The Role of Family Climates and Attachment Style in Romantic Relationship in Predicting Relation Role Expectations Among Adults

M. Çağatay Yiğit

Family Counselor/Psychological Counselor, Graduated from Dokuz Eylül Unversity, Family Counselling and Education Master's Programme, macagatayyigit@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-0890-1853

Assoc. Prof. Zekavet KABASAKAL

Dokuz Eylül Univesity, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department

zekavet.kabasakal@deu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3450-1060

Abstract

Considering the increasing divorce rates today, it is noteworthy that it is necessary to determine the factors that individuals pay attention to in choosing a spouse. From this point of view, the aim of the study is to examine the effect of family climate and attachment style on the prediction of adults' relationship role expectations.The sample of the study consists of 256 women and 103 men who are legally of age living in Turkey. Based on the purpose of the research, the data were collected with the Personal Information Form, Marriage Role Expectation Scale, the Family Climate Scale and the Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale. Correlations between variables were examined and multiple regression analysis was performed. According to the results of the research, relationship role expectations showed correlations with individuals' age, gender, number of siblings, family type, marital status, cohabitants and romantic relationship status. It was seen that the only variable predicting egalitarian role expectation was gender. Gender, marital status, intergenerational authority, secure attachment style, and anxious-avoidant attachment variables were found to predict traditional role expectancy.

621

Keywords: Marriage role expectations, attachment, family climate, role theory, family system theory.

Yetişkinlerde İlişki Rolü Beklentilerini Yordamada Aile İklimi ve Romantik İlişkideki Bağlanma Biçiminin Rolü

Özet

Günümüzde artan boşanma oranları dikkate alındığında bireylerin eş seçiminde dikkat ettikleri unsurların belirlenmesi gerektiği dikkat çekmektedir. Bu noktadan hareketle araştırmanın amacı, aile iklimi ve bağlanma biçiminin yetişkinlerin ilişki rolü beklentilerini yordama üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Türkiye'de. Araştırmanın amacına bağlı olarak Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Evlilikte Rol Beklenti Ölçeği, Aile İklimi Ölçeği ve Üç Boyutlu Bağlanma Stilleri Ölçeği ile veriler toplanmıştır. Değişkenler arasındaki korelasyonlar incelendi ve çoklu regresyon analizi yapıldı. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre ilişki rolü beklentileri, bireylerin yaşı, cinsiyeti, kardeş sayısı, aile tipi, medeni durumu, birlikte yaşadığı kişiler ve romantik ilişki durumu ile korelasyon göstermiştir. Eşitlikçi rol beklentisini yordayan tek değişkenin cinsiyet olduğu görülmüştür. Cinsiyet, medeni durum, nesiller arası otorite, güvenli bağlanma stili ve kaygılı-kaçınmalı bağlanma değişkenlerinin geleneksel rol beklentisini yordadığı bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Evlilik rol beklentileri, bağlanma, aile iklimi, rol teorisi, aile sistemleri kuramı.

1. Introduction

When developmental theories are examined, it is seen that the development of the individual is frequently discussed in certain areas. These areas are physical development, mental development, emotional development, social development, personality development and moral development. A lot of work has been done in each area separately and important explanations about the development have been found. However, Erikson's "Eight Ages of Man", which claims that development continues throughout life and explains development as a combination of psychological, cultural, genetic, biological and social forces, can be considered one of the most widely accepted theories (Eylen Özyurt, 2012; Karaca & İkiz, 2014; Özgüngör & Acun Kapıkıran, 2011; Yazgan İnanç & Yerlikaya, 2016).

According to Erikson, development continues throughout life. The individual has a tendency to form his own identity from the moment he is born. The process of creating identity and preserving the created identity continues throughout life as the task of the ego. Within the framework of Erikson's epigenetic principle, personality provides its development by solving the crises that are opposite to each other in each period of life. Although the crises that cannot be resolved within the current period can be resolved at

different stages of life, the optimum period is the defined interval (Öztemel, 2019; Sardoğan & Karahan, 2012; Yazgan İnanç & Yerlikaya, 2016).

It is seen that the period of isolation against intimacy defined by Erikson in the 20-40 age range is also considered as young adulthood and adulthood period in the literature. In this period, individuals have a more developed structure in terms of cognitive compared to the individuals in the adolescence period. On the other hand, just like in adolescence, there is a search for identity. Unlike adolescence, the individual is more independent from his/her family and at the same time, since the majority of them are university students, they may be closer to finding their identity in the career field. Individuals in young adulthood may experience a sense of being together. The individual feels neither a teenager nor an adult. He is far from adolescence because he has a clear and distinct idea of who he is. However, he did not have the responsibilities of an adult. They also do not have the economic freedom that an adult has. On the other hand, they are not under the control of their parents as much as in adolescence. However, beyond all these features, as Erikson stated, the main development task in this period is the effort to establish close relationships (Arnett, 2004; Cüceloğlu, 2015; Özü, 2017).

The concept of close relationships refers to the emotional closeness and the formation of a social bond between two individuals. The point that distinguishes close relationships from other interpersonal relationships is the signing of a mutual social agreement in close relationships. Mutually, the two parties express that they accept and want the existence of the existing bond (Siyez, 2017). It is seen that the search for a romantic partner begins with the adolescence period. However, the love felt during adolescence, the romantic relationship experienced, is more like a game and is more aimed at meeting the emotional needs of the individual. During and after young adulthood, this situation evolves into a search for a spouse whose life will be shared (Atak & Taştan, 2012; Kaçar, 2018).

In the light of this information, it can be said that the mate selection is an important element in terms of personality development of individuals. Considering this importance, individuals may prefer to go through a kind of trial process, especially today, for the decision of mate selection, which will affect the lives of individuals. Especially since the 19th century, the flirting behavior has also increased with the replacement of logic marriages with love marriages. According to the Turkish Language Association Current Turkish Dictionary (2020), flirt is defined as *"the emotional relationship between a woman and a man"*. At the same time, flirting, without the bond of marriage between two people; It can be defined as the type of relationship that is motivated by the feeling of love and in which individuals get the chance to get to know each other better. Although it is very similar to the concept of engagement in this respect, the concept of flirt is less accepted by the society than the concept of engagement. It is thought that individuals have an

important place in getting to know each other and establishing a happy marriage. (Köksal, 2017, Toprak Gültekin, 2019).

From another perspective, it is necessary to examine the number of marriages and divorces between 2010 and 2019 published by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) (2020), the ratio of divorce to marriage, and the ratio of divorce to total divorce due to incompatibility. According to TÜİK (2020) data, 582,715 marriages took place in 2010, but the highest number of marriages was seen as 602.982 in 2015 and it was seen as 541,424 in 2019 with a regular decrease. On the other hand, the number of divorces, which was reported as 113,039 in 2010, was 151,089 in 2019. Within the data between 2010-2019, it is seen that the ratio of total divorce to total marriage increased regularly and reached the highest value of 28.64% in 2019. At the same time, it can be seen that divorces are mostly due to incompatibility.

It is thought that controlling the match of marital role expectations before marriage can prevent divorce due to incompatibility and indirectly reduce divorce rates. Determining the factors affecting relationship role expectations will contribute to working with couples who want to get help before both marriage and divorce. Thus, it is thought that the result of this research will indirectly affect the divorce rates.

In the light of this information, the necessity of determining the factors that predict relationship role expectations, which is one of the necessary factors for a happy marriage, and the absence of a research on this subject and these variables in the relevant literature makes it necessary to conduct this research.

1.1.The Concept of Relationship Role Expectation

According to structural family therapy, it is the communication and mutual attitudes of family members that make up the family. Therefore, when an individual wants to get help regarding his/her family, the client is the family, not the individual. Individuals progress and develop with their behaviors, influences and influences in social contexts. Therefore, only helping the individual will not be effective. Therefore, structural therapists focus on reorganizing the family structure, not the individual. In order to achieve change, the family needs to be addressed in all aspects and holistically (Gladding, 2015; Minuchin, 1974; Nazlı, 2018).

According to structural family therapists, in order to get to know the family closely, the subsystems of the family, the boundaries of the family, the rules in the family, the power in the family and the roles defined in the family should be analyzed. The concept of subsystems is alliances of individuals within the family. While the mother and father form the parent subsystem in a family with children, different subsystems based on gender such as mother-daughter or father-son can also be established (Minuchin & Fishman, 2002; Nazlı, 2018). The concept of borders, on the other hand, refers to the differentiation of the subsystems we mentioned (Gladding, 2015). The concept of rules can basically be explained as principles and behaviors

that exist in regular patterns in the life of the family and provide information about the organization of the family (Friesen, 1985, as cited in Gladding, 2015). The concept of power, on the other hand, refers to the distribution of the authority to make decisions and implement the decisions taken (Gladding, 2015; Minuchin, 1974).

The concept of role is the concept that describes the behavior of individuals in subsystems. The clearer the role definitions, the more family harmony can be achieved. Because in a family structure where roles are clear, roles can be shaped according to expectations and expectations can be shaped according to roles. In families where roles are clear, individuals can predict what they can expect from other family members, and subsystems from other subsystems (Gladding, 2015; Minuchin, 1974; Minuchin & Fishman, 2002). Role theory, which deals with this concept of role from a wider perspective, is not a theory in the full sense, but examines the definition of roles in detail.

According to Hurvitz (1960) and Hurvitz (1965), role expectations constitute an important point in marital adjustment, as role sets in marriage have a certain continuity, are determined by mutual responsibilities and expectations, and therefore constitute the social structure of the family. If the expectations of individuals regarding the roles in marriage are not met, the satisfaction provided by this marriage to the individual is low (Sabatelli, 1984). There are different groupings of role expectations in foreign studies, but as a result of adaptation studies, role expectations appear as two basic classes. These are called traditional relationship role expectations and egalitarian relationship role expectations (Köksal, 2017; Tosun & Yazıcı, 2021). In traditional relationship role expectations, duties such as purchasing the house, relations with the outside world, and house renovations belong to the husband role. The role of the husband in the family is dominant. Women, on the other hand, have duties in housework, order of the house, determination of needs, child care and upbringing (Eken, 2006; İmamoğlu, 1993; Pollock, Die, and Marriot, 1990; Şafak, Çopur, & Özkan, 2006). It is seen that responsibilities are shared in the family where egalitarian roles are adopted. Housework, childcare, the interest shown in the education of the child, the decisions to be taken for the family, the management of the house and the provision of livelihood are decided jointly between the spouses and are carried out together (Dunn, 1960; Eken, 2006).

1.2. Family Climate Concept

The concept of family climate, which is discussed in this study, is not a concept that has been put forward while forming the theory. The concept was introduced by Björnberg and Nicholson (2007) in order to better understand family businesses and conduct a more comfortable study. The quality of communication between the concept of family climate and its members; position and interaction of family members in the family structure; It is a general psychological atmosphere that combines the intergenerational transmission of family values, principles and skills (Björnberg & Nicholson, 2007; Gönül, Işık-Baş, & Şahin-Acar, 2018;

van Steijn, Oerlemans, van Aken, Buitelaar, Rommelse, 2015). The sub-headings and equivalents of the concept are given in Table 1.

Table 1. The concept of family climate, its sub-concepts, sub-headings and equivalents of the concepts

Main Concept	Sub-Concept	Components of Sub-Concept	Explanation
Family Climate	Intergenerational Relations	Intergenerational Interest	Title examining the interest, value and experience conveyed by the older generation to the younger generation
		Intergenerational Authority	Title examining the family hierarchy
	Family Reconciliation	Emotional Adjustment	Title examining the positive emotional bonds of the family (love, feeling of support, trust, etc.)
		Cognitive Adjustment	The title that examines the harmony of the family on the plane of thought such as values, beliefs and perspectives.
	Family Processes	Open Communication	Title examining the level of communication in the family's ability to maintain its functionality.
		Compatibility	The title examining the plane of acting together in a crisis situation that the family will experience

Summarized from Gönül, Işık-baş & Şahin-Acar (2018) and Björnberg & Nicholson (2007).

1.3. Attachment Concept

The basic starting point of attachment theory is the effort to establish bonds that will make the individual feel safe. The type of bond that babies establish with their caregivers in the first years

of life will be decisive on the individual's psychological, social, emotional and many other aspects (Devecioğlu, 2020). Also, Bartholomew and Shaver (1998) emphasize that the relationships with the attachment figure in childhood play a role in shaping the expectations, emotions and defenses of the individual in their relationships. Accordingly, since the negative parenting styles exhibited by parents prevent the individual from establishing a healthy bond during childhood, these individuals have difficulty in establishing healthy close emotional bonds in adulthood (Özer, 2011).

As a result of their research, Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) revealed that there are three different attachment types, which they call secure, anxious and avoidant. Secure attachment is provided by the caregiver's attention to the child's wishes and needs. Anxious attachment occurs when the caregiver is relatively insensitive to the child's needs and wishes. Avoidant attachment, on the other hand, occurs as a result of the dominance of the caregiver's insensitive or distant, rejecting behaviors towards the child's needs and wishes (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Devecioğlu, 2020). Studies show that children's attachment styles also exist in adulthood in the same way (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985). Additionally, Moss and Schwebell (1993), romantic relationships; five dimensions: attachment, emotional intimacy, cognitive intimacy, physical intimacy and reciprocity. Sternberg (1986; 1988) states that romantic relationship consists of closeness, passion and attachment dimensions.

2. Method

2.1.Research Method

This research is a quantitative research. Correlational survey model was used. In this model, it shows the changes that two or more variables show together and, if they change together, how this change occurs (Karasar, 2011). From this point of view, whether adults' relationship role expectations are predicted in terms of family climate and attachment styles; whether it differs in terms of some demographic variables is handled according to the correlational survey model.

2.2.Participants

The population of the research consists of individuals aged 18 or over living in Türkiye. Within the scope of the research, data were collected from 361 people. However, due to problems such as missing forms and incomplete answers to questions, the data of 3 people were excluded from the

evaluation and 359 forms were evaluated. It is seen that 33.4% of the participant group is 18-25 years old, 27.6% is 45-60 years old, 19.2% is 26-34 years old, 0.8% is 61 years old and over. 71.3% of the participants are female and 28.7% are male. It was found that 52.1% of the participant group had 2 or more siblings and 42.9% had 1 sibling. It was observed that 5% of them had only one child.

In terms of education level, 66.9% of the participants are associate or undergraduate; 16.4% high school; 15.6% are postgraduate; 0.3% of them are primary school graduates. 79.4% of the participants stated that they grew up in a nuclear family, while 20.6% stated that they grew up in an extended family type. In terms of marital status, 48.5% of the participants were single, 44.8% were married, and 6.7% were divorced. The total income of 48.5% of the participants is 7000 TL or more; Between 5000 TL and 6999 TL of 23.4%; Between 3000 TL and 4999 TL of 18.4%; Between 1001 TL and 2999 TL of 8.1%; It was observed that 1.7% of them were 1000 TL or less. 35.7% of the participants with their spouse and children; 30.1% are alone with their parents; 9.2% only with their spouse; 0.8% of them stated that they lived with their romantic partner. 11.1% left out of these listed categories and marked the other option.

In terms of discussions at home during the pandemic period, 53.8% of the participants stated that they neither increased nor decreased. On the other hand, 26.5% stated that it increased slightly; 9.2% have increased considerably; 6.7% said that it has decreased considerably; 3.9% stated that it decreased slightly. It was found that 39% of the participants had a romantic relationship, 36.5% were married or divorced, and 24.5% did not have a romantic relationship.

44.3% of the married or divorced participants through their friends, 13% through their families; 12.2% declared that they met their spouses through an arranged method. 30% stated that they met their spouse in another way. 67.6% of the participants in a romantic relationship have never experienced a separation; 32.4% stated that they experienced separation. While 31.6% of the non-romantic participants stated that they had never had a romantic relationship, 68.4% stated that they had a previous romantic relationship.

2.3. Data Collection Process and Tools

Data was collected from participants with Google Forms. Each participant in the study voluntarily filled out the forms. A special link address was given to the participants to access the research form. Participants were first presented with an "Informed Consent Form", then "Personal

Information Form", "Marriage Role Expectations Scale", "Family Climate Scale", and "Three Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale".

2.3.1.Personal Information Form

For the purpose of this research, it is the form prepared by the researcher based on the factors that are thought to be effective on the result after the relevant literature review. In order to make the analysis more effective, the answers are presented in a categorized way.

2.3.2.Family Climate Scale

The original of the scale was developed as "Family Climate Scale" by Björnberg and Nicholson (2007). Its Turkish adaptation was made by Gönül, Işık-Baş and Şahin-Acar (2018). This scale is a scale that examines the life and communication in the family in which the individual grew up. The scale was arranged as a 5-point Likert scale. The first development group of the scale consisted of 474 adults. It consists of 34 questions in total and is divided into three sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are; "Intra-Family Relation", "Intergenerational Authority", "Cognitive Harmony". The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .91. When the subscales are evaluated within themselves; $\alpha = .95$ for "Family Relatedness"; $\alpha = .87$ for "Intergenerational Authority"; $\alpha = .87$ for "Cognitive Adjustment".

2.3.3.Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale

This scale was developed by Erzen (2016). This scale examines the communication and intimacy behaviors of the individual towards the attachment figure in his life. The scale was arranged as a 5-point Likert scale. The development group of the scale consisted of 460 students, 244 girls and 216 boys, between the ages of 12 and 25. It consists of 18 questions in total and is divided into three sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are; They are "Secure Attachment", "Anxious Attachment" and "Avoidant Attachment". Since the content of the scale consists of two negative and one positive sub-dimensions, a common reliability coefficient could not be calculated. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were .69 for "Secure Attachment"; .80 for "Avoid Attachment"; It was calculated as .71 for "Anxious Attachment".

2.3.4.Marriage Role Expectations Scale

The scale was developed by Köksal and İlhan (2018). It is a scale that examines the responsibilities that the individual considers appropriate to undertake in marriage and that he wants his partner to

undertake. The first development group of the scale consisted of 766 students. The scale was arranged as a 5-point Likert scale. It consists of 40 questions in total and is divided into two sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are; "Egalitarian" and "Traditional". The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients for the subscales were .87 for the "Egalitarian" subscale; It was calculated as .92 for the "Traditional" subscale.

2.4.Analysis of Data

2.4.1.Comparisons Between Groups

Shapiro-Wilk test was used for the normality tests of the scale scores of the groups and it was found that the scores did not show normal distribution in all of the groups compared. For this reason, non-parametric methods were preferred for comparisons between groups. Mann Whitney U test was used in paired group comparisons and Kruskal Wallis test was used in comparisons with more than two groups. In analyzes with statistically significant differences, pairwise comparisons were made with Bonferroni correction and Mann Whitney U tests. All analyzes were performed with SPSS 25.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) statistical program, statistical significance level was accepted as 0.05.

2.4.2.Correlation and Regression Analysis

Since the scale scores did not show a normal distribution, Spearman correlation analysis was preferred to examine the relationships between the scales. For the regression analysis, firstly, multivariate regression models were established with the Least Squares (Least Squares) estimation method, and the variables to enter the model were decided by the variable elimination method (backward selection). In order to control the adequacy of the created model, it was investigated whether the EQC prediction assumptions were met. This assumption was checked with the multivariate correlation coefficient (R). There should be no multicollinearity between the independent variables of the model. The variance amplification factor (VIF) measure was used to control this assumption. Whether the model errors are unrelated or not was checked with the Durbin Watson test . The conformity of the error terms to the normal distribution was checked with Shapiro-Wilk normality tests. Whether the variance of the errors is constant or not was investigated by the Breusch-Pagan test. As a result of the model adequacy checks, it was found that all regression models of the study did not provide the assumption of normal distribution of errors with constant variance, and there were many outliers in the error terms of the models. Since

the regression model did not provide the assumptions with the LCC estimation, the Robust regression method with the MM estimator, which is a regression method developed to analyze the data that has outliers and the errors are not normally distributed, was used to examine the relationship between marital role expectation and independent variables.

Regression analysis with correlation analysis and EKK estimation was performed with SPSS 25.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) statistical program, robust regression analysis with MM estimator was performed using robustbase package with RStudio version 4.0.3. The statistical significance level was accepted as 0.05.

3.Findings

3.1.Distribution of the Scores of the Participants from the Scales of the Study

Table 2. Comparison of marriage role expectation scores among demographic groups

Role Expectation	Group	n	Median	IQR	Test Statistics	P value
Egalitarian role expectation	Female	256	99	(96 – 100)	-5,520 [*]	**<0.001**
	Male	103	95	(88 – 99)		
Traditional role expectation	Female	256	29	(24 – 36.75)	8.070 [*]	**<0.001**
	Male	103	45	(33 – 63)		
Egalitarian role expectation	18 – 25 years	120	99	(96 – 100) [a]	22,260 [**]	**<0.001**
	26 – 34 years	69	98	(94 – 100) [a, b]		
	35 – 44 years	68	99	(93 – 100) [a]		
	45 – 60 years	99	97	(85 – 100) [b]		
	age 61 and over	3	90	(83 -) [a, b]		

Traditional role expectation	18 – 25 years	120	28	(22 – 33) [a]	30,853 [**]	**<0.001**
	26 – 34 years	69	34	(24 – 41.5) [a, b]		
	35 – 44 years	68	36	(26.25 – 44.75) [b]		
	45 – 60 years	99	36	(28 – 48) [b]		
	age 61 and over	3	30	(20 -) [a, b]		
Egalitarian role expectation	only child	18	99	(95.75 – 100) [a, b]	6,596 [**]	**0.037**
	has 1 sibling	154	99	(95 – 100) [a]		
	Has 2 or more siblings	187	98	(93 – 100) [b]		
Traditional role expectation	only child	18	30.5	(20.75 – 33.5) [a]	5.119 [**]	0.077
	has 1 sibling	154	31	(24 – 39) [a]		
	Has 2 or more siblings	187	34	(26 – 43) [a]		
Egalitarian role expectation	Primary/Middle School	4	97	(49 – 99.25) [a]	3,921 [**]	0.270
	High school	59	99	(96 – 100) [a]		

	Associate/Bachelor's	240	98	(93 – 100) [a]		
	Postgraduate	56	98.5	(95 – 100) [a]		
Traditional role expectation	Primary/Middle School	4	37	(27.25 – 37) [a]	2,767 [**]	0.429
	High school	59	30	(24 – 37) [a]		
	Associate/Bachelor's	240	32.5	(25 – 43) [a]		
	Postgraduate	56	34.5	(24 – 44.5) [a]		
Egalitarian role expectation	Nuclear family	285	99	(95 – 100)	-3.429 [*]	**0.001**
	Extended family	74	96	(86.75 – 100)		
Traditional role expectation	Nuclear family	285	32	(24 – 42)	0.301 [*]	0.764
	Extended family	74	32	(25 – 40)		
Egalitarian role expectation	Single	174	99	(96 – 100) [a]	8,483 [**]	**0.014**
	Married	161	98	(92 – 100) [b]		
	Divorced	24	98.5	(95 – 100) [a, b]		
Traditional role expectation	Single	174	28	(23 – 34.25) [a]	30,051 [**]	**<0.001**
	Married	161	36	(26 – 47) [b]		

	Divorced	24	37	(31.25 – 45.25) [b]		
Egalitarian role expectation	1000 TL and below	6	97	(89.25 – 99.25) [a]	2.185 [**]	0.702
	1001 – 2999 TL	29	98	(95.5 – 100) [a]		
	3000 – 4999 TL	66	97	(89.75 – 100) [a]		
	5000 – 6999 TL	84	98.5	(93 – 100) [a]		
	7000 TL and above	174	99	(94.75 – 100) [a]		
Traditional role expectation	1000 TL and below	6	30.5	(23.5 – 46.25) [a]	3.229 [**]	0.520
	1001 – 2999 TL	29	29	(22.5 – 36) [a]		
	3000 – 4999 TL	66	29	(24 – 40.75) [a]		
	5000 – 6999 TL	84	33.5	(26 – 42.75) [a]		
	7000 TL and above	174	33.5	(24 – 41.25) [a]		

[*] Mann Whitney U test standardized test statistic, [**] Kruskal Wallis test statistic, IQR: span of quarters

The egalitarian role expectation scores of women in the relationship are significantly higher than the scores of men. The traditional role expectation scores of men are significantly higher than the

scores of women. The egalitarian role expectation scores of the 18-25 age group were significantly higher than the 45-60 age group (U=57,691, z=4.229, p<0.01). The egalitarian role expectation scores of the 34 – 44 age group are also significantly higher than the 45 – 60 age group (U=44.729, z=2.827, p=0.047). There is no significant difference between the other age groups in terms of egalitarian role scores. The traditional role expectancy scores of the 18-25 age group differ from both the 35-44 age group scores (U=-61.948, z=-3.936, p=0.001) and the 45-60 age group scores (U=-72.566, z=-5.155, p<0.01) is significantly low. There is no significant difference between other age groups in terms of traditional role scores. There was a significant difference in egalitarian role expectancy scores between the group growing up as an only child and those with 1 sibling (U=10.411, z=0.416, p=1.00) and those with 2 or more siblings (U=36.221, z=0.144, p=0.432). there is none. The egalitarian role expectation scores of the group with 1 sibling were significantly higher than the group with 2 or more siblings (U=25.810, z=2.361, p=0.053). Traditional role expectancy scores, on the other hand, do not differ between groups separated by the number of siblings. Both the egalitarian role expectation and traditional role expectation scores of the groups separated by education levels do not differ between the groups. The egalitarian role expectation scores of the participants who grew up in a nuclear family are significantly higher than those who grew up in an extended family (U=7904.5, z=-3.429, p=0.001), while there is no significant difference between traditional role scores (U=10306.0, z=0.301, p=). 0.764). The egalitarian role expectation scores of the singles are significantly higher than the scores of the married people (U=31.954, z=2.909, p=0.011), while the traditional role expectation scores are significantly lower than the scores of the married people (U=-58.016, z=-5.117, p<0.01).). There is no significant difference between the single group and the divorced group in terms of egalitarian role expectation scores (U=12.120, z=0.554, p=1.000), while traditional role scores are significantly higher in the single group (U=-70.994, z=-3.144, p =0.005). There is no significant difference between the egalitarian role expectation (U=-19.834, z=-0.902, p=1.000) and traditional role expectation scores (U=-12.978, z=-0.572, p=1.000) of the married and divorced groups. Both egalitarian role expectation and traditional role expectation scores do not differ between groups separated by income levels (Table 2).

Table 3. Comparison of marriage role expectation scores among groups formed according to various social interaction situations

Role Expectation	Living With	n	Median	IQR	Test Statistics	P value
Egalitarian role expectation	Alone	47	99	(96 – 100) [a]	11,085 **	0.05
	With romantic partner	3	96	(83 –) [a]		
	With his wife/husband	33	99	(91.5 – 100) [a]		
	With his wife/husband and children	128	98	(92 – 100) [a]		
	With parents	108	99	(95 – 100) [a]		
	Other	40	99	(96 – 100) [a]		
Traditional role expectation	Alone	47	29	(26 – 34) [a, b]	22,412 **	**<0.001**
	With romantic partner	3	32	(22 –) [a, b]		
	With his wife/husband	33	33	(24.5 – 44) [a, b]		
	With his wife/husband and children	128	36	(28 – 47) [a]		
	With parents	108	28.5	(23.25 – 36.75) [b]		
	Other	40	29.5	(22 – 37) [b]		

Role Expectation	Conflicts in the Family During Social Isolation	n	Median	IQR	Test Statistics	P value
Egalitarian role expectation	Has increased considerably	33	99	(93 – 100) [a]	7,407 [**]	0.116
	Slightly increased	95	99	(95 – 100) [a]		
	Neither increased nor decreased	193	98	(94 – 100) [a]		
	Decreased a little	14	96	(91.5 – 98) [a]		
	It has decreased considerably	24	97.5	(82.25 – 100) [a]		
Traditional role expectation	Has increased considerably	33	29	(23 – 35) [a]	7,814 [**]	0.099
	Slightly increased	95	30	(25 – 41) [a]		
	Neither increased nor decreased	193	34	(26 – 43) [a]		
	Decreased a little	14	28.5	(23 – 36.75) [a]		
	It has decreased considerably	24	28.5	(23 – 42.5) [a]		
Role Expectation	Romantic Relationship Status	n	Median	IQR	Test Statistics	P value

		N	Median	iqr	Test Statistics	P Value
Egalitarian role expectation	Has a romantic relationship	140	99	(95 – 100)		
	No romantic relationship	88	98.5	(94.25 – 100)	2,881 **	0.237
	Married/Divorced	131	98	(93 – 100)		
Traditional role expectation	Has a romantic relationship	140	28	(23 – 37)		
	No romantic relationship	88	33	(26 – 39.75)	22,454 **	**<0.001**
	Married/Divorced	131	36	(29 - 45)		

Role Expectation	Meet With Partner	N	Median	iqr	Test Statistics	P Value
Egalitarian role expectation	Arranged	16	95.5	(89 – 99) [a]		
	Through friends	58	98	(93 – 100) [a]		
	Through families	17	98	(90 – 99.5) [a]	2,623 **	0.453
	Other	40	99	(94.25 – 100) [a]		
Traditional role expectation	Arranged	16	45	(36 – 60.25) [a]		
	Through friends	58	35	(27.75 – 45) [a]		
	Through families	17	37	(30 – 39) [a]	7,680 **	0.053
	Other	40	35	(25.75 – 43) [a]		

Role Expectation	Has he ever been separated?	n	Median	IQR	Test Statistics	P value
	No	75	99	(95 – 100)	-0.444	0.657

Egalitarian role expectation	Yes	36	98	(95.25 – 100)		
Traditional role expectation	No	75	27	(24 – 36)	-0.445	0.656
	Yes	36	28	(22.5 – 42.75)		

Role Expectation	**Has he had a romantic relationship before?**	**n**	**Median**	**IQR**	**Test Statistics**	**P value**
Egalitarian role expectation	No	37	98	(88.5 – 100)	-0.590	0.555
	Yes	80	99	(95.25 – 100)		
traditional role expectation	No	37	33	(22.5 – 44.5)	-0.637	0.524
	Yes	80	31	(26 – 36.75)		

[*] Mann Whitney U test standardized test statistic, [**] Kruskal Wallis test statistic, IQR: span of quarters

There is no significant difference in terms of egalitarian role expectancy scores between the groups separated according to the person they live with, but the traditional role expectancy scores in the group living with their spouse and children compared to the group living with their parents (U=55.863, z=4.123, p=0.001) and in the group that marked the other option. (U=61.377, z=3.268, p=0.016) significantly higher. There is no significant difference between the groups separated according to the change in family conflicts during the social isolation process, neither in terms of egalitarian role expectation nor traditional role expectation scores. There is no difference between the egalitarian role expectations scores of the groups separated according to their romantic relationship status. The traditional role expectation scores of the participants in the married/married/divorced group were significantly higher than the participants in the romantic relationship group (U=-59.725, z=-4.738, p<0.001). The egalitarian role expectation scores do not differ in the subgroups of the Married/Married/Divorced group divided according to the way of meeting the spouse. In the traditional role expectancy score, the scores of the arranged marriage group seem higher than the group that met through friends, but the Mann Whitney U test results with Bonferroni correction showed that the difference was not statistically significant (U=27.109,

z=2.531, p=0.068). Both the egalitarian role expectation and traditional role expectation scores of the group that had a romantic relationship and had not experienced separation before and the group that had a romantic relationship and had previously experienced separation did not differ. Similarly, there is no difference between the egalitarian and traditional role expectancy scores of the group that has not been in a romantic relationship at the moment and has lived before, and the group that has not had a romantic relationship and has not had a romantic relationship before (Table 3). Romantic relationship status There is a weak and negative relationship between the time they have been married and the egalitarian role expectation scores of the married/divorced group (r=-0.276, p=0.001), while there is no relationship between the time they have been married and traditional role expectation scores (r=0.046, p=0.602). There is no relationship between the duration of the romantic relationship group and egalitarian role expectation scores (r=-0.135, p=0.156), there is a weak and negative relationship between traditional role expectation scores (r=-0.221, p=0.020).

3.2.Findings on the Relationship between Marriage Role Expectation and Family Climate

Table 4 1. Relationship between marital role expectation and family climate

		family relatedness	intergenerational authority	cognitive adaptation
Egalitarian role expectation	r	**0.164**	**-0.150**	0.061
	p	**0.002**	**0.004**	0.249
Traditional role expectation	r	0.029	**0.251**	0.030
	p	0.580	**<0.001**	0.567

There is a very weak positive correlation between egalitarian role expectation and intra-familial relationality (r=0.164, p=0.002), and a very weak negative correlation with intergenerational authority (r=-0.150, p=0.004). There was no relationship between egalitarian role expectation and cognitive adjustment (r=0.061, p=0.249). Traditional role expectancy, on the other hand, showed a weak positive correlation only with intergenerational authority (r=0.251, p<0.001) (Table 4).

3.3.Findings on the Relationship between Marriage Role Expectation and Attachment Styles

Table 5 2Relationship between marital role expectancy and attachment styles

		Secure attachment style	avoidant attachment style	Anxious-ambivalent attachment style
Egalitarian role expectation	r	**0.113**	**-0.145**	-0.086
	p	**0.033**	**0.006**	0.105
Traditional role expectation	r	0.072	**0.121**	**0.161**
	p	0.176	**0.022**	**0.002**

There is a very weak positive correlation between egalitarian role expectation and secure attachment style (r=0.113, p=0.033), and a very weak negative relationship with avoidant attachment style (r=-0.145, p=0.006). There was no relationship between egalitarian role expectation and anxious-ambivalent attachment style (r=-0.086, p=0.105). Traditional role expectancy, on the other hand, showed a very weak positive correlation with avoidant attachment style (r=0.121, p=0.022) and a very weak positive correlation with anxious-ambivalent attachment style (r=0.161, p=0.002). It is not associated with secure attachment style (r=0.072, p=0.176) (Table 5).

3.4. Equitable Role Expectation Regression Model

Table 6. Equalitarian Role Expectation Linear Regression Model with MM Estimation

	non-standardized coefficients		t	p	95% CI for B	
	B	Std. Error			Lower	Top
(Still)	99,071	1,278	77,543	**<0.001**	96,558	101,584
45 - 60 years	-0.348	0.384	-0.906	0.365	-1.103	0.407
61 years and older	-6.041	4,355	-1.387	0.166	-14,606	2,524
Gender (Male vs female)	-1.561	0.581	-2.686	**0.008**	-2.704	-0.418

The type of family he grew up in (extended vs nuclear family)	-0.897	0.558	-1.607	0.109	-1.994	0.200
Secure attachment style	0.004	0.050	0.081	0.936	-0.094	0.102
avoidant attachment style	-0.019	0.038	-0.498	0.618	-0.094	0.056

Dependent variable: expectation of egalitarian role

When the model errors were examined, it was determined that there were many outliers, and these outliers were cleared from the data in order to eliminate the assumptions violations. However, when the regression line was re-estimated with the remaining data, it was observed that the errors were still not normally distributed, there was a problem of varying variance, and there were many outliers in the errors. In order to reduce the effect of outliers, the model was re-estimated using the MM estimator. Robust regression results showed that only gender was a predictor of the egalitarian role model score, and other independent variables were ineffective in predicting the egalitarian role expectation score (Robust std. error=2.216, Adjusted R2=0.112). Being male causes an average of 1.561 points decrease in the egalitarian role expectation score compared to being female (Table 6).

Traditional Role Expectation Regression Model

Table 7. Traditional Role Expectation Linear Regression Model with MM Estimation

	non-standardized coefficients				95% CI for B	
	B	Std. Error	t	p	Lower	Top
(Still)	8,918	4,850	1,839	0.067	-0.620	18,456
Gender (Male vs female)	11,854	2,509	4,724	<0.001	6,920	16,788

single	-7,860	1,115	-7.052	<0.001	-10,053	-5.667
intergenerational authority	0.357	0.092	3.858	<0.001	0.176	0.538
Secure attachment style	0.606	0.179	3.379	<0.001	0.254	0.958
Anxious-ambivalent attachment style	0.487	0.122	3.993	<0.001	0.247	0.727

Dependent variable: traditional role expectation

Robust regression results showed that all independent variables were predictors of traditional role model score (Robust std. error=9.297, Adjusted R2=0.361). The traditional role expectation scores of men are on average 11,854 points higher than women. The traditional role expectation scores of single people are on average 7,860 points lower than those of married and divorced people. With the increase in the intergenerational authority score by 1 point, an average of 0.357 points increase is observed in the traditional role expectation score. With an increase of 1 point in the secure attachment style score, an average of 0.606 points increase in the traditional role expectancy score, and an increase of 0.487 points in the traditional role expectation score with an increase in the anxious/ambivalent attachment style score by 1 point is observed (Table 7).

4.Discussion and Conclusion

When the relationship role expectations of the participants are examined in terms of their gender, it is seen that the egalitarian relationship role expectation scores of the female participants are statistically significantly higher than the male participants. At the same time, it is seen that the traditional role expectation scores of male participants are statistically significantly higher than female participants. When the relevant literature is scanned in terms of gender variable, it can be seen that the majority of the studies support this result (Dunn, 1960; Koçyiğit-Özyiğit, 2017; Markwart, 1999; Marlar & Jacobs, 1993; Tosun & Yazıcı, 2021).

When the results in terms of age in terms of egalitarian role expectancy are examined, it is found that young adults and middle adult individuals have a more egalitarian relationship role expectation than late adult individuals, and that egalitarian role expectation decreases as age increases; On the

other hand, it can be seen that traditional role expectations have increased. This result is consistent with other studies in the literature (Bener & Günay, 2013; İmamoğlu, 1993; Morgan & Walker, 1983; Öz-Soysal, Uz-Baş & Aysan, 2020; Tosun & Yazıcı, 2021).

When the relationship between the education levels of the participants and their relationship role expectations is examined, it is noteworthy that the research result contradicts the results of the research conducted by Moser (1961). However, in the study conducted by Moser (1961), it was revealed that the level of education being a determining factor in the mate selection is a variable that occurs due to the increase in the intelligence level of the participants. From this point of view, it can be said that education level does not appear to be a directly valid variable for mate selection or role expectations (Dunn, 1960; Moser, 1961).

According to the results of the research, it is seen that the egalitarian role expectation scores of the participants with 1 sibling are statistically significantly higher than the egalitarian role expectation scores of the participants with 2 or more siblings. When the relationship between the family type and relationship role expectation scores, which is another related variable, is examined, it can be seen that the egalitarian role expectation scores of the participants who grew up in the nuclear family are statistically significantly higher than the egalitarian role expectation scores of the participants who grew up in the extended family. There are studies supporting similar results in the related literature (Dunn, 1960; Marlar & Jacobs, 1993; Öz-Soysal, Uz-Baş & Aysan, 2020; Tosun & Yazıcı, 2021). The result of the research on the number of siblings seems insufficient to make a comment on its own. It is thought that the same situation will be valid for the fact that there is no significant difference between the participants with nuclear and extended families.

When the relationship between the relationship role expectations according to the marital status of the participants is examined, although there is no study related to the marital status in the relevant literature, the results of the studies on the employment status of the spouses, marital adjustment and signs of divorce support the results of this research (Burr; 1971; İlhan et all., 2018; Lognanecker, 1974).

When the differences between the income levels of the participants and their relationship role expectations are examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference between any two groups in terms of traditional or egalitarian role expectations. As a result of the examination of the relationship between people they live with and their relationship role

expectations, the traditional role expectation score of the participants living with their spouse and children was statistically significantly higher than the group living with their parents and choosing the other option. It is seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the egalitarian role expectation score of any group in terms of whether there is a romantic relationship or not. However, it was revealed that the traditional role expectation scores of the married or divorced participants were statistically significantly higher than the romantic relationship group. On the other hand, the expectation of an egalitarian role in terms of the duration of the union of the married or married and divorced group is statistically weak and negative; also, a statistically weak and negative relationship was found between the duration of the romantic relationship group and the traditional role expectation.

The relationships between egalitarian role expectations and family climate sub-dimensions were examined. Accordingly, a positive but weak relationship was found between the expectation of an egalitarian role in terms of intra-familial relationality and a negative but very weak relationship in terms of intergenerational authority; no statistically significant relationship was found in terms of cognitive adjustment. Then, the relation between attachment styles and sub-dimensions was investigated. There was a positive but very weak relationship between secure attachment and a negative but very weak relationship with anxious attachment. No statistically significant relationship was found with anxious-avoidant attachment. As a result of linear regression analysis, five different independent variables (age, gender, family type, secure attachment and avoidant attachment) were found; however, since the regression analysis did not give reliable results, Robust regression analysis was performed and it was revealed that only the gender variable, among the independent variables, actually predicted the egalitarian role expectation.

Within the scope of the research, the relationship between traditional role expectations and family climate sub-dimensions and attachment styles was evaluated. According to this; In the sub-dimensions of family climate, only intergenerational authority was positively but weakly correlated; As a result of linear regression analysis, five independent variables (gender, marital status, intergenerational authority, secure attachment, and anxious-avoidant attachment) were found to be predictors. However, since linear regression analysis did not give reliable results, Robust regression analysis was performed. The predictiveness of the variables found as a result of the analysis was confirmed. What is striking here is that secure attachment has a predictive feature, although it does not initially show correlation with traditional role expectations. This variable is

included in the regression model because it gains predictive properties with other variables in the Robust regression analysis.

Within the scope of this research, whether adults' relationship role expectations are predicted in terms of their perceived family climate and attachment style in their romantic relationships, in terms of some demographic variables (age, gender, number of siblings, education level, family they grew up in, marital status, income level, and marriage duration if married or divorced). and the method of meeting the spouse; if they have romantic relationships, their duration of togetherness and whether they live apart, whether they have any romantic relationships, whether they have any relationships and whether they have been separated in the last 6 months, with whom they live, and the level of conflicts at home during social isolation) were examined.

In terms of demographic variables, it was seen that adults' relationship role expectations differ according to their age, gender, number of siblings, family types they grew up in, marital status, people they live with, and whether they have romantic relationships. As a result of the correlation analysis, it was found that there was generally a weak level of correlation between the adult relationship role expectations sub-dimensions, the family climate sub-dimensions and the attachment styles sub-dimensions. As a result of the regression analysis, gender, marital status, intergenerational authority sub-dimension, secure attachment and anxious-avoidant attachment sub-dimensions predicted traditional role expectancy, but the percentages of explanation were low. Also found that, only gender predicted egalitarian role expectation .

Based on the results of the study, suggestions for researchers who will conduct research on this subject are as follows:

•The research can be repeated by using a different method for sample selection, with a more homogeneous distribution of role expectations.

• The validity and reliability studies of the "Marriage Role Expectations" scale used in the research can be repeated or the scale can be updated on a group other than the original adaptation study.

•Alternative scales can be used that can give similar results with the scales used in the research.

• The study can be carried out with the data set to be collected from a larger sample.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Atak, H., &Taştan, N. (2012). Romantik ilişkiler ve aşk. *Psikiyatride güncel yaklaşımlar, 4*(4). 520-546. https://doi.org/10.5455/cap.20120431

Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P.R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? İçinde J.A. Simpson ve W.S. Rholes (Eds.), Attachment theory and close relationships (pp: 25-45). Guilford Press.

Bener, Ö., & Günay, G. (2013). Gençlerin evlilik ve aile yaşamına ilişkin tutumları. *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 3*(1), 1-16 . doi: 10.14230/joiss9

Björnberg, Å., & Nicholson, N. (2007). The family climate scales – Development of a new measure for use in family research. *Family Business Review, 20*(3), 229-246. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-6248.2007.00098.x

Burr, W. R. (1971). An expansion and test of a role theory of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33(*2), 368. https://doi.org/10.2307/349423

Cüceloğlu, D. (2015). *İnsan ve davranışı.* (Otuzuncu basım). Remzi Kitabevi.

Devecioğlu, P., (2020). *Nişanlı bireylerde ilişki doyumunu yordamada bağlanma boyutlarının, evlilik tutumlarının ve beklentilerinin rolü*. (Yayın No: 635549) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Dunn, M.S. (1960). Marriage role expectations of adolescents. *Marriage and Family Living, 22*(2). 99-111. https://doi.org/10.2307/347324

Eken, H. (2006). Toplumsal cinsiyet olgusu temelinde mesleğe ilişkin rol ile aile içi rol etkileşimi: Türk silahlı kuvvetlerindeki kadın subaylar. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 15*, 247-281. http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/577/557

Erzen, E. (2016). Üç boyutlu bağlanma stilleri ölçeği. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(3), 1-21. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/267728

Eylen Özyurt, B. (2012). Gelişim konularına genel bir bakış. İçinde A. Kaya (Ed.), *Eğitim psikolojisi* (Yedinci baskı) (pp. 1-30). Pegem Akademi.

Gladding, S.T., (2015). *Family therapy* (Altıncı baskı). Pearson.

Gönül, B., Işık-Baş, H., & Şahin-Acar, B. (2018). Aile İklimi Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye uyarlanması ve psikometrik açıdan incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *8*(50), 165–200. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/571514

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 52*, 511-524. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511

Hurvitz, N. (1960). The measurement of marital strain. *American Journal of Sociology, 65*(6), 610-615. https://doi.org/10.1086/222793

Hurvitz, N. (1965). The Marital Roles Inventory as a counseling instrument. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27*(4), 492–501. https://doi.org/10.2307/3501890–615.

İlhan, T., Yöntem, M. K., Köksal, B., & Sarıkaya, Y. (2018, May). Evlilik rol beklentilerinin boşanma göstergeleri üzerindeki yordayıcı gücü [Kongre sunumu]. *ICPESS (International Congress on Politic, Economic and Social Studies)*. Venedik, İtalya.

İmamoğlu, O. (1993). Değişen dünyada değişen aile-içi roller. *Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi,* (1), 58-68. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/7112

Kaçar, M. (2018). *Flört süresinin bireylerin eş seçme önceliklerine ilişkisinin incelenmesi* (Yayın No: 530380) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Karaca, R. & İkiz, E. F. (2014). *Psikolojik danışma ve rehberlikte çağdaş bir anlayış: yaşamla iç içe, yaşam boyunca* (Üçüncü baskı). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Karasar, N. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Nobel Yayınları.

Koçyiğit-Özyiğit, M. (2017). The meaning of marriage according to university students: A phenomenological study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 17*(2), 679-711. https://www.jestp.com/index.php/estp/article/view/483

Köksal, B. (2017). *Evlilik rol beklentileri ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi* (Yayın No: 481311) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Köksal, B., & İlhan, T. (2018). Evlilik rol beklentileri ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 19(1), 300-319. https://doi.org/10.12984/egeefd.378847

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *50*(1/2), 66-104. https://doi.org/10.2307/3333827

Markwart, L. L. (1999). *Differences in the marriage role expectations of post-secondary students from divorced and ıntact family backgrounds in accordance with family-of-origin social class* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, University of Regina]. National Library of Canada.

Marlar, J. A., & Jacobs, K. W. (1993). Differences in the marriage role expectations of college students from intact and divorced families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 18*(3–4), 93–103. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v18n03_06

Minuchin, S. & Fishman H.C., (2002). *Family therapy techniques* (On altıncı baskı). Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, S., (1974). *Families and family therapy: History, theory and practice*. Harvard University Press.

Morgan, C. S., & Walker, A. J. (1983). Predicting sex role attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46*(2), 148–151. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033851

Moser, A. J. (1961). Marriage Role Expectations of High School Students. *Marriage and Family Living, 23*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.2307/346884

Moss, B.F. ve Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Marriage and romantic relationships: defining intimacy in romantic relationships. *Family Relations/National Counsil on Family Relations, 42*(1), 31-37.

Nazlı, S. (2018). *Aile danışmanlığı* (On üçüncü baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Özer, M. (2011). *Suçluluk-utanç, bağlanma, algılanan ebeveynlik (anne) tarzı ve psikolojik belirtiler arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayın No: 348807) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kara Harp Okulu Komutanlığı]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Özgüngör, S. & Acun Kapıkıran, N. (2011). Erikson'un psikososyal gelişim dönemleri ölçeklerinin Türk kültürüne uygunluğunun karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi: Ön bulgular. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 4*(36), 114-126. http://turkpdrdergisi.com/index.php/pdr/article/view/96

Öz-Soysal, F. S, Uz-Baş, A., & Aysan, F., (2020). A qualitative study for university students' marriage expectation. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 21*(1), 241-253. http://161.9.164.68/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/16975/Makale%20Dosyası.pdf?sequence =1&isAllowed=y

Öztemel, K. (2019). Yaşam boyu gelişim. İçinde Ş. Işık (Ed.), *Psikolojiye giriş* (İkinci baskı) (pp. 215-265). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Özü, Ö. (2017). Genç yetişkinlik dönemi ve uyum problemleri. İçinde F. Savi Çakar (Ed.), *Yaşam dönemleri ve uyum sorunları* içinde (pp. 27-72). Pegem Akademi.

Pollock, A. D., Die, A. H., & Marriott, R. G. (1990). Relationship of communication style to egalitarian marital role expectations. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 130*(5), 619- 624. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1990.9922953

Sabatelli, R. (1984). The marital comparison level index: A measure for assessing outcomes relative to expectations. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 46*(3). 651-662. https://doi.org/10.2307/352606

Sardoğan, M.E., & Karahan, T.F. (2012). Kişilik gelişimi. İçinde A. Kaya (Ed.), *Eğitim psikolojisi* (Yedinci baskı) (pp. 1-30). Pegem Akademi.

Siyez, D.M. (2017). Kişilerarası ilişkilerin başlangıcı ve gelişimi. İçinde A. Kaya (Ed.), *Kişilerarası ilişkiler ve etkili iletişim* (Onuncu baskı) (pp. 62-93). Pegem Akademi.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). A triangular theory of love. İçinde R.J. Sternberg ve M.L. Barnes (Eds), *The pscyhology of love* (pp: 68-99). Yale University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, *93*, 119-135. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.119

Şafak, Ş., Çopur, Z., & Özkan, M. (2006). Çocukların evle ilgili faaliyetlere harcadıkları zamanın incelenmesi. *Sosyolojik araştırmalar e-dergisi*, http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/makaleler/sszcmao.pdf

Toprak Gültekin, D. (2019). *Evlenme biçimi ve evlenme süresi bağlamında evlilik öncesi sürecin kadınlardaki evlilik doyumu ile ilişkisi* (Yayın No: 579428) [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Tosun, C., & Yazıcı, H. (2021). Algılanan ebeveyn ilişki tutumları ile romantik ilişkilerde akılcı olmayan inançların evlilik rol beklentileri üzerindeki etkisi: geleneksel mi, eşitlikçi mi?. *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet, 32*(1), 173-188. doi: 10.33417/tsh.781374

Türk Dil Kurumu (2020, 27 Aralık). Güncel Türkçe Sözlük. https://sozluk.gov.tr adresinden elde edilmiştir.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2020, 26 Şubat). Haber Bülteni (Sayı: 33708). https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Evlenme-ve-Bosanma-Istatistikleri-2019-33708 adresinden elde edilmiştir.

van Steijn, D.J., Oerlemans, A.M., van Aken, M.A.G., Buitelaar, J.K., & Rommelse, N.N.J. (2015). The influence of parental and offspring autism disorder (ASD) and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) symptoms on family climate. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 24*(7), 2021-2030. doi: 10.1007/s10826-014-0002-9

Yazgan İnanç, B. & Yerlikaya, E. E. (2016). *Kişilik kuramları.* (Onikinci baskı). Pegem Akademi.