



YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

**MASTER'S PROGRAM IN GUIDANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL
COUNSELING**

**THE PREDICTIVE ROLE OF SELF-CONTROL AND INTERPERSONAL
RELATIONSHIP STYLE IN EXPLAINING RELATIONSHIP
SATISFACTION IN EMERGING ADULTHOOD**

ZEHRA İLKE COŞKUN

September, 2021



YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES DIRECTORATE

THESIS SUBMISSION and APPROVAL FORM

TITLE: The predictive role of self-control and interpersonal relationship style in explaining relationship satisfaction in emerging adulthood

APPROVAL:

Assist. Prof. Serdar Körük
(Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Özabacı
(Member)

Assist. Prof. Zerrin Bölükbaşı Macit
(Member)

SUBMITTED BY : Zehra İlke Coşkun
DATE OF THESIS DEFENSE : 15.09.2021
DATE OF THESIS APPROVAL :

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 rules that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Zehra İlke Coşkun

Signature:

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to examine how the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults is predicted by their self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles. In addition, the relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles of the emerging adults according to demographic variables like gender, marital status, relationship duration, educational status, socioeconomic status was examined. The participants of the study consisted of 293 individuals between the ages of 18-30. The "Demographic Information Form" formed by the researcher to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants in the study, the "Romantic Relationship Satisfaction Scale" to measure the relationship satisfaction levels of the participants, the "Self-Control Scale" to measure the self-control behaviors and behavior patterns of individuals, "Interpersonal Style Scale" was applied to determine the negative communication styles they use in relationships. The data were analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 23 package program. Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the main variables of the study. ANOVA, T-test and Correlation analysis were also used in the study. As a result of the study, it was revealed that romantic relationship satisfaction is predicted by self-control and interpersonal style. According to these results, a positive and significant relationship was found between the "Reformative" and "Experiential" sub-dimensions of the Self-Control Scale and relationship satisfaction. A negative significant relationship was found between the "Avoidant Style" sub-dimension of the Interpersonal Style Scale and relationship satisfaction. In addition, significant relationships were found between romantic relationship satisfaction and marital status, relationship duration, and income level. The findings obtained from the research were evaluated according to the current research and the available literature.

Keywords: Emerging Adulthood, Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, Self-control, Interpersonal Style

ÖZET

Araştırmanın amacı beliren yetişkinlerin romantik ilişki doyumlarının öz-denetim düzeyleri ve kişilerarası ilişki tarzları tarafından nasıl yordandığının incelenmesidir. Ayrıca araştırmada beliren yetişkinlerin cinsiyet, medeni durum, ilişki süresi, öğrenim durumu, sosyoekonomik statü değişkenlerine göre ilişki doyumları, öz-denetim düzeyleri ve kişilerarası ilişki tarzları arasında nasıl bir ilişki olduğunu incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın katılımcılarını 18-30 yaş aralığındaki 293 birey oluşturmuştur. Araştırmada katılımcıların demografik özelliklerini belirlemek amacıyla araştırmacı tarafından oluşturulan “Demografik Bilgi Formu”, katılımcıların ilişki doyum düzeylerini ölçmek amacıyla “Romantik İlişki Doyumu Ölçeği”, bireylerin öz-denetim davranışlarına ilişkin yapılarını ve davranış şekillerini ölçmek amacıyla “Öz-Denetim Ölçeği”, bireylerin kişiler arası ilişkilerde kullandıkları negatif iletişim tarzlarını belirlemek amacıyla “Kişilerarası Tarz Ölçeği” uygulanmıştır. Veriler SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 23 paket programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmanın temel değişkenlerini analiz etmek için çoklu regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada ayrıca ANOVA, t-test ve korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonucunda romantik ilişki doyumunun öz-denetim ve kişilerarası tarz tarafından yordandığı ortaya konmuştur. Bu sonuçlara göre Öz-denetim Ölçeği’nin “İyileştirici” ve “Deneyimsel” alt boyutları ile ilişki doyumu arasında pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Kişilerarası Tarz Ölçeği’nin “Kaçınan Tarz” alt boyutu ile ilişki doyumu arasında negatif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Ayrıca romantik ilişki doyumu ile medeni durum, ilişki süresi ve gelir düzeyi arasında anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgular güncel araştırmalara ve mevcut literatüre göre değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Beliren Yetişkinlik, Romantik İlişki Doyumu, Öz- denetim, Kişilerarası Tarz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis has been a challenging and exciting journey for me. First of all, I would like to thank my advisor Assist. Prof. Serdar Körük, who generously shared his knowledge with me throughout this entire journey, for the valuable information and motivation he provided at every stage of my thesis. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Özabacı and Prof. Dr. Zerrin Bölükbaşı Macit for sharing their suggestions and opinions with me in my thesis jury.

I would like to thank my friend Onur Güzel, whose colleague I am proud of, for his efforts for me and my thesis. Let's continue to learn together throughout our lives. I would like to thank my dear Elif Şuekinçi for giving me the best years of my professional life and encouraging me to start my master's degree.

My mothers, Jülide Bilgili and Zeynep Coşkun, told me that I should think about my lessons first throughout my student life. Thank you so much for trusting me so much. The more you trusted me, the more my confidence grew. I would like to thank Enes Coşkun and Gözde Bilgili for making me laugh when I was most stressed, for taking a break and being more compassionate towards myself.

Finally, I would like to thank my father, Mustafa Bilgili, who taught me the value of hard work and the most kind-hearted and hardworking person I have ever seen in my life. I dedicate my thesis to you, my precious dad.

Zehra İlke Coşkun

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	4
ÖZET	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	6
CHAPTER I.....	10
INTRODUCTION	10
1.1. Problem Statement	10
1.2. Purpose Of The Research.....	14
1.3. The Importance Of The Research	15
1.4. Assumptions	17
1.5. Limitations	17
CHAPTER II.....	18
LITERATURE REVIEW	18
2.1. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction.....	18
2.1.1. Definition and Development of Romantic Relationships	18
2.1.2. Features and Dimensions of Romantic Relationships	20
2.1.3. Definition of Relationship Satisfaction	23
2.1.4. Factors Affecting Relationship Satisfaction	24
2.2. Self-Control	27
2.2.1. Definition of Self-Control	27
2.2.2. Functions of Self-Control Behavior	28
2.2.3. Domains of Self- Control	29
2.3. Interpersonal Relationships	30
2.3.1. Theoretical Approaches to Interpersonal Relationships	32
2.3.2. Interpersonal Communication	34
2.3.3. Interpersonal Styles	35
2.4. Related Researches in Turkey	37
2.5. Related Researches in Abroad.....	41
CHAPTER III	45
METHOD	45
3.1. Design of the Study	45
3.2. Population and Sample of Research.....	45
3.3. Data Collection Tools.....	46

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form.....	47
3.3.2. Relationship Satisfaction Scale	47
3.3.3. Self-Control Scale.....	47
3.3.4. Interpersonal Styles Scale.....	48
3.4. Data Collection Process	49
3.5. Statistics	50
CHAPTER IV	51
FINDINGS.....	51
4.1. Findings Related to Descriptives.....	51
4.2. T-Test Findings Related to Gender	52
4.3. T-Test Findings Related to Marital Status	53
4.4. Correlation Findings Related to Marital Duration	55
4.5. Correlation Findings Related to Relationship Duration for Single Participants	56
4.6. ANOVA Findings Related to Education Level of Participants.....	57
4.7. ANOVA Findings Related to Income of Participants.....	58
4.8. Regression Findings Related to Scales.....	62
CHAPTER V	63
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	63
5.1. Discussion Related to Regression Findings	63
5.1.1. Discussion of Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Self- Control.....	63
5.1.2. Discussion of Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Interpersonal Style.....	64
5.2. Discussion Related To T-Test Findings To Gender.....	66
5.3. Discussion Related To T-Test Findings To Marital Status.....	68
5.4. Discussion Related To Correlation Findings To Marital Duration And Relationship Duration	70
5.5. Discussion Related To ANOVA Findings To Educational Status.....	71
5.6. Discussion Related To ANOVA Findings To Income.....	72
CHAPTER VI.....	76
SUGGESTIONS	76

REFERENCES	77
APPENDICES	88
6.1. Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form	88
6.2. Appendix-2: Relationship Satisfaction Scale	89
6.3. Appendix-3: Self-Control Scale	91
6.4. Appendix-4: Interpersonal Style Scale	94
6.5. Appendix-5: Permission Letter For Relationship Satisfaction Scale	97
6.6. Appendix-6: Permission Letter For Self-Control Scale	98
6.7. Appendix-7: Permission Letter For Interpersonal Style Scale	99
6.8. Appendix-8: Ethics Committee Approval	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics	46
Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Values	49
Table 3. Descriptives	51
Table 4. T-Test Findings to Gender	53
Table 5. T-Test Findings to Marital Status	54
Table 6. Correlations for Marital Duration	55
Table 7. Correlations for Relationship Duration for Single Participants	56
Table 8. ANOVA Findings for Education Level of Participants	57
Table 9. ANOVA Findings for Income of Participants	59
Table 10. Correlations between Variables	61
Table 11. Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Self-control	62
Table 12. Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Interpersonal Style Scale	63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem Statement

Establishing relationships is one of the most important needs of a person since birth. As Yalom (2002) says, no one can surpass the need to establish relationships. The characteristics of the relationships people build with each other are affected by their age periods and developmental needs. The development of romantic relationships begins in adolescence and continues throughout life. In Erikson's psychosocial development theory, after the task of forming identity in adolescence, the new challenge is to establish an intimate relationship with a partner (Erikson 1968 cited in Santrock, 2012). According to the characteristics of the time in which the person is, romantic relationships acquire new aspects and new meanings and serve new features (Furman & Collins, 2009).

In the last half century, changes have started in the roles of young people in the transition to adulthood. Increasing the age of marriage and being parents, widening participation in education, prolonging the education period have extended the way to adulthood. For most young people, from the late teens to the late twenties is a period when they discover their possibilities in love and work and move slowly towards making permanent choices (Arnett, 2009). This period, which corresponds to the age range of 18-29, was named by Arnett (2000, 2009) as the “*emerging adulthood*”. There are 5 distinctive features in emerging adulthood.

The first is *identity exploration*. Emerging adulthood is a period when young individuals discover their identities in love, business and worldview. Creating an identity is a process of trial and decision. It begins in adolescence and continues into emerging adulthood. Romantic relationships are more about the here and now during adolescence and are more experienced in groups. In the emerging adulthood, the individual explores love by spending more dual time and building deeper relationships. Identity focused questions are started to ask such as “who am I?, what kind of person would suit me as the best partner through life?” (Arnett, 2000).

Second, emerging adulthood is an age of *instability* in love and work. In this process young people review their decisions many times in new options. Third, it is a time of *self-focus*. The purpose of self-focus is for the individual to develop skills that will enable them to get to know themselves better before acquiring permanent adult roles in relationships with others, in love and work. Fourthly, it is a stage *feeling in between* adolescence and adult responsibilities. The explorations about identity and the experienced variability make the emerging adults feel stuck in between. Arnett (2009) declares that, when emerging adults are asked whether they feel like adults, their answer is usually "both yes and no". Because according to emerging adults, the criteria for adulthood are taking responsibility, being able to make independent decisions, and being economically independent. In Turkey, according to most emerging adults, the most important criteria for adulthood are "taking own responsibilities and making independent decisions" (Atak & Çok, 2007). Lastly, emerging adulthood is a time of *possibilities* such as new opportunities and options in love and work (Arnett, 2009).

According to the studies conducted in our country, it has been revealed that the emerging adulthood is between the ages of 18-26 (Atak ve Çok 2007, Doğan-Ateş ve ark. 2007). As the research conducted by Atak and Çok (2008) indicates, the increase in the education level and the postponement of the age of marriage also delayed becoming a parent. The age of marriage has increased by an average of 3 years in the last 20 years in Turkey (TUIK, 2018).

As stated above, there are identity exploration, instability, self-focus, endless possibilities, feeling in-betweenness and uncertainty in emerging adulthood. All these characteristics are thought to affect the individual's interpersonal relationship and ability to manage behaviors.

The relationship that an individual establishes with his / her social environment is important for his / her life satisfaction. Studies have been carried out to show that close relationships are the main source of happiness, stress and protecting health as well as being a development task. According to the studies on friendship, family and romantic relationships, it has been found that all social relationships are effective on happiness and psychological well-being. Social relationships have a strong effect on the prevention of ill-health, mental disorder and other forms of

distress. In addition, a romantic relationship is the type of social relationship that most affects happiness and well-being. (Argyle, 2001; Argyle & Martin, 1991; Berkman and Syme, 1979).

As a result of the study on sources of satisfaction in different relationship areas, they concluded that satisfying relationships have three important characteristics. It was stated that these three factors bring satisfaction and make people happy: instrumental help, emotional support and companionship (Argyle & Martin, 1991).

According to Collins and van Dulmen (2006), there is an important continuity in all close relationships such as parent-child, friendship and romantic relationships. The characteristics of the relationship that occurs in one period constitute the basis of the nature of the relationship in the next period. For this reason, the closeness, consistency, and satisfaction of relationships in emerging adulthood are important for the individual's future relationship developments (cited in Fincham&Cui, 2011).

As stated in the person-centered approach of Rogers (1956), the relationship should have 3 qualities in order for individuals to be more psychologically compatible and experience relationship satisfaction. Unconditional acceptance, understanding and openness. These 3 qualities are directly related to each other and to romantic relationship satisfaction. Cramer (2003), in his study, revealed that these qualities expressed by Rogers are positively related to relationship satisfaction (cited in Cramer, 2004).

Social support is a very necessary factor for partners to experience relationship satisfaction. Cutrona (1996) made important inferences about why social support increases relationship satisfaction. The first is to prevent the person from isolating and withdrawing in difficult situations thanks to social support. Thus, the partner does not experience the negative effects of loneliness in times of stress. Secondly, social support in the relationship prevents depression. Third, it provides less tension in conflicts in relationships. Finally, social support leads to increased intimacy in the relationship. These four mechanisms can be interpreted according to the social learning model. According to the social learning model, support provides positive

experiences, while the lack or lack of support reveals negative experiences (Cutrona, 1996 cited in Cramer, 2004).

The desire to try to increase positive experiences and minimize negative experiences is one of the most basic behavioral laws of psychology (Alicke & Sedikides, 2009). Self-control level is very important to understand the nature and characteristics of the individual. Individuals with high self-control show less psychopathology and less food and alcohol addiction. There is also a positive relationship with self-control, better relationships, interpersonal skills, and secure attachment (Tangney et al., 2004). Also, there is a relationship between behavior and impulse control disorder, addiction, violence, emotional problems, school absenteeism, inability to complete tasks and relationship problems in individuals with low self-control (Baumeister et al., 2007).

Self-control has a psychologically desirable and particularly positive relationship. Individuals with good self-control show less aggression and commit less crime. These individuals have better psychological adjustment, their academic success and interpersonal relationships. Less financial, impulse control problems, eating disorders, alcohol and substance addiction are associated with higher self-control (Frieze & Hofmann, 2009).

Many studies have been conducted on the relationship of interpersonal relationship styles with psychological and physical health. When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are significant relationships between psychopathologies and physical ailments and negative interpersonal style. Inhibiting relationship styles were found to be associated with depression and anger (Şahin, Batıgün, & Koç, 2011). In a study investigating the relationship of interpersonal relationship styles with subjective well-being, it was concluded that nurturing relationship style was positively related to subjective well-being, and inhibitory relationship style was negatively related to subjective well-being (Doğan & Sapmaz, 2012). In another study, it was revealed that individuals with anxiety disorder have a more negative interpersonal relationship style than those who do not. In addition, it has been concluded that satisfaction with interpersonal relationships has an important role in understanding more severe anxiety symptoms (Şahin, Batıgün, & Uzun, 2011).

In the light of the information above, it is thought that it is important to investigate whether the level of self-control and interpersonal style have a predictive effect on emerging adults' romantic relationships.

1.2. Purpose of the Research

The aim of this study is to examine how the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults is predicted by their self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles. In addition, it was aimed to determine how the relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles of the emerging adults differ according to various demographic variables (gender, marital status, relationship duration, educational status, socioeconomic status). In line with these purposes, answers to the following questions were sought:

Accordingly, the purpose of the study the main research question is presented below:

- Is the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults predicted by their self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles?

Sub-research questions are as follows:

1. Do emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to

- a) Gender,
- b) Marital status,
- c) Education level
- d) Socioeconomic status ?

2. Is there any relationship between emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles according to the

- a) duration of marriage and
- b) duration of romantic relationship ?

1.3. The Importance of the Research

The emerging adulthood is a time when young people are willing to explore as many options as possible. This gives the opportunity to enter different social environments and develop new relationships (Arnett, 2003). Romantic relationships have an important effect on the development of the individual in emerging adulthood, where identity exploration is experienced in love and big cognitive, social and emotional changes occur (Eryılmaz& Ercan, 2010).

Fincham and Cui (2011) stated 3 reasons for the importance of romantic relationships in emerging adulthood. First, initiating and maintaining romantic relationships are critical developmental tasks of this period. Experiencing the relationship and seeing its options affect relationship experiences later in life. Secondly, there are many studies show that romantic relationships have an impact on emerging adults' well-being and behavioral adjustment. Third, the characteristics and form of relationships experienced in emerging adulthood may be predictive for an individual's future marriage. In other words, it is a period of discovering what kind of person they will marry and gaining relationship experience before living with someone permanently. The behaviors in relationships experienced during this period are largely exploratory, self-focused and determinant in future romantic relationships (Fincham& Cui, 2010; Arnett, 2004). From this perspective, it can be stated that the romantic relationship satisfaction of the adults and the marriage satisfaction of married individuals are based on the romantic relationships in emerging adulthood.

In family counseling, the family life cycle is used to express the changes that occur in families over time (Carter & McGoldrick, 1999). In family counseling, the developmental characteristics of the life period of family members and the change in their needs are effective on understanding the family and the interventions to be made. In addition, since it is known that the satisfaction of individuals from intimacy in relationships affects the next generation, it is thought that the findings obtained from studies on emerging adulthood can also be used in studies to be conducted in the field of family counseling (Gladding, 2012).

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that one of the most important reasons for emerging adults to apply to university psychological counseling centers is the difficulties they experience in romantic relationships (Eryılmaz & Ercan, 2010;

Creasey, Kershaw & Boston, 1999). Studies show that romantic relationship satisfaction has a positive relationship with happiness, subjective well-being and life satisfaction. This information shows that it is important to study romantic relationship satisfaction and the factors affecting it for the psychological health of the individual. (Korkut-Owen, Demirbaş-Çelik, Doğan, 2017; Harries, 2004).

Interpersonal relationship styles have an important place for romantic relationships as they affect the communication to be established with the partner positively and negatively. To effectively resolve conflicts that spoil romantic relationships; It is necessary to communicate effectively, to express feelings and thoughts appropriately and consistently, to have constructive discussions, that is to have a positive interpersonal style (Atak and Taştan, 2012). The fact that using positive interpersonal style is necessary for happy and satisfying relationships reveals the importance of studies on interpersonal style (Gottman, 2011 as cited in Atak & Taştan, 2012). Also, interpersonal relationships have a very important place in matters such as the level of satisfaction and happiness individuals receive from life, as well as establishing friendship and loving relationships. The interpersonal styles learned through early life enable people to spend their lives more sincerely and effectively in every period of their lives (Matthew, 1993; cited in Koç, 2014).

Self-control refers to the capacity of the individual to change and control their own reactions. It is the ability to adjust one's reactions in a way that is beneficial to ideals, values, social expectations and to one's future long-term goals (Baumeister et. Al, 2007). In other words, lack of self-control increases the tendency to behave inappropriately with one's goals and well-being. There are many studies abroad that show that the level of self-control has a broadly positive relationship with the well-being and functionality of romantic relationships (Zuo et al., 2020). Due to this information, it was determined that it would be important to investigate the effect of self-control on relationship satisfaction.

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that although many studies have been conducted on the importance of interpersonal style for relationship satisfaction, there are not enough studies in our country on self-control and relationship satisfaction. If the relationship of self-control with relationship satisfaction is determined, it may lead to new studies on self-control in individual, group counseling

and psycho-education practices on romantic relationships. In this context, it is thought that examining whether there is a meaningful relationship between the self-control and interpersonal styles of emerging adults in romantic relationships will be an important source of information for applied and theoretical studies on romantic relationships. These three variables that come together are thought to contribute to domestic and international research and literature.

1.4. Assumptions

In this study;

- Individuals participating in the research answered the measurement tools sincerely and accurately,
- The data collection tools used in the research have the power to measure the variables prepared to be measured,
- The sample of the study has the qualities to represent the universe,

was assumed.

1.5. Limitations

- The research data are limited to the qualities measured by the "Relationship Satisfaction Scale", "Interpersonal Style Scale" and "Self-Control Scale".
- The sample of the study is limited to individuals between the ages of 18-30 who participated in the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Related literature about variables of the study and related researches are presented in this section.

2.1. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction

Romantic relationships have an important place in the lives of individuals with the adolescence period and have a strong intensity that increases since the second decade of life. Love experienced in a romantic relationship refers to the physical and mental attraction towards the desired individual. While defining the romantic relationship, although the thoughts, feelings and behaviors of the partners vary from culture to culture, the biological and sexual development processes of individuals provide general definitions and inferences about romantic relationships (Miller & Benson, 1999).

2.1.1. Definition and Development of Romantic Relationships

According to Collins (2003) romantic relationships are voluntary interactions that are mutually accepted by the partners and have their own intensity. Romantic relationship is a kind of relationship in which individuals participate with emotional, behavioral and cognitive characteristics. It is formed between two partners who bring their own personalities and past life experiences, and they affect each other as a result of mutual interaction (Neyer & Voight, 2005).

Studies on the close relationships established during the period from adolescence to adulthood and the characteristics of these relationships have increased in recent years (Fincham & Cui, 2010).

Starting, maintaining, and ending a romantic relationship gracefully is one of the most important developmental tasks of adolescence and young adulthood (Snyder, 2006). According to Erikson's (1968) psychosocial development theory, having close and loving relationships is very important for an individual's well-being. Erikson specified romantic relationships play an important role in young people's identity formation, relationship skills and coping with their sexual drive. Identity, which is

tried to be acquired as the developmental task of adolescence, is experienced through romantic relationships. The emerging adulthood period coincides with the 6th stage of Erikson's psychosocial development theory: *isolation versus intimacy*. During this stage, if deep personal intimacy with the partner and other people cannot be established, loneliness and isolation are felt. In a romantic relationship, intimacy is not just a sexual attribution. Intimacy is indicated by honesty, love, and closeness. Therefore, intimacy provided in a romantic relationship enables the individual to create a happy and healthy life.

The foundations of romantic relationships are laid during adolescence and gradually increase towards the end of adolescence. Connolly and McIsaac (2009) state that the basis of a romantic relationship begins in adolescence and differs towards the end of the teens. From the age of eleven, adolescents enter the romantic attraction stage. They spend more of their time with both their own genders and start talking about romance and love. During this period, love is usually experienced unilaterally. Besides Çelen (2011) states that in the first years of adolescence, the environment of the adolescent became crowded and started to establish intergroup relations. In mixed environments with girls and boys, romantic relationships are understood as an attractive power of attraction toward others. From around the age of 14, adolescents can experience dating with people who are attracted to each other. From the age of about 17, more serious romantic relationships are established, individuals begin to evaluate their romantic relationships. In these relationships, emotional bonds are stronger, more stable and durable (Connolly & McIsaac, 2009).

Collins (2003) has conducted research on the developmental importance of romantic relationships experienced during adolescence. As a result of her studies, she emphasizes that romantic relationships have five distinctive features. The first of these is *involvement*. It refers to whether young people date, at what age the dating begins, its frequency and duration of a relationship. Another feature is *partner selection*. This feature explains with whom young people have romantic experiences. The personality of the partner determines the quality of the relationship. Another feature is *content*. Relationship *content* refers to the activities shared during the romantic relationship and how pairs spend their time together. Working towards common goals, communicating, and avoiding some situations while together is all about the content

of the relationship. The feature expressed by *quality* refers to the degree of being able to gain useful experiences from the relationship. The last feature is the *cognitive and emotional processes* of the relationship. Emotional reactions, perceptions, expectations, schemes, and meanings attributed to the partner and the relationship distinguish the romantic relationship from other types of relationships (for example, from the friendship relationship).

While intimacy is a very important concept in all periods of human life, it becomes even more important especially in adolescence and emerging adulthood. Eryılmaz and Atak (2009) revealed that there are 5 determinants of the initiation process that begins romantic intimacy in romantic relationships in their study. These are *self-perception, self-knowledge, behavioral intimacy, cognitive and emotional intimacy, and romantic verbalization*. *Self-perception*, includes opinions about whether the individual is competent or not. *Self-knowledge*, refers to having appropriate personal qualities to initiate a romantic relationship. *Emotional and cognitive intimacy*, refers to the ability of an individual to feel and express positive emotions to their partner. *Behavioral intimacy* includes behaviors such as shared time with a partner. Romantic verbalization, on the other hand, involves expressing feelings in a meaningful way to the interested person (Moss & Schwebel, 1993; Prager, 1995; Sternberg, 1986 cited in Eryılmaz & Atak).

The occurrence of romantic relationships from adolescence has been studied in various studies. While it is revealed in research that dating contributes to independence and autonomy. Consequently, some adolescents come out just because everyone is out. Another research added to this information that sexual experience, friendship and intimacy are also important reasons for dating (Place, 1975; McCabe & Rice, 1984 cited in Çelen, 2011).

2.1.2. Features and Dimensions of Romantic Relationships

Skipper and Nass (1996) states that having a romantic relationship (dating) has four basic functions for the individual. These are; entertainment, socializing, gaining status and courtship. Having fun together, developing different methods of communication while interacting with the partner, and gaining a status in the group by

dating people make romantic relationships important for the individual (cited in Çelen, 2011).

Expressing very different kinds of love in one word caused the psychoanalyst Theodore Reik (1941) to complain. In his book, *Love and Lust*, he said that love is one of the most overworked words in our vocabulary (cited in Pines, 2005). Rubin's theory (1970,1988) is one of the first psychological theories about love. He describes love as a cultural concept that includes cognitive, behavioral and emotional areas and individual differences. Rubin says that love has three components: intimacy, caring, and attachment. Intimacy is defined as close sharing with a partner, unlike other people. Caring is about the well-being of the partner and finally attachment refers to the bond established with the partner (cited in Üney & Güneri-Yöyen, 2020).

According to Sternberg (1986), romantic love consists of the components of love, intimacy and passion. He also said that there are many aspects of "love" that underlie close relationships. He presented a triangular theory of love that deals with both the nature of love and loves in different relationships. He suggested that there are three components in the love triangle: *passion*, *intimacy*, and *determination*. *Passion* refers to the physical attraction and sexual satisfaction experienced in a romantic relationship. It expresses *intimacy* as a commitment, warmth and sharing between partners in a relationship. *Determination / commitment* signals thoughts about maintaining the relationship and love even when faced with problems. These three components interact with each other to create a series of different loving experiences. The amount of love that a person experiences and the satisfaction of the relationship they experience depend on how and to what extent the 3 components are experienced.

Berscheid (2010) characterized love as a human behavior involving a wide variety of complex areas. There are different types of love that include quite wide relationship patterns. The first of these is *companionate love*. Grote & Frieze (1994), who developed the friendship-based love scale, defined companionate love as the experiences of partners who are based on mutual trust, comfortable, and include a deep feeling of friendship, and shared interests that accompany each other with pleasure (cited in Berscheid, 2010). The second type of love is *romantic love*, which involves sexuality and is generally more common in the early stages of romantic relationships. Romantic love includes quite complex emotions such as passion, fear,

anger, fun and jealousy (Regan, 2008 cited in Santrock, 2011). Romantic love is fueled by sexual attraction and satisfaction in the early stages of the relationship. There is discovery and innovation and distrust in this newly established bond. In this process, while partners experience high romantic relationship satisfaction, they may also experience negative emotions such as depression. Thirdly, *compassionate love* is also called caregiving, selfless or pure love. Romantic love, in which individuals feel intense deep emotions, leaves its place to compassionate love, where trust and attachment are matured. In compassionate love, people tolerate the negative behavior of the partner. In recent years, the importance given to “caregiving” and interest has increased because it affects romantic relationship satisfaction. Berscheid (2010) lastly defines *adult attachment love*, draws on Harlow and Bowlby's views on attachment. Adult attachment love is the final result of intimate love in consistent and ongoing relationships. It implies a safe, predictable, and agreed-upon relationship.

Lee's (1977) theory of the colors of love is another scientific work on romantic relationships. He explained love by analogy with the main and intermediate colors in nature. Accordingly, there are 3 main forms of love, such as the three main colors in nature: *Passionate love* (eros), *play-like love* (ludus) and *friendly love*. Different forms of love can also be formed by the combination of the main types of love, such as intermediate colors that occur with the combination of colors in nature. With friendly love and love like play combines to form *rational love* (pragma). Passionate love and play-like love combine to form *possessive love* (mania). Finally, passionate love and friendly love form *altruistic love* (agape). In passionate love, the physical desire of the partner is a priority. In love like play, there is little commitment between partners, but having fun together is a priority, the duration of the relationship is relatively shorter. Friendly love partners express a more stable and predictable relationship where they support each other emotionally like a team. In possessive love, partners experience their emotions very intensely, there may be jealousy and obsessions, partners seek confidence that they are loved. In the rational love type, partners live their love in harmony within their own rules and frameworks according to various demographic characteristics such as religion, profession, age. When analyzed according to gender differences, the passionate, friendly, play-like and altruistic love scores of men were found to be higher than the scores of women in the same types of love. In addition, the rational love scores of women were found to be

higher than the rational love scores of men (Durmaz & Ercan, 2019 cited in Üney & Güneri-Yönen, 2020).

2.1.3. Definition of Relationship Satisfaction

Relationship satisfaction is a very important concept as it indicates the determination and success of the intimate romantic relationship (Meeks et al., 1998). Rusbult (1983) defined relationship satisfaction as “a positivity of affect or attraction to one's relationship (p. 102).” Hawkins (1968) defined relationship satisfaction as a subjective evaluation of feelings of pleasure, happiness and satisfaction experienced by one's relationship. In addition, according to him, partners with high satisfaction feel commitment and trust in their relationships. The relationship expectations of the partners affect how they evaluate the relationship subjectively. Therefore, it can be said that the expectation about the relationship has an important role in examining the satisfaction obtained from the relationship.

Sabatelli (1988) also emphasized expectations while explaining the degree of relationship satisfaction. According to him, individuals evaluate their relationships by comparing the expectations they can obtain from that relationship and the behaviors that emerge. The level of these expectations varies from person to person. Therefore, through the social exchange model, he defined his relationship satisfaction as: "a product of an interaction between a person's expectations and his or her partner's behavior (p. 217)." People tend to understand their relationship by comparing their expectations of the relationship with the relationship they actually have. Therefore, relationship satisfaction is a result of the interaction between the partner's behaviors in the relationship and their expectations about the relationship.

According to Hendrick (1988) relationship satisfaction refers to the partners' subjective valuing of their relationships and their assessment of how they feel about their romantic relationship at the time. More generally, relationship satisfaction implies feelings, thoughts, or behaviors within a relationship associated with sexual attitudes, feelings of love, commitment, self-disclosure, and relationship investment.

2.1.4. Factors Affecting Relationship Satisfaction

The concept of attachment is an important concept for understanding the characteristics of life-long relationships. As reported by Harlow (1958) attachment is a form of love. People are born with a tendency to be attached to a familiar person who gives them comfort and protection. Attachment theorist Bowlby (1979) described the figure of attachment as a strong love bond between partners. Attachment behavior is a natural and healthy part of human life from birth to death (Bowlby, 1973). The characteristics of his bonding with the first caregivers in infancy predict the quality of social and romantic relationships during adolescence and young adulthood. Secure attachment in infancy is the beginning of an individual's first relationship with a social environment. Securely attached babies can establish good relationships with their peers in childhood and adolescence. These good relationships turn into closer and intense relationships with adolescence. Although infancy has an effect on the quality of romantic relationships, the changes that occur in adolescence constitute the beginning of romantic relationships (Sigelman & Rider, 2017). In other words, if the commitment to the basic caregiver established in the first 2 years of life is consistently and securely realized, it shapes the expectations and interactions in their lifelong relationships from peers and friends to teachers, from romantic relationships to their new family (Arnett, 2012).

The relationship between relationship satisfaction and individuals' attachment styles, conflict styles, and humor style was investigated in a study in which the participants consisted of individuals with an average age of 20.7 who did not graduate. According to the results of the study, it was found that conflict and humor styles were the mediators of the association between attachment style and relationship satisfaction (Cann et. al., 2008).

Dissatisfaction in romantic relationships has been found to be highly correlated with different views of partners and negative conflict styles (Cramer, 1998). Conflicts are a part of the relationship, and conflicts increase as the duration of the relationship increases. A study by Cramer (2000) has revealed that the way partners who have disagreement in romantic relationships deal with this negatively increase as the duration of the relationship increases. He revealed that it is not the

frequency of conflicts but the negative conflict resolution style that affects romantic relationship satisfaction.

Fincham et al., (2018). demonstrated the behavioral, emotional and cognitive linkage of romantic relationship satisfaction. Dissatisfied partners tend to exhibit more dysfunctional behaviors such as criticizing, complaining, harboring hostility, minimizing relationship and interaction compared to couples with satisfaction. In addition, partners who do not experience relationship satisfaction fall into a cycle of negative affect. Couples who experience relationship satisfaction, on the other hand, get out of this cycle more easily due to their constructive and restorative approach. Emotions positively and negatively affect romantic relationship satisfaction more strongly than verbal expressions. Cognitive evaluations also provide predictive information about romantic relationship satisfaction. If spouses have unrealistic beliefs about their relationship (e.g. no one changes, men / women always are), it is estimated that their romantic relationship satisfaction will be low.

In a study conducted to examine the relationship between emotional awareness and relationship satisfaction, it was concluded that high emotional awareness increases women's relationship satisfaction. In addition, in this study, it was revealed that differences in partners' emotional awareness are related to low levels of relationship satisfaction in both men and women (Croyle& Waltz, 2002)

According to researchers, there is a positive relationship between intimacy between partners and relationship satisfaction. Couple intimacy is the context of the relationships of the partners in the romantic relationship process. Positive communication experiences are one of the most important factors that help create intimacy in the relationship. Negative communication of partners disrupts intimacy and thus leads to a decrease in relationship satisfaction (Yoo et al., 2013).

In a study conducted by Eryılmaz and Atak (2009), it was revealed that being a man in initiating romantic intimacy has a positive relationship with having masculine and androgynous gender roles. In addition, emerging adults with high self-esteem initiate a more comfortable romantic relationship.

In romantic relationships, the importance attributed to close friends and the intrusive role of close friends on romantic relationships can become a factor that

directly affects relationship satisfaction. According to the findings obtained as a result of a study, friendship relationships affect satisfaction of romantic relationships (Saraç et al., 2015).

In the literature, the relationship between gender and relationship satisfaction has been found as a predictive variable in some studies, while in some studies no significant difference was found between relationship satisfaction and gender. Satici and Deniz (2018) conducted a meta-analysis study of the relationship between gender and relationship satisfaction in order to clarify this inconsistent information. The results of this study revealed that romantic relationship satisfaction does not differ significantly according to gender. In this study, it was also analyzed whether relationship satisfaction changes according to growing up in an individualistic or collective culture. According to the results, it was determined that growing up in an individualistic or collective culture was not significantly related to relationship satisfaction.

It is seen that researchers working on sexism reveal that there is a great difference in gender roles in patriarchal societies and this situation creates a contradictory sexist attitude among partners. One of these conflicting beliefs is that women are weak and therefore should be protected by men. This is called protective attitude (Glick & Fiske, 1999 cited in Aktan & Asker, 2020). There are longitudinal studies showing that women having a high level of protective sexist attitude negatively affects their satisfaction from the relationship (Hammond & Overall, 2013 cited in Aktan & Asker, 2020).

According to a study on attitudes towards stereotypes in romantic relationships, female participants agreed that men should be more sociable and active in romantic relationships. Male participants, on the other hand, agreed more with the stereotypes about male dominance and female acceptance in romantic relationships than female participants (Sakallı & Curun, 2001). In this study, it was revealed that the expectations between the genders differ in initiating and maintaining a romantic relationship.

2.2. Self-Control

Self-control refers to the capacity of the individual to change and control their own reactions. It is the ability to adjust one's reactions in a way that is beneficial to ideals, values, social expectations and to one's future long-term goals. Even if the individual knows the behavior that he/she has to do for the purpose, sometimes she/he can act in the opposite direction, such as delaying, laziness, doing different activities, etc. Self-control makes it possible to restrain or prevent one's unfavorable behavior, thus making different responses possible (Baumeister et. al, 2007).

2.2.1. Definition of Self-Control

Timpano & Schmidt (2013) defines self-control as “the capacity to exert control over one's behavior and is necessary for directing personal behavior toward achieving goals (p. 13.)” Self-control ability makes it easier to resist impulses and emotions that can harm the general well-being of the individual. Lack of self-control increases the tendency to behave inappropriately with one's goals and well-being.

Rosenbaum (1993) defines self-control as “It refers to the process by which individuals consciously decide to take charge of their own behaviour (p. 33).” People often automatically perform many behaviors such as eating, driving and reading in daily life. Self-controlled behaviors are governed by thinking processes. Self-control arises when it is necessary to learn a new behavior, when it is crucial to make a choice, when goals are reached or not (Kanfer and Gaelick-Buys, 1991 cited in Rosenbaum, 1993).

The actions that an individual has control over are directly related to cognitive processes. Having control over behavior requires being aware of them, being able to evaluate them, and to choose from a variety of actions (Rosenbaum, 1993). The person is also engaged in a process called “process-regulating cognitions” while performing the actions that he / she controls. *Process-regulating cognitions* are to regulate the decision-making process of one's own behavior. This process takes place before all controlled behaviors. The process-regulating cognitions are similar to the self-system concept in Bandura's (1978) social learning theory. It refers to a series of sub-functions related to the perception, evaluation and regulation of self-system behavior, and cognitive structures that provide reference to the person. In summary,

Bandura's concept of self-system or process-regulating cognitions provides the emergence of self-control with these thinking processes.

According to Vygotsky (1962), the language people use towards themselves, inner voice, has a self-regulating role. It helps them take control of their impulses and pursue their goals. Self-control is a widely described skill and refers to actions taken towards specific goals (cited in Duyan et al., 2012).

2.2.2. Functions of Self-Control Behavior

Rosenbaum (1993) identifies that self-control behaviors have three main functions. These are redressive self-control, reformative self-control, and experiential self-control.

Redressive Self-Control

In order for the self-control process to begin, a routine action that the individual continues must be disrupted by an environmental factor. Restorative self-control enables the individual to reorganize the failures he / she experiences for the purpose. It is the ability to control the emotions and thoughts that affect the individual's behavior. Thus, it helps the individual to establish a new balance and is improving (Rosenbaum, 1993).

Reformative Self-Control

Reformative self-control involves the behaviors that guide the individual's change process. Instead of a behavior that is more attractive, the individual performs a new behavior that is more appropriate but less likely to occur. Many health-related behaviors are associated with reformative self-control. There is a change in lifestyle such as an obese person changing his eating pattern. While the person tries to maintain a deteriorated process in redressive self-control, the effort of the person in reformative self-control is to add a new behavior to life (Rosenbaum, 1993).

Experiential Self-Control

According to Rosenbaum (1993), people don't just make an effort to defend themselves against life's difficulties. Tending to new and different experiences and trying to enjoy life enriches the personality. The self-control process leads to a stable

and balanced life. On the other hand, it enables people to acquire new life repertoires that enable them to develop. This function has been named as experiential self-control. This process consists of skills that enable the person to perform enjoyable activities by getting rid of the intervention of cognitive control processes. In fact, pleasant experiences can be thought of as a loss of self-control. Rosenbaum (1993) stated that this process also requires self-control for the following reasons:

- The individual consciously decides to realize the experience.
- Behaviors are target-oriented.
- It is necessary to overcome emotional and cognitive barriers to reach the experimental goal.

2.2.3. Domains of Self- Control

In explaining the concept of self-control, Tangley et al. (2004) focus on changing or inhibiting one's internal responses and at the same time staying away from the tendency to act according to undesirable behaviors such as impulses. They define self-control as the ability of a person to alter and adapt in order to behave better and appropriately. The person thus finds a better harmony between himself and the world.

Self-control is one of the most important characteristics of a person that affects an individual's success in life. Tangley et al. (2004) emphasized 6 beneficial domains relevant to self-control:

Achievement and task performance: According to the researches, university students with high self-control have higher grades in the long term. Because they fulfilled their responsibilities on time, experienced less lesson loss, were more skillful in time management and were able to stay away from emotional and physical distractions.

- 1) *Impulse control:* As a result of the studies carried out, it has been revealed that university students with high self-control experience less alcohol and eating problems, spend their money more controlled and do not have difficulty in saving (Pelusa et al., 1999; Kaplan, 1995 cited in Tangley et al.)
- 2) *Psychological adjustment:* Many psychological maladjustments indicate a lack of self-control. In the DSM-IV (The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental

Disorders), self-regulation has a distinctive feature for many problems under the heading "impulse control disorders". Lack and abundance of self-control is associated with weak psychological adjustment.

- 3) *Interpersonal relationships*: Having self-control leads individuals to be more desirable partners in relationships. Self-control helps the individual prevent sudden impulses. Therefore, behaviors such as controlling what they say and avoiding hurtful words during interpersonal conflict can be explained by self-control skills. Conversely, low self-control can lead to an explosion of anger or aggressive behavior that is not solution-oriented.
- 4) *Moral emotions*: Moral feelings refer to shame and guilt. It is predicted that having these feelings will be more constructive in interpersonal relationships, accepting and admitting their mistakes. At the same time, it is known that the feeling of shame activates the self-defense impulses. These are blaming, hiding, escaping, etc. For this reason, it is pointed out that there is a link between high tendency towards shame and low self-control.
- 5) *Related personality features*: Having a conscience and being a perfectionist are associated with a tendency to self-control. Self-control is an important capacity to act more conscientiously. Thus, the person fulfills his responsibilities and promises, finds a middle ground between himself and the other's expectations. In perfectionism, the person acts with unrealistic rules and expectations specific to the situation. For this reason, perfectionist attitude leads to adherence to these standards with high self-control.

2.3. Interpersonal Relationships

Relationship with others is an inevitable need for human beings, who are affected by their environment and affect their environment. The concept of interpersonal relationship is defined as mutual emotional interactions between two or more people, arising from different needs, with different intensity from acquaintance to intimacy (Erden-İmamoğlu & Aydın, 2009). According to Grahani & Lafollette (1989) Interpersonal relationships have two components: "*reciprocity*" and "*emotion, thought and behavior components*". In the initiation, maintenance and termination of interpersonal relationships, the choices and qualities of both sides function as determinants of the relationship (cited in Erden-İmamoğlu & Aydın, 2009).

Interpersonal theory states that human beings must interact with others from birth to death. The individual establishes his first relationship with the world through the first caregivers. Due to the need for closeness to someone else throughout life, interpersonal behaviors play a very important role in explaining personality and psychological health. Interpersonal relationships develop with at least two people. It is a concept that is based on different needs and includes mutual emotional and behavioral interaction (İmamoğlu, 2008).

Personality traits, the culture of the society in which the individual lives, skills such as starting, maintaining and ending relationships affect interpersonal relationships. At the same time, considering that interpersonal communication is a process in which individuals affect each other, these factors affect the meanings individuals attribute to communication and the quality of the relationship (İmamoğlu, 2008).

According to many approaches, interpersonal relationships develop based on two basic motives. The first is the need for status that expresses *control and power*. The second is the emotional need, which implies emotional *intimacy, togetherness, and intimacy*. The emotional importance given to the events and experiences of the individual depends on the cognitive interpretation processes specific to the person. Expressing one's emotions causes the other person to experience some emotions as well. In other words, emotions are not just a subjective interpretation of the individual; It enables individuals to engage in interpersonal interaction or to stay away from interaction (Batıgün & Şahin, 2009).

Averill (1983) emphasizes the importance of interpersonal relationships in the formation of emotions. Expresses that anger is a strong interpersonal emotion. Anger, an has an inhibitory effect on interpersonal interaction (Wiseman et al. 2006 cited in Şahin et.al., 2011). In his research, it is said that understanding anger requires understanding the social context in which it occurs. In addition, it was concluded that the target of anger is very close friends and loved ones in interpersonal relationships, rather than acquaintances or strangers. This is explained by the fact that the well-known person's response to anger is more predictable (Averill, 1983).

2.3.1. Theoretical Approaches to Interpersonal Relationships

Although the concept of interpersonal relations started from the concept of object relations with Freud and later with psychoanalytic researchers, it is seen that the first regular research on "interpersonal relations" was conducted with Sullivan. While explaining the concept of interpersonal relationships, Sullivan (1953) emphasizes the importance of interpersonal connections and learning in personality development. In addition, it emphasizes the necessity of understanding the experience and processes when dealing with the person and their relationships (Karataş, 2019).

According to Sullivan (1953), the need to interact with others is universal. When a baby is born, survival depends on establishing a relationship with the caregiver. Thus, physiological needs turn into interpersonal needs. The baby learns to adjust to behaviors from other people. This continues with the relationships we have built throughout life. Sullivan claims that people's psychological health is related to how aware they are of their interpersonal relationships. The source of human psychopathology and psychological well-being is the relationship it establishes with other people (cited in Geçtan, 2008).

Sullivan (2013) bases the importance of interpersonal relationships on two main points. The first is that communication processes interrupted by anxiety and inadequate communication are the causes of mental problems. Secondly, it expresses that two people who establish a mutual relationship are not a separate whole. With interpersonal relationships, individuals share an interpersonal space in which they influence and affect each other. Personality of the individual should be examined with the characteristics of the relationship established with others. Personality can only exist through interpersonal relationships. In other words, personality cannot be isolated from the complex interpersonal relationships in which a person lives and finds existence. In other words, in order to get to know a person well, it is necessary to observe relationships with others. This approach emphasizes that what needs to be examined is not the individual but the behavior.

Bowlby (1985) states that in the attachment theory, the relationship that a person establishes with the caregiver in the early period is decisive in shaping the person's perception of himself and the world. In other words, the individual's interaction with the caregiver in early childhood shapes the interpersonal relationship

style. The relationship that a person establishes with the caregiver in the early period is decisive in shaping a person's perception of himself and the world (Bowlby, 1969).

Bowlby (1973) suggested that the individual feels secure as a result of the positive interaction with the caregiver at an early age, and thus, the individual can develop positive expectations about oneself and others. On the contrary, negative expectations about the oneself and the outside world develop as a result of the caregiver's indifference in meeting the needs in early childhood. This is experienced as insecure attachment in relationships. Anxiety and avoidance are two basic dimensions of insecure attachment (Erdem & Kabasakal, 2015). Individuals with high attachment anxiety are characterized by a more dependent and obsessive attitude in their relationships and fear of rejection. The avoidant individual avoids close social contact in order to protect himself from painful and stressful conditions. Avoidance in interpersonal relationships is seen as a fear of intimacy and a tendency to maintain distance against close relationships. In addition, it was observed that avoidant individuals approach their relationships with a more negative outlook and experience higher rates of relationship dissolution (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; cited in Erdem & Kabasakal, 2015).

Safran (1990) also states in his Cognitive- interpersonal theory that the attitude of the person in the future interpersonal relationship is related to how the relationship is established with attachment persons in childhood. Safran and Segal (1990) explain that as a result of these attachment relationships, an individual creates an interpersonal schema against oneself and environment. Interpersonal schemas are conceptualized as internal working models, which Bowlby (1969) stated that they are shaped by interpersonal relationships as a result of attachment relationships. These interpersonal schemas or internal working models of children cause interpersonal relationships to continue to be structured through a similar model in adulthood. In other words, interpersonal relationship style is affected by the first attachment experiences (cited in Şahin&Oral, 2008).

According to Safran's (1990) Cognitive Interpersonal theory, cognitive processes cannot be considered separately from interpersonal processes. Interpersonal processes and cognitive processes should be considered together. Safran's (1990) particular emphasis is on interpersonal schema and interpersonal cycle. The

information structure based on previous self-other interactions containing information about the maintenance of interpersonal relationships is called interpersonal schemas. Dysfunctional interpersonal schemas create and sustain dysfunctional interpersonal-cognitive cycles.

People develop interpersonal schemas that facilitate adaptation in a developmental context and play a role in predicting interaction with others. Cognitions, emotions, and behaviors are shaped in an interpersonal context (Koç, 2008). In other words, interpersonal schemas are mental representations formed by the interaction with the outside world. The individual both shapes perception of the environment with these schemas and begins to perceive the outside world with an expectation that will confirm these schemas. For example, the individual whose perception is hostile towards the outside world is hostile to others. As a result, hostile responses are received from the outside and thus the interpersonal scheme is reinforced. will receive hostile reactions in return. Interpersonal schemas cause interpersonal cycles in this way. In the interpersonal cycle, individuals both interpret and change their environment. It leads to the continuation of dysfunctional and negative interpersonal relationships (Safran, 1990).

The social environment has an important role in the formation and development of personal schemas and interpersonal relationships. Cultural and historical backgrounds of social structures affect how the individual perceives oneself and the other person. This influence thus determines the style and characteristics of interpersonal relationships. Getting approval from the society and adaptation is desired by the individual while acquiring a social identity (Erden-İmamoğlu & Aydın, 2009).

2.3.2. Interpersonal Communication

The concept of interpersonal style is discussed in the literature within the framework of interpersonal relationship theories and bases (Karataş, 2019). Social skills of individuals are one of the important factors affecting interpersonal relationships. The concept of social skill is related to concepts such as interpersonal ability and communication skill. In the literature, it is seen that these concepts are used in the same sense as social skills (Koç, 2008).

According to Birtchnell (1983), how and under what conditions individuals communicate with each other shows the interpersonal communication style of individuals. To be more precise, interpersonal style refers to the behaviors and personality patterns that the individual exhibits in general in various relationships and situations (Buss & Craik, 1983 cited in Batıgün & Şahin, 2009).

Communicating involves transmission and processing of information between a source and a recipient. People in mutual communication continue their communication by transferring and interpreting the information or symbols they produce (Dökmen, 2008). Since communication is an interpersonal activity, meanings, emotions, different perspectives and understandings also become part of it (Treher& Noah, 2008).

Tubbs and Moss (1974) stated that three criteria are necessary for a communication to be defined as "interpersonal communication":

- Participants in interpersonal communication should be in close proximity and face to face.
- The messages between the participants should not be one-sided, but in the form of mutual exchange.
- The messages that the people in communication send to each other should be non-verbal and verbal. Communications in which messages other than these two types of messages are used (e.g. correspondence) are not accepted as interpersonal communication (cited in Dökmen, 1994).

2.3.3. Interpersonal Styles

Interpersonal relationships are of vital importance for the individual at every age period. Many life pleasures, happiness, personal success, making new friendships depend on relationships with other people. However, although interpersonal communication is one of the greatest needs of humanity, people do not always adopt a positive communication style in their relationships (Hasta & Güler, 2013).

According to Leary (1957) behavior that is consciously, ethically or symbolically associated with another person is interpersonal. Interpersonal behavior is

essential for the survival of the human infant. Individuals live their relationships with others depending on how they perceive these relationships and the meaning they attribute to their relationships. As a result of all these perceptions and attributions of meaning, an interpersonal relationship style is formed (Karataş, 2019).

Interpersonal relationship styles have been examined in different dimensions. Şahin, Durak, and Yasak (1994) discussed interpersonal relationship styles as a nurturing and inhibiting (toxic) relationship style. They dimensioned the nurturing relationship as an open and respectful style, and the inhibiting relationship as an egocentric and condescending style. In another study, interpersonal relationship styles were discussed as dominant style, avoidant style, angry style, insensitive style, manipulative style and sarcastic style. (Şahin, Batıgün, & Koç, 2011 cited in Doğan & Sapmaz, 2012).

Relationships can be healing, satisfying and nourishing the lives of individuals. These types of relationships are called nurturing relationship styles. Relationship styles that have a negative effect on the individual and can cause bad experiences are accepted as toxic or inhibiting relationship styles (Greenwald, 1999 cited in Hasta & Güler, 2013). In nurturing relationships, individuals can express their needs openly to others, and they show positive characteristics such as being accepting and respectful. There is a mutual understanding and a common harmony between individuals. In inhibiting relationships, individuals are in an approach that sees themselves superior to others, mocks and can easily be angry. There is coercion and pressure between individuals in an inhibitory relationship. As a result, while nurturing relationship styles help individuals to understand each other better; Inhibiting relationship styles make it difficult to maintain a healthy and positive relationship (Greenwald, 1999 cited in Hasta & Güler, 2013).

Conflict and dilemma are an important issue in all interpersonal relationships, especially in romantic relationships. Research shows that conflict and relationship dilemmas in a romantic relationship are more important than the amount of resolution they have. To effectively resolve conflicts that spoil romantic relationships; It is necessary to communicate effectively, to express feelings and thoughts appropriately and consistently, to have constructive discussions. Atak and Taştan (2012) state that men and women have different roles in romantic relationships, but they are expected

to follow the same path for a solution. This way is through staying calm, being able to listen and understand the partner empathically. When the partners of the relationship try and apply these rules, in other words, having a nurturing/positive interpersonal style a happy and satisfying relationship emerges (Gottman, 2011 as cited in Atak & Taştan, 2012).

Interpersonal relationship styles are important because these give the individual the opportunity to measure self-perception, self-worth, self-esteem and self-confidence (Erdoğan, 2002 cited in Erözkan, 2009). Self-perception, in other words, the self-worth, has an effect on the psychological well-being and interpersonal interactions of the person. Likewise, interpersonal interactions affect the self-perception of the person. As a result of mutual effects, individual interaction patterns, that is interpersonal styles, are formed (Şahin et.al., 2011). Naturally, the primary condition of interpersonal communication is the individual's capacity and ability to communicate with self. There are research results showing that individuals who enjoy and prefer to spend time with themselves establish better interpersonal relationships (Rieman et.al., 1997 cited in Burger, 2006).

2.4. Related Researches in Turkey

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that the positive role of having romantic relationship satisfaction in the emerging adulthood period is emphasized. A study consisting of 314 participants was conducted to determine whether the well-being of individuals differ according to their satisfaction with romantic relationships. It was concluded that individuals with romantic relationships were significantly correlated with scores of total well-being, understanding of life and being goal-oriented, and cognitive and emotional well-being scores, according to their relationship satisfaction level. In other words, as individuals' romantic relationship satisfaction increases, their well-being also increases (Korkut-Owen, Demirbaş-Çelik, Doğan, 2017).

Ulutaş (2018) conducted a thesis study examining the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, personality traits and self-esteem. 470 university students in a romantic relationship participated in the study. According to the findings of the study, a significant relationship was found between the level of romantic relationship satisfaction and self-esteem and the perceived frequency of meeting with

the partner. It was concluded that the level of romantic relationship satisfaction did not differ according to gender, age, class, and duration of romantic relationship. In addition, it was concluded that there was a negative relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction and emotional inconsistency personality traits, and a positive correlation between romantic relationship satisfaction and responsibility, adaptability, and openness to development personality traits.

Saraç (2013) investigated the relationship between irrational beliefs about romantic relationships and pre-marital relationship perceptions and relationship satisfaction. The sample group of the study consists of 299 university students. According to the findings obtained, it is seen that the relationship satisfaction of fiancée and engaged individuals is higher than the individuals who have dating. This result shows that as the romantic relationship of individuals gets more serious, their satisfaction with the relationship increases. In the research, this situation has been explained from a social perspective. It has been said that the fact that the relationship status reaches a more formal dimension such as engagement from dating may have increased the feelings of commitment and belonging towards the relationship. In addition, it was determined that the higher the scores obtained from the "religious values", "communication", "friendships" and "family relations" sub-dimensions, the higher the relationship satisfaction.

Yılmaz (2020) examined the relationship between the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults and the separation of the ego, authenticity and depressions. The study group consists of 552 women and 249 men between the ages of 18-26 who have romantic relationships. As a result of the analyzes, a positive relationship was found between self-discrimination and authenticity and romantic relationship satisfaction, and a negative relationship between depression and romantic relationship satisfaction. Authenticity or originality means being aware of emotions, controlling the functionality of thoughts, creating own values and preserving these values in a healthy way. Authenticity was determined as the variable affecting romantic relationship satisfaction the most. It is seen that the group with the highest romantic relationship satisfaction and authenticity is the individuals with the most relationship duration.

Karataş (2019) investigated the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, emotion regulation difficulties and interpersonal styles. The sample of the study consisted of 254 volunteers. As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that there are negative significant relationships between romantic relationship satisfaction, difficulty in emotion regulation and interpersonal style. As the difficulty in emotion regulation and negative styles used in interpersonal relationships increase, romantic relationship satisfaction decreases.

Beştav (2007) investigated the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction and gender, attachment styles, irrational beliefs, love attitudes and place of birth. The sample group consists of 586 university students. The findings revealed that there were also negative correlations between anxious, obsessive, and avoidant attachment styles, irrational relationship beliefs, and relationship satisfaction. Finally, a positive relationship was found between the types of love called "friendly love" and "passionate love" and relationship satisfaction. In another study involving 269 university students that investigated the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction and attachment styles, it was concluded that individuals with anxious-avoidant attachment had lower romantic relationship satisfaction (Yavuz, 2018).

Karatatar (2018) conducted a thesis study in the context of perceived parenting style and personality traits of emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction. The study was carried out with 417 individuals between the ages of 19-26 who had a romantic relationship for at least 6 months. According to the research findings, the effect of perceived acceptance / interest / love from the mother on all personality traits except openness to experience is significant. The perceived acceptance / interest / affection from the father positively predicts personality traits other than emotional imbalance. Being open to experience as a personality trait positively predicts romantic relationship satisfaction, and emotional instability predicts relationship satisfaction negatively.

In another study, the role of gender, age, relationship duration, self-clarity and personal agency in predicting romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults was investigated with 344 university students. The findings of the study revealed that gender, age and relationship duration are not significant predictive variables in predicting romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults. However, self-clarity

and personal agency, which means taking responsibility for one's own decisions and overcoming obstacles, positively predicts relationship satisfaction (Çürükvelioğlu, 2012).

Çelen-Demirtaş (2010) examined the role of gender, relationship status, relationship satisfaction, and commitment to career choices in predicting subjective well-being. The sample of the study consists of 400 university students. Results showed that gender and romantic relationship satisfaction predicted the life satisfaction sub-dimension of subjective well-being. In addition, the results revealed that there is a significant relationship between low romantic relationship satisfaction and students' negative emotion scores.

Satıcı (2013) conducted two independent studies to propose a model for young adults' romantic relationship satisfaction. In Study I, whether romantic relationship satisfaction showed a significant difference according to gender was examined using a meta-analysis technique. As a result of the meta-analysis, it was understood that gender did not have a significant effect on romantic relationship satisfaction. In other words, it was concluded that the romantic relationship satisfaction of men and women was close to each other. In addition, it was concluded that the culture did not act as a moderator in the connection between gender and romantic relationship satisfaction. In Study II, the mediating roles of emotional intelligence and conscious awareness were examined between perfectionism and romantic relationship satisfaction. 421 university students participated in Study II. When the findings were examined, it was found that emotional intelligence and conscious awareness partially mediated between perfectionism and romantic relationship satisfaction. It has been revealed that lowering the perfectionism levels of individuals can strengthen their romantic relationship satisfaction.

Öcal-Yüceol (2016) examined the relationships between attitudes towards gender roles, irrational beliefs in romantic relationships, and relationship satisfaction. The sample of the study consists of 225 undergraduate students attending Hacettepe University, Middle East Technical University and Gazi University. According to the findings, as gender roles are egalitarian, individuals' irrational beliefs about romantic relationships decrease. Male gender role and traditional gender role negatively predict

relationship satisfaction. In addition, thinking differently, physical intimacy, excessive expectations and gender differences also negatively predict relationship satisfaction.

2.5. Related Researches in Abroad

When the studies on relationship satisfaction and self-control level are examined, it provides a prediction that high self-control level of the person will increase relationship satisfaction in both the person and his partner (Zuo et al., 2020). In a recent study conducted by Zuo et al. (2020), the relationship between the self-control level of the person and the relationship satisfaction of his partner was investigated. This study was conducted cross-sectionally and longitudinally with 3 data groups consisting of heterosexual couples. As a result of the study, it was concluded that the partner's self-control level positively affected the romantic relationship satisfaction. In addition, a positive relationship was found between men's self-control level and their partners' relationship satisfaction. However, women's self-control levels are not affected by their partners' relationship satisfaction.

Another study investigating the relationship between self-control and happiness obtained from romantic relationships was conducted cross-sectionally and longitudinally with 59 heterosexual couples living in the USA and the Netherlands. According to the results of the study, the higher the total self-control score in the relationships is associated with a better romantic relationship. The high mutual self-control level of the partners in the relationship has many positive consequences that will positively affect the relationship satisfaction. These can be listed as relationship satisfaction, absence of rejection, secure attachment, stable and healthy love style, forgiveness, and smooth daily interactions (Vohs et al., 2011).

A study was conducted to examine the role of romantic relationship quality in predicting the happiness of emerging adults. The sample of the study consists of 221 students who continue their education at a university in the USA and have a romantic relationship. The findings show that the quality of the romantic relationship contributes to the happiness level of emerging adults beyond the effect of personality traits. The research continued with a second extended study of 187 university students. According to the results of the second study, emotional security and companionship of romantic relationships are the strongest features in predicting

happiness. The research also concluded that the realization of "identity formation", which is an important developmental task of emerging adulthood, at a high level increases the happiness levels of individuals in romantic relationships (Demir, 2007).

Harries (2004) conducted a thesis to examine the relationship between the meaning of life, life satisfaction, romantic relationship satisfaction, and romantic love. The research sample consists of couples who have had a consistent romantic relationship for at least 12 months. As a result of the study, it was found that there is a positive correlation between the meaning of life and romantic relationship satisfaction, love and the meaning of life, love and romantic relationship satisfaction. In addition, it was concluded that romantic relationship satisfaction has a mediating effect between life meaning and life satisfaction (cited in Yılmaz, 2020).

Voigt and Neyer (2004) conducted a study to examine the link between romantic relationship satisfaction and the personality traits of partners and social networks. The research was conducted with 100 young adult couples in Berlin. According to the results of the research, the personality traits of the partners are similar and there is no significant relationship between gender and relationship quality. In the analyzes made, it was seen that the perceived relationship quality was better predicted by the person's own personality traits, not the personality traits of the partner. When the effects of personality traits are excluded, it was concluded that social network quality of individuals can predict the quality of the relationship. This research has shown that the quality and characteristics of established social and interpersonal relationships also affect relationship satisfaction.

Attachment styles, conflict styles and humor styles in romantic relationships were studied with the participation of 438 undergraduate students. In this study, it was concluded that conflict and humor styles had a mediating role in the relationship between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. This research also emphasized that attachment styles are the basis of interpersonal style that affects relationship satisfaction (Cann, Norman, Welbourne & Calhoun, 2008).

Relationship satisfaction has also been studied through cross-cultural studies. The relationship between attachment, autonomy, and gender roles of British and Turkish individuals with relationship satisfaction was investigated. Avoidance, relatedness,

autonomy, and masculinity are the mediators in predicting the relationship between culture and romantic relationship satisfaction. Regarding cultural differences, Turkish participants scored lower on relationship satisfaction and autonomy, while British participants scored lower on avoidance and relatedness. This finding shows that Turkish participants in romantic relationships are less autonomous and have less relationship satisfaction than British participants. In addition, no significant difference was found between gender role differences between Turkish and British participants in the study (Celenk, Vijver & Goodwinn, 2011).

The relationship between personality traits of partners and romantic relationship satisfaction, love styles and intimacy was investigated with 196 heterosexual university students who had a relationship for more than 6 months. According to the analysis results, a negative relationship was found between the neurotic personality trait and relationship satisfaction and intimacy. Extraversion and conformity personality traits have been positively associated with relationship satisfaction and intimacy, especially for men. Likewise, a negative relationship was found between emotional inconsistency, personality trait and relationship satisfaction. No significant relationship was found between romantic relationship satisfaction and responsibility and openness to development (White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004).

In order to determine the relationship between the self-concept and romantic relationship satisfaction, a study was conducted in two studies. The sample of the first step of the research is 199 undergraduate students and the second step is 78 undergraduate students. In both studies, high self-concept clarity was found to be associated with higher romantic relationship satisfaction and commitment (Lewandowski, Nardone, & Raines, 2010).

Weiser and Weigel (2016) emphasized that self-efficacy in romantic relationships is associated with relationship satisfaction. They claimed that the reason for this was that individuals with high self-efficacy were more willing to perform the behaviors of maintaining the relationship, which are positivity, openness, assurance networks and tasks. To investigate the mediating role of relationship maintenance behaviors between relationship satisfaction and self-efficacy, they conducted a study with 187 university students who had romantic relationships. Findings show that maintaining the relationship mediates self-efficacy and relationship satisfaction. In addition,

individuals with high self-efficacy and those who think their partners are competent and competent have higher relationship satisfaction.



CHAPTER III

METHOD

Sample characteristics, instruments, data collection process, and information about data analysis are presented in this section.

3.1. Design of the Study

In this study, correlational design which is one of the quantitative research designs was used to investigate the relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal styles of emerging adults. In correlational design, the relationships between two or more variables are examined without any attempt to influence them. There are two important purposes of correlational research. The first is to explain whether there is a relationship among variables. The second purpose is prediction. In other words, additional to explaining the relationship between variables, predictions about possible outcomes can be made by using certain variables as predictors (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The dependent variable of this research is relationship satisfaction. The independent variables are self-control and interpersonal relationship styles.

3.2. Population and Sample of Research

The study population of the research consists of emerging adults whose ages range from 18 to 30. The sample of the study, from different provinces of Turkey to participate in the study has established that accept adults as volunteers. A total of 334 people participated in the research conducted with the online sampling method. Since 41 people who did not meet the criteria of being in the 18-30 age range were not included in the sample group, the number of participants was determined as 293. The characteristics of the sample group introduced in Table1.

Table 1: Demographics

Preferences		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Gender		Erkek	Kadın					
	<i>n</i>	94	199					293
	%	32,1	67,9					100
Marital Status		Married	Single					
	<i>n</i>	69	224					293
	%	23,5	76,5					100
RS for Single		In a Relation	Not					
	<i>n</i>	139	85					224
	%	61,8	38,2					100
Educational St.		Secondary Sch.	High Sch.	Pre-University	University	Master	Doctoral	
	<i>n</i>	1	20	25	200	46	1	293
	%	0,3	6,8	8,5	68,3	15,8	0,3	100

When the demographic variables are examined, it is seen that participants of the study consists of a total of 293 people, 199 women (67.9%) and 94 men (32.1%). The age range of the participants is found 18-30, and the average age is 25. According to marital status, 224 participants stated that they were single (76.5%) and 69 were married (23.5%). 139 of the 224 participants who were single stated that they had a relationship (61.8%). Marriage duration of married participants was found to be minimum 1 month maximum 8 years, and average 4 years. Relationship duration of single participants with a romantic relationship is a minimum of 1 month and a maximum of 8 years, and average 1 year. With regard to the variable of education level, 1 (0.3%) were secondary school graduated, 20 (6.8%) were high school graduated, 25 (8.5%) were pre-university graduated, 200 (68.3%) university graduated and 47 (16.1%) were postgraduated. Finally, the income levels of the participants are between 0 - 15.000 TL and an average of 3.774 TL.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In this study, to obtain data from participants four instruments were used. Demographic Information Form was formed by the researcher to determine demographic characteristics of the participants, Relationship Satisfaction Scale was used to measure the romantic relationship satisfaction levels of the participants, Self-Control Scale was used to measure the structures and behavior patterns of the participants' self-control behaviors and Interpersonal Style Scale was used to determine negative communication styles between individuals in interpersonal relationships.

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

Demographic Information Form was formed by the researcher for the present study to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. The gender, age, education level, average monthly income, marital status, durations of romantic relationship and marriage were asked to the participants.

3.3.2. Relationship Satisfaction Scale

Relationship Satisfaction Scale was developed by Hendrick (1988) to measure the satisfaction of individuals from their romantic relationships. The scale is a 7-point Likert-type scale consisting of 7 items in total. The items in the scale were scored between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 7 and the highest score is 49. Items 4 and 7 are the reverse items in the scale. It is accepted that as the scores obtained from the scale increase, the romantic relationship satisfaction of the individuals also increases. The adaptation study of Romantic Assessment Scale to Turkish was conducted by Curun (2001) with 140 university students who were in a romantic relationship. According to factor analysis results, the scale had a one factor structure and this factor was found to indicate 52% of the total variance. The internal consistency coefficient of the adapted scale was determined as .86. As seen in table 2, the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was found to be .92 in this study.

3.3.3. Self-Control Scale

Self-Control Scale was developed by Rosenbaum (1980) to measure individuals' states of self-control behaviors and their tendency to use these behaviors when encountering problems in daily life. The scale consists of 36 items and three different dimensions; experiential self-control, reformative self-control, and redressive self-control. Redressive self-control includes behaviors that affect individuals' feelings and thoughts towards their goals. These behaviors help individuals to balance and are redress. Reformative self-control includes behaviors of individuals towards change processes. Experiential self-control includes behaviors that enable individuals to tend to enjoyable activities (Rosenbaum, 1993). The scale is answered in a 6-point Likert type. The scale items were scored as -3, -2, -1, +1, +2, +3, from the option Does Not Fit Me Completely (-3) to Fits Me Completely (+3).

Items 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 29 and 35 are reverse items of the scale. The total score that can be obtained from the Experiential Self-Control and Redressive Self-Control subscales is between -33 and +33; The total score that can be obtained from the Reformative Self-Control subscale varies between -42 and +42, and the total score that can be obtained from the whole Self-Control Scale varies between -108 and +108. High scores from the scale indicate higher self-control level; low scores mean that the level of self-control is low (Duyan et al., 2012).

The Turkish validity and reliability study of the self-control scale was conducted by Duyan et al. (2012) on 1796 university students. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the whole self-control scale was found to be .81. For Experiential Self-Control sub-scale, Reformative Self-Control sub-scale and Redressive Self-Control sub-scale Cronbach's alpha value respectively found as .84; .76 and .73. As presented in Table 2, Cronbach's alpha value of the whole scale was found to be .77 in this study. It was calculated as .64, .74 and .74 for the sub-scales of the scale, respectively.

3.3.4. Interpersonal Styles Scale

Interpersonal style scale was developed by Şahin et al. (2007) in order to determine the negative communication styles and communication barriers that individuals use in interpersonal relationships. The scale is a 5-point Likert type scale consisting of 60 items. The items are answered according to the question "How much does it describe you?". %0 is 1 point; 25%, 2 points; 50%, 3 points; 75% is evaluated with 4 points and 100% with 5 points. Accordingly, the lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 60 and the highest score is 300. Higher scores on the scale and sub-factors indicate that the individuals use the negative relationship style more. As a result of forming the factor structure of the scale and the validity and reliability study, 6 factors were found. These are: dominant style, avoidant style, angry style, emotion avoiding/insensitive style, manipulative style, sarcastic/ sardonic style (Koç, 2008). Reliability coefficient of the scale was found as $\alpha = .93$. The reliability coefficients obtained for the factor subscales are $\alpha = .88$ for the "Dominant Style" sub-scale (number of items 14); For the "Avoidant Style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .79$ (number of items 11); For the "Angry Style" subscale, $\alpha = .79$ (number of items 9); $\alpha = .77$ for the "Emotion-Avoiding Style" sub-scale (number of items 11); For the "Manipulative Style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .74$ (number of items 10); For the "Sardonic Style" sub-scale, $\alpha =$

.67 (number of items 5) (Şahin et al. 2007). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha value of the whole scale was found as .95. For the "Dominant style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .91$; for the "Avoidant Style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .83$; for the "Angry Style" sub-scale $\alpha = .83$; for the "Emotion-Avoiding Style" sub-scale $\alpha = .79$; for the "Manipulative Style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .79$; For the "Sardonic Style" sub-scale, $\alpha = .70$.

Cronbach alpha values of the scales and sub-scales used in the study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: *Cronbach's Alpha Values*

Scales	Sub-Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
Relationship Satisfaction		.92
Self-control		.77
	Experiential self-control	.64
	Reformative self-control	.74
	Redressive self-control	.74
Interpersonal Styles		.95
	Dominant style	.91
	Avoidant style	.83
	Angry style	.83
	Emotion avoiding style	.79
	Manipulative style	.79
	Sarcastic style	.70

3.4. Data Collection Process

Necessary permissions were obtained from the academicians who adapted the scale for the relationship satisfaction scale, the self-control scale and the interpersonal style scale used in the study. The scales and demographics were transferred to online

platforms and the data were collected through e-mail sampling. In the online data collection form, individuals were informed about the purpose of the research. Participation in the study was voluntary. Volunteers were asked to fill the scales which were shared on various online social platforms. It took about 15 minutes to fill out the data forms and was filled in without any time limit.

3.5. Statistics

In the analysis of the data, SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) package program was used. Before analyzing the data, the data set was checked, and the participants who did not meet the 18-30 age range criteria in the sample group were not included in the analysis. The reverse items in the scales are inverted. Normality test was conducted to determine whether the data were normally distributed. As a result, it was concluded that the data showed normal distribution according to the kurtosis and skewness values obtained. Parametric tests were used in the analysis due to the normal distribution of the data set. Descriptive statistical values of scales and variables of age, gender, marital status, romantic relationship status, relationship and duration of marriage, and income level were calculated. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated for the scales and sub-scales used in the study. Whether the scores of relationship satisfaction, self-control, and interpersonal style differ significantly according to gender and marital status were examined by Independent Sample T Test. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test whether there is a significant difference between relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal style levels and education and income level. Pearson Moments Multiplication Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-control, and interpersonal style, and romantic relationship duration and duration of marriage. In order to answer the main question of the study, multiple regression analysis was applied to determine whether the romantic relationship satisfaction of the participants was predicted by self-control, interpersonal style and the sub-dimensions of these scales. The level of significance was taken as .05 in the study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this section, findings regarding the regression analysis, independent sample t test, correlation analysis and One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) made with the data of the research are presented. The main research question and sub-research questions, which were created in line with the main purpose of the study, were answered step by step.

4.1. Findings Related to Descriptives

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores, and Skewness and Kurtosis scores for the main variables of the study was presented in Table 3.

Table 3: *Descriptives*

Variables	Sub-Scales	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Relationship Satisfaction		293	1,00	7,00	5,45	1,37	-1,194	0,794
Self-control		293	2,31	5,64	2,12	0,57	0,021	0,691
	Experiential self-control	293	1,55	5,27	1,89	0,71	-0,134	-0,518
	Reformative self-control	293	2,50	6,00	2,07	0,67	-0,074	0,150
	Redressive self-control	293	1,82	6,00	2,46	0,78	-0,084	0,164
Interpersonal Styles		293	1,02	5,00	1,87	0,57	0,943	1,754
	Dominant style	293	1,00	5,00	2,32	0,67	1,110	1,163
	Avoidant style	293	1,00	5,00	2,35	0,85	0,887	0,881
	Angry style	293	1,00	5,00	4,07	0,48	0,660	0,207
	Emotion avoiding style	293	1,00	5,00	3,57	0,77	1,099	2,556
	Manipulative style	293	1,00	5,00	4,52	0,61	0,461	0,362
	Sarcastic style	293	1,00	5,00	4,00	0,75	0,623	0,171

Before the analyses were conducted, normality of research variables was examined via Skewness and Kurtosis values. According to George and Mallery (2010), if the Skewness and Kurtosis scores are between +2.0 and -2.0, parametric tests can be used in researches. When the Skewness and Kurtosis values of Relationship Satisfaction Scale are examined, Skewness values were -1,194 and

Kurtosis values were 0,794. For Self-control Scale, Skewness values were 0,021, and Kurtosis values were 0,691. Lastly, the values of Skewness and Kurtosis for Interpersonal Styles Scale are 0,943 and 1,754. Since the values of these tests between +2.0 and -2.0, parametric tests were used in this research.

According to findings that are obtained from descriptive analyses for all scales, the participants' mean score of Relationship Satisfaction Scale is 5,45 and standard deviation is 1,37. Minimum and maximum scores of this scale are 1 and 7 point. For Self-control Scale, mean score is 2,12 and standard deviation is 0,57. Minimum and maximum scores range from 2,31 to 5,64. Experiential Self-control, Reformative Self-control and Redressive Self-control are sub-scales of the Self-control Scale. For mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores of all sub-scales of the Self-control Scale are presented in Table 2. Lastly, when the findings of Interpersonal Styles Scale considered, the mean score is found as 1,87, standard deviation is found as 0,57 and minimum and maximum scores are found as 1,02 and 5. For the sub-scales of Interpersonal Styles Scale that are dominant, avoidant, angry, emotion avoiding, manipulative and sarcastic styles, mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores also can be seen in Table 2.

4.2. T-Test Findings Related to Gender

In this section, the independent sample t-test analysis was conducted to determine if there is a significant difference between relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal styles according to the gender of the participants.

Related sub-question about this section is “Do emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to gender?” and the findings about this sub-question are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: *T-Test Findings to Gender*

Variables	Sub-Scales	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
						t	P
Relationship Satisfaction		Male	94	5,68	1,24	2,02	0,44
		Female	199	5,34	1,42		
Self-control		Male	94	4,06	0,51	-0,28	0,78
		Female	199	4,08	0,47		
	Experiential self-control	Male	94	3,65	0,76	1,25	0,21
		Female	199	3,53	0,78		
	Reformative self-control	Male	94	4,38	0,66	-2,72	0,01
		Female	199	4,59	0,58		
	Redressive self-control	Male	94	4,06	0,73	0,93	0,35
		Female	199	3,98	0,76		
Interpersonal Styles		Male	94	2,36	0,66	5,25	0,00
		Female	199	2,00	0,48		
	Dominant style	Male	94	2,22	0,82	5,71	0,00
		Female	199	1,73	0,60		
	Avoidant style	Male	94	2,28	0,75	3,76	0,00
		Female	199	1,98	0,60		
	Angry style	Male	94	2,61	0,88	2,25	0,03
		Female	199	2,39	0,72		
	Emotion avoiding style	Male	94	2,15	0,68	6,17	0,00
		Female	199	1,74	0,46		
	Manipulative style	Male	94	2,52	0,69	3,54	0,00
		Female	199	2,23	0,64		
	Sarcastic style	Male	94	2,61	0,93	3,58	0,00
		Female	199	2,23	0,78		

As it can be seen in Table 4, there is no significant differences between relationship satisfaction levels and gender of the participants ($t=2,02$ $p>.05$). For the self-control level, no significant differences can be found according to gender ($t=-2,72$ $p>.05$). However, for the reformative self-control level, significant relationship can be seen with gender ($t=-2,72$ $p<.01$). It is seen that female's reformative self-control levels are significantly higher than male's. Lastly, there are significant differences between interpersonal style levels and gender ($t=5,25$ $p<.00$). Males have higher scores than women in all sub-dimensions of the interpersonal style scale. It can be said that there are significant differences between all scores of sub-scales of interpersonal style and gender.

4.3. T-Test Findings Related to Marital Status

In order to predict whether the relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal style have a significant difference according to marital status,

independent sample t-test analysis was conducted. Findings are presented in Table 5. Related sub-research question is “Do emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to marital status?”

Table 5: *T-Test Findings to Marital Status*

Variables	Sub-Scales	Marital Status	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
						t	P
Relationship Satisfaction		Married	69	6,20	0,68	5,47	0,00
		Single	224	5,22	1,44		
Self-control		Married	69	4,17	0,47	1,82	0,07
		Single	224	4,04	0,49		
	Experiential self-control	Married	69	3,67	0,83	1,20	0,23
		Single	224	3,54	0,75		
	Reformative self-control	Married	69	4,61	0,61	1,40	0,16
		Single	224	4,49	0,61		
	Redressive self-control	Married	69	4,09	0,75	1,13	0,26
		Single	224	3,98	0,75		
Interpersonal Styles		Married	69	2,06	0,56	-0,99	0,32
		Single	224	2,13	0,57		
	Dominant style	Married	69	1,82	0,68	-0,96	0,34
		Single	224	1,91	0,72		
	Avoidant style	Married	69	2,03	0,70	-0,59	0,56
		Single	224	2,09	0,66		
	Angry style	Married	69	2,38	0,75	-0,96	0,34
		Single	224	2,48	0,79		
	Emotion avoiding style	Married	69	1,83	0,47	-0,72	0,47
		Single	224	1,88	0,60		
	Manipulative style	Married	69	2,27	0,70	-0,74	0,46
		Single	224	2,33	0,66		
	Sarcastic style	Married	69	2,28	0,81	-0,88	0,38
		Single	224	2,38	0,86		

According to statistical findings obtained, there is a significant difference between relationship satisfaction levels and marital status ($t=5,47$ $p<.00$). Married individuals have higher romantic relationship satisfaction than single individuals. For the self-control levels of participants, it can be seen that there are no significant differences according to marital status ($t=1,82$ $p>.05$) and also there are no significant differences between Interpersonal Style levels and marital status ($t=-0,99$ $p>.05$).

4.4. Correlation Findings Related to Marital Duration

In order to explain the relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-control level and interpersonal style in terms of marital duration, Pearson correlation analysis were conducted. The sub-question related to this section is “Is there any relationship between emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles according to the duration of marriage?” Findings about analyses are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: *Correlations for Marital Duration*

Scales	Sub-Scales	Marriage Duration
		Pearson Correlation
Relationship Satisfaction		**0,19
Self-control		0,06
	Experiential self-control	0,04
	Reformative self-control	0,09
	Redressive self-control	0,00
Interpersonal Styles		-0,03
	Dominant style	-0,03
	Avoidant style	-0,01
	Angry style	-0,04
	Emotion avoiding style	-0,02
	Manipulative style	0,00
	Sarcastic style	-0,11

$n = 293$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$

According to Pearson correlation analysis, relationship satisfaction levels of participants is positively correlated with marital duration ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). It is seen that as the duration of marriage increases, romantic relationship satisfaction increases. There is no significant correlation between self-control and marital duration ($r = .06$, $p > .05$). Lastly, there is no significant correlations between interpersonal styles and marital duration ($r = -.03$, $p > .05$).

4.5. Correlation Findings Related to Relationship Duration for Single Participants

In order to define the relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-control level and interpersonal style in terms of relationship duration for single participants, Pearson correlation analysis were conducted. The following question of this section is “Is there any relationship between emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles according to the duration of relationship for single participants?” Findings are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: *Correlations for Relationship Duration for Single Participants*

Scales	Sub-Scales	RD for Single
		Pearson Correlation
Relationship Satisfaction		**0,23
Self-control		-0,01
	Experiential self-control	-0,02
	Reformative self-control	0,03
	Redressive self-control	-0,02
Interpersonal Styles		0,05
	Dominant style	0,04
	Avoidant style	0,00
	Angry style	*0,12
	Emotion avoiding style	0,01
	Manipulative style	0,06
	Sarcastic style	0,01

$n = 293$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$

According to Pearson Correlation analysis, relationship satisfaction level of single participants is positively correlated with relationship duration ($r = .23$, $p < .01$). There is no significant correlation between self-control levels and duration of relationship ($r = -.01$, $p > .05$). Lastly, there is no significant correlation between interpersonal styles and relationship duration ($r = .05$, $p > .05$). However, the Angry style which is sub-scale of Interpersonal Styles Scale is positively correlated with relationship duration of single participants ($r = .12$, $p < .05$).

4.6. ANOVA Findings Related to Education Level of Participants

In order to test whether relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal styles levels differed in terms of the education level of participants, ANOVA was conducted. The related sub-question in this section is “Do the emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to education level?” Findings of ANOVA analyses are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: ANOVA Findings for Education Level of Participants

Variables	Sub-Scales	Education Status	N	Mean	SD	S.V.	SS	MS	F	p
Relationship Satisfaction		Secondary&High Sch.	21	5,26	1,88	Between Groups	0,84	0,42	0,22	0,80
		University	225	5,47	1,37	Within Groups	545,79	1,88		
		Postgraduate	47	5,45	1,08	Total	546,63			
		Total	293	5,45	1,37					
Self-control		Secondary&High Sch.	21	4,19	0,42	Between Groups	0,30	0,15	0,65	0,53
		University	225	4,07	0,49	Within Groups	67,97	0,23		
		Postgraduate	47	4,06	0,50	Total	68,28			
		Total		4,07	0,48					
	Experiential self-conrol	Secondary&High Sch.	21	3,42	0,90	Between Groups	1,08	0,54	0,91	0,41
		University	225	3,56	0,78	Within Groups	173,29	0,60		
		Postgraduate	47	3,68	0,66	Total	174,38			
		Total		3,57	0,77					
	Reformative self-conrol	Secondary&High Sch.	21	4,72	0,55	Between Groups	0,93	0,47	1,24	0,29
		University	225	4,50	0,63	Within Groups	109,44	0,38		
		Postgraduate	47	4,52	0,58	Total	110,37			
		Total		4,52	0,61					
	Redressive self-control	Secondary&High Sch.	21	4,28	0,72	Between Groups	2,75	1,38	2,48	0,09
		University	225	4,01	0,75	Within Groups	160,79	0,55		
		Postgraduate	47	3,85	0,73	Total	163,55			
		Total		4,00	0,75					
Interpersonal Styles		Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,04	0,46	Between Groups	1,16	0,58	1,80	0,17
		University	225	2,15	0,60	Within Groups	93,36	0,32		
		Postgraduate	47	1,99	0,43	Total	94,51			
		Total		2,12	0,57					
	Dominant style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	1,77	0,58	Between Groups	1,17	0,58	1,15	0,32

	University	225	1,92	0,74	Within Groups	147,86	0,51		
	Postgraduate	47	1,78	0,61	Total	149,03			
	Total		1,89	0,71					
Avoidant style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,08	0,44	Between Groups	1,62	0,81		
	University	225	2,11	0,70	Within Groups	127,89	0,44	1,83	0,16
	Postgraduate	47	1,91	0,55	Total	129,50			
	Total		2,07	0,67					
Angry style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,29	0,56	Between Groups	2,90	1,45		
	University	225	2,52	0,82	Within Groups	175,74	0,61	2,40	0,09
	Postgraduate	47	2,28	0,64	Total	178,64			
	Total		2,46	0,78					
Emotion avoiding style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,04	0,60	Between Groups	2,15	1,07		
	University	225	1,89	0,58	Within Groups	93,22	0,32	3,34	0,04
	Postgraduate	47	1,70	0,47	Total	95,37			
	Total		1,87	0,57					
Manipulative style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,12	0,47	Between Groups	0,95	0,47		
	University	225	2,34	0,69	Within Groups	129,58	0,45	1,06	0,35
	Postgraduate	47	2,31	0,64	Total	130,53			
	Total		2,32	0,67					
Sarcastic style	Secondary&High Sch.	21	2,10	0,74	Between Groups	2,57	1,28		
	University	225	2,40	0,88	Within Groups	209,02	0,72	1,78	0,17
	Postgraduate	47	2,24	0,73	Total	211,59			
	Total		2,35	0,85					

As illustrated in Table 8, findings of ANOVA reveal that relationship satisfaction and self-control levels do not differ significantly according to education levels of participants ($F=0,22$, $p>.05$; $F=0,65$, $p>.05$). There is no significant difference between Interpersonal style scale levels and education levels of participants ($F=1,80$, $p>.05$). However, Emotion Avoiding Style levels which is sub-scale of Interpersonal Style differs significantly according to education levels of participants ($F= 3,34$, $p<.05$). As the level of education increases, the use of Emotion Avoiding Style decreases.

4.7. ANOVA Findings Related to Income of Participants

In order to analyze whether relationship satisfaction, self-control and interpersonal styles differed in terms of income level of participants, ANOVA was conducted. The

related sub-question in this section is “Do emerging adults' romantic relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to socioeconomic status?” Findings of ANOVA analyses are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: ANOVA Findings for Income of Participants

Variables	Sub-Scales	Income	N	Mean	SD	S.V.	SS	MS	F	p
Relationship Satisfaction		0-3000 TL	134	5,12	1,51	Between Groups	26,97	13,48	7,53	0,01
		3001-6000 TL	109	5,70	1,17	Within Groups	519,66	1,79		
		6000 and above	50	5,78	1,20	Total	546,63			
		Total	293	5,45	1,37					
Self-control		0-3000 TL	134	4,01	0,47	Between Groups	1,03	0,51	2,22	0,11
		3001-6000 TL	109	4,10	0,49	Within Groups	67,25	0,23		
		6000 and above	50	4,17	0,50	Total	68,28			
		Total	293	4,07	0,48					
	Experiential self-control	0-3000 TL	134	3,40	0,81	Between Groups	7,20	3,60	6,25	0,00
		3001-6000 TL	109	3,70	0,69	Within Groups	167,18	0,58		
		6000 and above	50	3,75	0,76	Total	174,38			
		Total	293	3,57	0,77					
	Reformative self-control	0-3000 TL	134	4,55	0,61	Between Groups	0,61	0,30	0,81	0,45
		3001-6000 TL	109	4,46	0,61	Within Groups	109,76	0,38		
		6000 and above	50	4,57	0,63	Total	110,37			
		Total	293	4,52	0,61					
	Redressive self-control	0-3000 TL	134	3,94	0,79	Between Groups	0,95	0,48	0,85	0,43
		3001-6000 TL	109	4,04	0,70	Within Groups	162,60	0,56		
		6000 and above	50	4,08	0,73	Total	163,55			
		Total	293	4,00	0,75					
Interpersonal Styles		0-3000 TL	134	2,10	0,50	Between Groups	0,23	0,12	0,36	0,70
		3001-6000 TL	109	2,10	0,60	Within Groups	94,28	0,33		
		6000 and above	50	2,18	0,66	Total	94,51			
		Total	293	2,12	0,57					
	Dominant style	0-3000 TL	134	1,86	0,65	Between	0,22	0,11	0,22	0,81

					Groups				
	3001-6000 TL	109	1,90	0,78	Within Groups	148,81	0,51		
	6000 and above	50	1,93	0,75	Total	149,03			
	Total	293	1,89	0,71					
Avoidant style	0-3000 TL	134	2,07	0,61	Between Groups	0,81	0,41		
	3001-6000 TL	109	2,03	0,67	Within Groups	128,69	0,44	0,92	0,40
	6000 and above	50	2,18	0,79	Total	129,50			
	Total	293	2,07	0,67					
Angry style	0-3000 TL	134	2,47	0,78	Between Groups	0,06	0,03		
	3001-6000 TL	109	2,44	0,79	Within Groups	178,59	0,62	0,05	0,96
	6000 and above	50	2,47	0,80	Total	178,64			
	Total	293	2,46	0,78					
Emotion avoiding style	0-3000 TL	134	1,83	0,53	Between Groups	0,48	0,24		
	3001-6000 TL	109	1,90	0,58	Within Groups	94,89	0,33	0,74	0,48
	6000 and above	50	1,92	0,65	Total	95,37			
	Total	293	1,87	0,57					
Manipulative style	0-3000 TL	134	2,35	0,62	Between Groups	1,05	0,53		
	3001-6000 TL	109	2,24	0,71	Within Groups	129,47	0,45	1,18	0,31
	6000 and above	50	2,40	0,70	Total	130,53			
	Total	293	2,32	0,67					
Sarcastic style	0-3000 TL	134	2,33	0,81	Between Groups	0,53	0,27		
	3001-6000 TL	109	2,34	0,89	Within Groups	211,05	0,73	0,37	0,69
	6000 and above	50	2,45	0,88	Total	211,59			
	Total	293	2,35	0,85					

Findings of ANOVA reveal that relationship satisfaction level differs significantly according to income levels of participants ($F= 7,53$, $p<.01$). As the income level increases, the level of romantic relationship satisfaction increases. There is no significant difference between Self-control levels and income levels of participants ($F= 2,22$, $p>.05$). However, Experiential Self-control Sub-scale level differs positively and significantly according to income levels of participants ($F= 1,80$, $p>0,05$). Lastly, there is no significant difference between Interpersonal style scale levels and income levels of participants ($F= 0,36$, $p>.05$).

Table 10: *Correlations between variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Relationship Satisfaction	1													
2 Self-control	,27**	1												
3 Experiential Self-control	,29**	,55**	1											
4 Reformative Self-control	,16**	,77**	0,08	1										
5 Redressive Self-control	0,10	,74**	0,04	,50**	1									
6 Interpersonal Style	-0,05	-,25**	-,25**	-,18**	-0,07	1								
7 Dominant Style	-0,03	-,23**	-,22**	-,18**	-0,07	,91**	1							
8 Avoidant Style	-,12*	-,20**	-,26**	-,14*	-0,02	,86**	,67**	1						
9 Angry Style	-0,02	-,28**	-,27**	-,14*	-,18**	,82**	,73**	,61**	1					
10 Emotion-avoiding Style	-0,00	-0,09	-,17**	-0,07	0,07	,70**	,55**	,61**	,39**	1				
11 Manipulative Style	-0,06	-,21**	-,21**	-,18**	-0,04	,84**	,71**	,71**	,60**	,51**	1			
12 Sarcastic Style	-0,02	-,15**	-0,03	-,19**	-0,08	,71**	,64**	,52**	,61**	,35**	,52**	1		
13 Age	,17**	,12*	,18**	0,05	0,02	-0,04	-0,02	-0,02	-0,09	-0,02	-0,03	-0,05	1	
14 Income	,19**	0,11	,17**	-0,00	0,06	-0,01	-0,01	0,02	-0,06	0,04	-0,02	0,01	,56**	1

n =293, *p<,05, **p<,01

4.8. Regression Findings Related to Scales

The findings related to the main question of this research are presented in this section. The main question is “Are the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults predicted by their self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles?”

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to investigate whether romantic relationship satisfaction was predicted by self-control and interpersonal style. Findings are presented in Table 4 and Table 11.

Table 11: *Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Self-control*

Self-Control Scale	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	2,29	0,64		3,57	0,00
Experiential Self Control	0,50	0,09	0,28	5,09	0,00
Reformative Self Control	0,30	0,124	0,14	2,44	0,02

n=293, R=.325, R²=.105, F=17.09, p<.05

As seen in Table 4 Experiential Self-control (B=.5, p=.00) and Reformative Self-control (B=.3, p=.01) significantly predict relationship satisfaction in positive way. These two variables explain 11% variance of total relationship satisfaction (R²=.11, p<.05).

Table 12: *Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Interpersonal Style Scale*

Interpersonal Style Scale	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	5,97	0,26		22,92	0,00
Avoidant Style	-0,25	0,12	-0,12	-2,09	0,04

n=293, R=.121, R²=.15, F=4.35, p<.05

As seen in Table 12 Avoidant Style (B= -.3, p=.05) negatively and significantly predict relationship satisfaction. This variable explains 15% variance of total relationship satisfaction (R²=.15, p<.05). In other words, the regression analysis predicts that as the avoidant style scores of the participants increase, their relationship satisfaction will decrease.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The aim of this study is to examine how the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults is predicted by their self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles. In addition, it was aimed to determine how the relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles differ according to various demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, relationship duration, educational status, socioeconomic status). Emerging adults whose ages range from 18-30 are specifically aimed in this research because romantic relationships have an important effect on the development of the individual in this period of life when identity exploration is experienced and tested through love, commitment, and important cognitive, social, and emotional changes (Eryılmaz & Ercan, 2010).

The findings of this research are discussed in the same order of research questions and findings and presented below section.

5.1. Discussion Related to Regression Findings

Multiple-linear regression analysis was conducted to investigate whether romantic relationship satisfaction was predicted by self-control and interpersonal style. Findings of this analysis are discussed in this section.

5.1.1. Discussion of Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Self-Control

When the regression findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Self-Control are considered, it can be seen that Experiential Self-control sub-scale and Reformativ Self-control sub-scale significantly and positively predict relationship satisfaction.

When the related literatures in Turkey are examined, research that is directly using self-control and relationship satisfaction variables. However, some studies have been found in the general literature using the variables of self-control and relationship satisfaction. In the study that is examined by Vohs, Finkenauer and Baumeister (2011) the relationship between self-control and happiness obtained from romantic relationships was conducted cross-sectional and longitudinally with 59 heterosexual

couples living in the USA and the Netherlands. According to the results of the study, the higher the total self-control score in the relationships is associated with a better romantic relationship. The high mutual self-control level of the partners in the relationship has many positive consequences that will positively affect the relationship satisfaction. It can be stated that the findings of this research are in line with previous study by Vohs, Finkenauer and Baumeister (2011). In another study investigating the relationship between self-control level of the person and the relationship satisfaction of his partner conducted by Zuo et al. (2020). The findings of this study showed that the partner's self-control level positively affected the romantic relationship satisfaction. As it can be seen, the findings of this research are in line with current study.

According to the current findings and previous research, it can be claimed that reformative self-control and experiential self-control have positive and significant effects on relationship satisfaction. The reason for this may be that experiential self-control enables people to acquire new life repertoires that enable them to develop. This process consists of skills that enable people to perform enjoyable activities by diminishing the intervention of cognitive control processes (Rosenbaum, 1993). While this process is continuing, experiential self-control skills that partners have provide them to stay in the moment and to enjoy companionship with each other. On the other hand, reformative self-control involves the behaviors that guide the individual's change process in a rational manner. Instead of a behavior that is more attractive, the individual performs a new behavior that is more appropriate but expected less likely to occur (Rosenbaum, 1993). For example, when couples conflict, spouses' ability to monitor their anger and other emotions can be included in reformative self-control. As a result, since it is known that romantic relationships are directly related to psychological and physical well-being and engaging in and enjoying activities that are done with a partner, it is thought that reformative self-control and experiential self-control skills will increase relationship satisfaction.

5.1.2. Discussion of Regression Findings of Relationship Satisfaction to Interpersonal Style

When the regression findings of relationship satisfaction to interpersonal style are considered, it can be seen that avoidant sub-dimension significantly but negatively

predict relationship satisfaction. In other words, the regression analysis predicts that as the avoidant style scores of the participants increase, their relationship satisfaction will decrease.

When related literature is examined, Karataş (2019), investigated the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, emotion regulation difficulties and interpersonal styles. As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that there are negative significant relationships between romantic relationship satisfaction, difficulty in emotion regulation and interpersonal style. As the difficulty in emotion regulation and negative styles used in interpersonal relationships increase, romantic relationship satisfaction decreases. White, Hendrick and Hendrick (2004) investigated the relationship between personality traits of partners and romantic relationship satisfaction, love styles and intimacy. According to the results, a negative relationship was found between the neurotic personality trait and relationship satisfaction and intimacy. It has been concluded that extroverted communication with the partner increases relationship satisfaction. Like findings of this research, avoidant style, which is a neurotic personality trait, has a negative relationship with relationship satisfaction. One of the important factors affecting satisfaction in romantic relationships is conflict. The interpersonal styles of the partners also determine how they resolve conflicts. In a study conducted by Erok (2013), it was revealed that couples who communicate in a manipulative, avoidant, angry, dominant, and contemptuous manner experience more marital conflict. Romantic relationships require harmony between partners. Couples with adaptive skills solve their problems with a more effective communication style. In a study conducted by Süataç (2010), it was concluded that interpersonal style predicts the marital adjustment of couples. In a study examining whether couples talk about their relationship and establish open communication, couples who talked about their relationships on positive or negative issues were perceived as happier than those who did not (Kastro, 1998).

Considering relevant literature, it is seen that positive interpersonal communication has a positive relationship in areas that are directly related to romantic relationship satisfaction, such as life satisfaction and well-being. Interpersonal style refers to the behaviors and personality patterns that the individual exhibits in general in various relationships and situations (Buss & Craik, 1983 cited in Batıgün & Şahin,

2009). And also, many life pleasures, happiness, personal success, making new friendships depend on relationships with other people. (Hasta & Güler, 2013). Therefore when the person has success in interpersonal style, it is predicted that his/her romantic relationship satisfaction will also increase. Talking about their romantic relationships is an opportunity for partners to solve their problems together. Having an avoidant style prevents expressing emotions in the relationship and overcoming the problems experienced. This situation is thought to reduce relationship satisfaction, as is the result of this study.

5.2. Discussion Related to T-Test Findings to Gender

According to findings about gender, there is no significant difference between relationship satisfaction levels and gender of the participants. In the reformative self-control level, there is a significant relationship with gender. In other words, female participants have a higher reformative self-control score than male participants. Lastly, the findings show that there are significant differences between all scores of sub-dimensions of interpersonal style and gender.

When the related literature about relationship satisfaction and gender is examined, the connection between relationship satisfaction and gender has been given a great deal of attention in Turkey and abroad. Ulutaş (2018) conducted a study examining the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, personality traits and self-esteem. It was concluded that the level of romantic relationship satisfaction did not differ according to gender. The findings of the study revealed that gender is not a significant predictive variable in predicting romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults. Satici (2013) conducted two independent studies to propose a model for young adults' romantic relationship satisfaction. In the first study of Satici, whether romantic relationship satisfaction showed a significant difference according to gender was examined using a meta-analysis technique. As a result of the meta-analysis, it was understood that gender did not have a significant effect on romantic relationship satisfaction. In other words, it was concluded that the romantic relationship satisfaction of males and females was close to each other. Considering the previous studies, it was concluded that the gender variable did not make a significant difference in terms of relationship satisfaction, as seen in the findings of this study.

Secondly, related literature about reformative self-control according to gender are examined. Studies show that men have lower levels of self-control than women and that self-control level has a positive relationship with problem-solving skills (Boyalı, 2020; Karataş, 2014). In the study that is examined by Zuo et al. (2020), females have higher self-control than males and a positive relationship was found between male's self-control level and their partners' relationship satisfaction. According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), all individuals go through a similar developmental self-control process until the age of 8 or 10. After these ages, the self-control development of individuals becomes more stable, not dynamic. Jo and Bouffard (2014), in their study to analyze this view, concluded that the self-control of both genders is affected by social factors. According to the results of the study conducted by Alakuş (2020) on the relationship expectations of university students, females expect a higher level of trust and control in their romantic relationships compared to males. In addition, it was found that the desire and expectations of females to have a quality romantic relationship were higher than males. Culturally, women are given the task of keeping the relationship alive, they are more likely to change and be more consistent. Considering that reformative self-control is related to the ability to make behavioral changes that will carry the individual to a better place than the situation they are in, it is thought that our culture gives females the responsibility for the peace and quality of romantic relationships, and the changing relationship expectations may be the reasons for the high level of self-control of females.

Since interpersonal style scores include negative communication skills, getting a low score on this scale is an indicator of having a more positive communication style. When looking at similar studies in the literature, there are many studies that have found that the interpersonal style scores of women are lower than men. Karataş (2019) examined the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, interpersonal style, and emotion regulation and concluded that females use a more positive interpersonal style than males. Tekin (2019) also concluded in his research on interpersonal style, subjective well-being, and perceived parenting style, male participants used more negative / inhibiting interpersonal styles than females. We see that both the current research and the literature findings are in parallel with each other. At the same time, when gender differences between communication styles are considered in terms of empathy and emotional awareness levels, there are studies that

conclude that women communicate more emphatically and have higher emotional awareness than men (Uçar, 2020; Sungur, 2018).

Interpersonal communication refers to the process of constructing a mutual meaning. Many components such as cultural context, past experiences and perception of the environment of individuals influence interpersonal style. Therefore, gender roles play an important role in constructing the meaning in question. Because the gender role includes a social expectation for the behaviors that the individual must fulfill. These expectations lead to a hierarchical structure in the relationship and some characteristics of males and females, as stereotypes and generalities. For example, it is expected that the woman should be more harmonious, gentler and more tolerant in interpersonal relationships (Ünlü, 2019). It is thought that the feminine and masculine roles assigned to the genders by the culture are the most important reason for the result that females establish more positive interpersonal communication compared to males in this study.

5.3. Discussion Related to T-Test Findings to Marital Status

According to the findings, romantic relationship satisfaction of married couples was found to be significantly higher than singles who have romantic relationships. No significant difference was found between marital status and self-control and interpersonal style. Although it was not found to be statistically significant, the level of self-control and positive interpersonal style use of married people was found to be relatively higher than singles.

When the literature is examined, there are studies showing that the relationship satisfaction of married or engaged couples is higher than single couples. Saraç (2013) investigated the relationship between irrational beliefs about romantic relationships and pre-marital relationship perceptions and relationship satisfaction. According to the findings obtained, it is seen that the relationship satisfaction of fiancée and engaged individuals is higher than the individuals who have dating. According to the results of the research conducted by Reisoğlu (2020), relationship status of individuals dating and being engaged makes a significant difference on their relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction of the engaged individuals was found to be significantly higher than the individuals who have dating.

According to the literature, the most important components of romantic love are intimacy, caring and commitment. Considering that these are the reasons behind the individuals' decision to move their relationships from dating to marriage, and adding that marriage is an institution to register loyalty, it can be expected that the romantic relationship satisfaction of married couples is as high as in this study. With relationship status reaching a more formal dimension such as engagement from dating may have increased the feelings of commitment and belonging towards the relationship. Buunk (1981) stated that marital partnership is a type of relationship that gives more confidence because individuals know each other better, so married people experience less jealousy than singles. In addition, when viewed from a cultural perspective, the marriage of individuals can enable them to live their relationships more comfortably in the social environment. Since the seriousness of the relationship situation and its transformation into marriage will make individuals feel more approved by the society, the activities and intimacy of the couples can increase.

Süataç (2010) examined the relationship between marital adjustment and interpersonal relationship styles. She defines marriages that can agree on consensus, share a common life view, and try to establish open and positive communication about problems as positive marriages. In another study conducted by Karataş (2019), it has been concluded that singles have more limited access to effective strategies for emotion regulation, they have more difficulty in clearly showing their emotional reactions and controlling their impulses when they are under negative emotions. Emotion regulation and self-control are very close concepts. The ability to regulate emotions requires self-control. In this study, no significant relationship was found between marital status and interpersonal style and self-control, but it was found that married individuals use a more positive interpersonal style and have more self-control level. In line with the studies mentioned above, it can be interpreted that married individuals feel more trust and closeness to each other than single individuals with romantic relationships, and therefore they use more positive relationship styles and have a higher level of self-control in this study.

5.4. Discussion Related to Correlation Findings to Marital Duration and Relationship Duration

According to findings, it can be seen that relationship satisfaction levels of participants are positively correlated with marital and relationship duration. In other words, as the duration of marriage and relationship increases, romantic relationship satisfaction increases. There was no significant relationship between self-control level and duration of marriage and relationship. It was concluded that there is a significant relationship between interpersonal style and only the duration of the relationship.

Studies examining the relationship between marital satisfaction and the year of marriage have obtained different results. While some studies state that marital adjustment increases during the period of marriage, some have concluded that the duration of marriage decreases after the first years (Guilford & Bengston, 1979; Süataç, 2010). Frideres (1981) states that marital satisfaction is high in the first years of marriage and begins to decrease with the birth of children. A similar discrepancy is observed in studies between romantic relationship satisfaction and relationship duration of single individuals. Çürükvelioğlu (2012) did not find a significant difference between the romantic relationship satisfaction of single emerging adults and the duration of the relationship in his study. On the contrary, Yılmaz (2020) concluded that the romantic relationship satisfaction of the adults who appeared had a significant positive relationship with the duration of the relationship. In this study, relationship satisfaction increased as the duration of marriage and relationship increased. The more time couples spend together, the more they get to know each other, spend more time and accompany each other more at important moments in their lives. This can be interpreted as a situation that directly affects intimacy and commitment, which increases romantic relationship satisfaction.

While there was no significant relationship between interpersonal style and duration of marriage, a significant relationship was found for single individuals with the duration of the relationship. According to the findings of the study, as the duration of the romantic relationship increases, the use of anger style by single participants increases. According to Berscheid (2010) there are different types of love that include quite wide relationship patterns. One type of love is *romantic love*, which involves

sexuality and is generally more common in the early stages of romantic relationships. Romantic love includes quite complex emotions such as passion, fear, anger, fun and jealousy. Also, romantic love is fueled by sexual attraction and satisfaction in the early stages of the relationship. There is discovery and innovation and distrust in this newly established bond. In this process, while partners experience high romantic relationship satisfaction, they may also experience negative emotions such as anger (Regan, 2008 cited in Santrock, 2011). In this study, the age range of the participants is 18-30, since emerging adults are involved. Therefore, 81% of single participants are in the first 2 years of their relationship and the mean of relationship duration is 1.20 years. Considering that most of the participants are at the beginning of their relationship, it is thought that the positive relationship between the use of angry style and the increase in the duration of the relationship may be related to the characteristics of the relationship and the period in the light of the above information.

5.5. Discussion Related to ANOVA Findings to Educational Status

The findings of ANOVA reveal that relationship satisfaction and self-control levels do not differ significantly according to education levels of participants. However, Emotion Avoiding Style levels, which is a sub-dimension of interpersonal style differs significantly according to education levels of participants.

When the literature was examined, it was seen that there were different results about the relationship between relationship satisfaction and educational status. While Karataş (2020) concluded that there is no significant relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction and educational status, Ezer (2017) stated in his study that there is a significant relationship between long-lasting romantic relationships with the increase in educational status. According to some studies conducted with married couples, as the educational level increases, dysfunctional beliefs of couples about their marriage decrease, which positively affects relationship satisfaction (Hamamcı, 2005). Çağ and Yıldırım (2013) found that as the education level of married individuals increases, their marital satisfaction decreases. There are studies showing that there is a positive relationship between conflict resolution skills that directly affect relationship satisfaction and education level. In this study, no significant relationship was found between educational status and relationship satisfaction.

When the relationship between self-control and educational status is investigated, there was no significant difference between self-control level and education level in Boyalı (2020) 's study. However, in Onursal's (2019) study, the self-control scores of undergraduate graduates were found to be significantly lower than the self-control scores of graduate students. In this study, too, a significant relationship was not found between self-control and educational status. However, the majority of the research participants, 225 people, are university graduates. The number of participants with lower education level is 21 and the number of participants with higher education level is 47. Perhaps different results can be reached with the closer the number of participants regarding the link between relationship satisfaction and self-control with educational status.

Karataş (2019) could not find a significant relationship between relationship satisfaction and education level in the study in which she examined the relationship between relationship satisfaction and interpersonal style and emotion regulation. However, it was concluded that middle-high school graduates use the dominant style and insensitive style more than university and postgraduate education levels in their interpersonal relationships. In the study conducted by Süataç (2010), significant relationships were found between education level and interpersonal style. It has been observed that as the level of education increases, individuals use dominant, manipulative and angry styles more. In this study, it was found that the level of using emotion avoiding style has a negative and significant relationship with the education level. Individuals who use an emotion-avoiding style avoid taking responsibility for the problems experienced in the relationship. It is a form of communication in which the individual avoids disclosing positive and negative emotions and indirectly conveys their demands and reactions to the partner. The findings show parallelism with many studies showing that positive interpersonal communication skills such as the quality of communication between individuals, verbal expression skills and empathy and problem solving skills are associated with education level.

5.6. Discussion Related to ANOVA Findings to Income

Findings of ANOVA reveal that relationship satisfaction and experiential self-control sub-dimension of the self-control scale differs significantly according to

income levels of participants. Lastly, there is no significant difference between Interpersonal Style Scale levels and income levels of participants.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are different findings about the relationship between relationship satisfaction and income status. Karataş (2019) could not reach a significant difference between relationship satisfaction and income level in the study she conducted. In a study examining whether university students' expectations from romantic relationships differ in terms of their perceived economic status, it was found that students who expressed a low economic level had higher expectations of trust in romantic relationships than students with higher income levels (Alakuş, 2020). It is thought that being economically inferior causes a negative perception and anxiety towards the individual and this situation affects trust expectation and relationship satisfaction. Taşköprü (2013) found that there is a positive and significant relationship between the income levels and relationship satisfaction of married couples. Differently, there are studies showing that there is no significant relationship between marital adjustment and income level (Süataç, 2010). In this study, relationship satisfaction increases significantly in favor of the high-income group. The economic situation is one of the factors that determine the expectations and living standards for the future. Having a good economic income gives individuals the chance to realize their wishes and evaluate their options. Emerging adulthood is also a period in which career plans are tested and new options are explored in this context. Establishing and maintaining positive romantic relationships and achieving economic independence are among the basic development tasks of this period. It is thought that individuals' overcoming the problem of economic independence, which is very important for them, will enable them to spend better time for each other, to feel safer and to live in a relationship where they produce options.

When studies on self-control and income are investigated, it is seen that, on the contrary to this study, Boyalı's (2020) study did not find a significant relationship between self-control and income status. In this study, it was found that the experiential self-control level has a significant positive relationship with the income status of the participants. According to Rosenbaum (1993) experiential self-control can be considered as a tendency for individuals to enjoy life by taking pleasure in new

and different experiences and the moment. In other words, experiential self control offers individuals an opportunity to gain and develop new life experiences. In line with the findings of this study, it is thought that having a good income economically will facilitate the individuals' experience of experiential self-control.

When the studies comparing the relationship between income status and interpersonal style are examined, it is seen in the study conducted by Karataş (2019) and Sepetçi (2019) that there is no significant difference between interpersonal style and income level. In this study, however, no significant relationship was found between interpersonal style and income level.

In this study, it was aimed to examine how the romantic relationship satisfaction of emerging adults is predicted by self-control and interpersonal style. In addition, it was aimed to determine how the relationship satisfaction, self-control levels and interpersonal relationship styles of the emerging adults differ according to gender, marital status, relationship duration, educational status and socioeconomic status.

As a result, in line with the findings obtained in the research:

- Romantic relationship satisfaction was predicted by self-control and interpersonal style. There is a positive and significant relationship was found between the reformative and experiential self-control and relationship satisfaction. There is a negatively significant relationship was found between the avoidant style sub-dimension of the interpersonal style scale and relationship satisfaction.
- There is a significant relationship was found between romantic relationship satisfaction and marital status, relationship duration, and income level. Individuals who are married, have a higher income, and have a longer duration of romantic relationship have higher relationship satisfaction.
- There is a positive and significant relationship was found between relationship duration of single participants and the use of angry style sub-dimension of interpersonal style.
- There is a significant relationship between the self-control levels, gender and income level. Reformative self-control levels of females were found to be

significantly higher than males. Individuals with higher incomes were found to have higher levels of experiential self-control.

- It was found that male participants used negative interpersonal style significantly more than females with all its sub-dimensions.
- Lastly, there is a significant and negative relationship between and the education level and emotion avoiding sub-dimension.



CHAPTER VI

SUGGESTIONS

The total number of participants of the study is 293. 199 of the participants are women and 94 are men. The distribution by marital status is 69 married and 224 singles. From this point of view, it is thought that the closer female-male and married-single ratio in the study can give more reliable results for future studies. In addition, the fact that 225 of the participants (76.8%) are university graduates, depending on the education level, can be recommended to study with a large sample from which data can be collected in a more balanced way.

Cross-sectional method was used in this study. Considering that the emerging adulthood period covers the age range of 18-30, it is thought that the information obtained as a result of the research with a longitudinal study will be more detailed and will provide an opportunity to make inferences about its causes and consequences.

A significant relationship was found between the relationship status and romantic relationship satisfaction in favor of the married. Studies on premarital attitudes and expectations of the emerging adulthood period can be conducted in future research.

The fact that the self control and interpersonal styles predict relationship satisfaction significantly suggests that psychoeducational studies can be conducted to improve the relationships of emerging adults in different developmental stages of the romantic relationship.

REFERENCES

Aktan, T. & Asker, H. (2019). Relations of Dysfunctional Romantic Beliefs with Ambivalent Sexism and Relationship Experience in University Students. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences* 22(3), 635-653.

Alakuş, E. (2020). *Developing awareness scale about expectations from romantic relationships and determining the awareness of university students' expectations from romantic relationships*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Institute of Educational Science, Burdur.

Alicke, M. D., & Sedikides, C. (2009). Self-enhancement and self-protection: What they are and what they do. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 20(1), 1-48 doi:10.1080/10463280802613866

Argyle, M. (2001). Social relationships. In M. Argyle (Ed.), *The Psychology of Happiness* (pp. 70-87). New York: Methuen & Co. Company.

Argyle, M., & Martin, M. (1991). The psychological causes of happiness. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective well-being. An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 77-86). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>

Arnett, J.J. (2009). *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road from the Late Teens through the Twenties*. (First edition). Oxford University Press, New York.

Atak, H . (2011). Yetişkinliğe Aşamalı Geçiş: Beliren Yetişkinlik Tek Bir Ana Yol Mu? *İlköğretim Online*, 10(1), 51-67. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ilkonline/issue/8593/106846>

Atak, H. & Çok, F. Emerging adulthood and perceived adulthood in Turkey, 3rd Conference on Emerging Adulthood, Tucson, AZ, USA, 15-16 February 2007.

Averill, J. R. (1983). Studies on anger and aggression: Implications for theories of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 38(11), 1145–1160. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.38.11.1145

Batıgün, A. D., Şahin, N. H. (2009). Interpersonal style, anger, and self-perception: common elements in psychopathologies (Project No. 08B5358001). Ankara: Ankara University Scientific Research Projects.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The Strength Model of Self-Control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 351–355. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x

Berscheid, E. (2010). Love in the fourth dimension. *Annual review of psychology*, 61(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100318>

Birtchnell, J. (1993). *How humans relate: a new interpersonal theory*. UK: Psychology Press

Bowlby J. (1979). *The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds*. London: Tavistock

Boyalı, C. (2020). *Examining the mediating role of smartphone addiction in the relationship between self-control and academic procrastination*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University Institute of Educational Science, İstanbul.

Burger, J.M. (2006). *Personality*. İstanbul: kaknüs.

Cann, A., Norman, M. A., Welbourne, J. L., & Calhoun, L. G. (2008). Attachment styles, conflict styles and humour styles: Interrelationships and associations with relationship satisfaction. *European Journal of Personality*, 22, 131-146.

Celenk, O., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Goodwin, R. (2011). Relationship satisfaction among Turkish and British adults. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 628-640.

Collins, W. A. (2003). More and myth: the developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 1-24.

Connolly, J. A., & McIsaac, C. (2009). *Romantic relationships in adolescence*. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology: Contextual influences on adolescent development* (p. 104–151). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy002005>

Cramer, D. (2000). Relationship Satisfaction and Conflict Style in Romantic Relationships. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 134(3), 337-341, DOI: 10.1080/00223980009600873

Cramer, D. (2004). Emotional Support, Conflict, Depression, and Relationship Satisfaction in a Romantic Partner. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(6), 532–542. doi:10.3200/jrlp.138.6.532-534

Croyle, K. L., & Waltz, J. (2002). Emotional awareness and couples' relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 28(4), 435–444. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2002.tb00368.x

Curun, F. (2001). *The Effects Of Sexism And Sex Role Orientation On Romantic Relationship Satisfaction*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Çelen, N. (2011). *Adolescence and young adulthood*. İstanbul: Papatya.

Çelen-Demirtaş, S. (2010). *The role of gender, relationship Status, romantic relationship satisfaction, and commitment to career choices in the components of subjective well-being among senior university students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Demir, M. (2007). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(2), 257–277. doi:10.1007/s10902-007-9051-8

Doğan, T. ve Sapmaz, F. (2012). Interpersonal relationship styles and subjective well-being. *The Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 10(3), 585-601.

Duyan, V., Gül den, Ç. ve Gelbal, S. (2012). Self-Control Scale – SCS: Reliability and Validity Study, *Society and Social Work*, 23, 25-38.

Erdem, Ş., Kabasakal, Z. (2015). Psychological well-being and adult attachment dimensions. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 4, 82-90.

Erikson E.H. (1968) *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton Company, Inc.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: Penguin.

Erözkan, A. (2009). The Predictors Of Interpersonal Relationship Styles In High School Students. Selçuk University, *Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*, 21, 543 –551.

Eryılmaz, A., & Atak, H., (2009). Ready or not? Markers of Starting Romantic Intimacy at Emerging Adulthood: Turkish Experience. *International Journal of Social Science*, 4 (1), 31-38.

Eryılmaz, A., & Ercan, L., (2012). Initiating Romantic Intimacy and Coping at Emerging Adulthood. *Uludağ University Journal of Education Faculty* 23 (2), 2010, 381-397.

Ezer, E. (2017). *The relationship between adults attachment, and relationship satisfaction and personality traits*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Beykent University Institute of Social Science, İstanbul.

Fincham, F. D., Rogge, R., & Beach, S. R. H. (2018). *Relationship satisfaction*. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (p. 422–436). Cambridge University Press.

Fincham, F. D., & Cui, M. (2010). *Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood*. Cambridge University Press.

Furman, W., & Collins, W. A. (2009). *Adolescent romantic relationships and experiences*. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Social, emotional, and personality development in context. Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (p. 341–360). The Guilford Press.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Frieese, M. and Hofmann, W. (2009). Control me or I will control you: impulses, trait self-control, and the guidance of behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 795–805.

Geçtan, E. (2008). *Psikanaliz ve sonrası*. İstanbul: remzi.

Gottfredson, M. R. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gilford, R., & Bengtson, V. (1979). Measuring marital satisfaction in three generations: Positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(2), 387–398. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351705>

Halpern-Meehin, S., Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2013). Relationship churning, physical violence, and verbal abuse in young adult relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 2–12. <https://doi.org.lproxy.yeditepe.edu.tr/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01029.x>

Harlow, H. F. (1958). The nature of love. *American Psychologist*, 13(12), 673–685. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047884>

Hasta, D. & Güler, M. E. (2013). Aggression: an investigation in terms of interpersonal styles and empathy. *Ankara University Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (1).

Hawkins, J. L. (1968). Associations between companionship, hostility, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 30(4), 647–650. <https://doi.org/10.2307/349510>

Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The Relationship Assessment Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 137–142. doi:10.1177/0265407598151009

Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352430>

İmamoğlu, S. E., & Aydın, B. (2009). Scale of Dimensions of Interpersonal Relationships. *Studies in Psychology*, 29, 39-64.

İmamoğlu, S. (2008). *Examination of interpersonal relationships in young adulthood in terms of gender, sex-role, and loneliness*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Jo, Y. & Bouffard, L. (2014). Stability of self-control and gender. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(4), 356-365. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.05.001>

Karataş, M. (2014). *The study on relation between social problem solving skills and self-control on police officers in Turkish National Police, Center Headquarter Department*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara.

Karataş, Z. (2019). *The examination of the relationship between romantic relationship satisfaction, emotion regulation difficulties and interpersonal styles*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Maltepe University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Karatatar, H. (2018). *The mediator role of personality traits between the relationship of perceived parenthood style and relationship satisfaction in emerging adulthood*. (Unpublished master's thesis), Yıldırım Beyazıt University Institute of Social Science, Ankara.

Kastro, R. (1998). *Marital adjustment and depression: A study on the quality of marital relationship and symptom formation in spouses*. (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Koç V. (2008). *Interpersonal style, self-perception, anger and depression*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Koç, B. (2014). The relationship between interpersonal relationship styles and aggression. *International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture and Education* 3(4), 160-182.

Korkut- Owen, F., Demirbaş-Çelik, N. & Doğan, T. (2017). Well-being in adults. *International Journal of Social Research*, (10)53, 600-611.

Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Lee, J. A. (1977). A Typology of Styles of Loving. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3(2), 173–182. doi:10.1177/014616727700300204

Lewandowski, G. W., Nardone, N., & Raines, A. J. (2010). The Role of Self-concept Clarity in Relationship Quality. *Self and Identity*, 9(4), 416–433. doi:10.1080/15298860903332191

Meeks, B. S., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1998). Communication, Love and Relationship Satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(6), 755–773. doi:10.1177/0265407598156003

Miller, B.C., Brad, B. (1999). *Romantic and sexual relationship development during adolescence*. In W. Furman, B. Brown, C. Feiring (Eds.), *The Development of Romantic Relationships in Adolescence* (pp. 99-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Marriage and romantic relationships: defining intimacy in romantic relationships. *Family Relations*, 42, 7-31.

Neyer, F. J., & Voigt, D. (2004). Personality and social network effects on romantic relationships: a dyadic approach. *European Journal of Personality*, 18(4), 279–299. doi:10.1002/per.519

Öcal-Yüceol, S. (2016). *The relations between gender role attitudes, relationship satisfaction and irrational romantic relationship beliefs*. (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Bilim University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Pines, M.A. (2005). *Falling in Love: Why We Choose the Lovers We Choose*. New York: Routledge.

Prager, K. J. (1995). *The psychology of intimacy*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Regan PC. (1998). Of lust and love: Beliefs about the role of sexual desire in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships* 5(2), 139–57.

Reisoğlu, G. (2020). *The relationship between satisfaction in romantic relationship, beliefs related to forgiveness and forgiveness*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziantep University Institute of Educational Science, Gaziantep.

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science* (Vol. 3, pp. 184-256). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rosenbaum, M. (1980). A schedule for assessing self-control behaviors: Preliminary findings. *Behavior Therapy*, 11, 109-121. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(80)80040-2

Rosenbaum, M. (1993). The three functions of self-control behaviour: Redressive, reformative and experiential. *Work & Stress*, 7(1), 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678379308257048>

Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101-117. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.101

Sabatelli, R. M. (1988). Exploring Relationship Satisfaction: A Social Exchange Perspective on the Interdependence between Theory, Research, and Practice. *Family Relations*, 37(2), 217. doi:10.2307/584323

Safran, J. (1990). Towards a refinement of cognitive therapy in light of interpersonal theory: I. Theory. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 10(1), 87-105. doi:10.1016/0272-7358(90)90108-m

Safran, J. D., & Segal, Z. V. (1990). *Cognitive therapy: An interpersonal process perspective*. New York: Basic.

Şahin, N.H., Çeri, Ö., Düzgün, G., Ergün, H., Karşı, E., Koç, V., Örfli, P., Uzun, C. (2007). Interpersonal Style Scale. Ankara: Unpublished Study.

Şahin, N.H., Durak-Batıgün, A., Koç, V. (2011). Interpersonal style, self-perception, anger and depression, *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 22(1), 17-25.

Şahin, N.H. & Oral, N. (2008). The Relationship of Eating Attitude Disorder with Interpersonal Schemas, Attachment, Interpersonal Relationship Styles and Anger. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 23 (62), 37-48.

Şahin, N. H., Batıgün, A. D. Ve Uzun, C. (2011) Anxiety disorder: a study on interpersonal style, self perception, and anger. *Journal of Anatolia Psychiatry*, 12, 107-113.

Şahin, N. H., Durak, A., & Yasak, Y. (1994). Interpersonal Style, Loneliness And Depression. *23rd International Congress Of Applied Psychology*, (TSCLN (7)3, July, 17-22, 1994, Madrid, Spain.

Sakallı, N., & Curun, F. (2001). Attitudes toward some stereotypes related to romantic relationships. *Psychology Studies*, 22, 31-45.

Santrock, J.W. (2011). *Life-Span Development* (13th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill

Saraç, A., Hamamcı, Z., Güçray, S. (2015). Predicting Romantic Relationship Satisfaction of University Students. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 5(43) 69-81.

Saraç, A. (2013). *The role of irrational beliefs and perceptions related with premarital relationship in predicting romantic relationship satisfaction of university students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Satıcı, B. Deniz, M. E.(2018). Gender Differences in Romantic Relationship Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis Study. *Elementary Education Online*, 17(2): pp. 1077-. doi 10.17051/ilkonline.2018.419356

Satıcı, B. (2013). *An investigation of the mediating roles of emotional intelligence and mindful-awareness on the association between perfectionism and romantic relationship satisfaction in early adulthood*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yıldız Technical University Institute of Educational Science, İstanbul.

Snyder, A.R. (2006). *Risky and casual sexual relationships among teens*. In A. C. Crouter&A. Booth (Eds.), *Romance and sex in adolescence and emerging adulthood: risks and opportunities* (pp. 161-169). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sternberg, R.J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*,93(2), 119-135

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton ve Company.

Sullivan, H. S. (Ed.). (2013). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. Routledge.

Süataç-Özmen, A. (2010). *Marital adjustment research in terms of interpersonal style and anger*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ege University Health Sciences Institute, İzmir.

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High Self-Control Predicts Good Adjustment, Less Pathology, Better Grades, and Interpersonal Success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271–324. doi:10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

Tekin, F. (2019).*Relationship between subjective well-being levels and interpersonal relations styles and perceived parental styles of university students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Arel University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul.

Timpano, K. R., & Schmidt, N. B. (2013). The relationship between self-control deficits and hoarding: A multimethod investigation across three samples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 122(1), 13–25. doi:10.1037/a0029760

Treher, E. & Noah, J. (2008). *Interpersonal Communication: Challenges and Solutions: Strategies to Improve Organizational and Individual Communication*. *Laboratory Medicine* 39(5):261-264. Doi: 10.1309/cqruednet7mb4rw

Uçar-Sayıkoğlu, M. (2020). *An investigation of identity styles and interpersonal relationships in university students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University Institute of Educational Science, Ankara.

Ulutaş, E. (2018). *Investigation of the correlation of romantic relationship satisfaction with personality traits and self esteem in university students*.

(Unpublished master's thesis). Uludağ University Institute of Educational Science, Bursa.

Üney, R. Güneri-Yönen, E. (2020). The Relationship Between Self Structure, Romantic Relationship Forms and Gender, *İstanbul Gelişim University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (1), p. 170-184.

Ünlü, D. G. (2019). Determining Stereotypes about the Gender Identity in Interpersonal Communication Process: A Research On Body Language Of the Communication Source. *Erciyes Journal of Communication* , 6 (1) , 243-262 . DOI: 10.17680 / erciyes contact.472193

Vohs, K. D., Finkenauer, C., & Baumeister, R. F. (2010). The Sum of Friends' and Lovers' Self-Control Scores Predicts Relationship Quality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2(2), 138–145. doi:10.1177/1948550610385710

Weiser, D. A., & Weigel, D. J. (2016). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: direct and indirect effects on relationship maintenance and satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 152–156. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.013

White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(7), 1519–1530. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.02.019

Yalom, I. (2005). *The Schopenhauer Cure*. İstanbul: Kabalcı.

Yılmaz, B. (2020). *The differentiation of self, authenticity and depression as predictors of relationship satisfaction in emerging adulthood*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Mersin University Institute of Educational Science, Mersin.

Yoo, H., Bartle-Haring, S., Day, R. D., & Gangamma, R. (2013). Couple Communication, Emotional and Sexual Intimacy, and Relationship Satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 40(4), 275–293. doi:10.1080/0092623x.2012.751072

Zuo, P.-Y., Karremans, J. C., Scheres, A., Kluwer, E. S., Burk, W. J., Kappen, G., & Ter Kuile, H. (2020). A Dyadic Test of the Association Between Trait Self-Control

and Romantic Relationship Satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.594476

APPENDICES

6.1. Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın () Erkek ()
2. Yaşınız:
3. Medeni durumunuz: Bekar () Evli ()
4. Eğer bekar iseniz bir romantik ilişkiniz var mı? Evet () Hayır ()
5. Var ise romantik ilişkinizin süresi:
6. Eğer evli iseniz evliliğinizin süresi:
7. Öğretim durumunuz: İlkokul () Ortaokul () Lise () Yüksekokul ()
Üniversite() Yüksek lisans () Doktora ()
8. Aylık ortalama kazancınız:

6.2. Appendix-2: Relationship Satisfaction Scale

İLİŞKİ DOYUMU ÖLÇEĞİ

Açıklama: Aşağıda ilişkinizi değerlendirmenize ilişkin 7 ifade bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her bir ifadenin size uygunluğunu 7 dereceli ölçek üzerinde değerlendirip ifadenin üzerine işaretleyiniz.

1. Sevgiliniz ihtiyaçlarınızı ne kadar iyi karşılıyor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok iyi
karşılamıyor						karşılıyor

2. Genel olarak ilişkinizden ne kadar memnunsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç memnun						Çok
değilim						memnunum

3. Diğerleri ile karşılaştırıldığında ilişkiniz ne kadar iyi?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çok daha						Çok daha
kötü						iyi

4. Ne sıklıkla ilişkinize hiç başlamamış olmayı istiyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç bir						Her zaman
zaman						

5. İlişkiniz ne dereceye kadar sizin başlangıçtaki beklentilerinizi karşılıyor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Tamamen
karşılamıyor						karşılıyor

6. Sevgilinizi ne kadar seviyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok
sevmiyorum						seviyorum

7. İlişkinizde ne kadar problem var?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok fazla
yok						problem var

6.3. Appendix-3: Self-Control Scale

ÖZ-DENETİM ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda belirtilen ifadelerin yanında yer alan sütuna, belirtilen ifadelerin size uyma derecesini belirten rakamı yazınız.

Bana tamamen uyuyor +3, Bana çoğunlukla uyuyor +2, Bana biraz uyuyor +1 Bana biraz uymuyor -1, Bana çoğunlukla uymuyor -2, Bana tamamen uymuyor -3

Sıkıcı bir iş yaptığımda, işin daha az sıkıcı olan yanlarını ve işi bitirdiğimde elde edeceğim ödülü düşünürüm.

Beni endişelendiren bir şey yapmak zorunda olduğumda, işi yaparken endişemin nasıl üstesinden geleceğimi gözümde canlandırmaya çalışırım.

Düşünme şeklimi değiştirerek, çoğu zaman neredeyse her şeye ilişkin duygularımı da değiştirebilirim.

Dışarıdan yardım almaksızın, sinirlilik, öfke ve gerginliğimin üstesinden gelebilmem çoğu zaman zordur.

Moralim bozuk olduğunda güzel şeyler düşünmeye çalışırım

Yaptığım hataları düşünmekten kendimi alamam.

Zor bir problemle karşılaştığımda, onu sistematik bir şekilde ele almaya çalışırım.

Biri bana baskı yaptığımda, yapmam gereken şeyi genellikle daha kısa sürede yaparım.

Zor bir karar vermem gerektiğinde tüm verilere sahip olsam dahi karar vermeyi ertelemeyi tercih ederim.

Okuduğum şeye odaklanmakta zorluk yaşadığımda, konsantrasyonumu artırmanın yollarını ararım.

Çalışmayı planladığımda, işimle ilgisi olmayan her şeyi ortadan kaldırırım.

Kötü bir alışkanlıktan kurtulamaya çalışırken, öncelikle bu alışkanlığa sahip olma nedenlerimi bulmaya çalışırım.

Tatsız bir düşünce canımı sıktığında, güzel şeyler düşünmeye çalışırım.

Günde iki paket sigara içiyor olsaydım, sigarayı bırakmak için dışarıdan yardım almaya ihtiyaç duyardım.

Moralim bozuk olduğunda ruh halimin değişmesi için neşeli davranmaya çalışırım.

Yanımda sakinleştirici olsa gergin ve sinirli olduğumda bir tane alırdım.

Moralim bozuk olduğunda sevdiğim şeylerle meşgul olmaya çalışırım.

Hoşlanmadığım işleri hemen yapabilecek durumda olsam bile onları erteleme eğilimindeyimdir.

Bazı kötü alışkanlıklarımdan kurtulmak için dışarıdan yardım almaya ihtiyaç duyarım.

Kendimi işe veremediğimde ve işi yapmakta zorlandığımda, kendimi işe vermenin yollarını ararım.

Kendimi kötü hissetmeme sebep olsa bile olası tüm felaketleri düşünmekten kendimi alamam.

Sevdiğim şeyleri yapmaya başlamadan önce yapmak zorunda olduğum işi bitirmeyi tercih ederim.

Bir yerim ağrıdığımda onu düşünmemeye çalışırım.

Kötü bir alışkanlığımın üstesinden gelmeyi başardığımda kendime olan saygım artar.

Başarısızlığa eşlik eden kötü duygulardan kurtulmak için çoğu zaman kendime bunun feci bir şey olmadığını ve bir şeyler yapabileceğimi söylerim.

Düşünmeden hareket ettiğimi hissettiğimde kendime durmamı ve onunla ilgili bir şey yapmadan önce düşünmemi söylerim.

Birine aşırı derecede sinirlendiğimde bile yapacaklarımı dikkatlice düşünürüm.

Karar vermem gerektiğinde, çabuk ve içimden geldiği gibi karar vermek yerine genellikle farklı seçenekler ararım.

Genellikle yapmam gereken daha acil şeyler olduğunda bile önce yapmayı sevdiğim şeyi yaparım.

Önemli bir toplantıya geç kalmamın kaçınılmaz olduğunu fark ettiğimde, kendime sakin olmamı söylerim.

Bir yerim ağrıdığında, düşüncelerimi başka yöne çevirmeye çalışırım.

Yapmam gereken birkaç şey olduğunda genellikle işlerimi planlarım.

Param azaldığında ilerde daha dikkatli bütçe yapmak için tüm harcamalarımı kaydetmeye karar veririm.

Bir işe konsantre olmakta zorluk yaşarsam onu küçük parçalara bölerim.

Çoğu zaman beni rahatsız eden tatsız düşüncelerin üstesinden gelemem.

Acıktığımda ve yemek yeme fırsatım olmadığında, düşüncelerimi midemden başka bir yere yönlendirmeye ya da tok olduğumu hayal etmeye çalışırım

6.4. Appendix-4: Interpersonal Style Scale

KİŞİLERARASI İLİŞKİ TARZLARI ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup, sizi ne kadar tanımladığını sağ tarafındaki seçeneklerden birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Lütfen boş bırakmayınız. Seçeneklerde "doğru" ya da "yanlış" diye bir değerlendirme yoktur, önemli olan sizin kendinizi nasıl tanımladığınızdır. Lütfen isim yazmayın. Katkılarınız için çok teşekkür ederiz.

		Sizi ne kadar tanımlıyor				
		0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
1	İnsanlarla konuşurken iğneleyici sözler söylemekten çekinmem.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2	Problemini anlatan bir kişinin, duygularından bahsetmesinden rahatsız olurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3	Problem yaşadığım bireyin ne hissettiğiyle ilgilenmem.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4	Karşımdaki insanı yapmasını istediğim davranış konusunda zorlarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5	İnsanlara emir vererek bir işi daha çabuk yaptırabileceğimi düşünürüm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6	Kendi çıkarım için başkalarına hoş sözler söylemekten kaçınmam.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7	Eleştirilmemek ya da reddedilmemek için kendi doğrularımı kendime saklarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8	İstediklerimi yapmaları için gerektiğinde insanlara gözdağı veririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9	Karşımdaki bireyle konuşurken onu küçük düşürücü ifadeler kullandığım olur.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10	Sorduğum sorularla karşımdakini sıkıştırmaktan hoşlanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11	İnsanları dinlerken, sık sık sıkılıp konuyu değiştirmeye çalışırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12	Birilerini dinlerken genelde elimde bir şeylerle oynuyor olurum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13	Birini dinlerken oturduğum yerde kıpırdanmadan duramam.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14	Haksız olsam da karşımdaki kişi ne derse desin, kendimi savunurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15	Karşımdaki kişiye açıklama yapmaktansa, doğrudan ne yapması gerektiğini söylemeyi tercih ederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16	Sohbet sırasında birini dinlemek istemesem de dinliyormuş gibi görünürüm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17	İnsanlarla çatışmaktan ve aramızda var olan problemleri tartışmaktan kaçınırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18	İnsanlarla sorunlarımı çözerken, kendi ihtiyaçlarımı ön planda tutarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19	İnsanlara istediğim bir şeyi yaptırmak için onları pohpohlarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20	Sinirlendiğimde sonradan pişman olacağım sözler söylerim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21	Biri beni eleştiriyorsa “asıl sen kendine bak” derim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22	Arkadaşlarıma kendi taktığım isimlerle seslenirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
23	Dertlerini anlatan arkadaşına, bunları boş vermesini söylerim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
24	Genellikle karşımdakileri dinlerken hiç soru sormam.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
25	Karşımdakileri eleştirmekten kaçınmam.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
26	İnsanlarla konuşurken duygularımı gizlemeye çalışırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
27	Başkalarının hatalarını görürsem yüzlerine vururum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
28	Karşımdakilerin sorunlarını dinlemekten kaçınırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29	Başka insanların beğendiğim özelliklerini övmekten çekinirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30	Birini dinlerken anlamadığım ya da kaçırdığım bir yer olduğunda, sözünü kesip anlayamadığımı ya da kaçırdığımı söyleyemem.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
31	Söylediklerimin aynen yapılmasını beklerim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
32	İnsanların çoğunun aptal olduğuna inanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33	Öfkeli olduğumda genellikle bağırıp çağırırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
34	Eğer bir kişiye kızmışsam öfkemi başkalarından çıkarırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		Sizi ne kadar tanımlıyor				
		0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
35	Birisiyle konuşurken göz teması kurmaktan rahatsız olurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
36	Birini dinlemek istemezsem ilgisiz sorularla geçiştirmeye çalışırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37	Sıkıcı konular açıldığında; konuyu hemen değiştiririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
38	Sıklıkla konuşulan konu sonlanmadan başka bir konuya geçtiğimi fark ettiğim olmuştur.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39	Kişilerarası sorunumu çözerken, karşımdakini anlamak zorunda olmadığımı düşünürüm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40	Genelde, almak istediğim cevabı alacağım türden sorular sorarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41	İnsanlar yaptığım övgüleri hak etmeseler de onları överim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
42	Biriyle tartışırken, tek amacım o tartışmayı kazanmaktır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
43	Karşımdakilerle içten içe alay etmekten hoşlanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
44	İnsanlara nasihat vermeyi severim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
45	İnsanların dış görünüşleri onlara karşı davranışlarımı/konuşma biçimimi/ilişkilerimi belirler.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46	İnsanlar istediklerimi yapmazlarsa onlara küseceğimi bilirler.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47	Arkadaşlarıma isim takmaktan hoşlanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48	Karşımdakini sorguya çekiyormuşum gibi sorular sorarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49	Çoğu zaman isteklerimi yaptırmak için insanlara karşı tehditkar olurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50	Karşımdaki kişi ile aynı düşünceleri paylaşmadığımda söylediklerini sonuna kadar dinleyemem.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51	Çevremdeki insanları kendi istek ve gereksinimlerime göre yönlendiririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
52	Başkalarına emirler vermekten hoşlanırım	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
53	Karşımdakini dinlerken aklımda başka düşünceler olsa da onu anlıyormuş gibi görünmeye devam ederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
54	Çok öfkeli olduğum zaman gözüm hiç kimseyi görmez.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
55	Başkasıyla konuşurken, cevabını pek önemsemediğim halde sorular sorarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
56	Birileri benimle tartışırsa sonunda kırılabileceklerini bilirler.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
57	İnsanların çoğunun riyakar olduğuna inanırım	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
58	Birisi bana sorunlarını anlatmaya başladığında içimden “umarım fazla uzatmaz” diye geçiririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
59	İsteklerimi soru şeklinde (yapar mısın, eder misin gibi) yöneltmek yerine doğrudan (yap, et gibi) ifade etmeyi tercih ederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
60	Kendi düşüncelerimi savunmak için gerekirse karşımdakini kırarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

6.8. Appendix-8: Ethics Committee Approval

YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ BEŞERİ VE SOSYAL BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU KOMİSYONU

18.02.2021 TARİHLİ
15/2021 No'lu TOPLANTI KARARLARI

Öğretmenlerin, Yöneticilerinin Yeterlilikleri Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

25) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden Serra Oğuz’un “4 Yaşındaki Türkçe İngilizce İki Dilli Çocuğun Dil Gelişimi Üzerine Bilimsel Bir Vaka Çalışması” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

26) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Doktora Programı öğrencilerinden Suna Altun’un “Türkiye’de Genel İngilizce ve Özel Amaçlı İngilizce Programlarının Karşılaştırılması/An Investigation of General English Versus English for Specific Purposes Programs in Turkey” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

27) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden Zehra İlke Coşkun’un “Beliren Yetişkinlikte İlişki Doyumunun Açıklanmasında Öz Denetim ve Kişilerarası İlişkin Tarzının Yordayıcı Rolü” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

28) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden Aslıhan Küçük’ün “Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Çocuklukçağı Travmaları, Olumsuz Değerlendirilme Korkusu ve Yetersizlik Duygusunun Mükemmeliyetçilik Üzerindeki Yordayıcı Rolü” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

29) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencilerinden Baran Ertuğrul’un “Tedarik Zinciri Yönetimi Sürecinin Rekabet Avantajı ve Organizasyonel Performans Üzerine Etkisi” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşerî ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.

30) Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Doktora Programı öğrencilerinden Sevinç Yerli Usul’un “Anlaşılabilirlik Olgusunun Dilbilimsel ve Bağlamsal Değişkenlerinin Araştırılması/Investigating the Linguistic and Contextual Parameters of the Construct of Comprehensibility” başlıklı araştırmasının Beşerî Bilimler etik standartlarına



