



## EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND ATTACHMENT STYLES PREDICTING TENDENCIES IN INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

**Serdar Körük<sup>i</sup>**

Phd Student, Research Assistant, Eskişehir Osmangazi University,  
Faculty of Education, Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance,  
Eskişehir, Turkey

### **Abstract:**

The aim of this study is to investigate the predictive strength of early maladaptive schemas and adult attachment styles on psychological tendencies performed in intimate relationships. Correlational model was used and the sample consisted of 100 individuals. The data was gathered through online survey. The Turkish form of Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire was used to measure psychological tendencies. The Turkish form of Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form-3 was used to measure early maladaptive schemas and the Turkish form of Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised was used to measure attachment styles. The multiple linear regression analysis was conducted on each psychological tendency considering maladaptive schemas and attachment styles as independent variables. The regression results were analyzed to gender and the findings showed that there are significant gender differences in schema domains and attachment styles predicting psychological tendencies in intimate relationship.

**Keywords:** early maladaptive schemas, attachment styles, psychological tendencies, intimate relation

### **1. Introduction**

Behaviors, thoughts and attitudes performed in intimate relationships are important factors effecting the quality and continuity of the relationships and forming interpersonal styles which include these behaviors, thoughts and attitudes and which guide intimate relationship is one of the main developmental tasks of adulthood (Yoo,

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [serdarkoruk1989@gmail.com](mailto:serdarkoruk1989@gmail.com)

Park, & Jun, 2014). Snell, Schicke and Arbeiter (2002) defined these interpersonal styles in intimate relationships as psychological tendencies including *relational esteem* explaining one's own positive evaluations about his/her skills and capacity to maintain relationship; *relational preoccupation* explaining one's frequent obsessions about the intimate relationship; *internal relational control* explaining one's belief that his/her behaviors and personal aspects control the relationship; *relational awareness* explaining one's ability to be aware of the positive and negative aspects of intimate relationships; *relational motivation* explaining one's willingness to be in intimate relationship; *relational anxiety* explaining one's anxiety about being in intimate relationship; *relational assertiveness* explaining one's level of being assertive in intimate relationship like expressing his/her expectations, wishes, feelings and thoughts; *relational depression* explaining one's negative feelings like unhappiness, disappointment, dissatisfaction about being in an intimate relationship; *external relationship control* explaining one's belief that his/her intimate relationship is guided by external factors like fate, chance or others' directions; *relational monitoring* explaining one's attention to others' evaluations about his/her intimate relationship; *relational fear* explaining one's fear of engaging in intimate relationship; *relational satisfaction* explaining one's satisfaction and happiness she/he has about his/her intimate relationship (Büyükaşahin, 2005).

The experience of negative interactions with primary care givers in early stages of life has harmful effects on interpersonal relationships in adolescence and adulthood (Tezel, Kışlak, & Boysan, 2015). Attachment is defined as a consistent and continuous emotional bond which was formed by the interactions between the child and the primary care giver in infancy and which affects the child's relationships with others in adolescence and adulthood (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bowlby, 1980). A child's emotional and physical needs should be continuously and consistently met by the care givers for the formation of healthy and secure attachment (Bowlby, 1969, 1973). The repetitive interactions between the child and care givers form internal working models of the child in the child's mind and these internal working models direct the individual's social interactions in adolescence and adulthood by being activated in sense of stress, anxiety, and fear which the individual had felt during infancy and childhood (Pierce, Baldwin & Lydon, 1997).

Another psychological agency related to attachment which determines the human reactions in social context is cognitive schemas (Beck, 1964). Cognitive schemas are defined as cognitive images related to self and others formed by the interactions with care givers in infancy and childhood and enable individuals to make sense of the external world (Young, Klosko, & Weishaar, 2003). Negative and frustrating life experiences in early stages of life cause individuals to have maladaptive schemas.

Young (2009) defined early maladaptive schemas as pervasive cognitive themes that tend to develop during infancy and childhood, affect self-perception, and strongly influence personal relationships. Satisfying the emotional and physical need of the child with the bond of secure attachment causes the child to have positive and more functional schemas related to him/her and others and to have the sense of worth, autonomy, competence, being loved and cared (Young & Lindeman, 1992). On the basis of insecure attachment, early traumatic life experiences and unhealthy parental interactions cause the child to have maladaptive schemas which make them more prone to have psychopathology and interpersonal problems in later years (Young & Lindermann, 1992; Young et al., 2003).

## **2. Method**

### **2.1 Research Design**

The aim of this study is to determine the effects of early maladaptive schemas and adult attachment styles on psychological tendencies in intimate relationships individuals perform. This study is a quantitative research in which correlational design was used.

### **2.2 Sample**

The data was gathered from 100 individuals through online survey. E-mail sampling method was conducted. The scales were transformed into online forms and shared on various social media platforms along with their explanations. The sample consisted of 24 (24%) male and 76 (76%) female participants whose age ranged from 18 to 55 and the mean age was found 27. 70 participants were single and 30 participants were married. Eight participants had divorce experience. Participants' occupations varied including psychological counselor (21/21%), teacher (21/21%), university student (26/26%), lawyer (3/3%), academician (7/7%), engineer (4/4%), sociologist (3/3%), civil servant (5/5%), banker (3/3%), psychologist (1/1%), worker (1/1%), retired (1/1%), and unemployed (2/2%).

### **2.3 Research Instruments**

Participants' demographic information was measured by Demographic Variable Form designed by the researcher including participants' gender, age, occupation, marital status and divorce experience.

Psychological tendencies of participants were measured by the Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire which was developed by Snell et al. (2002) and adapted into Turkish by Büyüksahin (2005). The Turkish form of MRQ consists of 53 items rated on

five Likert scale (1= never defines me, 5=definitely defines me) and eight subscales. These subscales are defined as focus on relationship extremely, relational satisfaction, fear of relationship/relationship anxiety, relational monitoring, relational esteem, external relational control, relational assertiveness, and internal relational control. The reliability and validity of the Turkish version of MRQ was conducted on 480 university students. The Cronbach's alpha for the MRQ was found .81. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of subscales varied from .73 to .91. The test-retest reliability was conducted on 117 university students with a break of 15 days and the test-retest reliability coefficient was found .80. The test-retest coefficients of subscales ranged from .63 to .86. In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha for the MRQ was found .81.

Early maladaptive schemas of participants were measured by the Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form-3 developed by Young et al. (1991, 2003) and adapted into Turkish by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, and Çakır (2009). The Turkish form of YSQ consists of 90 items rated on six Likert scale (1=never defines me, 6=definitely defines me), 14 schema structures and five schema domains. During the adaptation study, the factor analysis explained these schema domains as impaired autonomy, disconnection, unrelenting standards, other-directedness, and impaired limits. Impaired autonomy includes dependency, abandonment, failure, pessimism, and vulnerability to harm schemas; disconnection includes emotional deprivation, emotional inhibition, social isolation, and defectiveness schemas; unrelenting standards domain includes unrelenting standards schema and approval seeking; impaired limits include insufficient self-control, and other directedness includes self-sacrifice, and punitiveness maladaptive schemas. The adaptation study was conducted on 1071 university students. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of schema structures ranged from .63 to .80 and the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of schema domains ranged from .53 to .81. The test-retest reliability analysis of YSQ was conducted on 150 university students with a break of three weeks and the coefficients of schema structures ranged from .66 to .82. The test-retest coefficients of schema domains ranged from .66 to .83. For convergent validity of YSQ, correlations with SCL-90-R symptom inventory were analyzed. The results showed statistically significant coefficients and the direction of the relationships were congruent with theoretical expectations.

The attachment styles of participants were measured by Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) developed by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) and adapted to Turkish Selçuk, Günaydın, Sümer and Uysal (2005). The Turkish form of ECR-R consists of 36 items rated on 7 Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree) and two subscales. The subscales are attachment-related avoidance (18 items) and attachment related anxiety (18 items). The adaptation study was conducted on 256

university students. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for attachment-related avoidance was found .90, for attachment-related anxiety, Cronbach's alpha was found .86. The test-retest reliability analysis was conducted on 86 university students with a break of six weeks. The test-retest reliability coefficient was found .82 for anxiety, .81 for avoidance. For convergent validity ECR-R's correlations with Relationship Happiness Scale, Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, and Sociotropy Autonomy Scale were analyzed. The results showed statistically and theoretically significant coefficients. In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found .94 for attachment-related avoidance, .90 for attachment-related anxiety.

### **2.5 Data analysis**

The dependent variable of the study is psychological tendencies in intimate relationships whereas independent variables are early maladaptive schemas and adult attachment styles. The effects of independent variables on dependent variable to gender were analyzed by conducting linear regression analysis using IBM SPSS 21.00 package program. The regression analysis was repeated for each subscale of psychological tendencies considering to both schema structures and attachment styles.

Serdar Körük  
EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND ATTACHMENT STYLES PREDICTING TENDENCIES IN  
INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

### 3. Results

**Table 1: Correlations**

|                                      | 1 | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      | 9      | 10     | 11     | 12     | 13     | 14     | 15     | 16     | 17     | 18     | 19     | 20      | 21     | 22     | 23      | 24     | 25     | 26      | 27     | 28      | 29     |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| <b>1. Attachment-anxiety</b>         | 1 | ,619** | ,589** | ,429** | ,534** | ,653** | ,504** | ,472** | ,489** | ,118   | ,256*  | ,737** | ,370** | ,627** | ,582** | ,396** | ,675** | ,701** | ,496** | ,118    | ,364** | ,361** | -,625** | ,641** | ,473** | -,474** | ,356** | -,445** | -,033  |
| <b>2. Attachment-avoidance</b>       |   | 1      | ,647** | ,383** | ,482** | ,581** | ,602** | ,308** | ,352** | -,002  | ,229*  | ,490** | ,271** | ,546** | ,566** | ,353** | ,677** | ,580** | ,385** | -,002   | ,292** | -,055  | ,660**  | ,702** | ,557** | -,616** | ,448** | -,687** | -,143  |
| <b>3. Emotional deprivation</b>      |   |        | 1      | ,563** | ,610** | ,730** | ,687** | ,407** | ,456** | ,112   | ,368** | ,646** | ,421** | ,786** | ,589** | ,362** | ,908** | ,721** | ,442** | ,112    | ,462** | ,024   | -,626** | ,625** | ,383** | -,540** | ,296** | -,690** | -,092  |
| <b>4. Failure</b>                    |   |        |        | 1      | ,429** | ,511** | ,486** | ,332** | ,568** | ,247*  | ,266** | ,472** | ,361** | ,727** | ,418** | ,232*  | ,642** | ,688** | ,319** | ,247*   | ,365** | -,084  | -,371** | ,334** | ,139   | -,504** | ,054   | -,411** | -,252* |
| <b>5. Pessimism</b>                  |   |        |        |        | 1      | ,675** | ,588** | ,588** | ,499** | ,265** | ,393** | ,650** | ,595** | ,623** | ,748** | ,405** | ,711** | ,856** | ,562** | ,265**  | ,574** | ,132   | -,373** | ,436** | ,258** | -,277** | ,269** | -,467** | -,013  |
| <b>6. Social isolation</b>           |   |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,645** | ,545** | ,400** | ,371** | ,488** | ,711** | ,556** | ,726** | ,748** | ,479** | ,890** | ,780** | ,587** | ,371**  | ,611** | ,083   | -,612** | ,606** | ,348** | -,491** | ,389** | -,512** | ,002   |
| <b>7-Emotional inhibition</b>        |   |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,469** | ,424** | ,193   | ,255*  | ,496** | ,425** | ,616** | ,644** | ,393** | ,841** | ,670** | ,493** | ,193    | ,394** | ,084   | -,414** | ,585** | ,402** | -,354** | ,222*  | -,599** | -,099  |
| <b>8. Approval-seeking</b>           |   |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,302** | ,367** | ,240*  | ,461** | ,699** | ,449** | ,677** | ,491** | ,535** | ,613** | ,828** | ,367**  | ,538** | ,205*  | -,287** | ,317** | ,328** | -,166   | ,228*  | -,274** | ,192   |
| <b>9. Dependency</b>                 |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,096   | ,415** | ,641** | ,283** | ,619** | ,386** | ,177   | ,532** | ,744** | ,269** | ,096    | ,414** | ,098   | -,303** | ,336** | ,202*  | -,258** | ,041   | -,393** | -,147  |
| <b>10. Insufficient self-control</b> |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,296** | ,144   | ,302** | ,146   | ,432** | ,323** | ,241*  | ,310** | ,395** | 1,000** | ,351** | ,016   | ,030    | ,011   | -,067  | ,162    | ,033   | ,133    | ,239*  |
| <b>11. Self sacrifice</b>            |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,511** | ,449** | ,381** | ,453** | ,306** | ,427** | ,517** | ,320** | ,296**  | ,867** | ,073   | -,167   | ,180   | ,108   | -,062   | -,026  | -,207*  | ,105   |
| <b>12. Abandonment</b>               |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,449** | ,770** | ,623** | ,360** | ,743** | ,854** | ,468** | ,144    | ,565** | ,218*  | -,466** | ,464** | ,281** | -,384** | ,222*  | -,423** | -,004  |
| <b>13. Punitiveness</b>              |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,483** | ,673** | ,481** | ,538** | ,613** | ,668** | ,302**  | ,834** | ,157   | -,232*  | ,219*  | ,161   | -,235*  | ,093   | -,311** | ,053   |
| <b>14. Defectiveness</b>             |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,586** | ,315** | ,879** | ,823** | ,432** | ,146    | ,505** | ,086   | -,536** | ,513** | ,299** | -,592** | ,254*  | -,618** | -,162  |
| <b>15. Vulnerability to harm</b>     |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,576** | ,736** | ,831** | ,717** | ,432**  | ,654** | ,159   | -,377** | ,469** | ,325** | -,266** | ,289** | -,434** | ,056   |
| <b>16. Unrelenting standards</b>     |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,446** | ,461** | ,895** | ,323**  | ,457** | ,122   | -,130   | ,274** | ,289** | -,121   | ,124   | -,256*  | ,126   |
| <b>17. Disconnection</b>             |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,849** | ,561** | ,241*   | ,563** | ,079   | -,624** | ,665** | ,409** | -,558** | ,335** | -,684** | -,094  |
| <b>18. Impaired autonomy</b>         |   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1      | ,611** | ,310**  | ,660** | ,144   | -,475** | ,518** | ,312** | -,412** | ,237*  | -,533** | -,071  |

Serdar Körük  
EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND ATTACHMENT STYLES PREDICTING TENDENCIES IN  
INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

|  |   |        |        |      |        |         |         |         |         |         |        |
|--|---|--------|--------|------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| <b>19-Unrelenting standards</b>        | 1 | ,395** | ,570** | ,184 | -,231* | ,338**  | ,354**  | -,163   | ,197*   | -,305** | ,179   |
| <b>20. Impaired limits</b>             |   | 1      | ,351** | ,016 | ,030   | ,011    | -,067   | ,162    | ,033    | ,133    | ,239*  |
| <b>21. Other directedness</b>          |   |        | 1      | ,132 | -,232* | ,233*   | ,156    | -,169   | ,036    | -,301** | ,095   |
| <b>22. Focus on relation extremely</b> |   |        |        | 1    | -,053  | ,190    | ,334**  | ,235*   | ,186    | ,099    | ,212*  |
| <b>23. Relational satisfaction</b>     |   |        |        |      | 1      | -,778** | -,432** | ,698**  | -,536** | ,650**  | ,236*  |
| <b>24. Fear of relation/anxiety</b>    |   |        |        |      |        | 1       | ,626**  | -,568** | ,566**  | -,621** | -,034  |
| <b>25. Relational monitoring</b>       |   |        |        |      |        |         | 1       | -,274** | ,463**  | -,513** | ,060   |
| <b>26. Relational esteem</b>           |   |        |        |      |        |         |         | 1       | -,302** | ,620**  | ,343** |
| <b>27. Extrenal relation control</b>   |   |        |        |      |        |         |         |         | 1       | -,347** | ,074   |
| <b>28. Relational assertiveness</b>    |   |        |        |      |        |         |         |         |         | 1       | ,244*  |
| <b>29. Internal relational control</b> |   |        |        |      |        |         |         |         |         |         | 1      |
| n =100, *p<.05, ** p<.01               |   |        |        |      |        |         |         |         |         |         |        |

**Table 2:** Maladaptive schemas predicting focus on relationship extremely tendency

| Focus on relationship extremely |   | B   | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|---------------------------------|---|-----|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| Male                            | Constant  | 2.6 | .34 |         | 7.75  | .00 |
|                                 | 1. Unrelenting standards                        | .30 | .10 | .54     | 3.04  | .01 |
|                                 | n=24, R=.54, R <sup>2</sup> =.30, F=9.25, p<.01 |     |     |         |       |     |
| Female                          | Constant  | 2.8 | .20 |         | 14.30 | .00 |
|                                 | 1. Abandonment                                  | .18 | .09 | .24     | 2.15  | .04 |
|                                 | n=76, R=.24, R <sup>2</sup> =.06, F=4.62, p<.05 |     |     |         |       |     |

The maladaptive schemas predicting focus on relationship extremely tendency differed to gender as seen on Table 1. Unrelenting standards explained 30% of total tendency variance (R<sup>2</sup>=30, p< .01) for males while abandonment explained 6% of total tendency variance (R<sup>2</sup>=6, p< .05) for females.

**Table 3:** Maladaptive schemas predicting relational satisfaction tendency

| Relational satisfaction                          |  | B    | SE  | B     | t     | p   |
|--|--|------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| Male   | Constant   | 3.71 | .49 |       | 7.66  | .00 |
|  | 1. Social isolation                              | -.91 | .16 | -1.17 | -5.77 | .00 |
|  | 2. Insufficient self-control                     | .42  | .18 | .42   | 2.37  | .03 |
|  | 3. Vulnerability to harm                         | .38  | .17 | .47   | 2.32  | .03 |
|  | n=24, R=.80, R <sup>2</sup> =.63, F=11.42, p<.01 |      |     |       |       |     |
| Female   | Constant   | 3.98 | .45 |       | 8.89  | .00 |
|  | 1. Social isolation                              | -.37 | .12 | -.41  | -2.99 | .00 |
|  | 2. Insufficient self-control                     | .27  | .12 | .22   | 2.36  | .02 |
|  | 3. Emotional deprivation                         | -.35 | .13 | -.36  | -2.76 | .00 |
| n=76, R=.71, R <sup>2</sup> =.50, F=24.16, p<.01 |  |      |     |       |       |     |

Social isolation and insufficient self-control schemas were found the predictors of relational tendency for both gender but the third ones differed. Vulnerability to harm schema predicted relational satisfaction positively among men while emotional deprivation predicted the tendency negatively among women. Related schemas explained 63% of total tendency variance for males (R<sup>2</sup>=63, p< .01) while 50% for females (R<sup>2</sup>=50, p< .01).

**Table 4:** Maladaptive schemas predicting fear of relationship/anxiety tendency

| Fear of relationship/anxiety |                              | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| Male                         | Constant                     | 2.54 | .30 |         | 8.51  | .00 |
|                              | 1. Emotional deprivation     | .60  | .13 | .69     | 4.51  | .00 |
|                              | 2. Insufficient self-control | -.61 | .13 | -.79    | -4.79 | .00 |
|                              | 3. Unrelenting standards     | .30  | .07 | .54     | 4.14  | .00 |
|                              | 4. Defectiveness             | .37  | .14 | .40     | 2.68  | .02 |



Serdar Körük  
EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND ATTACHMENT STYLES PREDICTING TENDENCIES IN  
INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

|               |  |      |     |      |       |     |
|---------------|--|------|-----|------|-------|-----|
|               | 5. Punitiveness                                  | -.25 | .12 | -.37 | -2.11 | .05 |
|               | n=24, R=.90, R <sup>2</sup> =.81, F=15.67, p<.01 |      |     |      |       |     |
| <b>Female</b> | Constant   | 1.15 | .19 |      | 6.14  | .00 |
|               | 1. Emotional deprivation                         | .18  | .11 | .24  | 1.75  | .09 |
|               | 2. Social isolation                              | .24  | .09 | .33  | 2.70  | .01 |
|               | 3. Emotional inhibition                          | .19  | .09 | .24  | 2.07  | .04 |
|               | n=76, R=.73, R <sup>2</sup> =.53, F=26.89, p<.01 |      |     |      |       |     |

Emotional deprivation, social isolation and emotional inhibition schemas predicted fear of relationship/anxiety tendency positively among women and they explained 53% of total variance (R<sup>2</sup>=.53, p< .01). Emotional deprivation, unrelenting standards and defectiveness predicted the tendency positively and insufficient self-control and punitiveness predicted the tendency negatively among men and these maladaptive schemas explained 81% of total tendency variance (R<sup>2</sup>=.81, p< .01).

**Table 5:** Maladaptive schemas predicting relational monitoring tendency

| Relational monitoring |  | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t    | p   |
|-----------------------|--|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| <b>Female</b>         | Constant   | 1.02 | .40 |         | 2.57 | .01 |
|                       | 1. Emotional inhibition                          | .28  | .10 | .31     | 2.75 | .00 |
|                       | 2. Approval-seeking                              | .29  | .11 | .28     | 2.51 | .01 |
|                       | n=76, R=.50, R <sup>2</sup> =.25, F=12.36, p<.01 |      |     |         |      |     |

Emotional inhibition and approval-seeking schemas predicted relational monitoring tendency among women and these two maladaptive schemas explained 25% of total tendency variance (R<sup>2</sup>=.25, p< .01). No statistically significant schemas were found to explain the tendency variance for men.

**Table 6:** Maladaptive schemas predicting relational esteem tendency

| Relational esteem                                |  | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|--|--|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| <b>Male</b>                                      | Constant   | 3.85 | .27 |         | 14.52 | .00 |
|  | 1. Emotional deprivation                         | -.40 | .12 | -.49    | -3.34 | .00 |
|  | 2. Insufficient self-control                     | .50  | .10 | .69     | 5.23  | .00 |
|  | 3. Social isolation                              | -.50 | .10 | -.88    | -4.98 | .00 |
|  | 4. Vulnerability to harm                         | .21  | .09 | .34     | 2.34  | .03 |
|  | n=24, R=.90, R <sup>2</sup> =.82, F=20.93, p<.01 |      |     |         |       |     |
| <b>Female</b>                                    | Constant   | 3.74 | .41 |         | 9.26  | .00 |
|  | 1. Insufficient self-control                     | .28  | .10 | .26     | 2.94  | .00 |
|  | 2. Defectiveness                                 | -.61 | .09 | -.63    | -7.17 | .01 |
| n=76, R=.67, R <sup>2</sup> =.44, F=28.96, p<.01 |  |      |     |         |       |     |

Insufficient self-control predicted relational esteem tendency positively and defectiveness predicted negatively among women and these schemas explained 44% of total tendency variance ( $R^2=44$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Insufficient self-control and vulnerability to harm predicted positively and emotional deprivation and social isolation predicted negatively among men and these four schemas explained 82% of total relational esteem tendency variance ( $R^2=82$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

**Table 7:** Maladaptive schemas predicting external relational control tendency

| External relational control |   | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|-----------------------------|---|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| <b>Male</b>                 | Constant                                    | 3.95 | .58 |         | 6.81  | .00 |
|                             | 1. Punitiveness                             | -.67 | .18 | -.71    | -3.69 | .00 |
|                             | 2. Emotional inhibition                     | .54  | .18 | .57     | 2.96  | .00 |
|                             | n=24, R=.65, $R^2=.42$ , F=7.62, $p < .01$  |      |     |         |       |     |
| <b>Female</b>               | Constant                                    | 2.62 | .33 |         | 7.95  | .00 |
|                             | 1. Social isolation                         | .47  | .10 | .56     | 4.78  | .00 |
|                             | 2. Self-sacrifice                           | -.22 | .10 | -.25    | -2.13 | .04 |
|                             | n=76, R=.49, $R^2=.24$ , F=11.46, $p < .01$ |      |     |         |       |     |

Punitiveness predicted negatively and emotional inhibition predicted positively external relational control tendency among men and these two maladaptive schemas explained 42% of total tendency variance for men ( $R^2=42$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Social isolation predicted positively and self-sacrifice predicted negatively the tendency among women and these schemas explained 24% of total tendency variance for women ( $R^2=24$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

**Table 8:** Maladaptive schemas predicting relational assertiveness tendency

| Relational assertiveness                    |  | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|---|--|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| <b>Male</b>                                 | Constant                                   | 4.66 | .31 |         | 14.95 | .00 |
|   | 1. Failure                                 | -.38 | .16 | -.46    | -2.45 | .02 |
|   | n=24, R=.46, $R^2=.21$ , F=5.99, $p < .05$ |      |     |         |       |     |
| <b>Female</b>                               | Constant                                   | 4.22 | .37 |         | 11.30 | .00 |
|   | 1. Emotional deprivation                   | -.50 | .10 | -.54    | -5.13 | .00 |
|   | 2. Insufficient self-control               | .28  | .09 | .23     | 3.14  | .00 |
|   | 3. Emotional inhibition                    | -.25 | .10 | -.27    | -2.56 | .01 |
| n=76, R=.78, $R^2=.61$ , F=37.45, $p < .01$ |  |      |     |         |       |     |

Failure schema was found the only predictor of relational assertiveness tendency for men and it predicted negatively. Failure explained 21% of total tendency variance for men ( $R^2=21$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Emotional deprivation and emotional inhibition predicted negatively and insufficient self-control predicted positively the tendency among

women and these three schemas explained 61% of total tendency variance for women ( $R^2= 61, p< .01$ ).

**Table 9:** Maladaptive schemas predicting internal relational control tendency

| Internal relational control             |                              | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|---|------------------------------|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| Female                                  | Constant                     | 2.00 | .36 |         | 5.65  | .00 |
|   | 1. Insufficient self-control | .25  | .08 | .33     | 3.21  | .00 |
|   | 2. Failure                   | -.29 | .08 | -.37    | -3.58 | .00 |
|   | 3. Approval-seeking          | .23  | .07 | .34     | 3.26  | .00 |
| n=76, R=.56, $R^2=.31$ , F=10.72, p<.01 |                              |      |     |         |       |     |

Insufficient self-control and approval-seeking predicted positively and failure predicted negatively internal relational control tendency among women. These schemas explained 31% of total tendency variance ( $R^2= 31, p< .01$ ). No statistically significant maladaptive schemas were found to predict the tendency for men.

**Table 10:** Adult attachment styles predicting psychological tendencies in intimate relationships

| Focus on relationship extremely         |   | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
|---|---|------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| Male                                    | Constant                                | 2.69 | .46 |         | 5.85  | .00 |
|   | 1. Attachment-anxiety                   | .50  | .16 | .72     | 3.14  | .00 |
|   | 2. Attachment-avoidance                 | -.37 | .17 | -.50    | -2.15 | .04 |
|   | n=24, R=.57, $R^2=.32$ , F=4.95, p<.05  |      |     |         |       |     |
| Female                                  | Constant                                | 2.20 | .31 |         | 7.00  | .00 |
|   | 1. Attachment-anxiety                   | .50  | .11 | .62     | 4.76  | .00 |
|   | 2. Attachment-avoidance                 | -.29 | .09 | -.40    | -3.10 | .00 |
| n=76, R=.49, $R^2=.24$ , F=11.36, p<.01 |   |      |     |         |       |     |
| Relational satisfaction                 |   | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
| Male                                    | Constant                                | 5.44 | .60 |         | 9.08  | .00 |
|   | 1. Attachment-anxiety                   | -.45 | .16 | -.50    | -2.71 | .01 |
|   | n=24, R=.50, $R^2=.25$ , F=7.34, p<.05  |      |     |         |       |     |
| Female                                  | Constant                                | 6.23 | .33 |         | 18.63 | .00 |
|   | 1. Attachment-anxiety                   | -.43 | .11 | -.38    | -3.86 | .00 |
|   | 2. Attachment-avoidance                 | -.45 | .10 | -.45    | -4.58 | .00 |
| n=76, R=.75, $R^2=.56$ , F=47.01, p<.01 |   |      |     |         |       |     |
| Fear of relationship/anxiety            |   | B    | SE  | $\beta$ | t     | p   |
| Male                                    | Constant                                | .98  | .29 |         | 3.40  | .00 |
|   | 1. Attachment-avoidance                 | .54  | .11 | .73     | 4.99  | .00 |
|   | n=24, R=.73, $R^2=.53$ , F=24.95, p<.01 |      |     |         |       |     |
| Female                                  | Constant                                | .34  | .26 |         | 1.30  | .20 |
|   | 1. Attachment-avoidance                 | .35  | .08 | .45     | 4.58  | .00 |
|   | 2. Attachment-anxiety                   | .34  | .09 | .38     | 3.86  | .00 |

Serdar Körük  
EARLY MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS AND ATTACHMENT STYLES PREDICTING TENDENCIES IN  
INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP

| n=76, R=.75, R <sup>2</sup> =.56, F=46.99, p<.01 |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
|--|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>Relational monitoring</b>                     |                         | <b>B</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>β</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>p</b> |
|  | Constant                | 1.49     | .53       |          | 2.82     | .01      |
| Male   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | .47      | .20       | .45      | 2.34     | .03      |
| n=24, R=.45, R <sup>2</sup> =.20, F=5.47, p<.05  |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
|  | Constant                | 1.16     | .27       |          | 4.25     | .00      |
| Female   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | .54      | .09       | .59      | 6.26     | .00      |
| n=76, R=.59, R <sup>2</sup> =.35, F=39.22, p<.01 |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
| <b>Relational esteem</b>                         |                         | <b>B</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>β</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>p</b> |
|  | Constant                | 4.97     | .34       |          | 14.57    | .00      |
| Male   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | -.35     | .13       | -.50     | -2.73    | .01      |
| n=24, R=.50, R <sup>2</sup> =.25, F=7.44, p<.05  |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
|  | Constant                | 5.25     | .25       |          | 21.30    | .00      |
| Female   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | -.53     | .08       | -.62     | -6.83    | .00      |
| n=76, R=.62, R <sup>2</sup> =.39, F=46.61, p<.01 |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
| <b>External relational control</b>               |                         | <b>B</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>β</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>p</b> |
|  | Constant                | 1.40     | .48       |          | 2.92     | .01      |
| Male   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | .56      | .18       | .55      | 3.06     | .01      |
| n=24, R=.55, R <sup>2</sup> =.30, F=9.35, p<.01  |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
|  | Constant                | 2.10     | .30       |          | 6.88     | .00      |
| Female   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | .37      | .10       | .41      | 3.82     | .00      |
| n=76, R=.41, R <sup>2</sup> =.16, F=14.55, p<.01 |                         |          |           |          |          |          |
| <b>Relational assertiveness</b>                  |                         | <b>B</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>β</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>p</b> |
|  | Constant                | 5.77     | .23       |          | 24.86    | .00      |
| Female   | 1. Attachment-avoidance | -.69     | .07       | -.74     | -9.41    | .00      |
| n=76, R=.74, R <sup>2</sup> =.55, F=88.58, p<.01 |                         |          |           |          |          |          |

Attachment-anxiety predicted focus on relationship extremely tendency positively and attachment-avoidance predicted negatively for both men and women. The total variance explained for men by attachment was found 32% (R<sup>2</sup> = 32, p< .05) while for women, it was found 24% (R<sup>2</sup>=24, p< .01).

Attachment-anxiety predicted relational satisfaction tendency negatively for both men and women while attachment-avoidance predicted negatively only for women. 25% (R<sup>2</sup> =25, p< .05) of men's relational satisfaction tendency can be explained by attachment-anxiety while 56% (R<sup>2</sup> =56, p< .01) of women's can be explained by attachment-anxiety and attachment avoidance.

Attachment-avoidance predicted fear of relationship/anxiety tendency positively for both gender while attachment-anxiety predicted positively only for women. Avoidance explained 53% (R<sup>2</sup> =53, p< .01) of total tendency variance for men while avoidance and anxiety explained 56% (R<sup>2</sup>=56, p<. 01) for women.

Attachment-avoidance predicted relational monitoring tendency positively for both gender and 20% ( $R^2=20$ ,  $p<.05$ ) of tendency variance was explained for men while 35% ( $R^2=35$ ,  $p<.01$ ) for women.

Attachment-avoidance predicted relational esteem tendency negatively for both gender and 25% ( $R^2=25$ ,  $p<.05$ ) of tendency variance was explained for men while 39% ( $R^2=39$ ,  $p<.01$ ) for women.

Attachment-avoidance predicted external relational control tendency positively for both gender and 30% ( $R^2=30$ ,  $p<.01$ ) of tendency variance was explained for men while 16% ( $R^2=16$ ,  $p<.01$ ) for women.

Attachment-avoidance predicted relational assertiveness tendency negatively only for women. 55% ( $R^2=55$ ,  $p<.01$ ) of assertiveness variance was explained by attachment-avoidance for women.

#### **4. Discussion**

Unrelenting standards and abandonment maladaptive schemas were found the predictors of focus on relationship extremely tendency. Güngör (2015) also found that unrelenting standards schema increases the focusing level in a relationship. Gender difference in this study indicates that men demand more from their partners and to provide these demands they focus more on their relationship. Women's focusing was found more related to abandonment schema. Abandonment schema along with its anxiety may direct women to focus more on their relationship considering the traditional gender roles. Attachment-anxiety promotes focusing on relationship for both genders. Avoidant behaviors decrease focusing level for both genders. Anxiety-attached individuals are more preoccupied with their relationships (Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

Social isolation, insufficient self-control, vulnerability to harm and emotional deprivation were found the predictor schemas of relational satisfaction. In one study, couples' seeking divorce social isolation insufficient self-control, vulnerability to harm and emotional deprivation scores were found higher than couples not seeking divorce (Yoosefi, 2010). In another research, it was found that these four maladaptive schemas decrease couple satisfaction (Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012). In this study, insufficient self-control was found as positive predictor of relational satisfaction for both genders while vulnerability to harm was found as positive predictor for men. These findings differ from previous researches. Insufficient self-control may provide an environment in an intimate relationship which individuals satisfy their emotional needs and express their feelings much more freely among Turkish sample. Vulnerability to harm schema may make Turkish men gain more support from their partners and this may increase their

relational satisfaction. Attachment anxiety and avoidance predicted relational satisfaction negatively for women while only attachment anxiety predicted negatively for men. It indicates that men do not consider their avoidant behaviors related to their relationship satisfaction while women do.

Emotional deprivation, unrelenting standards and defectiveness increase relationship fear/anxiety for men while insufficient self-control and punitiveness decrease. Emotional deprivation, social isolation and emotional inhibition increase relationship fear/anxiety for women. Mason, Platts and Tyson (2005) found that preoccupied individuals' emotional deprivation and unrelenting standards schemas scores were higher while social isolation and emotional inhibition schemas scores were higher among fearful individuals. Unrelenting standards may force the individual to show more performance over a relationship in order to satisfy the expectations formed by the individual and anxiety may occur as a result of this over performance. Emotional deprivation is related to lack of feelings while emotional deprivation is related to lack of ability to express feelings. These two schemas along with defectiveness schema explaining one's own negative evaluations and negative self-worth and social isolation schema belong to disconnection schema domain and individuals in this domain experience problems about establishing social and intimate relationships (Young et al., 2003). Insufficient self-control schema may reduce relationship fear/anxiety by keeping the partner away from the problems of relationship or giving too much attention to problems to solve. Punitiveness schema may function as a compensatory mechanism of negative moods and this may reduce the relationship fear/anxiety. Güngör (2015) also explained that impaired limits schema domain which includes insufficient self-control schema is negatively correlated with relationship fear/anxiety. Only attachment avoidance for men and both attachment avoidance and anxiety for women predicted relationship fear/anxiety positively.

Relational monitoring tendency explains one's attention to others' evaluations on his/her relationship (Büyüksahin, 2005). Emotional inhibition and approval-seeking predicted positively this tendency for women while no statistically significant predictors were found for men. Emotional inhibition schema forces individuals not to share emotions and feelings in order not to be criticized or in order to lose control. Individuals' whose approval-seeking schema is strong, self-esteem depends on others' positive reactions and status, being recognized and social appearance are important for these people (Young et al., 2003). These two maladaptive schemas are related to relational monitoring by making the individual adjust the social appearance of his/her relationship. Attachment-avoidance for both men and women predicted relational monitoring positively. Avoidant behaviors can be performed in order to provide the

idealized couple image to get the positive evaluations of others. Intimacy and closeness may be perceived as a triggering factor causing problems which damage the idealized couple image.

Among men, emotional deprivation and social isolation predicted relational esteem negatively while insufficient self-control and vulnerability to harm predicted positively. Among women, insufficient self-control predicted relational esteem positively while defectiveness predicted negatively. Emotional deprivation, social isolation and defectiveness belong to disconnection schema domain. Insufficient self-control belongs to impaired limits domain and vulnerability to harm belongs to impaired autonomy domain (Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, & Çakır, 2009). In Güngör's (2015) study, disconnection predicted relational esteem negatively and impaired limits predicted positively similar to these results. In emotional deprivation, individuals think that their emotional needs can't be satisfied by others sufficiently and they feel deprivation of love, empathy and support. In social isolation, individuals withdraw from social interactions and their surroundings and they think that they can't belong to any group or community. In defectiveness, individuals feel that they are inferior, undesirable, unwanted and imperfect (Yoosefi, 2010). Similar to relationship satisfaction, in relational esteem, insufficient self-control and vulnerability to harm schemas have positive effect. Vulnerability to harm schema may provide men more support and attention from their partners, men may perceive these behaviors as signs of love and interest, and this perceiving enables them to have more esteem of maintaining and continuing the relationship. Insufficient self-control schema for both genders may provide an environment in which emotions, feelings and impulses are expressed without limitations and control and this may enable men and women to have the sense of confidence and self-esteem on the relationship. In attachment dimensions, attachment-avoidance predicted relational esteem negatively for both genders. Individuals with high avoidance avoid intimate relationships and keep themselves away in order to protect themselves from being hurt because they don't value others as they should supposed to do (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Punitiveness predicted external relationship control negatively for men while self-sacrifice predicted negatively for women. Emotional inhibition predicted the tendency positively for men while social isolation positively for women. Snell et al. (2002) explained external relational control as the belief that the maintenance and continuity of intimate relationship is determined by external factors like fate, change or others' guidance. Punitiveness and self-sacrifice schemas belong to other-directedness schema domain (Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, & Çakır, 2009). Individuals in this domain are open to external guidance and they easily obey others' wishes. They perceive their

connectedness to others' guidance as normal attitudes to gain approval and love (Young et al., 2003). Other-directedness schema domain reduces the sense of external control because external control has already become a normal routine for these individuals. Attachment-avoidance predicted external relational control positively for both genders. Avoidant behaviors may occur as a result of individuals' belief that their relationships depend on outside factors rather than their own control and they may perceive the intimacy useless.

Failure schema predicted relational assertiveness negatively for men while emotional deprivation and emotional inhibition predicted negatively for women. Insufficient self-control predicted relational assertiveness positively for women. Relational assertiveness includes being active and taking initiative in a relationship by expressing feelings, thoughts and expectations to partner (Snell et al., 2002). Failure schema which belongs to impaired autonomy schema domain explains the sense that one is not capable of achieve something and his/her failures are repetitive (Young et al., 2003). These disruptive feelings may prevent men performing assertive actions in intimate relationships. Emotional deprivation and emotional inhibition schemas which belong to disconnection schema domain act like prohibitive mechanisms of relational intimacy (Güngör, 2015; Stiles, 2004). The impulsivity side of insufficient self-control schema which belongs to impaired limits schema domain may promote to relational assertiveness of women by providing them a communication channel which they express themselves to their partners. On the attachment side, attachment-avoidance predicted negatively relational assertiveness among women. Avoidant behaviors and attitudes may decrease the enterprising behaviors in relationships and this may lead to drop of relational assertiveness.

Insufficient self-control and approval-seeking schemas predicted internal relational control positively while failure schema predicted negatively among women. Internal relational control indicates the feeling that the aspects of a relationship depend on the partners' behaviors and their control (Snell et al., 2002). In Güngör's (2015) study, impaired autonomy predicted the tendency negatively while impaired limits predicted positively. Impaired autonomy schema domain includes failure schema while impaired limits includes insufficient self-control. The results are compatible with each other. Failure schema may damage internal relationship control by the feelings of insufficiency it forces the individual to feel. The impulsivity patterns related to insufficient self-control schema may create a sense of control over ongoing aspects of relationships by making women more participate in ongoing situations. Approval-seeking schema which belongs to unrelenting standards schema domain explains the excessive efforts to gain approval and recognition of others (Young et al., 2003).



Approval-seeking schema may activate to compensate the inferiority and defective feelings of a relationship and a sense of internal control may occur as a result of this compensation because the disruptive feelings disappear.

## References

1. Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
2. Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226-244.
3. Beck, A. T. (1964). Thinking and depression: 2. Theory and therapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 10, 561–571.
4. Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment: Volume 1 of Attachment and loss*. London, England: Tavistock.
5. Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss vol. 2: Separation, anxiety and anger*. London, England: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
6. Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Volume 3. Loss: Sadness and depression*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
7. Büyükşahin, A. (2005). The multidimensional relationship questionnaire: A study of reliability and validity. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 16(2), 1-9.
8. Dumitrescu, D., & Rusu, A. S. (2012). Relationship between early maladaptive schemas, couple satisfaction and individual mate value: An evolutionary psychological approach. *Journal of Cognitive & Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 12(1), 63-76.
9. Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350-365.
10. Güngör, H. C. (2015). The predictive role of early maladaptive schemas and attachment styles on romantic relationships. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 5, 417-430.
11. Mason, O., Platts, H., & Tyson, M. (2005). Early maladaptive schemas and adult attachment in a UK clinical population. *Psychology and psychotherapy: Theory, research and practice*, 78(4), 549-564.
12. Pierce, G. R., Baldwin, M. W., & Lydon, J. E. (1997). A relational schema approach to social support. In G. R. Pierce, B. Lakey, I. G. Sarason, & B. R.

- Sarason (Eds.), *Sourcebook of social support and personality* (pp. 19-47). New York: Plenum Press.
13. Selçuk, E., Günaydın, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal, A. (2005). A new scale developed to measure adult attachment dimensions: Experiences in close relationships-revised (ECR-R)-Psychometric evaluation in a Turkish sample. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 8(16), 1-11.
  14. Snell, W. E, Jr, Schicke M., Arbeiter T. (2002) The multidimensional relationship questionnaire: Psychological dispositions associated with intimate relations. In W. E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *New directions in the psychology of intimate relations: Research and theory*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications.
  15. Soygüt, G., Karaosmanoğlu, A., & Çakır, Z. (2009). Assessment of early maladaptive schemas: A psychometric study of the Turkish young schema questionnaire-short form-3. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 20(1), 75-84.
  16. Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örnekleme üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirilmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(43), 71-106.
  17. Stiles, O. E. (2004). Early maladaptive schemas and intimacy in young adult's romantic relationships. *Unpublished Dissertation Proquest Information and Learning Company*. Retrieved from [www.proquest.com](http://www.proquest.com).
  18. Tezel, F. K., Kışlak, Ş. T., & Boysan, M. (2015). Relationships between childhood traumatic experiences, early maladaptive schemas and interpersonal styles. *Archives of Neuropsychiatry*, 52(3), 226-232.
  19. Yoo, G., Park, J. H., & Jun, H. J. (2014). Early maladaptive schemas as predictors of interpersonal orientation and peer connectedness in university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 42(8), 1377-1394.
  20. Yoosefi, N., Etemadi, O., Bahrami, F., Fatehizade, M. A. S., & Ahmadi, S. A. (2010). An investigation on early maladaptive schema in marital relationship as predictors of divorce. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 51(5), 269-292.
  21. Young J (1991) *Early maladaptive schemas*. Unpublished manuscript.
  22. Young, J. E. (1994). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema focused approach* (2nd ed.). Sarasota. Professional Resource Exchange.
  23. Young, J. E., & Lindemann, M. D. (1992). An integrative schema-focused model for personality disorders. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 6(1), 11-23.
  24. Young J. E., Klosko J. S., Weishaar M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York. The Guilford Press.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).