared by the researcher and her supervisor. Then the final version of the Turkish scale was checked by a bilingual psychologist before administering the instrument to the participants.

#### *3.2.4.3 Pilot Study 2 - Validity and Reliability Studies of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study*

A pilot study was carried out to obtain evidence for reliability and validity of the Turkish form. This initial study was conducted with 263 (175 female,88 male) undergraduate students of METU who were volunteered to participate in the study and who were already involved in a romantic relationship at the time of the research. These students were not the participants of the main study. The students represented the 5 faculties of the university: 3 students (1.2%) were in Architecture, 50 students (19.7%) were in Arts and Sciences, 19 students (7.5%) were in Economic and Administrative Sciences, 101 students (39.8%) were in Education, and 81 students (31.8%) were in Engineering. 9 students did not report their department. Grade level distributions were as follows: 25 (10 %)

freshmen, 77 (30.8 %) sophomores, 73 (29.2 %) juniors, and 75 (30 %) seniors. 13 students did not report their grade level. Age of the students ranged from 18 to 37, with a mean of 22.23 years (*SD* = 2.37). After obtaining the necessary permissions from the ethic committees of the university, the questionnaires were administered to volunteered students in the service courses of psychology department, "guidance" service course of the education faculty and "economy" service course of the faculty of economics and administrative sciences. Anonymity was assured.

In order to assess the validity of the Turkish version, RCI was administered together with Emotional Dependence Scale (ED) (Buunk, 1981), Intention Towards Infidelity Scale (ITI) (Jones, Olderbak, & Figueredo, 2011) and items developed by the researcher to assess dedication and constraint. To explain, the researcher developed 7 questions in the demographic form of the pilot study (10 point-likert scale items) to measure dedication and 6 different constraint subscale. In the dedication question, the researcher asked the participant to rate their overall dedication to their current relationship between 1 and 10. This question is named as *dedication DbR* (developed by the researcher) in the tables. Similarly, the researcher developed 6 constraint questions in which she asked the participants to rate how much each of these constraints were effecting their decision to stay in their present relationship between 1 and 10. These 6 constraint questions created by the researcher can be listed as *social pressure DbR* (developed by the researcher), *financial alternatives DbR, termination procedure DbR, concern for partner's welfare DbR, availability of other partners DbR,* and *structural investments DbR*. Convergent and divergent validity of the scale was assesses by checking the correlations between RCI, ED, ITI, and these overall dedication and constraint items developed by the researcher. Factor structure of RCI was investigated by using confirmatory factor analysis. Finally, internal consistency and split half correlations were computed to obtain reliability evidence.

*3.2.4.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study*

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to provide evidence of construct validity and to test the factor structure of the Turkish version of RCI.

AMOS version 18.0 was used as the software to test CFA. Maximum likelihood was the estimation method and covariance matrices were analyzed in order to test the original four-factor of the Turkish version of RCI. All the criteria for the goodness-of-fit statistics of the model (Chi-Square, df ratio ($\chi^2$/df), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) were reported in this study. The following criteria were used to indicate goodness of fit: CFI .90 or higher, RMSEA .08 or lower, and chi-square/df ratio 3 or lower (Bentler, 1990). Since the sample was nonnormal, bootstrapping was conducted before running the CFA analysis. CFA yielded the following results:[bollensteine$\chi^2$ (254) = 507.773, *p* = .00; bollensteine$\chi^2$*/df- ratio* = 1.99; CFI = .85, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .06]. These results indicate a mediocre fit for Turkish version of RCI for the current sample (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). Only CFI value was lower than expected (.90). However, it is argued that good RMSEA value with low CFI is caused by low correlations among the variables (items, in this case) (Muthen & Muthen, 2007). Based on these results, the construct validity of Turkish version of RCI was considered to be confirmed for the current sample. Appendix F shows the standardized coefficients of the model. As can be seen in the Appendix F, the coefficient in standardized values ranged between.-1.44 and .81 for the Revised Commitment Inventory. The results indicate that seven-factor structure of RCI was confirmed for the current sample providing evidence for the construct validity of the Turkish version of RCI.

*3.2.4.3.2 Convergent Validity of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study*

In order to assess the validity of the Turkish version, RCI was administered together with Emotional Dependence Scale (ED) (Buunk, 1981) which was translated into Turkish by Karakurt (2001), Intention Towards Infidelity Scale (ITI) (Jones, Olderbak, & Figueredo, 2011) which was translated into Turkish by Toplu-Demirtaş and Tezer (2013), and 7 items (one for dedication and 6 for constraints) with a 10-point rating scale developed by the researcher to measure participants' overall evaluations of dedication (Dedication DbR) and constraints (Constraints DbR).

Convergent and divergent validity of the Dedication subscale was assessed by checking the correlations between Dedication subscales of RCI,ED, ITI, and Dedication DbR and results are presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Dedication Subscale of RCI, ED, ITI, and Dedication DbR*

| Variables | M | SD | ED | ITI | Dedication DbR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dedication of RCI | 43.55 | 7.19 | .58** | -.44** | .47** |

*** p< .01 (two-tailed)*

As can be seen in Table 3.5, Dedication subscale of RCI was significantly positively correlated with Emotional Dependence ($r$ = .58, $p$ < .01) and the Dedication question developed by the researcher (DbR) ($r$ = .47, $p$ < .01) while it was significantly negatively correlated with Intention towards Infidelity ($r$ = -.44, $p$ < .01) as it was expected theoretically.

Before obtaining the validity evidence for the 6 constraint subscales of RCI, means, standard deviations, and intercorrelation coefficients were calculated between subscales and results are presented in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Intercorrelations of Constraint Subscales of RCI*

| Variables | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Social Pressure | 17.90 | 5.19 | - | | | | | |
| 2. Financial alternatives | 4.23 | 2.24 | .07 | - | | | | |
| 3. Termination Procedure | 15.71 | 3.96 | .26** | -.01 | - | | | |
| 4. Concern for Partner's Welfare | 8.48 | 3.46 | .17** | .09 | .37** | - | | |
| 5. Availability of Other Partners | 10.32 | 4.11 | .05 | .08 | .12* | .26** | - | |
| 6. Structural Investments | 7.32 | 3.40 | .06 | .15* | -.06 | .01 | -.09 | - |

** p< .05, **p< .01 (two-tailed)*

As can be seen from Table 3.6, Social Pressure were found to be positively correlated with Termination Procedure ($r$ = .26, $p$< .01) and Concern for Partner's

Welfare ($r$ = .17, $p$< .01). Termination Procedure was also found to be positively correlated with Concern for Partner's Welfare ($r$ = .37, $p$< .01) and Availability of Other Partners ($r$ = .12, $p$< .05). The other positive significant correlations were between Financial Alternatives and Structural Investments ($r$ = .15, $p$< .05) and between Concern for Partner's Welfare and Availability of Other Partners ($r$ = .26, $p$< .01).

Validity evidence was obtained by calculating the correlations between Constraint subscales of RCI, ED, ITI, and 6 Constraint items developed by the researcher (DbR). By following the original subscale names, DbR-1 refers Social Pressure; DbR-2 refers Financial Alternatives; DbR-3 refers Termination Procedure; DbR-4 refers Concern for Partner's Welfare; DbR-5 refers Availability of Other Partners; and DbR-6 refers Structural Investments in the table. Results are presented in Table 3.7 below.

Table 3.7

*Correlations Between Constraint Subscales of RCI, ED, ITI, and Constraint DbR 1-6*

| Variables | ED | ITI | DbR-1 | DbR-2 | DbR-3 | DbR-4 | DbR-5 | DbR-6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Social Pressure | .28** | -.17** | -.03 | .03 | -.01 | -.02 | -.19** | .20** |
| 2. Financial Alternatives | -.02 | .20** | .21** | .52** | .11 | .18** | .35** | .06 |
| 3. Termination Procedure | .38** | -.22** | .04 | -.02 | .30** | .11 | -.15* | .24** |
| 4. Concern for Partner's Welfare | .27** | -.06 | .19** | .07 | .27** | .41** | .01 | .11 |
| 5. Availability of Other Partners | .47** | -.20** | -.04 | .03 | -.02 | .14* | -.07 | -.02 |
| 6. Structural Investments | -.06 | .09 | .05 | .01 | .01 | .10 | .04 | .09 |

** p< .05 (two-tailed), ** p< .01 (two-tailed)*

As can be seen from Table 3.7, Social Pressure subscale was positively correlated with Emotional Dependence ($r$ = .28, $p$ < .01) and Structural Investments DbR ($r$ = .20, $p$ < .01) while it was negatively correlated with Intention towards Infidelity ($r$ = -.17, $p$ < .01) and Availability of Other Partners DbR ($r$ = -.19, $p$ < .01). Financial Alternatives subscale was positively correlated with Intention towards Infidelity ($r$ = .20, $p$ < .01), Social Pressures DbR ($r$ = .21, $p$ < .01), Financial Alternatives DbR ($r$ = .52, $p$ < .01), Concern for Partner's

Welfare DbR ($r$ = .18, $p$ < .01), and Availability of Other Partners DbR ($r$ = .35, $p$ < .01). Termination Procedure subscale was positively correlated with Emotional Dependence ($r$ = .38, $p$ < .01), Termination Procedure DbR ($r$ = .30, $p$ < .01), Structural Investments DbR ($r$ = .24, $p$ < .01); and it was negatively correlated with Intention towards Infidelity ($r$ = -.22, $p$ < .01), Availability of Other Partners ($r$ = -.15, $p$ < .05). Concern for Partner's Welfare subscale was positively correlated with Emotional Dependence ($r$ = .27, $p$ < .01), Social Pressure DbR ($r$ = .19, $p$ < .01), Termination Procedure DbR ($r$ = .27, $p$ < .01), and Concern for Partner's Welfare DbR ($r$ = .41, $p$ < .01). Availability of Other Partners subscale was positively correlated with Emotional Dependence ($r$ = .47, $p$ < .01) and Concern for Partner's Welfare DbR ($r$ = .14, $p$ < .05) while it was negatively correlated with Intention towards Infidelity ($r$ = -.20, $p$ < .01). Structural Investments was not correlated with any of the criterion scales which may be understandable considering the fact that structural investments are limited if not totally irrelevant for the dating population.

*3.2.4.3.3 Reliability of the Turkish Version of RCI for the Present Study*

Internal consistency and split half correlations were computed to obtain reliability evidence. The Cronbach alpha values were found as.76 for dedication subscale, .62 for financial alternatives subscale, .70 for termination procedure subscale, .79 for concern for partner's welfare subscale, .59 for availability of other partners subscale, .68 for structural investments subscale, .64 for social pressure subscale and .66 for total constraints. Split half reliability was also computed for each subscale. Guttman split-half coefficient was .66 for full scale, .79 for dedication subscale, .49 for financial alternatives subscale, .68 for termination procedure subscale, .79 for concern for partner's welfare subscale, .59 for availability of other partners subscale, .68 for structural investments subscale, .54 for social pressure subscale, and .66 for total constraints.

## 3.3 Procedure

Before administering the instruments, necessary permission were obtained from the ethics committeeof METU (*see* Appendix G). Throughout all the data collection procedures of this study, rules and requirements of the Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee were followed. All the scales used in the study were examined and approved by the committee before

data collection. The data of the pilot studies were collected during 2013-2014 spring semester and 2014-2015 fall semester. The data of the main study were collected during 2014-2015 spring semester. Data were collected from service courses which are open to students of all departments in the university such as psychology 100 and psychology 150 courses given by psychology department, guidance courses given by education faculty, economy courses given by faculty of economics and administrative sciences, basic history courses given by history department, calculus courses given by mathematics department and some courses in engineering departments and modern languages department. All data were collected in the classroom settings with the permission of the course instructors. No identifying information were requested from the participants such as name, surname and student id number to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the subjects. The completion of each survey package took approximately 20 - 25 minutes. Only the students who are currently involved in a romantic relationship were asked to participate in the study since commitment to the current romantic partner is measured as the research question of this study. The students who are not currently involved in a romantic relationship did not participate in the study. The questionnaires were administered at the of the lesson and the students not participating in the study -who are not involved in romantic relationship - were able to leave class earlier.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

Several steps were followed to analyze the data. Firstly, frequency and minimum-maximum score analysis were conducted to control the data for data entering mistakes. As the second, missing values were replaced thorough em calculations. Thirdly, data screening and data cleaning procedures were conducted to check for normality and to eliminate outliers before the main analysis. Then, descriptive statistics were used to describe the data. After these, Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed to show the construct validity of the Turkish translation of Close Relationship Belief Scale and Revised Commitment Inventory. Moreover, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to reveal the relationship between the variables as an evidence for convergent validity and Cronbach alpha values were computed for evidence of reliability. Finally, structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to conduct the full

mediation analysis to examine complex relationships among variables. The data analysis was carried out using SPSS, Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 18.0 (Arbuckle, 2009), and LISREL8.51 (Hoyle, 1995).

### 3.5 Limitations

This study has some limitations that should be considered while evaluating the results. First of all, all measures that were used in the study were based on self-report measures and all the criticisms for self- report measures are relevant for this study as well. A convenient sampling procedure used in data collection procedure limits the generalizability of the findings. Random sampling procedure may be recommended for future studies. In addition to sampling procedure, sample characteristics is another limitation of the study since the data is collected from METU university students which may again limit the generalizability of the findings to other university students in other universities at other regions of Turkey. And the third limitation is that cross-sectional design used in the study requires cautious interpretation of causal inferences made.

# CHAPTER IV

# RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. In the first section, preliminary analyses of the data are explained in detail. The second section is devoted to the descriptive statistics of the study variables and the correlations among the study variables. And in the third section, the results of the Full Mediation Path Analysis are reported. Fourth section is composed of a brief summary of the results of the main analysis.

## 4.1 Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analysis conducted for this study composed of two parts. First, missing value analyses were conducted and as the second, the assumptions for SEM were checked before conducting the main analysis.

### 4.1.1 Missing Value Analysis

Before assessing the missing values, the data was checked for wrong entries. For the missing value analysis, the criteria of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) were used, which states that the missing values should be less than 5 percent. Since the missing values were less than 5% for the given study, they were replaced with em values and the analysis was conducted afterwards.

### 4.1.2 Checking the Assumptions

The assumptions of SEM are independence of observers, sample size, outlier analysis, and tests of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

#### *4.1.2.1 Independent Observer*

Independent observation assumption was met by the researcher since all the data were collected in classroom settings while the researcher herself was always present.

#### *4.1.2.2 Sample Size*

There are several guidelines for appropriate sample size for SEM. Kline (2005) states that sample size should be at least 200 to conduct SEM. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007, p.123) proposes a model in which $N > 50 + 8m$ where m means number of independent variables. And Stevens (2002, p.143) recommends 15

subject per predictor. This study was conducted with 485 participants meeting all the given criteria above.

#### *4.1.2.3 Outlier Analysis*

To detect the univariate outliers, the data was transformed into z-score to see the cases which are higher or smaller than ±3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Then, Mahalanobis distance was computed to check for the multivariate outliers. The cases exceeding the chi square of 22.45 ($df = 6, p < .001$) were identified and there were 5 of them. After univariate and multivariate outlier analyses, the main analyses were conducted both before and after deleting the outliers. Since the results did not change, the outliers were not deleted and the analyses were conducted with 485 participants.

#### *4.1.2.4 Test of Normality*

The values of skewness and kurtosis were checked for univariate normality. Skewness and kurtosis values should be close to "0" and the indices of normality are presented in Table 4.1

Table 4.1

*Indices of Normality for the Variables of the Study*

| Variables | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|---|---|
| **Attachment** | | |
| Anxiety | .352 | -.054 |
| Avoidance | .644 | .083 |
| **Relationship Beliefs** | | |
| Intimacy | -.755 | .609 |
| Individuality | -.883 | .687 |
| Passion | -.407 | .287 |
| External Factors | -.215 | -.027 |
| **Commitment** | -.573 | -.446 |

As seen in Table 4.1, each of the study variables manifested a normal distribution, since none of the values are higher or lower than ± 3 (Stevens, 2002).

Actually, there is even no skewness / kurtosis value outside of the ± 1 range which is a more conservative criteria for normality. Since each of the study variables met the criteria for univariate normality, multivariate normality was also safely assumed.

#### *4.1.2.5 Linearity and Homoscedasticity*

In order to examine linearity and homoscedasticity, residual plots and bivariate plots were examined. In the present study, meeting the criteria for the given assumptions, residuals did not show any specific pattern, dependent variable showed equal variance across the range of predictor variables, and bivariate scatterplots were oval-shaped demonstrating that variables were linearly related and their variances were homogenously distributed (Hair et. al., 2006).

## 4.2 Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations of attachment, relationship beliefs and commitment scores of female and male participants are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Variables of the Study*

| | Female ($n$ = 287) | | Male ($n$ = 197) | | Total ($n$ = 485) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| **Attachment** | | | | | | |
| Anxiety | 61.36 | 16.78 | 59.02 | 15.24 | 60.40 | 16.17 |
| Avoidance | 44.63 | 16.70 | 43.17 | 15.65 | 44.03 | 16.27 |
| **Relationship Beliefs** | | | | | | |
| Intimacy | 15.31 | 1.32 | 14.76 | 1.77 | 15.09 | 1.54 |
| Individuality | 15.58 | 1.85 | 14.44 | 2.36 | 15.12 | 2.14 |
| Passion | 14.15 | 2.40 | 13.54 | 2.16 | 13.90 | 2.32 |
| External Factors | 11.62 | 2.05 | 11.71 | 2.15 | 11.65 | 2.09 |
| **Commitment** | 6.18 | 1.23 | 6.08 | 1.33 | 6.13 | 1.27 |

As can be seen from Table 4.2, mean scores for anxiety were 61.36 for females and 59.02 for males; mean scores for avoidance were 44.63 for females and 43.17 for males; mean scores for intimacy belief was 15.31 for females and 14.76 for males; mean scores for individuality belief were 15.58 for females and 14.44 for males; mean scores for passion belief were 14.15 for females and 13.54 for males; mean scores for external factors belief were 11.62 for females and 11.71 for males; and mean scores for commitment were 6.18 for females and 6.08 for males.

To report maximum and minimum scores that can be obtained from each of these variables; for attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance, maximum score that can be obtained is 126 while the minimum score is 18; for each of the intimacy, individuality, passion and external factors beliefs, maximum score that can be obtained is 18 while the minimum score is 3; for commitment maximum score that can be obtained is 7 while the minimum score is 1.

In order to determine if it is necessary to control for possible effects of gender on the Commitment scores of the participants, independent sample t-test was conducted. The results indicated that there was no gender difference, $F(1,482) = 4.109$, $p = .043$; $t(482) = 0.859$, $p = .391$. Thus, gender was not included in the main analysis of this study.

### 4.2.1 Multicollinearity and Correlation Analysis

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to display the relationships among all of the study variables and to control for multicollinearity. The correlation matrix showing the relationships among the predictors (anxiety and avoidance), mediators (intimacy, individuality, passion and external factors), and the criterion variable (commitment) are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

*Correlation Matrix for the Study Variables*

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Anxiety | - | | | | | | |
| 2.Avoidance | .40** | - | | | | | |
| 3.Intimacy | -.04 | -.40** | - | | | | |
| 4.Individuality | -.07 | -.15** | .26** | - | | | |
| 5.Passion | -.03 | -.24** | .42** | .30** | - | | |
| 6.External Factors | .17** | .15** | .36** | .08 | .25** | - | |
| 7.Commitment | -.21** | -.49** | .49** | -.03 | .06 | -.03 | - |

***p < .01 level (2-tailed)*

As can be seen from Table 4.3, correlation coefficients changed between -.03 and .49. Thus, it can be concluded that multicollinearity was not a problem for the present data since none of the correlation coefficients between the study variables exceeded the critical value of .90 (Kline, 2005). In addition, VIF values were not greater than 4 and Tolerance values were not less than .20 indicating that multicollienarity was not detected for the present data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The examinations of the correlations between dependent and independent variables indicated that commitment was positively correlated with intimacy *(r = .49, p< .01)*and passion beliefs *(r = .06, p > .01)*and it was negatively correlated with attachment anxiety *(r =- .21, p < .01)*, attachment avoidance *(r = -.49, p < .01)*,individuality belief *(r =- .03, p > .01)*and external factors belief *(r =- .03, p > .01).*

Correlations were also inspected for the study variables and the demographic variables of age and the length of the current relationship of the participants (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4

*Correlations between the Study Variables and the Demographic Variables*

| | Age | Relationship Length |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Anxiety | -.09 | -.05 |
| 2.Avoidance | -.02 | -.19** |
| 3.Intimacy | -.06 | .11** |
| 4.Individuality | .04 | .06 |
| 5.Passion | -.02 | .01 |
| 6.External Factors | .02 | .01 |
| 7.Commitment | .02 | .16** |

***p < .01 level (2-tailed)*

As can be seen in Table 4.4, there was a significant negative relationship between avoidance and relationship length ($r$ = -.19, $p < .01$); significant positive relationship between intimacy belief and the relationship length ($r$ = .11, $p < .01$); and a significant positive relationship between commitment and relationship length ($r$ = .16, $p < .01$). Age of the participants did not have a significant correlation with any of the study variables.

**4.3 Full Mediation Path Analysis: Effects of Attachment Anxiety and Attachment Avoidance on Commitment via Close Relationship Beliefs**

In order to test the relationships among the scores of anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment, four close relationship beliefs, namely, intimacy, individuality, passion, and external factors; and commitment, Full Mediation Path Analysis was conducted by using LISREL 8.51 (Hoyle, 1995). In this study, alpha level of .05 was used for all the significance tests.

Full mediation path model explores all the significant and non-significant direct and indirect relationships for the study variables. When the relationship length of the participants was controlled, the results of the Full Mediation Path Analysis revealed the same significant and non-significant direct and indirect effects. Therefore, relationship length was not included in the main analysis of the present study. Figure 4.1 displays the standardized estimation values of the paths in the full mediation model.

*Figure 4.1 Standardized estimation values of the full mediation path model*

As can be seen in the Figure 4.1, standardized estimation values ranges from -.46 to .50. The results of the full mediation analysis revealed that 3 of the paths were non-significant: from anxiety to commitment, from anxiety to individuality belief and from anxiety to passion belief, as shown with color red. All the other paths were significant.

In order to investigate the amount of variance explained by the proposed mediation model, the squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) were examined. All the $R^2$ values are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

*Squared Multiple Correlations for the Study Variables*

| | Intimacy | Individuality | Passion | External Factors | Commitment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $R^2$ | .22 | .02 | .08 | .03 | .47 |

As can be seen in the Table 4.5 , attachment style explains 22% of the variance in intimacy belief, 2% of the variance in individuality belief, 8% of the variance in passion belief and 3% of the variance in external factors belief. Overall, the proposed mediation model explained 47% of the variance in commitment.

### 4.3.1 Direct and Indirect Relationships

In the present study, a full mediation model was tested to see whether close relationship beliefs mediated the relationship between attachment and commitment in romantic relationships of university students. While interpreting the beta coefficients, Cohen's (1992) criteria for effect size values were used and .10 indicates small effect size, values around .30 indicate medium effect size and values of .50 or more indicate large effect size.

Results of the mediation path analysis revealed that there are several direct, indirect and total effects contributing to the prediction of commitment in a statistically significant way (see on Table 4.6).

Table 4.6

*Results of Path Coefficients*

| Path | Standardized | Unstandardized |
|---|---|---|
| *Direct effects* | | |
| Anxiety → Intimacy | .14*** | .12 |
| Anxiety → Individuality | -.01 | -.002 |
| Anxiety → Passion | .08 | .02 |
| Anxiety → External factors | .13** | .08 |
| Avoidance → Intimacy | -.45*** | -.39 |
| Avoidance → Individuality | -.15** | -.03 |
| Avoidance → Passion | -.27*** | -.08 |
| Avoidance →External factors | .10* | .07 |
| Intimacy → Commitment | .51*** | .34 |
| Individuality → Commitment | -.15*** | -.34 |
| Passion → Commitment | -.15*** | -.29 |
| External factors→ Commitment | -.10** | -.09 |
| Anxiety → Commitment | -.07 | -.04 |
| Avoidance → Commitment | -.28*** | -.16 |
| *Indirect effects* | | |
| Anxiety → Commitment | .05* | .03 |
| Avoidance → Commitment | -.18*** | -.10 |
| Anxiety → Intimacy → Commitment | .07 | .04 |
| Anxiety → Individuality → Commitment | .00 | .00 |
| Anxiety → Passion → Commitment | -.01 | -.01 |
| Anxiety → External factors → Commitment | -.01 | -.01 |
| Avoidance → Intimacy → Commitment | -.23 | -.13 |
| Avoidance → Individuality → Commitment | .02 | .01 |
| Avoidance → Passion → Commitment | .04 | .02 |
| Avoidance → External factors → Commitment | -.01 | -.01 |
| *Total effects* | | |
| Anxiety→ Commitment | -.02 | -.01 |
| Avoidance→ Commitment | -.46** | -.26 |

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

Regarding the direct effects of the independent variables, avoidance had a significant direct negative effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.28) with a

medium effect size whereas the direct effect of anxiety on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.07) was not significant.

When the direct effects close relationship beliefs are examined, results revealed that all of the relationship belief factors- intimacy, individuality, passion and external factors- had a significant direct effect on commitment. Intimacy had a direct significant positive effect on commitment (*path coeff.* =.50) with a large effect size; individuality had a direct significant negative effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.15) with a small effect size, passion had a direct significant negative effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.15) with a small effect size, and external factors had a direct significant negative effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.10) with a small effect size.

When it comes to the direct effects of attachment dimensions on close relationship beliefs, results revealed that attachment anxiety had a significant direct positive effect on intimacy (*path coeff.* =.14) with a small effect size; and anxiety had a significant direct positive effect on external factors (*path coeff.* =.13) with a small effect size. For the relationship between attachment avoidance and close relationship beliefs, results revealed that avoidance had a significant direct negative effect on intimacy (*path coeff.* = -.46) with a large effect size; avoidance had a significant direct negative effect on individuality (*path coeff.* = -.14) with a small effect size; avoidance had a significant direct negative effect on passion (*path coeff.* = -.27) with a medium effect size; and avoidance had a significant direct positive effect on external factors (*path coeff.* =.10) with a small effect size.

For the indirect effects, some researchers argue that if an independent variable does not have a significant direct effect on the dependent variable, then it is unnecessary to check or report the indirect effect implying that if there is no direct relationship then there is no mediation to search for, taking this as a prerequisite for the statistical analysis of mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). However, there are also some recent researchers claiming that indirect effect is independent of mediation and therefore, indirect effects can be inspected and reported even if there is no direct relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Considering the recent theoretical arguments in the literature, although there is no direct relationship

between anxiety and commitment, indirect effects were inspected for both anxiety and avoidance. Bootstrapping, which is one of the most commonly used methods to test the indirect effects, was used for this process (Bollen & Stine, 1990). However, LISREL yields only two main indirect effects; one for anxiety, close relationship beliefs and commitment path; and one for avoidance, close relationship beliefs and commitment path. In other words, it does not yield indirect effect of each of the close relationship beliefs included in the path model. Indirect effect of each specific close relationship belief was computed by the researcher with the following formula: (path coefficient X) multiplied by (path coefficient Y), path coefficient X referring to the direct effect of IV on MV, and path coefficient Y referring to direct effect of MV on DV.

Before exploring the indirect effects, possible suppression effects were checked. To explain, as can be seen in Table 4.3, there is a positive correlation between passion belief and commitment ($r$ = .06). However, in the main analysis, the path coefficient between passion belief and commitment is negative (*path coeff.* = -.15) changing its direction (see Figure 4.1). This kind of a situation can happen either because there is a correlation between the independent variables or because there is suppression effect meaning that the mediator is simply suppressing the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Before safely exploring the indirect effects, relevant formula was used and the results revealed that there was no suppression effect.

$$\beta_i = \frac{r_{y1} - (r_{y2} r_{12})}{(1 - r_{12}^2)}$$

For the indirect effect of anxiety on commitment, results revealed that anxiety has a significant indirect effect on commitment via close relationship beliefs (*path coeff.* =.05, $p$ < .05, small effect size). When specific close relationship beliefs are examined, as can be seen in Figure 4.1, anxiety is positively associated with intimacy and external factors. To explain, anxiety increases intimacy belief which in turn increases commitment and anxiety increases external factors belief which in turn decreases commitment. To put it in another way, indirect effect of anxiety is both positive and significant (*path coeff.* =.05, $p$ < .05) while its direct effect on commitment is both negative and non-significant (*path coeff.* =-.07, $p$ > .05) meaning that close relationship beliefs

changes its negative relation with commitment into a positive effect, buffering its negative impact on commitment.

For the indirect effect of avoidance on commitment, results revealed that attachment avoidance has a significant indirect effect on commitment via close relationship beliefs (*path coeff.* =-.18, $p < .001$, small effect size). To explain, avoidance decreases intimacy belief which increases commitment, avoidance decreases the individuality belief which decreases commitment, avoidance decreases passion belief which decreases commitment and avoidance increases the belief of external factors which decreases commitment.

The findings revealed that the indirect effect of avoidance on commitment (*path coeff.* =-.18, $p < .001$) is less negative when compared to its direct effect on commitment (*path coeff.* =-.28, $p < .001$) meaning that close relationship beliefs tend to reduce its negative effect on commitment. Since there is a significant direct and indirect effect of avoidance on commitment, and since the negative effect of avoidance on commitment shrinks when the relationship beliefs are included, Sobel tests (Sobel, 1982) were used to further explore the significance of mediation effect of each of the close relationship beliefs. The results of the Sobel tests revealed that intimacy belief ($z = -8.62, p < .001$), individuality belief ($z = 2.20, p < .05$) , and the passion belief ($z = 3.47, p < .01$) had a significant mediation effect, partially mediating the relationship between attachment avoidance and commitment, while the external factors belief did not have a significant mediation effect ($z = -1.88$, $p > .05$).

The total effect is the sum of direct and indirect effects of all presumed pathways (Kline, 2005). In the present study the outcome variable was commitment and there were two total effects on this variable; total effect of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. Total effect of anxiety on commitment was -.02 ($p > .05$) and total effect of avoidance on commitment was -.46 ($p < .01$, large effect size).

**4.4 Summary of the Results**

To summarize the results, it is concluded in the present study that gender did not have a significant effect on commitment and therefore was not included as a factor in the main analysis. Overall, results yielded that avoidance has a direct negative effect on commitment independent of all other factors. It also has an

indirect effect on commitment through close relationship beliefs. When the significance of mediation effects were checked one by one, it was found that intimacy, individuality and passion beliefs partially mediated the relationship between avoidance and commitment while external factors belief does not have a significant mediation effect. Being different from avoidance, anxiety does not have a significant direct effect on commitment while it has a significant indirect positive effect on commitment via close relationship beliefs.

# CHAPTER V

# DISCUSSION

This chapter is devoted to the general discussion of the results of the present study. First section is devoted to the discussion of the findings of the pilot studies and the main study of the present research. Second section is about the implications of the study and the third section lists the recommendations for future research.

## 5.1 Discussion of the Findings

The basic aim of the present study was to investigate the relationships of adult attachment style (anxiety and avoidance),close relationship beliefs (intimacy, individuality, passion and external factors), and commitment (operationally defined as dedication) in romantic relationships among university students. A full mediation path analysis was conducted to investigate the relationships among all these variables proposing that attachment and close relationship beliefs would be the predictors of commitment (see Figure 1.1).

Before running the main analysis, gender differences were inspected by using independent samples t-test. As it was reported in the results section, there was no gender difference in commitment for the sample of this study [$t(482) = 0.859$, $p = .391$]. Therefore, gender was not included as a separate variable in the main analysis. This finding was consistent with the former literature stating that although men and women may show their commitment at different ways in their romantic relationships, there is no difference between them in terms of the amount of commitment they have (Stanley, Markman, & Whitton, 2002).

For the findings of the main study, the full mediation path analysis explored all the significant and non-significant direct and indirect relationships of the study variables. Figure 4.1 displays the standardized estimation values of the paths in the full mediation model. As the full mediation analysis revealed, attachment style explained 22% of the variance in intimacy belief, 2% of the variance in individuality belief, 8% of the variance in passion belief and 3% of the variance in external factors belief. Overall, attachment and close relationship

beliefs explained the 47% of the variance in commitment. Each of the direct and indirect effects found in the study will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

To begin with the direct effects of attachment on commitment, the results revealed that avoidance has a significant direct negative effect on commitment meaning that commitment decreases as the avoidance increases. This finding was parallel with the literature consistently reporting that avoidance has a direct negative impact on commitment (Birnie et. al.,2009; Schindler, Fagundes, & Murdock,2010;Ho et. al., 2012; Li & Chan, 2012; Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013; Givertz et. al., 2013; Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014; Saucedo-Coy, & McInnes-Miller, 2014). What the researchers generally suggest is that attachment avoidance has a direct negative impact on commitment independent of all the other factors in the relationship such as trust, constraints etc.

Being different from avoidance, anxiety did not have a significant direct effect on commitment. This non-significant finding is expected considering that the literature has conflicting findings about the impact of attachment anxiety on commitment. This finding can be explained in different ways. First of all, there are some researchers specifically reporting that anxiety positively affects structural commitment but not dedication (Ho et. al., 2012). Since the present study defined and measured commitment as dedication, it may be irrelevant for attachment anxiety. Another possible explanation for this non-significant finding may be that as Joel, MacDonald, and Shimotomai (2011) summarized the literature, anxiously attached individuals can be ambivalent about commitment, feeling both positive and negative about commitment at the same time. The researchers had proposed that though anxiously attached people really want to commit to their partner, their insecurity about their partner's affection and their reduced satisfaction in the relationship seem to have a downward pressure on their commitment. This ambivalence may explain why some researchers report that anxiety reduces commitment (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Li & Chan, 2012; Givertz et. al., 2013) while the others report that it increases commitment (Ho et. al., 2012). And these conflicting forces in their commitment may also explain this statistically non-significant relationship.

For the direct effects of anxiety on close relationship beliefs results revealed that attachment anxiety had a significant direct positive effect on intimacy belief and external factors belief, both with a small effect size. To put it in another way, higher anxiety was related to higher intimacy belief and higher external factors belief. However, in this study, anxiety was not related to individuality belief and passion belief in a statistically significant way. Considering the literature, it was assumed that attachment, being the earliest schema about self, others and relationships, would affect the adult close relationship beliefs and experiences (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In fact, it was reported before that higher anxiety was associated with more endorsement of irrational beliefs (Stackert & Bursik, 2003; Kilmann et al., 2013). But this study revealed that although anxiety was associated with some close relationship beliefs it was not significantly related to others. To explain them one by one, when the literature is considered, the finding that higher anxiety is associated with higher intimacy belief makes sense. As it was postulated before, anxious individuals have an overwhelming need to couple up and meet their attachment needs with the partner by hyperactivating their attachment strategies (Morgan & Shaver, 1999), often enter relationships too quickly and over-self-disclose to maintain relationships (Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011). These findings and arguments implying that they tend to become intimate too quickly may explain the positive association between anxiety and intimacy belief. When it comes to the positive relation between anxiety and the external factors belief, it may be helpful to remind the sub-beliefs measured under the external factors belief which are; personal security, important others, finance, commonality and children (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992). It is quite easy to see the similarity between these sub-beliefs and the items under constraint commitment which are; concern for partner's welfare, financial alternatives, termination procedures, social pressure, structural investments and availability of other partners (Owen et. al., 2011). It is well known in the literature that anxious individuals overinvest (Ho et. al., 2012; Etcheverry et. al., 2013; Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014) to secure their relationships and anxiety is therefore associated more with constraint commitment (Ho et. al., 2012). But although they have a tendency to invest more into the relationship, they have the shortest relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1990)

probably because having a sensitive perception for threats in the relationships and having a trust problem in the relationship (Gere et. al., 2013). Under perceived threat, anxiously attached individuals may have a tendency to diagnose the relationship depending on these external factors and quickly terminate the relationship like people high in destiny belief do (Knee, Patrick, & Lonsbary, 2003). Therefore, anxiously attached individuals may believe in the importance of external factors more than less anxious individuals.

Regarding the direct effects of avoidance on close relationship beliefs, results revealed that avoidance had a significant direct negative effect on intimacy with a large effect size; significant direct negative effect on individuality with a small effect size; significant direct negative effect on passion with a medium effect size; and significant direct positive effect on external factors with a small effect size. To begin with the first finding that avoidance is related to less intimacy belief, the findings is actually self-explanatory since it is well known in the literature that avoidant people are disengaged and tend to reject intimacy and closeness (Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014), and also have difficulty in perceiving the closeness and intimacy shown by the partner (Gere et. al., 2013) and even have a tendency to not to enter into intimate relationships (Schindler, Fagundes, & Murdock, 2010) but rather prefer to have promiscuous sexual relations with multiple partners (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998) especially during young adulthood years. The second finding is the significant but negative association between avoidance and the individuality belief which include the sub-beliefs of independence and equity. One would expect this association to be positive in nature since avoidant people prefer individuality over intimacy. However, the negative association may be due to a possible lack of equity belief since they have a perception of *negative others* (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) as a social schema. For the significant and negative relationship between avoidance and passion same things that were discussed for intimacy belief can be repeated. Passion beliefs include items like the importance of the romance and as it was discussed before, avoidant people do not value or even avoid intimacy, closeness and warmth in romantic relationships which explains the inverse relationship between avoidance and passion. For the significant positive relation between avoidance and external factors belief, again it may be argued that since

avoidant people lack dedication commitment in their relationships (Ho et. al., 2012), constraints and external factors, may become more important for them. Actually it was already reported that the prediction of commitment by avoidance was mediated by satisfaction, alternatives, and investments (Etcheverry et. al., 2013) implying that structural dependence or the external factors are important for them while deciding to stay in the relationship or to leave.

When it comes to the direct effects of close relationship beliefs on commitment, the results revealed that all of the four close relationship belief had a significant direct effect on commitment although the direction of the relationship was different for each belief. In the present study, results revealed that while intimacy predicted commitment positively with a large effect size, the rest of the close relationship beliefs; namely, individuality, passion and external factors had a significant negative direct effect on commitment with small effect sizes. In other words, as intimacy belief increases, commitment increases as well but the increase in beliefs of individuality, passion and external factors seems to be associated with a decrease in commitment. This finding is somehow surprising considering that in their original study of scale development, Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) postulates that all of these four belief factors; namely, intimacy, individuality, passion and external factors are beliefs about what makes close relationships successful. If these are the beliefs that make relationships successful, one would expect them to be positively correlated with commitment which is a core concept in successful close relationships. However, except intimacy belief, all the other close relationship beliefs (individuality, passion and external factors) were negatively associated with commitment, though with small effect sizes. To explain this finding, cultural issues may be taken into account. As it was mentioned before, functionality or dysfunctionality of a belief may change depending on the culture. For instance, studies conducted with irrational belief scale revealed that only two of the irrational relationship beliefs, out of five, was negatively associated with dyadic adjustment in a study conducted in Africa (Möller & Zyl, 1991) although all of these five irrational beliefs were reported as detrimental to marriage in Western cultures (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982). Similarly, Hamamcı (2005), using the same scale in a Turkish sample, found that there was a negative correlation between mind reading belief and conflicts among

married people. Authors of both the studies argued that functionality of close relationship beliefs may change depending on culture. Likewise, Gao (2001) compared American and Chinese couples in terms of the love style they value and found that American couples valued passion more than Chinese couples. In a similar vein, Medora and colleagues (2002), compared American, Turkish and Indian university students in terms of their attitudes towards romanticism. The findings yielded that American students scored higher in valuing romanticism which was followed by Turkish students and then lastly by Indian students. In the light of these cultural differences, it seems close relationship beliefs developed and used in a Western culture may have a different effect on commitment of Turkish young adults. It seems that beliefs of individuality, passion and external factors do not make a successful relationship in this culture, if success is to be defined as commitment. However, considering that the effect sizes are too small, further studies may be needed in Turkish culture.

For the indirect effects found in the present study, the results revealed that anxiety has a significant indirect effect on commitment via close relationship beliefs with a small effect size. The thing that should be underlined here is that, indirect effect of anxiety (*path coeff.* = .05, $p < .05$) is both positive and significant while its direct effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.07, $p > .05$) was both negative and non-significant meaning that close relationship beliefs changes its negative relation with commitment into a positive effect buffering its negative impact on commitment. This finding is meaningful considering the postulation that close relationship beliefs are beliefs that make a relationship successful (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992) and having these positive beliefs about relationships seems to reduce the negative impact of attachment anxiety on commitment.

For the indirect effect of avoidance on commitment, results revealed that attachment avoidance has a significant indirect effect on commitment via close relationship beliefs with small effect size. The thing that should be underlined in this finding is that, the indirect effect of avoidance on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.18, $p < .001$) is less negative when compared to its direct effect on commitment (*path coeff.* = -.28, $p < .001$) meaning that close relationship beliefs tend to reduce its negative impact on commitment. Similar to the indirect effect of

anxiety discussed above, this findings makes sense since close relationship beliefs are claimed to be beliefs that define successful relationship and therefore holding these beliefs seem to reduce the negative impact of attachment avoidance on commitment.

Since there was a significant direct and indirect effect of avoidance on commitment, significance of the possible mediation effects was further explored. Results of the mediation analyses revealed that intimacy, individuality and passion beliefs significantly and partially mediated the relationship between avoidance and commitment while there was no significant mediation effect of external factors belief. It was already proposed at the beginning of this study that close relationships would mediate the relationship between attachment and commitment. This model was proposed depending on the literature that attachment, being the earliest schema about self, others and relationships, would affect the relationship beliefs (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) which in turn would affect close relationship experiences such as satisfaction and commitment (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992; Fletcher, Rosanowski, & Fitness, 1994; Cox et. al., 1997;Sprecher & Metts, 1999; Stacker & Bursik, 2003). Therefore the mediation effects of close relationship beliefs were already expected. However, the only surprising finding is that the external factors belief did not have a significant mediation effect. One possible explanation for this finding can be the sample of the study. Since this study was conducted with dating university students, the external factors like finance, children, and important others may not be relevant for them but rather, those factors may make more sense for couples involved in more serious relationships such as cohabitation, engagement or marriage.

**5.2 Implications**

This study seems to have several implications for both research purposes and psychological counseling practices. To begin with the research purposes, two important scales; Close Relationship Beliefs Scale and Revised Commitment Inventory were translated into Turkish and their adaptation studies were carried on as separate pilot studies which will enable more cross cultural research in this area. In fact, conducting more cross cultural research seems even more important in the light of the findings of this study since the results revealed a noteworthy cultural difference in terms how close relationship beliefs affect commitment. As

it was discussed above, individuality, passion and external factors beliefs seem to have a negative relationship with commitment which was operationally defined as dedication in this study. However, the developers of the Close Relationship Beliefs Scale (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992) had postulated that these are the beliefs which make a relationship successful which implies that they should have a positive relationship with important relationship experiences like satisfaction and commitment. Findings of this study is critical in lighting the way to the possibility of cultural differences in terms of how close relationship beliefs affect important relationship experiences, such as commitment, in different cultures. As cultural differences were reported for some other relationship belief measures (Möller & Zyl, 1991; Davies, 2001; Gao, 2001; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2002; Medora, Larson, Hortaçsu, & Dave, 2002; Hamamcı, 2005), there may be some cultural differences in the way close relationship beliefs measure functions as well.

Another implication of this study is how close relationship beliefs change the relationship between attachment and commitment. As being consistent with the former literature, this study ended up with the conclusion that avoidance has a direct negative effect on commitment and anxiety does not have a statistically significant direct effect on commitment. The present study also revealed that attachment and close relationship beliefs explain the variance in commitment more when taken together, with close relationship beliefs mediating the relation between attachment avoidance and commitment. The results of this study also revealed that endorsement of close relationship beliefs included in this study turned the negative impact of anxiety on commitment into a positive effect, and reduced the negative impact of avoidance on commitment. This finding is crucial since literature is fairly consistent that attachment avoidance is detrimental to commitment (Schindler, Fagundes & Murdock, 2010; Li & Chan, 2012; Givertz et. al., 2013; Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014) and especially to dedication component of commitment (Morgan & Shaver, 1999; Fraley & Shaver, 2000; Birnie et. al., 2009; Joel, MacDonald, & Shimotomai, 2011; Ho et. al., 2012; Saucedo-Coy, & McInnes-Miller, 2014) independent of other factors. However, the findings of the present study pave the way to the possibility of reducing its negative impact on commitment by increasing certain close relationship beliefs.

Especially the intimacy belief seems to have a moderation effect between avoidance and commitment. In other words, when people are higher in intimacy belief, the relation between avoidance and commitment is significantly much weaker, intimacy belief acting as a buffer and reducing its negative impact on commitment.

The present study was also significant since it revealed which close relationship beliefs are useful or detrimental for commitment. Intimacy belief seems specifically vital affecting commitment in a positive way and having a large effect size. As it was discussed before, college years are very important in terms of close relationship experiences and it is a suitable period to conduct psycho-education groups with young adults (Erikson, 1968; Coie et. al., 1993; Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1993; Beach, Smith, & Fincham, 1994; Forthofer et. al., 1996; Sinclair, & Nelson, 1998; Creasey, Kershaw, & Boston, 1999; Furman, 2002; Demir, 2008; Le et. al., 2010; Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013; Küçükarslan & Gizir, 2014). By using the results of this study, programs can be prepared first to help them realize their close relationship beliefs and then to change those beliefs in the positive direction. This is very important considering the fact that close relationship beliefs, with a special emphasis on intimacy belief, seem to change the direction and magnitude of the relationship between attachment avoidance and commitment in adult romantic relationships.

### 5.3 Recommendations

Future research can retest the revised commitment inventory in a sample of married individuals. Actually, university students dating population is not very suitable to test the constraints subscale since those constraints are more relevant for cohabitation relationships or marriages. As the second, close relationship beliefs could be investigated more in terms of their effect on other relationship related variables. To explain, as it was mentioned before, although this scale has the claim to measure the beliefs that make a relationship successful, in the Turkish sample most of the subscales revealed an inverse relationship with commitment. Their effect on other relationship variables such as satisfaction or dyadic adjustment can be inspected in the future. Third, in order to test the cultural differences, close relationship beliefs and commitment relationship can be investigated in other cultures as well to compare its effect on commitment in other

cultures. The same path design can be tested in individualistic and collectivistic cultures in a cross cultural study and the findings may be compared. Fourth, commitment can be sought with other relationship beliefs scale, in the future. As the fifth recommendation, the same model can be tested with married couples as well. This may be needed to explain why external factors did not have a significant mediation effect between attachment avoidance and commitment while all the other close relationship beliefs significantly mediated the relationship between the two variables. Being similar to constraint commitment, external factors may be more relevant for more seriously committed couples, the ones who are engaged or married. If this study is repeated in a sample of married couples, moderation analysis can also be conducted since there seems to be a different role of intimacy belief, moderating the relationship between attachment avoidance and commitment. Last but not the least, although there was no gender difference in commitment in the sample of the present study, gender roles can be investigated in terms of their possible effect on commitment in romantic relationships.

## REFERENCES


Adams, J. M., & Jones, W. H. (1997). The conceptualization of marital commitment: an integrative analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(5), 1177-1196.

Agnew, C. R., Rusbult, C. E., Van-Lange, P. A. M., & Langston, C. A. (1998). Cognitive interdependence: commitment and the mental representation of close relationships. Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(4), 939-954.

Ainsworth, M. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*(4), 333-341.

Allen, E. S., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., Williams, T., Melton, J., & Clements, M. L. (2008). Premarital precursors of marital infidelity. *Family Process, 47*(2), 243-259.

Amato, P. R. (1996). Explaining the intergenerational transmission of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 628-640.

Amato, P. R., & Deboer, D. D. (2001). The transmission of marital stability across generations: relationship skills or commitment to marriage? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(4), 1038-1051.

Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 59,* 612-621.

Arbuckle, J. L., (2009). Amos 18.0 [*Computer Software*]. Chicago, IL: Small Waters.

Arbuckle, J., & Wothke, W. (1999). AMOS 4 user's reference guide. Chicago: Smallwaters Corp.

Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: affective, cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(9), 1190- 1203.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(2), 226-244.

Beach, S. R. H., Smith, D. A., & Fincham, F. D. (1994). Marital interventions for depression: Empirical foundation and future prospects. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 3,* 233-250.

Bentler, P. M., (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107,* 238-246.

Birnie, C., McClure, M. J., Lydon, J. E., & Holmberg, D. (2009). Attachment avoidance and commitment aversion: A script for relationship failure. *Personal Relationships, 16,* 79-97.

Bollen, K. A., & Stine, R. (1990). Direct and indirect effects: Classical and bootstrap estimates of variability. *Sociological Methodology, 20*(1), 15-140.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss.* NY: Basic Books

Bradbury, T. N, & Fincham, F. D. (1988). Individual difference variables in close relationships: A contextual model of marriage as an integrative framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(4), 713-721.

Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Saver, P. R. (1998). Dimensions of adult attachment: an integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & S. Rholes (Eds.). *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp.46-76). New York: Guifford.

Buunk, B., (1981). Jealousy in sexually open marriages. *Alternative Lifestyles, 4,* 357-372.

Büyükşahin, A., & Hovardaoğlu, S. (2004). Çiftlerin aşka ilişkin tutumlarının Lee'nin çok boyutlu aşk biçimleri kapsamında incelenmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi [Turkish Journal of Psychology], 19*(54), 59-72.

Carter, A. M., Fabrigar, L. R., Macdonald, T. K., & Monner, L. J. (2013). Investigating the interface of the investment model and adult attachment theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43,*661-672.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155.

Coie, J. C., Watt, N. F., West, S. G., Hawkins, C. D., Asarnow, J. F., Markman, H. J., Ramey, S. L., Shure, M. B., & Long, B. (1993). The science of prevention: A conceptual framework and some directions for a national research program. *American Psychologist, 48,* 1013-1022.

Cox, C. L., Wexler, M. O., Rusbult, C. E., & Gaines, S. O. (1997). Prescriptive support and commitment processes in close relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*(1), 79-90.

Creasey, G., Kershaw, K., & Boston, A. (1999). Conflict management with friends and romantic partners: The role of attachment and negative mood

regulation expectancies. *The Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28*(5), 523-543.

Dandurand, C., Bouaziz, A. R., & Lafontaine, M. F. (2013). Attachment and couple satisfaction: The mediating effect of approach and avoidance commitment. *Journal of Relationships Research, 4,* 1-11.

Davies, M. F. (2001). Socially desirable responding and impression management in the endorsement of love styles. *The Journal of Psychology, 135*(5), 562-570.

DeBord, J., Romans, J. S. C., & Krishok, T. (1996). Predicting dyadic adjustment from general and relationship-specific beliefs. *The Journal of Psychology, 130*(3), 263-280.

Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9,* 57-277.

DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E. B., Pond, R. S., Deckman, T., Finkel, E. J., Luchies, L. B., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(6), 1302-1316.

Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., & Verette, J. (1999). Level of commitment, mutuality of commitment, and couple well being. *Personal Relationships, 6,* 389-409.

Duemmler, S. L., & Kobak, R. (2001). The development of commitment and attachment in dating relationships: attachment security as relationship construct. *Journal of Adolescence, 24,* 401-415.

Ehrenberg, M F., Robertson, M, & Pringle, J. (2012). Attachment style and marital commitment in the context of remarriage. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 53,* 204-219.

Eidelson, R. J., & Epstein, N. (1982). Cognition and relationship maladjustment: Development of a measure of dysfunctional relationship beliefs. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*(5), 715-720.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton Company.

Etcheverry, P. E., Le, B., Wu, T., & Wei, M. (2013). Attachment and the investment model: Predictors of relationship commitment, maintenance, and persistence. *Personal Relationships, 20,* 546-567.

Fagundes, C. P., & Schindler, I. (2012). Making of romantic attachment bonds: Longitudinal trajectories and implications for relationship stability. *Personal Relationships, 19*, 723-742.

Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(2), 281-291.

Finkel, E. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2001). Self-control and accommodation in close relationships: an interdependence analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(2), 263-277.

Finkel, E. J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., & Hannon, P. A. (2002). Dealing with betrayal in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 956-974.

Fitzpatrick, J., & Sollie, D. L. (1999). Unrealistic gendered and relationship-specific beliefs: Contributions to investments and commitment in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*(6), 852-867.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Kininmonth, L. A., (1992). Measuring relationship beliefs: an individual differences scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 26,* 371-397.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Rosanowski, J., & Fitness, J. (1994). Automatic processing in intimate contexts: The role of close-relationship beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 888-897.

Forthofer, M. S., Markman, H. J., Cox, M., Stanley, S., & Kessler, R. C. (1996). Associations between marital distress and work loss in a national sample. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 597-605.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology, 4,* 132-154.

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 350-365.

Furman, W. (2002). The emerging field of adolescent romantic relationships. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11,* 177-180.

Gao, G. (2001). Intimacy, passion and commitment in Chinese and USA romantic relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*(3), 329-342.

Gere, J., MacDonald, G., Joel, S., Spielmann, S. S., & Impett, E. A. (2013). The independent contributions of social reward and threat perceptions to romantic commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(6), 961-977.

Givertz, M., Woszidlo, A., Segrin, C., & Knutson, K. (2013). Direct and indirect effects of attachment orientation on relationship quality and loneliness in married couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*(8), 1096-1120.

Guidice, M. D. (2011). Sex differences in romantic attachment: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(2), 193-214.

Hadden, B. W., Smith, C. V., & Webster, G. D. (2014). Relationship duration moderates associations between attachment and relationship quality: meta-analytic support for the temporal adult romantic attachment model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*(1), 42-58.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hamamcı, Z. (2005). Dysfunctional relationship beliefs in marital conflict. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 23*(3), 245-261.

Hamamcı, Z., Kapçı, E. G., & Türkçapar, H. (2010). İlişki inançları ölçeğinin psikometrik özelliklerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, 11*, 127-132.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(3), 511-524.

Helgeson, V. S. (1994). The effects of self-beliefs and relationship beliefs on adjustment to a relationship stressor. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 241-258.

Hendrick, S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The relationships assessment scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 15* (1), 137-142.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 392-402.

Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (2002). *Love*. In C.R. Snyder, S.

Ho, M. Y., Chen, S. X., Bond, M. H., Hui, C. M., Chan, C., & Friedman, M. (2012). Linking adult attachment styles to relationship satisfaction in Hong Kong and the united states: The mediating role of personal and structural commitment. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*, 565-578.

Hoyle, R. H. (1995). *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications.* SAGE Publications, Inc: California.

James, S., Hunsley, J., & Hemsworth, D. (2002). Factor structure of the relationship belief inventory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 26*(6), 729-744.

Joel, S., MacDonald, G., & Shimotomai, A. (2011). Conflicting pressures on romantic relationship commitment for anxiously attached individuals. *Journal of Personality, 79*(1), 51-73.

Jones, D. N., Olderbak, S. G., & Figueredo, A. J., (2011). The intentions towards infidelity scale. 3.rd edition (Ed. T.D. Fisher, C.M. Davis, W.L. Yarber, & S.L. Davis) *Handbook of Sexuality-Related Measures.* (pp. 251-253) New York: Routledge.

Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy.* (*Unpublished master thesis) Middle East Technical University*, Ankara, Turkey.

Kaygusuz, C. (2013). Irrational beliefs and abuse in university students' romantic relations. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 51*, 141-156.

Keelan, J. P. R., Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1994). Attachment style and heterosexual relationships among young adults: A short-term panel study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 201-214.

Kelley, H. H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, J. H., Huston, T. L., Levinger, G., McClintok, E., Peplau, L. A., & Peterson, D. R. (2002). *Close Relationships.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Malarkey, W. B., Chee, M., Newton, T., Cacioppo, J. T., Mao, H. Y., & Glaser, R. (1993). Negative behaviour during marital conflict is associated with immunological down-regulation. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 55*, 395-409.

Kilmann, P. R., Finch, H., Parnell, M. M., & Downer, J. T. (2013). Partner attachment and interpersonal characteristics. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 39*, 144-159.

Kline, R. B., (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Klohnen, E. C., & Luo, S. (2003). Interpersonal attraction and personality: What is attractive- self similarity, ideal similarity, complementarity, or attachment security? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 709-722.

Knee, C. R., (1998). Implicit theories of relationships: assessment and prediction of romantic relationship initiation, coping, and longevity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 360-370.

Knee, C. R., Patrick, H., & Lonsbary, C., (2003). Implicit theories of relationships: orientations toward evaluation and cultivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*(1), 41-55.

Knee, C. R., Patrick, H., Victor, N. A., & Neighbors, C. (2004). Implicit theories of relationships: Moderators of the link between conflict and commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(5), 617-628.

Küçükarslan, M., & Gizir, C. A. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin romantik ilişki inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi [Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal], 5*(42), 148-159.

Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the investment model. *Personal Relationships, 10,*37-57.

Le, B., Dove, N. L., Agnew, C. R., Korn, M. S., & Mutso, A. A. (2010). Predicting non-marital romantic relationship dissolution: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Personal Relationships, 17,* 377-390.

Li., T., & Chan, D. K. S. (2012). How anxious and avoidant attachment affect romantic relationship quality differently: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42,* 406-419.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M., (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods, 1*(2), 130-149.

Maddox-Shaw, A. M., Rhoades, G. K., Allen, E. S., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2013). Predictors of extradyadic sexual involvement in unmarried opposite-sex relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 598-610.

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.

Morgan, H. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Attachment processes and commitment to romantic relationships. In J. M. Adams & W. H. Jones (Eds.). *Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability* (pp.109-124). New York: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum.

Möller, A. T., & Zyl, D. V. (1991). Relationship beliefs, interpersonal perception, and marital adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47*(1), 28-33.

Muthen, L. K., & Muthen, B. O. (2007). *MPus user's guide* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthen & Muthen.

Overall, N. C., Girme, Y. U., Lemay, E. P., & Hammond, M. D. (2014). Attachment anxiety and reactions to relationship threat: The benefits and

costs of inducing guilt in romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(2), 235-256.

Owen, J., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J., (2011). The revised commitment inventory: Psychometrics and use with unmarried couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 32*(6), 820-841.

Öner, B., (2000). Relationship satisfaction and dating experience: Factors affecting future time orientation in relation to relationships with the opposite sex. *The Journal of Psychology, 134*(5), 527-536.

Öner, B. (2001). Factors predicting future time orientation for romantic relationships with the opposite sex. *The Journal of Psychology, 135*(4), 430-438.

Öner, B. (2002).Self-monitoring and future time orientation in romantic relationships. *The Journal of Psychology, 136*(4), 420-424.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879-891.

Ragsdale, J. D., Brandau-Brown, F., & Bello, R. (2010). Attachment style and gender as predictors of relational repair among the remarried rationale for the study. *Journal of Family Communication, 10*, 158-173.

Rhoades, G. K., Petrella, J. N., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Premarital cohabitation, husbands' commitment, and wives' satisfaction with the division of household contributions. *Marriage and Family Review, 40*(4), 5-22.

Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? predicting dating relationship stability from four aspects of commitment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*(5), 543-550.

Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., & Ragan, E. P. (2012). Parents' marital status, conflict, and role modeling: Links with adult romantic relationship quality. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 53*, 348-367.

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.

Rodrigues, D. F. L., & Lopes, D. M. F. (2014). Validating the measurement of components of commitment in a Portuguese sample. *Social Indicators Research, 121*(1), 273-289.

Ross, L. R., McKim, M. R., & DiTomasso, E. (2006). How do underlying "self" and "other" dimensions define adult attachment styles? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 38*(4), 294-310.

Rusbult, C. E., Johnson, D. J., & Morrow, G. D. (1986). Predicting satisfaction and commitment in adult romantic involvements: An assessment of the generalizability of the investment model. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 49*(1), 81-89.

Rusbult, C. E., & Martz, J. M. (1995). Remaining in an abusive relationship: An investment model analysis of nonvoluntary commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 558-571.

Rusbult, C. E., Zembrodt, I. M., & Gunn, L. K. (1982). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(6), 1230-1242.

Saucedo-Coy, J., & McInnes-Miller, M. (2014). Intimate partners who struggle with formal commitments: Attachment styles, major challenges, and clinical implications. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 42*, 232-242.

Schindler, I., Fagundes, C. P., & Murdock, K. W. (2010). Predictors of romantic relationship formation: Attachment style, prior relationships, and dating goals. *Personal Relationships, 17*, 97-105.

Scott, S. B., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Allen, E. S., Markman, H. J. (2013). Reasons for divorce and recollections of premarital intervention: implications for improving relationship education. *Couple and Family Psychology Research and Practice, 2*(2), 131-145.

Segrin, C., Taylor, M. E., & Altman, J. (2005). Social cognitive mediators and relational outcomes associated with parental divorce. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(3), 361-377.

Selçuk, E., Günaydın, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal, A. (2005). Yetişkin bağlanma boyutları için yeni bir ölçüm: yakın ilişkilerde yaşantılar envanteri-II'nin Türk örnekleminde psikometrik açıdan değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları [Turkish Psychological Articles], 8*(16), 1-11.

Simpson,J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 971-980.

Sinclair, S. L., & Nelson, E. S. (1998). The impact of parental divorce on college students' intimate relationships and relationship beliefs. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 29*(1/2), 103-129.

Slotter, E. B. & Finkel, E. J. (2009). The strange case of sustained dedication to an unfulfilling relationship: Predicting commitment and breakup from attachment anxiety and need fulfillment within relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(1), 85-100.

Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. *Sociological Methodology, 13,* 290-312.

Sprecher, S., & Metts, S. (1989). Development of the "Romantic Beliefs Scale" and examination of the effects of gender and gender-role orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6,* 387-411.

Sprecher, S., & Metts, S. (1999). Romantic beliefs: Their influence on relationships and patterns of change over time. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*(6), 834-851.

Stackert, R. A., & Bursik, K. (2003). Why am I unsatisfied? Adult attachment style, gendered irrational relationship beliefs, and young adult romantic relationship satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34,* 1419-1429.

Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 595-608.

Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., & Whitton, S. W. (2002). Communication, conflict, and commitment: Insights on the foundations of relationship success from a national survey. *Family Process, 41*(4), 659-675.

Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., Amato, P. R., Markman, H. J., & Johnson, C. A. (2010). The timing of cohabitation and engagement: Impact on first and second marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72,* 906-918.

Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., & Whitton, S. W. (2010). Commitment and the securing of romantic attachment. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 2,* 243-257.

Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., & Markman, H. J. (2004). May be I do. Interpersonal commitment and premarital or nonmarital cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues, 25*(4), 496-519.

Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., Sadberry, S. L., Clements, M. L., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Sacrifice as a predictor of marital outcomes. *Family Process, 45*(3), 289-303.

Stevens J. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences,* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Surra, C. A., & Hughes, D. K. (1997). Commitment processes in accounts of the development of premarital relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59,* 5-21.

Sümer, N. (2006). Categorical and dimensional comparison of the adult attachment measures. *Turkish Journal of Psychology, 21*(57), 1-22.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Toplu-Demirtaş, E., & Tezer, E. (2013). Aldatmaya yönelik niyet ölçeğinin Türkçe uyarlaması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmaları. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi [Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal], 4*(39), 37-45.

Tran, S., & Simpson, J. A. (2009). Prorelationship maintenance behaviours: The joint roles of attachment and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(4), 685-698.

Whitton, S. W., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2008). Effects of parental divorce on marital commitment and confidence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(5), 789-793.

Whitton, S. W., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2007). If i help my partner, will it hurt me? perceptions of sacrifice in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 26*(1), 64-92.

Whitton, S. W., Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., & Johnson, C. A. (2013). Attitudes toward divorce, commitment, and divorce proneness in first marriages and remarriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 75*, 276-287.

Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behaviour, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 942-966.

Wittenborn, A. K., Faber, A. J., & Keiley, M. K. (2012). An attachment and affect regulation based multiple couple group intervention for couples transitioning to marriage/commitment. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy, 11*,189-204.

Wittenborn, A. K., Keiley, M. K., & Sprenkle, D. H. (2012). The evaluation of a multiple group intervention for couples transitioning to marriage: A mixed-methods pilot project. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy, 11*, 130-148.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: Demographic Information Form (DIF)

### Kişisel Bilgi Formu

**1. Yaşınız: ……**

**2. Cinsiyetiniz: ( ) K ( ) E**

**3. Bölümünüz: ……**

**4. Sınıfınız:** ( ) 1. sınıf ( ) 2. sınıf ( ) 3. sınıf ( ) 4.sınıf

**5. İlişki Durumunuz:**

Şu anda romantik bir ilişkiniz var mı? ( ) Evet ( ) Hayır

Cevabınız "Evet" ise ilişkinin süresini ay olarak belirtiniz: .....ay

## APPENDIX B: Sample Items of Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised Scale (ECR-R)

**Aşağıda, kişilerin yakın ilişkilerdeki yaşantılarına ilişkin ifadeler sıralanmıştır. Her bir maddenin size ne kadar uyduğunu belirten rakamı işaretleyiniz.**

**Hiç katılmıyorum 1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6----------7 Tamamen katılıyorum**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Birlikte olduğum kişinin sevgisini kaybetmekten korkarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Gerçekte ne hissettiğimi birlikte olduğum kişiye göstermemeyi tercih ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin artık benimle olmak istemeyeceği korkusuna kapılırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## APPENDIX C: Sample Items of Close Relationship Beliefs Scale (CRB)

**Aşağıda, <u>size göre romantik bir ilişkinin başarılı olup olmayacağını belirleyen en önemli faktörlerin neler olduğu</u> sorulmuştur. Her bir maddenin sizin genel ilişki inançlarınıza ne kadar uyduğunu belirten rakamı yanına işaretleyiniz. <u>Eş</u> sözcüğü <u>flörtünüz/sevgiliniz</u> anlamında kullanılmıştır.**

**Kesinlikle inanmıyorum 1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6 Kesinlikle inanıyorum**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. İnsanlar her zaman eşlerinin altta yatan mesajlarını dinlemelidir. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Başarılı ilişkilerde eşler birbirlerini ne kadar sevdiklerini sürekli olarak gösterirler. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. Eşler arasında tam bir dürüstlük olmalıdır. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**APPENDIX D: The CFA Model of Close Relationship Belief Scale (CRB)**

**with Standardized Estimates in This Study**

## APPENDIX E: Sample Items of the Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI)

**Aşağıdaki her bir maddeyi şu anda içinde bulunduğunuz ilişkinizi ve bu ilişkideki eşinizi (flörtünüzü/sevgilinizi) düşünerek cevaplandırınız.**

**Hiç katılmıyorum 1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6----------7 Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Eşim ve ben ayrılsak arkadaşlarım bunu önemsemez. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. Bu ilişkiyi bitirsek, maddi durumumla ilgili bir sorun yaşamam. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Bu ilişkiyi bitirmek için atmam gereken adımlar çok fazla zaman ve çaba gerektirir. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**APPENDIX F:The CFA Model of the Revised Commitment Inventory (RCI)**

**with Standardized Estimates in This Study**

## APPENDIX G: Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee Approval Letter

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816/ 186 - 345

10.04.2014

Gönderilen : Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer
Eğitim Bilimleri

Gönderen : Prof. Dr. Canan Özgen
IAK Başkanı

İlgi : Etik Onayı

Danışmanlığını yapmış olduğunuz Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü öğrencisi Ceyda Öztekin'in "Romantik İlişkilerde Bağlılığı Yordayan Bilişsel Değişkenler" isimli araştırması "İnsan Araştırmaları Komitesi" tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Etik Komite Onayı

Uygundur

10/04/2014

Prof.Dr. Canan Özgen
Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi
( UEAM ) Başkanı
ODTÜ 06531 ANKARA

## APPENDIX H: Turkish Summary

## TÜRKÇE ÖZET

## ROMANTİK İLİŞKİLERDE BAĞLILIĞIN YORDAYICILARI OLARAK BAĞLANMA STİLLERİ VE YAKIN İLİŞKİ İNANÇLARI

### 1. GİRİŞ

Romantik ilişkilerde bağlılığın doğasını anlamak evlilik, nişanlılık, birlikte yaşama ve flört ilişkisi gibi bir çok ilişki türünde önemli olmuştur (Kelley ve ark., 2002). Erikson'un (1968) da belirttiği gibi, bağlılığı olan romantik ilişkiler kurmak ve sürdürmek, erken yetişkinlik döneminin en önemli gelişimsel görevlerinden bir tanesidir. Erikson, ayrıca bu dönemde olgun yetişkin ilişkileri kurabilmenin kişilerin kalan hayatları süresince ruh sağlıklarını etkileyeceğini savunmuştur. Bu kuramlar doğrultusunda bağlılığın önemi fark edilmiş ve hem bağlılığın ilişkilerde neleri etkilediğine hem de bağlılığı yordayan faktörlere yönelik birçok çalışma yapılmıştır.

Romantik ilişkilerde bağlılık kavram olarak tarihte oldukça farklı şekillerde tanımlanmaya çalışılmıştır. Tüm bağlılık tanımları incelendiğinde, gelecek zaman yönelimi ve ilişkinin devam edeceğine dair inanç, ortak iki nokta olarak görünmektedir. Diğer bir deyişle, bağlı ilişkiler içinde yer alan çiftler ilişkilerinin bir geleceği olduğuna ve ilişkilerinin uzun vadede devam edeceğine inanmaktadırlar (Arriaga ve Agnew, 2001) ve bağlı çiftler iyi günde ve kötü günde ilişkide kalmaya devam etme eğilimi göstermektedirler (Kelley ve ark., 2002). Diğer bir ifadeyle bağlılık, getireceği fayda ve zararlar ne olursa olsun, ilişkide her türlü iniş çıkışlara rağmen, uzun vadede ilişkiyi devam ettirme *niyetidir*. Niyet kelimesinden de anlaşılabileceği gibi, bağlılık sadece bir ilişkide kalma davranışı değil, bir karar, bir zihinsel yapı ve dolayısıyla bilişsel bir kavramdır (Amato ve Rogers, 1997; Duemmler ve Kobak, 2001).

Bu kuramsal tartışmalar temelinde, Stanley ve Markman (1992) bağlılık kavramını 2 alt boyut ile tanımlamış ve bu 2 boyutu da içerecek şekilde bir

bağlılık ölçeği geliştirmişlerdir. Bu alt boyutlar adanmışlık (kişisel bağlılık) ve kısıtlamalar (yapısal bağlılık) olarak ifade edilmiştir. *Adanmışlık*, kişinin kendisinin ilişkinin uzun süreli olmasını istemesi, eşiyle bir çift olarak ortak kimlik geliştirmesi ve ilişkisini hayatında bir önceliği yapması olarak tanımlanırken, *kısıtlamalar* kişinin ilişkiden neden çıkamayacağını ya da çıkmak istemeyeceğini belirten faktörlerdir (örn. sosyal baskı, maddi gerekçeler, başka bir alternatif eş bulup bulamayacağına ilişkin endişeler gibi) (Stanley, Whitton, ve Markman, 2004). Yani adanmışlık kişinin neden ilişkide kalmak istediğini açıklarken kısıtlamalar kişinin neden ilişkiden çıkmak istemediğini belirten faktörlerdir. Owen ve arkadaşlarının da (2011) belirttiği gibi, kısıtlamalar kişinin ilişkide kalma kararını etkilemekle birlikte ilişki kalitesi ile adanmışlık kadar ilişkili değildir. Ayrıca kısıtlamalar, flört ilişkisinden ziyade evlilik gibi birlikte yaşanılan ve hayatın daha çok paylaşıldığı ilişki türlerinde daha geçerli ve anlamlıdır. Bu nedenle, flört eden üniversite öğrencileri ile yürütülen bu çalışma kapsamında bağlılığın işe vuruk tanımı *adanmışlık* olarak ele alınmıştır.

Literatürde bağlılığın ilişkide neleri etkilediğine yönelik oldukça fazla çalışma bulunmaktadır. En temel bulgulardan bir tanesi, bağlılığın ilişki doyumunu arttırdığı (Stanley, Markman, ve Whitton, 2002) ve bağlılık eksikliğinin ilişkinin bitmesini belirleyen faktörlerin başında geldiğidir (Scott ve ark., 2013). Bunların yanı sıra bağlılığın olumlu etkilediği diğer değişkenler şu şekilde sıralanmıştır; çiftler arasında fikir birliği, başarılı duygusal ifade, uyuşma, yakınlık, sağlıklı cinsellik, etkin problem çözebilme (Rodrigues ve Lopes, 2014), güven (Drigotas, Rusbult, ve Verette, 1999), özveri (Agnew ve ark., 1998; Stanley ve ark., 2006; Whitton, Stanley, ve Markman, 2007), bağışlayıcılık (Finkel ve Campbell, 2001; Finkel ve ark., 2002), daha az şiddet eğilimi (Stanley, Whitton, ve Markman, 2004), daha az bencillik, stres ve ilişkide doyumsuzluğa daha yapıcı tepkiler verme (Rusbult, Zembrodt, ve Gunn, 1982; Wieselquist ve ark., 1999; Ragsdale, Brandau-Brown, ve Bello, 2010), daha az sadakatsizlik riski (Allen ve ark., 2008; Maddox-Shaw ve ark., 2013). Özetle bağlılık, yakın ilişkilerin birçok boyutunu olumlu yönde etkileyen oldukça önemli ve çok boyutlu bir kavramdır.

Bağlılık kavramının önemi ve yakın ilişkilerde gerekliliği göz önünde bulundurularak, bağlılığı yordayan çeşitli bireysel ve ilişkisel değişkenler çalışılmıştır. Kişinin kendisi ve diğerleri ile ilgili ilk şemalarını oluşturan

bağlanma stili de bağlılığı yordayan bireysel faktörlerin başında yer almaktadır. Aslında 2010'da Le ve arkadaşları tarafından yapılan meta-analiz çalışmasında bağlanma stilinin ilişkilerin oluşumu, kalıcılığı ve kalitesini anlamada oldukça önemli bir değişken olduğu araştırma sonuçlarıyla desteklenmiştir.

Bağlanma kuramı (Bowlby, 1969; Ainsworth ve Bowlby, 1991), ilk etapta anne-bebek arasındaki bağlanmaya odaklanmış, daha sonra ergen ve yetişkin ilişkilerini anlamak ve açıklamak üzere kapsamı geliştirilmiştir. Bu genişletmenin altındaki varsayım, anne-bebek ilişkisinde gelişen güvenebilme, diğer kişinin ihtiyaç anında orada olacağına dair inanç ve kişinin çocukluk döneminde geliştirdiği öz değerin daha sonraki yetişkin ilişkilerini de etkileyeceğidir (Hazan ve Shaver, 1987). Sonuçta dört farklı yetişkin bağlanma stili kategorik olarak tanımlanmıştır: güvenli, saplantılı, kayıtsız ve korkulu (Bartholomew ve Horowitz, 1991). Bu bağlanma stillerinin ya da kategorilerinin altında iki temel boyut tespit edilmiştir: kaygı ve kaçınma (Brennan, Clark, ve Shaver, 1998). Son dönemde araştırmacılar bağlanmanın kategoriler yerine bu iki boyutla tanımlanmasını ve çalışılmasını önermektedirler (Brennan, Clark, ve Shaver, 1998; Selçuk ve ark., 2005; Sümer, 2006). Bu iki boyutu açıklamak gerekirse, *kaçınma* kişinin daha az yakınlık istemesi ve psikolojik ve duygusal açıdan daha bağımsız kalmak istemesi; *kaygı* da kişinin partnerinin ulaşılabilir olup olmayacağı ya da kendisini terk edip etmeyeceği yönündeki endişeleri olarak tanımlanmıştır. Son dönemde önerilen bu iki boyutlu modeli takip ederek bu çalışmada bağlanma kaygı ve kaçınma boyutları ile tanımlanmış ve bu boyutların kişilerin zihinsel modellerini oluşturarak daha sonraki yetişkin ilişkilerindeki bilişsel süreçlerini ve davranışlarını etkileyeceği varsayılmıştır.

Bağlanmanın bu iki boyutu ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleyen çalışmalar kaygının kişilerin bağlanma stratejilerini fazlasıyla aktive etmelerine, sürekli olarak eşlerinin kendilerine karşı sevgisi konusunda onay ve doğrulamaya ihtiyaç duymalarına neden olurken; kaçınmanın tam ters biçimde kişilerin bağlanma stratejilerini daha az aktive etmelerine, kendi kendilerine yeterli olmaya çalışmalarına, bağlanma ile ilgili tehdit ve arzuları görmezden gelmelerine ve ilişkide soğuk ve mesafeli davranmalarına neden olduğunu netlikle göstermiştir (Joel, MacDonald, ve Shimotomai, 2011; Dandurand, Bouaziz, ve Lafontaine, 2013). Ayrıca literatür kaçınmanın, daha az bağlılık, daha az güven, ilişkiye ve

eşe daha az yatırım yapma, ve yakınlıktan rahatsız olma ile ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir (Schindler, Fagundes, ve Murdock, 2010). Kaçınma ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişki her ne kadar net görünse de, kaygı ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişki daha tartışmalıdır. Bazı araştırmacılar kaygı boyutunda yüksek olan erkeklerin evlenmeden önceki flört süreçlerinin daha kısa olduğunu rapor ederek kaygı boyutunda yüksek olan bireylerin daha çabuk bağlılık gösterdiğini savunmuştur (Joel, MacDonald, ve Shimotomai, 2011). Karşıt görüşteki bazı araştırmacılar da yüksek kaygı boyutunun ilişki süresinin daha kısa olması ile ilişkili olduğunu ve bu nedenle genel bağlılıkla olumsuz bir ilişkisinin olduğunu savunmuştur (Feeney ve Noller, 1990). Özetlemek gerekirse, kaygılı kişiler sıklıkla ilişkiye çok hızlı girmekte, ilişkiyi korumak için kendini çok fazla açmakta, ve bazen bağlılık ile ilgili saplantılı olabilmektedir. Ancak bununla birlikte, kaygılı bağlanma genellikle daha kısa ilişki süresi ile ilişkili çıkmaktadır ve buradan genel olarak bağlılık ile negatif bir ilişkisinin düşünülmektedir.

Özellikle kaygı boyutu ve bağlılık konusundaki belirsiz bulgulara dayanarak, araştırmacılar bağlanma ve bağlılık arasında farklı değişkenleri ara değişken olarak çalışmıştır. En sıklıkla çalışılan ara değişkenler ilişki doyumu (Fraley ve Shaver, 2000), başka eş seçeneklerinin olup olmaması (Carter e ve ark., 2013), çatışma (Li ve Chan, 2012), aşk (Feeney ve Noller, 1990), ve akılcı olmayan ilişki inançları (Stackert ve Bursik, 2003; Kilmann ve ark., 2013) olarak sıralanabilir.

Bu çalışmada yakın ilişki inançları, bağlanma ve bağlılık arasında ara değişken olarak ele alınmıştır. Ara değişkeni belirleme sürecinde hem kuramsal hem de bağımsız araştırmaların sonuçları dayanak olarak kullanılmıştır. Bağlanma kuramının varsaydığı üzere, kişinin bağlanma ile ilgili hatıraları, inançları, beklentileri, ihtiyaçları ve bağlanma ihtiyaçlarını gidermede kullandığı stratejileri, kişinin bağlanmaya ilişkin bilişsel modelini oluşturmakta ve bu bilişsel model de daha sonraki yetişkin ilişkilerindeki bilişsel süreçleri ve davranışları etkilemektedir. Fletcher ve Kininmonth'un da (1992) belirttiği gibi, insanlar ilişkiye boş bir kâğıt gibi girmemekte, beraberlerinde inançlarını, bilgi yapılarını ve şemalarını getirmektedirler. Bu kuramsal iddiaların yanı sıra birçok araştırma da ilişki inançlarının ilişkideki bağlılığı açıklamada önemli bir yordayıcılığı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu çalışmalardan örnek vermek gerekirse, Cox ve

arkadaşları (1997) kişilerin ilişkinin devam etmesi gerektiğine dair inançlarının bağlılığı belirlediğini, ve yine benzer olarak Sprecher ve Metts de (1999) ilişkilerle ilgili genel olumlu inançların bağlılık ile pozitif bir ilişkisi olduğunu belirtmiştir. İlişki inançları ve bağlılık arasındaki bir diğer çalışma, Knee ve arkadaşları (2004) tarafından gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu çalışmada yakın ilişki inançları *kader inancı* ve *gelişme inancı* olarak iki boyutta tanımlanmış ve çalışmada gelişme inancının çatışma ve bağlılık arasında bir ara değişken olduğu saptanmıştır. Bir başka deyişle, gelişme inancı yüksek olan bireylerin ilişkilerindeki çatışmanın bağlılıklarını daha az olumsuz etkilediği bulunmuştur. Diğer taraftan kader inancı yüksek olan bireylerin, ilişkinin başlarında doyumlarının düşük olması durumunda ilişkiye daha fazla yatırım yapmak ya da bağlılık göstermek yerine, zorluklarla karşılaştıklarında hızlı bir biçimde ilişkiden çıktıkları belirtilmiştir. İlişki inancı konusunda çalışan bir başka araştırmacı grubu, akılcı olmayan ilişki inançlarının ilişkide daha fazla çatışmaya, daha negatif problem çözme stillerine sebep olduğunu ve bunlarında dolaylı olarak bağlılığa zarar verdiğini ifade etmişlerdir (Hamamcı 2005; Kaygusuz, 2013). Hem bağlanma stillerinin hem de rasyonel olmayan ilişki inançlarının çalışıldığı bir çalışmada bağlanma kaygısı veya kaçınma boyutunda yüksek olan bireylerin daha fazla rasyonel olmayan ilişki inancına sahip olduğu ve bunun da ilişki doyumunu olumsuz etkilediği bulunmuştur (Stacker & Bursik, 2003).

Yukarıda tartışılan araştırmalardan da anlaşılabileceği gibi literatürde ilişki inançları çok farklı şekillerde tanımlanmıştır. Bu çalışmada ilişki inançları Fletcher ve Kinninmonth (1992) tarafından yakın ilişki inançları olarak isimlendirilen ve 4 boyuttan oluşan yapı ile tanımlanmıştır. Fletcher ve Kinninmonth'a göre yakın ilişki inançları 4 alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır: yakınlık, bireysellik, tutku ve dışsal faktörler. Yakın ilişki inançları ölçeği diğer inanç ölçeklerine göre oldukça geniş bir inanç yelpazesini değerlendirmekte ve bu inançların hepsi de yakın ilişkileri başarılı kılan inançlar olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Bu inançların kişilerin ilişkiler hakkındaki genel inançlarını ifade etmekte olduğu ve hem evli hem de evli olmayan/flört ilişkisi örneklemlerde kullanıma uygun olduğu belirtilmektedir.

Özet olarak birçok çalışma hem bağlanma stillerinin hem de ilişki inançlarının romantik ilişkide bağlılığı açıklamada önemli olduğunu belirtmiştir.

Ayrıca çalışmalar bağlanma stillerinin de ilişki inançlarını belirlediğini ifade etmiştir. Bu kuramsal tartışmalar ve bulgular doğrultusunda bu çalışma, bağlanma stilleri ve ilişki inançlarının bağlılığı açıklamadaki ortak etkiyi araştırmayı hedeflemektedir.

### 1.2 Çalışmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın amacı yetişkin bağlanma stili, yakın ilişki inançları ve romantik ilişkilerde bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Daha açık ifade etmek gerekirse, bağlanmanın kaçınma ve kaygı boyutları ile yakın ilişki inançları olan yakınlık, bireysellik, tutku ve dışsal faktörlerin, ilişkide bağlılığı açıklamadaki yordayıcılıklarını incelemek hedeflenmiştir.

### 1.3 Çalışmanın Önemi

Bu çalışma hem araştırma olarak hem de psikolojik danışmanlık uygulamalarına ışık tutmak açısından önem taşımaktadır. Öncelikle araştırmanın bağlanma, yakın ilişki inançları ve bağlılığı kavram olarak tanımlama ve ölçme yönü güçlü olarak nitelendirilebilir. Çalışmanın bağımlı değişkeni olan bağlılık ile başlamak gerekirse, bağlılığın nasıl tanımlanıp ölçüleceğine karar vermeden önce literatürdeki mevcut tartışmalar incelenmiştir. Arriaga ve Agnew 'ın (2001) da belirttiği gibi bağlılık sadece kişinin mevcut ilişkisinin devam ediyor olmasına indirgenmemeli, bunun ötesinde duygusal, bilişsel ve motivasyonel bileşenleri içeren bir psikolojik durum olarak tanımlanmalıdır. Stanley, Whitton ve Markman'ın (2004) da belirttiği gibi, kişiler ilişkilerine kişisel bir bağlılıkları/ adanmışlıkları varsa sağlıklı ve mutlu bir ilişkiye sahip olabilirler. Eğer sadece evlilik kurumuna bağlı oldukları için ilişki içinde kalmaya devam ediyorlarsa bu bağlılığın zayıf ve yetersiz bir tanımıdır. Bu çalışma, üniversite öğrencileri örnekleminde kısıtlamaların da uygun olmadığını varsayarak bağlılığı adanmışlık olarak tanımlaması ve bu adanmışlığı evli olmayan insanlar için özellikle geliştirilen bir ölçekle ölçmesi (Owen ve ark., 2011) bakımından önemlidir.

Yakın ilişki inançlarının tanımlanması ve ölçülmesinde de benzer bir titizlik gösterilmiş, ilişki inançlarının işe vuruk tanımlamasında, rasyonel olmayan ilişki inançları gibi negatif odağı olan bir ölçek yerine, ilişkileri hangi inançların başarılı kıldığına ilişkin koruyucu ruh sağlığına hizmet edebilecek bir tanımlama seçilmiştir. Ayrıca kavram, birçok farklı inancı içeren geniş bir ölçekle ölçülmüştür. Bu ölçümün diğer bir güçlü yanı sadece genel ilişki inançlarını

ölçmesidir. Fletcher ve Kininmonth'un da (1992) belirttiği gibi bazı ilişki inancı ölçeklerinde hem genel ilişki inançları hem de kişinin o andaki mevcut ilişkisine yönelik inançlarını ölçen maddeler aynı ölçekte yer almakta ve bu durum bir ölçme hatası olarak nitelendirilmekte ve ölçeğin geçerliği konusunda problem yaratığı öne sürülmektedir. Bu çalışmada seçilen söz konusu ölçekle, bu olası geçerlik sorunu da ortadan kaldırılmıştır.

Benzer olarak bağlanma kavramı da son zamanlarda araştırmacıların önerdiği gibi kategorik bir yapı ile değil, veri kaybını en aza indirgeyen ve kuramsal olarak son yıllarda geçerliliği daha çok kabul edilen iki sürekli kaygı ve kaçınma boyutu olarak tanımlanmış ve kavram, üniversite örnekleminde uygunluğu önceden test edilmiş olan YİYE-II ile ölçülmüştür (Selçuk ve ark., 2005).

Çalışmanın ölçme adına bir diğer önemi, iki ölçme aracının, Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği ve gözden geçirilmiş Bağlanma Envanteri, bu çalışmanın pilot uygulaması kapsamında Türkçeye çevrilmiş olması ve Türk örnekleminde geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmalarının yapılmış olmasıdır. Bu ölçeklerin Türkçeye çevrilmiş ve psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmiş olması da bundan sonraki Türk çalışmalarına katkıda bulunacaktır.

Psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik uygulamaları adına bakıldığında çalışmanın genç yetişkinlerle yapılmış olması önem taşımaktadır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin öğrenci danışma merkezlerine en çok başvurma nedenlerinin başında romantik ilişkilerdeki deneyimleri ve güçlüklerinin geldiği bilinmektedir (Creasey, Kershaw, ve Boston, 1999). Romantik ilişkiler genç yetişkinlerin hayatının merkezini oluşturmakta (Demir, 2008) ve 18-26 yaşları arasındaki gençlerin en önemli psiko-sosyal gelişimsel görevi olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Erikson, 1968). Ayrıca ilk yaşanan romantik ilişkilerle oluşturulan algı ve beklentilerin daha sonraki ilişkileri etkilediği ve kişilerin daha sonraki yakın ilişkilerinin kalitesini ve evlilikteki eş seçimlerini belirlediği bilinmektedir (Furman, 2002; Le ve ark., 2010). Bu çalışmanın bulguları doğrultusunda üniversite öğrencilerinin ilişki inançlarına yönelik önleyici çalışmalar düzenlemek ve uzun vadede daha bağlı ve sağlıklı ilişkiler yaşayabilmelerine katkı sağlama imkanı olabilecektir. Bağlı ve sağlıklı ilişkiler yaşayabilme ve sürdürebilmenin yetişkin ruh sağlığına olumlu katkısı göz önünde bulundurulduğunda (Coie ve

ark., 1993; Kiecolt-Glaser ve ark., 1993; Beach, Smith, ve Fincham, 1994; Forthofer ve ark., 1996; Sinclair, ve Nelson, 1998; Dandurand, Bouaziz, ve Lafontaine, 2013) çalışmanın bulguları toplum ruh sağlığına hizmet eder nitelikte kullanılabilecektir.

Evlilik eğitimi ile ilgili bir araştırmanın eğitimi almış ancak sonrasında boşanmış olan katılımcıları, söz konusu evlilik eğitimini bir bağlılık kararı almadan önce almamış olmaktan ötürü pişmanlıklarını belirtmişlerdir (Scott ve ark.., 2013). Gelişimsel olarak üniversite öğrencileri hayatlarının bu döneminde yakın ilişkiler konusunda meraklı ve öğrenmeye açık olmaktadırlar. Bu nedenle bu yaş dönemi konuyla ilgili psiko-eğitim çalışmalarını düzenlemek ve uygulamak için oldukça elverişli ve verimlidir (Küçükarslan & Gizir, 2014).

İnançlar kişilerin eşlerinden bağımsız olarak ilişkiye getirdikleri şeylerdir (DeBord, Romans, ve Krieshok, 1996) ve bazı ilişki inançlarının psiko-eğitim ile değiştirilebileceği bilinmektedir (Mazaheri ve Mousavi, 2011). Bu çalışmada bağlılığı olumu etkileyen ilişki inançları saptanabildiği takdirde, üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik olarak doğru zamanda ve doğru içerikle uygun eğitim programları düzenlemek ve genç yetişkinlerin sonraki romantik ilişkilerini ve evliliklerini olumlu yönde etkileyebilmek mümkün olacaktır.

## 2. YÖNTEM

Bu bölümde örneklem, veri toplama araçları, veri toplama süreci ve verilerin analizleri ile ilgili bölümler yer almaktadır.

### 2.1 Örneklem

Araştırmaya, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nde eğitim gören 485 (287 kadın, 197 erkek, ve 1 katılımcı cinsiyetini belirtmemiş) öğrenci gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. Öğrencilerin yaşları 18 ile 31 arasında değişmektedir ve yaş ortalaması 21.97'dir (SS=1.80).

### 2.2 Veri Toplama Araçları

Bu çalışmada toplam 4 veri toplama aracı kullanılmıştır: (1) Demografik Bilgi Formu (DBF), (2) Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II (YİYE-II), (3) Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği (Yİİ), (4) Bağlılık Envanteri (BE). Veri toplama araçları ile ilgili ayrıntılı bilgi aşağıdaki bölümlerde verilmektedir.

### 2.2.1 Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II (YİYE-II)

Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri Fraley ve arkadaşları (2000) tarafından yetişkin bağlanma boyutlarını ölçmek üzere geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek 36 maddeden oluşmuştur ve her bir madde 7 dereceli yanıt formatına sahiptir. Ölçeğin kaygı ve kaçınma olmak üzere 2 alt boyutu vardır ve her bir alt boyut 18 madde ile ölçülmektedir. Test tekrar test katsayısı kaygı için .93, kaçınma için .95 olarak rapor edilmiştir (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000).

Ölçeğin Türkçe uyarlama çalışmaları Selçuk ve arkadaşları (2005) tarafından yapılmıştır. İç tutarlılık katsayısı kaçınma için .90, kaygı için .86 olarak bildirilmiştir. Test tekrar test katsayıları da kaçınma için .81, kaygı için .82 olarak rapor edilmiştir. Ölçeğin orijinal faktör yapısını test etmek için Açımlayıcı ve Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizi kullanılmıştır. Bu analizlerin uyum değerleri sonuçlarına göre ölçek Türk örnekleminde de orijinal 2 faktörlü yapısını korumaktadır. Ölçeğin Cronbach alfa katsayısı bu çalışmada kaçınma için .89 kaygı için .86 olarak hesaplanmıştır.

### 2.2.2 Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği (Yİİ)

Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği Fletcher ve Kininmonth (1992) tarafından yakın ilişkileri başarılı kılan inançları ölçmek amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek 6 dereceli yanıt formatına sahip 54 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçekte 18 farklı ilişki inancı ölçülmektedir ve bunlar 4 farklı ilişki inancı boyutu olarak gruplanmıştır: yakınlık, bireysellik, tutku ve dışsal faktörler. Ölçeğin Türkçeye uyarlaması, bu çalışma kapsamında araştırmacı tarafından yapılmıştır. Türkçe uyarlama süreci aşağıdaki bölümlerde özetlenmiştir.

#### *2.2.2.1 Ölçek Çeviri Çalışması*

Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeğinin Türkçe çeviri çalışmaları "çeviri tekrar çeviri" yöntemiyle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çeviri çalışmasında izlenen adımlar şu şekildedir: Öncelikle ölçek 3 uzman tarafından (1 psikolojik danışmanlık ve rehberlik doktora öğrencisi, 1 psikolog ve 1 İngilizce öğretmeni) İngilizceden Türkçeye çevrilmiştir. Araştırmacılar, yapılan çevirileri karşılaştırıp, en uygun çeviriyi belirleyip Türkçe formu oluşturmuşlardır. Daha sonra farklı 3 uzman (1 psikolojik danışmanlık ve rehberlik profesörü, 1 psikolog ve 1 İngilizce öğretmeni) Türkçe formu tekrar İngilizceye çevirmişlerdir. Tekrar çeviriler araştırmacılar tarafından kıyaslanmış ve değerlendirilmiştir. Son olarak veri

toplanmadan önce Türkçe form 2 dilli (Türk-İngiliz) bir psikolog tarafından kontrol edilmiştir.

#### *2.2.2.2 Ölçek Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması*

Ölçeğin güvenirlik ve geçerliğini belirlemek amacıyla Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nde okuyan 385 (263 kadın, 121 erkek, ve 1 kişi cinsiyetini belirtmemiş) öğrenci ile pilot çalışma yapılmıştır. Pilot çalışmada yer alan katılımcılar, ana çalışmaya katılmamıştır. Katılımcıların yaşı 19 ve 34 arasında değişmektedir. Yaş ortalaması 22.17 (*SS* = 1.74) olarak hesaplanmıştır.

Ölçeğin Türkçe formunun yapı geçerliğini test etmek için Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizi kullanılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre ölçek yeterli (zayıf) uyum indekslerine sahiptir: [$\chi^2$ (1371) =4311.886, bollen-stine düzeltilmiş $p$ =.00; $\chi^2/df$-*oranı*= 3.15; CFI= .55, SRMR = .11, RMSEA = .08].

Ölçeğin uyum geçerliğini kanıtlamak için katılımcılara ölçekle birlikte Aşka İlişkin Tutumlar ölçeği (Hendrick, Dicke, ve Hendrick, 1998), ve Romantik İlişkilerde Gelecek Zaman Yönelimi ölçeği (Öner, 2000) verilmiştir. Aşka İlişkin tutumların 6 alt boyutu bulunmaktadır: özgeci aşk, tutkulu aşk, sahiplenici aşk, arkadaşça aşk, mantıklı aşk ve oyun gibi aşk. Uyum geçerliği çalışması kapsamında, bu 6 aşk türü ve romantik ilişkilerde gelecek zamanı yönelimi ile, Yakın İlişki İnançlarının 4 boyutu olan yakınlık, bireysellik, tutku ve dışsal faktörler arasındaki ilişkiye bakılmıştır. Sonuçlar göstermiştir ki, Türkçeye çevrilen İlişki İnançları Ölçeğinin alt boyutları ile diğer ilişki inançları arasında anlamlı ilişkiler vardır (bakınız Tablo 3.3).

Ölçeğin güvenirlik çalışması kapsamında Cronbach alfa iç tutarlık katsayısı yakınlık için .87, bireysellik için .69, tutku için .74, ve dışsal faktörler için .76 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Ayrıca Guttman iki-yarı korelasyon katsayısı yakınlık için .80, bireysellik için .72, tutku için .75 ve dışsal faktörler için .74 olarak hesaplanmıştır.

### 2.2.3 Bağlılık Envanteri (BE)

Bağlılık Envanteri Owen ve arkadaşları tarafından (2011) yakın ilişkilerde bağlılığı ölçmek amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek 7 dereceli yanıt formatında 25 maddeden oluşmaktadır. 7 alt boyuttan oluşan ölçeğin 1 alt boyutu ilişkiye adanmışlığı ölçmekte, diğer 6 alt boyut da kişilerin ilişkide kalmaya devam etmesini sağlayan kısıtlayıcıları ölçmeye yöneliktir. Bu kısıtlayıcılar şu şekildedir:

sosyal baskı, maddi alternatifler, bitirme süreci, eşin iyilik hali ile ilgili endişe, diğer eşlerin ulaşılabilirliği, maddi yatırımlar. Ölçeğin Türkçeye uyarlaması, bu çalışma kapsamında araştırmacı tarafından yapılmıştır. Türkçe uyarlama süreci aşağıdaki bölümlerde özetlenmiştir.

#### *2.2.3.1 Ölçek Çeviri Çalışması*

Bağlılık Envanterinin Türkçe çeviri çalışmaları "çeviri tekrar çeviri" yöntemiyle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çeviri çalışmasında izlenen adımlar şu şekildedir: Öncelikle ölçek 3 uzman tarafından (1 psikolojik danışmanlık ve rehberlik doktora öğrencisi, 1 psikolog ve 1 İngilizce öğretmeni) İngilizceden Türkçeye çevrilmiştir. Araştırmacılar, yapılan çevirileri karşılaştırıp, en uygun çeviriyi belirleyip Türkçe formu oluşturmuşlardır. Daha sonra farklı 3 uzman (1 psikolojik danışmanlık ve rehberlik profesörü, 1 psikolog ve 1 İngilizce öğretmeni) Türkçe formu tekrar İngilizceye çevirmişlerdir. Tekrar çeviriler araştırmacılar tarafından kıyaslanmış ve değerlendirilmiştir. Son olarak veri toplanmadan önce Türkçe form 2 dilli (Türk-İngiliz) bir psikolog tarafından kontrol edilmiştir.

#### *2.2.3.2 Ölçek Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması*

Ölçeğin güvenirlik ve geçerliğini belirlemek amacıyla Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nde okuyan 263 (175 kadın, 88 erkek) gönüllü öğrenci ile pilot çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu pilot çalışmaya katılan katılımcıların en az 2 aydır devam eden bir romantik ilişkisi / partneri bulunmaktadır. Pilot çalışmada yer alan katılımcılar, ana çalışmaya katılmamıştır. Katılımcıların yaşı 18 ve 37 arasında değişmektedir. Yaş ortalaması 22.23 (*SS* = 2.37) olarak hesaplanmıştır.

Ölçeğin Türkçe formunun yapı geçerliğini test etmek için Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizi kullanılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre ölçek yeterli uyum indekslerine sahiptir: [bollensteine $\chi^2$ (254) = 507.773, $p$ = .00; bollensteine $\chi^2/df$-*oranı* = 1.99; CFI = .85, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .06].

Ölçeğin uyum geçerliğini kanıtlamak için katılımcılara ölçekle birlikte Buunk tarafından geliştirilen (1981) ve Karakurt (2001) tarafından Türkçeye çevrilen Duygusal Bağlılık Ölçeği ve Jones, Olderbak ve Figueredo (2011) tarafından geliştirilen ve Toplu-Demirtaş ve Tezer (2013) tarafından Türkçeye çevrilen aldatmaya karşı tutum ölçeği verilmiştir. Bunlara ek olarak araştırmacı, ölçeğin geçerlilik çalışması için adanmışlık ve kısıtlayıcılar boyutlarının her birisi için olmak üzere toplamda 7 soru geliştirilmiş ve katılımcıların kendilerini 1 ile 10

arasında değerlendirmelerini istemiştir. Sonuçlar adanmışlık alt boyutunun beklenildiği üzere duygusal bağlılık ölçeği ile olumlu, aldatmaya karşı tutum ölçeği ile olumsuz, araştırmacının geliştirdiği adanmışlık sorusu ile olumlu ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkilere sahip olduğunu göstermiştir (bakınız Tablo 3.4). Kısıtlayıcılar boyutunda ise, maddi alternatifler, bitirme süreci ve eşin iyilik hali ile ilgili endişe alt boyutları araştırmacının geliştirdiği kısıtlayıcılar soruları ile istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olumlu ilişkiler gösterirken, sosyal baskı, diğer eşlerin ulaşılabilirliği ve maddi yatırımlar alt boyutları anlamlı ilişkiler göstermemiştir. Kısıtlayıcıların, birlikte yaşama ya da evlilik ilişkisi gibi ilişkilerde daha geçerli olduğu göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, flört eden üniversite öğrencileri popülasyonunda mevcut örneklem için anlamlı olmaması, araştırmacılar tarafından anlaşılabilir bulunmuştur.

Ölçeğin güvenirlik çalışması kapsamında Cronbach alfa iç tutarlık katsayısı adanmışlık için .76, maddi alternatifler için .62, bitirme süreci için .70, eşin iyilik hali ile ilgili endişe için .79, diğer eşlerin ulaşılabilirliği için .59, maddi yatırımlar için .68, sosyal baskı için .64 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Ayrıca Guttman iki-yarı korelasyon katsayısı adanmışlık için .79, maddi alternatifler için .49, bitirme süreci için .68, eşin iyilik hali ile ilgili endişe için .79, diğer eşlerin ulaşılabilirliği için .59, maddi yatırımlar için .68, sosyal baskı için .54 olarak hesaplanmıştır.

### 2.3 İşlem

Bu çalışma için öncelikle Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi'nden Etik Kurul izni alınmıştır ve veri toplama sürecine bundan sonra başlanmıştır. Daha sonra uygulama yapılacak derslerin öğretim elemanlarından gerekli onaylar alındıktan sonra araştırmada kullanılacak ölçüm araçları sınıf ortamında gönüllü katılımı olan üniversite öğrencilerine uygulanmıştır. Ana çalışmanın verileri 2014-2015 akademik yılı bahar döneminde toplanmış ve katılımcıların anket uygulamalarını tamamlamaları yaklaşık 20-25 dakika sürmüştür.

### 2.4 Verilerin Analizi

Araştırmanın ilk basamağı olarak betimleyici istatistik yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Daha sonrasında ise araştırmanın değişkenleri arasındaki ilişkileri test etmek için Yol Analizi kullanılmıştır (Full Mediation Path Analysis). Yol

analizlerinden sonra da ara değişkenlerin etkisinin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olup olmadığını test etmek için Sobel test kullanılmıştır. Tüm bu analizlerin gerçekleştirilmesinde program olarak SPSS, AMOS - 18.0 (Arbuckle, 2008), ve LISREL8.51 (Hoyle, 1995) kullanılmıştır.

### 2.5 Sınırlılıklar

Her çalışmanın olduğu gibi bu çalışmanın da sınırlılıkları mevcuttur ve çalışmanın sonuçları bu sınırlılıklar göz önünde bulundurularak değerlendirilmelidir. Öncelikle bu çalışma öz bildirim yöntemi ile veri toplamıştır ve öz bildirim yöntemi ile ilgili tüm eleştiriler bu çalışma için de geçerlidir. İkinci sınırlılık çalışmanın seçkisiz örneklem yöntemini kullanmış olması ve çalışmanın sadece Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi öğrencileri ile yürütülmüş olmasıdır. Bunlar çalışmanın bulgularının başka üniversite öğrencilerine ya da daha geniş olarak Türkiye'nin popülasyonuna genellenmesine yönelik olarak tedbirli olunmasını gerekli kılmaktadır. Son olarak da çalışmanın kesitsel bir yapısının olması nedeniyle değişkenler arasında neden-sonuç ilişkileri iddia etmek mümkün olmamaktadır.

## 3. BULGULAR

İlk olarak 610 kişiden toplanan veri seti eksik ve yanlış girilmiş veriler açısından kontrol edilmiş ve gerekli düzeltmeler yapıldıktan sonra analizler 485 kişi üzerinden yapılmıştır.

### 3.1 Betimleyici İstatistik ve İlişki/Korelasyon Matrisi

Çalışmanın ana analizlerine geçmeden önce veriler betimsel analiz yöntemi ile değerlendirilmiş ve çalışmanın değişkenleri için ortalama ve standart sapma değerleri hesaplanmıştır. Sonuçlar aşağıda, Tablo 3.1'de verilmiştir.

Tablo 3.1
*Çalışmadaki Değişkenlerin Ortalama ve Standart Sapma Değerleri*

| | Kadın (*n* = 287) | | Erkek (*n* = 197) | | Toplam (*n* = 485) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Değişkenler | *Ort.* | *SS* | *Ort.* | *SS* | *Ort.* | *SS* |
| **Bağlanma** | | | | | | |
| Kaygı | 61.36 | 16.78 | 59.02 | 15.24 | 60.40 | 16.17 |
| Kaçınma | 44.63 | 16.70 | 43.17 | 15.65 | 44.03 | 16.27 |
| **İlişki İnançları** | | | | | | |
| Yakınlık | 15.31 | 1.32 | 14.76 | 1.77 | 15.09 | 1.54 |
| Bireysellik | 15.58 | 1.85 | 14.44 | 2.36 | 15.12 | 2.14 |
| Tutku | 14.15 | 2.40 | 13.54 | 2.16 | 13.90 | 2.32 |
| Dışsal Faktörler | 11.62 | 2.05 | 11.71 | 2.15 | 11.65 | 2.09 |
| **Bağlılık** | 43.25 | 8.64 | 42.55 | 9.30 | 42.94 | 8.92 |

Değişkenler arası ilişkileri belirlemek için de korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Değişkenler arasındaki korelasyonlar aşağıda Tablo 3.2'de verildiği gibidir.

Tablo 3.2

*Çalışmadaki Değişkenler için Korelasyon Matrisi*

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Kaygı | - | | | | | | |
| 2.Kaçınma | .40** | - | | | | | |
| 3.Yakınlık | -.04 | -.40** | - | | | | |
| 4.Bireysellik | -.07 | -.15** | .26** | - | | | |
| 5.Tutku | -.03 | -.24** | .42** | .30** | - | | |
| 6.Dışsal faktörler | .17** | .15** | .36** | .08 | .25** | - | |
| 7.Bağlılık | -.21** | -.49** | .49** | -.03 | .06 | -.03 | - |

***p < .01*

**3.2 Yol analizi**

Yol analizlerinde değişkenler arasındaki beta yükleri (path coefficient) incelenmiş ve hangi değişkenler arasında anlamlı ilişki olduğuna bakılmıştır. Yol modelinde test edilen toplam 14 yoldan 3 tanesi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı çıkmamış, diğer tüm yollar anlamlı çıkmıştır. Anlamlı çıkmayan yollar, bağlanma kaygısından bağlılığa olan yol, bağlanma kaygısından bireysellik inancına olan yol ve bağlanma kaygısından tutku inancına olan yoldur. Çalışmada istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bulunan yollar şu şekilde özetlenebilir:

1. Bağlanma kaygısı değişkeninin yakınlık inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitiftir (.14)

2. Bağlanma kaygısı değişkeninin dışsal faktörler inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitiftir (.13).

3. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkenin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.28).

4. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkeninin yakınlık inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.46).

5. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkeninin bireysellik inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.14).

6. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkeninin tutku inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.27).
7. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkeninin dışsal faktörler inancı üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitiftir (.10).
8. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkenin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.28).
9. Yakınlık inancı değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitiftir (.50).
10. Bireysellik inancı değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.15).
11. Tutku inancı değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.15).
12. Dışsal faktörler inancı değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.10).
13. Bağlanma kaygısı değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki dolaylı etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitiftir (.05).
14. Bağlanma kaçınması değişkeninin bağlılık üzerindeki dolaylı etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve negatiftir (-.18).

Bir ara değişkenin ara değişken olarak (*mediator*) tanımlanabilmesi için bağımsız değişkenin bağımlı değişken üzerinde hem doğrudan hem de dolaylı bir etkisinin olması ön koşulu vardır (Baron ve Kenny, 1986). Bağlanma kaçınmasının bağlılık üzerinde hem doğrudan hem de dolaylı etkisi olduğundan, yakın ilişki inançlarının ara değişken olarak istatistiksel olarak anlamlılığı ayrıca araştırılmış ve Sobel test kullanılarak test edilmiştir (Sobel, 1982). Sobel test sonuçları göstermiştir ki yakınlık inancı ($z$ = -8.62, $p$< .001), bireysellik inancı ($z$ = *2.20*, $p$< .05) , ve tutku inancı ($z$ = 3.47, $p$< .01) bağlanma kaçınması ve bağlılık arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ara değişken etkisine sahiptir (*mediation effect*). Aynı etki, dışsal faktörler inancı için istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bulunmamıştır ($z$ = -1.88, $p$ > .05).

Değişkenler arası toplam etki, doğrudan etki ve dolaylı etkilerin toplanması ile elde edilmektedir (Kline, 2005). Bu çalışmada bağlanma kaygısının bağlılık üzerindeki toplam etkisi -.02 (istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değil) ve

bağlanma kaçınmasının bağlılık üzerindeki toplam etkisi -.46** (istatistiksel olarak anlamlı) olarak hesaplanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada yol modelini açıklayan varyanslar korelasyon katsayısının karesine ($R^2$) bakılarak değerlendirilmiş ve yol modelindeki değişkenlerin bağlılıktaki varyansın %47'sini açıkladığı görülmüştür.

## 4. TARTIŞMA

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı bağlanma stili ve yakın ilişki inançlarının romantik ilişkilerdeki bağlılığı ne ölçüde yordadığını test etmektir. Bunun için öncelikle Yakın İlişki İnançları Ölçeği ve Bağlılık Envanteri Türkçeye çevrilmiş ve pilot çalışma kapsamında güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışmaları yapılmıştır. Pilot çalışma sonunda her iki ölçeğin de güvenirlik ve geçerlilik kanıtlarının orijinal çalışmaları ile benzer olduğu bulunmuştur.

Ana çalışmaların bulguları incelendiğinde bağlanmanın bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkileri ile ilgili bulgular önceki yazınla paralellik göstermektedir. Açıklamak gerekirse, bu çalışmada bağlanma kaçınmasının bağlılık üzerinde olumsuz ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir doğrudan etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur ve daha önceki literatür de bunu destekler niteliktedir (Birnie eve ark., 2009; Schindler, Fagundes, & Murdock, 2010; Ho ve ark., 2012; Li & Chan, 2012; Dandurand, Bouaziz, & Lafontaine, 2013; Givertz ve ark., 2013; Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014; Saucedo-Coy, & McInnes-Miller, 2014). Benzer olarak bu çalışmanın bağlanma kaygısının bağlılık üzerindeki doğrudan etkisini istatistiksel olarak anlamsız bulması da önceki yazın tarafından desteklenmektedir (Joel, MacDonald, ve Shimotomai, 2011). Araştırmacılar, bağlanma kaygısı yüksek insanların bağlılık konusunda hem büyük bir istek duyduklarını hem de ilişkide terk edilmekten korkmaları ve ilişki doyumlarının düşük olmasının bağlılığı olumsuz etkilediğini ve bu çelişkili etkilerin bağlılık konusundaki bulguları istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olmaktan uzaklaştırdığını belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca bazı çalışmalar da bağlanma kaygısının, bağlılığın bu araştırmada ölçülen adanmışlık bileşeninden ziyade, yapısal bağlılığı daha iyi yordadığını belirtmiştir (Ho ve ark., 2012).

Çalışmanın tartışılması gereken bir diğer bulgusu, ölçülen yakın ilişki inançlarının hepsinin bağlılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olarak tahmin edebiliyor olmasıyla birlikte, ilişkinin yönünün beklenenden farklı olmasıdır. Açıklamak

gerekirse ölçeğin orijinalini geliştiren yazarların belirttiği üzere (Fletcher & Kininmonth, 1992), yakın ilişki inançları ölçeği, ilişkiyi başarılı kılan inançları ölçmek üzere geliştirilmiştir. Böyle bir ilişki inancı grubunun, ilişkideki doyum ve bağlılık gibi temel ilişki deneyimleri ile olumlu bir ilişkisinin olması beklenirken, bu çalışmada yakınlık haricindeki diğer üç inancın (bireysellik, tutku ve dışsal faktörler) bağlılık ile olumsuz ilişki göstermiş olması değerlendirilmesi gereken bir bulgudur. Bazı çalışmalar, ilişki inançlarının öneminin ve o kültürdeki ilişkiler için işlevsel olup olmayacağının kültüre göre değişebileceğini göstermiştir (Möller & Zyl, 1991; Gao, 2001; Medora ve ark., 2002; Hamamcı, 2005). Benzer şekilde bu çalışmada da bazı kültürel etkilerin rol oynamış olabileceği düşünülmüştür.

Çalışmanın tartışılması gereken bir diğer önemli sonucu, yakın ilişki inançlarının ara değişken (*mediator*) olarak bağlanma kaygısı ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkideki rolüdür. Yapılan analizler, yakınlık, bireysellik ve tutku inançlarının istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ara değişken rolü olduğunu, ancak dışsal faktörler inancının istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ara değişken rolü olmadığını göstermiştir. Dışsal faktörlerin flört ilişkisinde çok geçerli olmadığı düşünüldüğünde, bu bulgunun anlaşılabilir olduğu düşünülmüştür. Ara değişken analizlerinin bir diğer önemli sonucu da yakınlık inancının, bağlanma kaygısının bağlılık etkisi üzerindeki olumsuz etkisini düşürücü rolüdür.

Bu çalışma ve bulguları birçok açıdan önem teşkil etmektedir. Öncelikle, bu çalışma kapsamında iki tane ölçek (Yakın İlişki İnançları ölçeği ve gözden geçirilmiş Bağlılık Envanteri) Türkçeye çevrilmiş ve pilot uygulamalarda geçerlik/ güvenirlik çalışmaları yapılmıştır. Bu ölçeklerin Türkçeye kazandırılmış olması bundan sonra bu konuda daha fazla kültürlerarası çalışma yapılmasını mümkün kılacaktır. Aslında çalışmanın bulguları da, özellikle ilişki inançlarının dört tanesinden üç tanesinin bağlılık ile olumsuz ilişki göstermesi açısından kültürel farklara yönelik daha fazla çalışma yapmanın gerekliliğini ortaya koymuştur.

Çalışmanın bir diğer önemi, yakın ilişki inançlarının bağlanma kaygısı ve bağlılık arasında bir ara değişken rolü oynadığını ortaya koymuş olmasıdır. Özellikle yakınlık inancının bağlanma kaçınmasının bağlılık üzerindeki olumsuz

etkisini azalttığını göstermesi, daha sonra bu konuda yapılabilecek koruyucu ruh sağlığı çalışmalarına ışık tutabilir niteliktedir.

**Kuramsal ve Uygulamaya Yönelik Öneriler**

Öncelikle, bu çalışma kapsamında Türkçeye çevirisi ve uyarlaması gerçekleştirilen gözden geçirilmiş Bağlılık Envanterinin evli çiftler örnekleminde tekrar test edilmesi önerilebilir. Çalışma içinde daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, bu envanterin kısıtlayıcılar alt boyutu, üniversite öğrencilerinin flört ilişkilerinden ziyade, evlilik gibi hayatın daha fazla paylaşıldığı gruplarda geçerlidir ve bu gruplar için tekrar test edilmesi uygun olabilir. İkinci bir öneri, çoğu bağlılık üzerinde olumsuz bir etkiye sahipmiş gibi görünen yakın ilişki inançlarının ilişki doyumu ya da ilişki doyumu gibi diğer kritik ilişki değişkenleri ile ilişkisinin araştırılması olabilir. Böylece Türk kültüründe sadece bağlılıkla mı yoksa diğer ilişki değişkenleri ile de mi olumsuz ilişki gösterdiği bilgisine ulaşılabilir. Yine aynı konu ile ilgili olarak üçüncü bir öneri, yakın ilişki inançları ve bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin başka kültürlerde de test edilmesi ve kültürler arası farkların tespit edilip edilmediğine bakılması olabilir. Bir diğer öneri Türk kültüründe bağlılığı yordayabilecek farklı ilişki inancı ölçeklerinin de test edilmesi olabilir. Ayrıca bundan sonraki çalışmalar, farklı analizler kullanarak yakınlık inancının, bağlanma kaçınması ve bağlılık arasında bir moderator etkisi olup olmadığını test edebilir.

## APPENDIX I: Curriculum Vitae

**Surname, Name:** Öztekin, Ceyda
**email:** ceydaoztekin@gmail.com
**web address:** www.ceydaoztekin.com

### EDUCATION

| Degree | Institution | Graduation Year |
|---|---|---|
| Ph.D | Middle East Technical University, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Ankara | 2016 |
| M.S. | Middle East Technical University, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Ankara | 2008 |
| B.S. Minor | Middle East Technical University, Business Administration, "General Management" subprogram, Ankara | 2004 |
| B.S. | Middle East Technical University, Psychology, Ankara | 2004 |

### FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Advanced English (TOEFL: 106/120)

### PUBLICATIONS

Oztekin, C. & Tezer, E. (2009). The Role of Sense of Coherence and Physical Activity in Positive and Negative Affect of Turkish Adolescents. *Adolescence, 44*(174), 422-432.

**WORK EXPERIENCE**

| Year | Place | Position |
|---|---|---|
| 2013-present | Boylam Psychiatry Center | Family and Marriage Counselor / Child Psychologist |
| 2011 - 2013 | Madalyon Psychiatry Center | Child Psychologist |
| 2008 - 2011 | BLIS, Bilkent Laboratory and International School, Preschool and Elementary Division | School Psychologist |
| 2006 - 2008 | Middle East Technical University, Psychology Department, Safety Research Unit | Research Project Assistant |
| 2005 - 2006 | Sihirli Bahçe Montessori School | School Psychologist |

## APPENDIX J: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu

**ENSTİTÜ**

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ✓

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

**YAZARIN**

Soyadı : ÖZTEKİN

Adı : CEYDA

Bölümü : EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ

**TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :**ATTACHMENT STYLES AND CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS AS PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

**TEZİN TÜRÜ :** Yüksek Lisans Doktora ✓

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.

2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullancılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ✓

Yazarın imzası ..... Tarih .....