

# **The Role of Gender, Romantic Jealousy and Intimate Partner Violence on Relationship Satisfaction during Young Adulthood**

**Akile Yüzügülen**

Submitted to the  
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Science  
in  
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University  
July 2016  
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

---

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tümer  
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman  
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman  
Supervisor

---

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan

---

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

---

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman

---

## **ABSTRACT**

Developing a healthy romantic relationship has a fundamental effect on an individuals' well being as it is linked to better physical and mental health. The current study aimed to investigate the role of gender, romantic jealousy and attitudes towards intimate partner violence on relationship satisfaction while at the same time assessing the differences between emerging and young adults.

The sample included 230 (149 females; 81 males) Turkish speaking heterosexual unmarried individuals between 18 to 30 years old who completed self-report measures including Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MDJS), Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale (IPVAS) and Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS).

Results showed that cognitive jealousy predicted relationship satisfaction. When participants showed higher jealousy, their relationship satisfaction was also high. There were no age period or gender differences on jealousy levels. Abusive attitudes were correlated with behavioral and emotional jealousy. Women showed more positive abusive attitudes than men. Participants with abusive attitudes were found to have higher relationship satisfaction. The role of additional relationship variables, namely being whether it's the participant's first relationship, the perception of relationship as 'long term', and relationship duration were also assessed. Perception of relationship as long term was found to positively predict relationship satisfaction. The results yielded no significant differences between emerging and young adults on any of the measures. The results are discussed in light of the traditional nature of the

Turkish speaking emerging and young adults culture with implications for developing healthier intimate relationships.

**Keywords:** Jealousy, relationship satisfaction, attitudes toward IPV

## ÖZ

Sağlıklı bir romantik ilişki geliştirmek, bireylerin iyilik halinde temel ve belirgin etkiler bırakarak, bireylerin daha iyi fiziksel ve zihinsel gelişimi ile ilişkilendirilir. Bu araştırma, kıskançlığın ve yakın ilişkilerde şiddete (YİŞ) karşı tutumların, ilişki doyumu üzerindeki rolünü incelemeyi hedeflemiştir. Aynı zamanda, cinsiyet ve beliren yetişkinlik rollerinin etkisi de değerlendirilmiştir.

Örnekleme; Türkçe konuşan, yaşları 18 ile 30 arasında değişen, evli olmayan 230 heteroseksüel (149 kadın – 81 erkek) katılımcı oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada, Çok Boyutlu Kıskançlık Ölçeği, YİŞ'e Karşı Tutum Ölçeği ve İlişki Değerlendirme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır.

Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, kıskançlık ölçeğinin bilişsel altölçeği, ilişki doyumunu yordadığı görülmüştür. Katılımcılar, yüksek düzeyde kıskançlık gösterdiği zaman, ilişki doyumunda yükselmiştir. Kıskançlık seviyeleri üzerinde herhangi bir yaş ya da cinsiyet farkı bulunmamıştır. Şiddete karşı olumlu tutumların davranışsal ve duygusal kıskançlık ile ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Kadınların erkeklere kıyasla şiddete bakış açılarının daha olumlu olduğu bulunmuştur. Şiddete karşı olumlu tutumları olan katılımcıların ilişki doyumlarında yüksek olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. İlişki değişkenlerine ek olarak, ilk ilişki olup olmadığı, ilişkinin uzun vadeli olarak düşünülüp düşünülmediği ve ilişki süresi de değerlendirilmiştir. İlişkinin uzun vadeli olacağıyla ilgili değerlendirmelerin, ilişki doyumunu yordadığı bulunmuştur. Ölçeklerden elde edilen bulgular doğrultusunda, beliren ve erken yetişkinlik arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır. Sonuçlar, sağlıklı yakın ilişkiler geliştirebilmek için

Türkçe konuşan beliren ve erken yetişkin kültürlerin geleneksel doğasına göre tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kıskançlık, ilişki doyumu, YİŞ'e karşı tutumlar

To my parents and my sister

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman for her valuable guidance, suggestions and advices while working on this thesis. I am extremely grateful for her continuous support, motivation and encouragements throughout the research.

Mostly importantly, I would like to express my appreciation to my family, and my fiancée for their patience, unconditional love and endless understanding. They have been always standing next to me.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Relationship Satisfaction.....	2
1.1.1 Demographic Variables and Relationship Satisfaction.....	4
1.1.1.1 Emerging Adulthood and Relationship Satisfaction.....	4
1.1.1.2 Gender and Relationship Satisfaction.....	6
1.1.1.3 Relationship Variables and Relationship Satisfaction.....	7
1.2 Jealousy.....	8
1.2.1 Gender and Jealousy.....	9
1.2.2 Age and Jealousy.....	11
1.2.3 Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction.....	12
1.3 Intimate Partner Violence.....	13
1.3.1 Gender and IPV.....	14
1.3.2 Age and IPV.....	17
1.3.3 Jealousy and IPV.....	18
1.3.4 IPV and Relationship Satisfaction.....	19
1.4 Current Study.....	21
2 METHOD.....	24
2.1 Participants.....	24

2.2 Materials .....	25
2.2.1 Demographics .....	25
2.2.2 Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MDJS) .....	25
2.2.3 Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale (IPVAS) .....	26
2.2.4 Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS).....	26
2.3 Design.....	27
2.4 Procedure .....	27
3 RESULTS .....	29
3.1 Gender Differences.....	29
3.2 Differences in Age Period .....	31
3.3 Correlational Analysis .....	31
3.4 Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction .....	35
4 DISCUSSION.....	37
REFERENCES .....	48
APPENDICES .....	69
Appendix A: Demographic Information Sheet.....	70
Appendix B: Multidimensional Jealousy Scale.....	71
Appendix C: Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale.....	73
Appendix D: Relationship Assessment Scale.....	75
Appendix E: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter .....	76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of multidimensional jealousy subscales (MDJ), relationship satisfaction (RAS) and intimate partner violence subscales (IPV) according to gender.....	30
Table 2: Means and standard deviations of all variables for emerging adulthood and young adulthood.....	32
Table 3: Correlation coefficients values (Pearson) of all variables .....	34
Table 4: Hierarchical regression analysis for relationship satisfaction .....	36

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

Forming romantic relationships is an innate and biological constituent of human behavior (Guerrero, Anderson & Afifi, 2011). Romantic relationships are central part to being human, and associated to personal, social, emotional and physical benefits which cover all aspects of human life, therefore; it is becoming more significant to study in the topic of romantic relationships. In fact, research on romantic relationships has demonstrated that a good, healthy relationship is linked with better physical and mental health (Guerrero et al., 2011).

Relationships can come in varieties; these can include work relationships, classmates at school, or parental relationships with their children. The focus of the thesis is the relationship between partners in a loving, intimate or 'romantic relationship'. Romantic relationships differ from more casual ones because they may include knowledge, caring, interdependence, mutuality, trust and commitment (Miller, Perlman & Brehm, 2007).

Many researchers have been interested in romantic relationships and developing romantic relationships is thought to be a developmental milestone (Butzer & Campbell, 2008; Erikson, 1982; Reis, Collins & Oishi, 2000). A study has shown that the quality of relationship and its supportive nature has a positive impact on emotional and psychological health such as decreased risk for anxiety and

depression (Prigerson, Maciejewski & Rosenheck, 1999). Also, satisfaction in relationship is shown to be related with increased immune system and physical health (Whiffen & Aube, 1999). These results emphasize the importance of the forming interpersonal bonds and have been shown to have a vital effect of satisfaction on the people lives.

On the other hand, romantic relationships might not always link with pleasure and happiness. Individuals can come across with potential tension and conflicts in their romantic relationships and this has been intensely examined by researchers who look at the negative side of relationships, from jealousy to partner violence (Miller et al., 2007). In a study investigating violence in dating relationships showed that young participants viewed violence as nondisruptive and even seen as a positive outcome to their relationships (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd & Christopher, 1983). Another study demonstrated that people who report violence perpetration are more likely to report jealousy, cheating and verbal conflict than their non-violent counterparts (Giordano, Soto, Manning & Longmore, 2010). However, no significant differences were found in the level of caring, love, and intimate self-disclosure, and also violent relationships are reported by more frequent contact and longer relationship duration (Giordano et al., 2010). These results suggest that the negative relationship characteristics can be discussed in terms of traditional gender role ideology and acceptance of violence within romantic relationships.

### **1.1 Relationship Satisfaction**

Relationship satisfaction has diverse definitions as it is used interchangeably with adjustment, quality or stability (Sabatelli, 1988). Whether it is called satisfaction, quality or happiness, it is mainly measured as an individually and based on an

individuals' subjective evaluation of their relationship or marriage (Anderson, Russell, & Schumm, 1983).

According to Rusbult, Martz and Agnew (1998), relationship satisfaction is defined as the “positive versus negative influence experienced in a relationship and is affected by to degree to which a partner satisfies the individual’s most essential needs” (p.359). Relationship satisfaction is also defined as subjective feelings of happiness, pleasure and satisfaction when evaluating all facets of a relationship (Hawkins, 1968). Another perspective about satisfaction is that people are more satisfied when they have equal relationship outcomes they believe they deserve based on their values, inputs, and partners (Hatfield, Utne, & Trautmann, 1979). Although the term has various definitions, each definition includes evaluation of couples’ romantic relationship and importance of subjective well-being of individuals.

Satisfied people generally have positive feelings towards their relationship, and believe that they have valuable relationship with their partner (Berkman, 1995). It has been revealed that positive relationships are correlated with health, mental and physical well-being and absence one of these features can result in poor physical and psychological well-being (Berkman, 1995). Gottman (1994) also showed that satisfied couples are more likely discuss about conflicts in their relationship. In contrast, dissatisfied couples are inclined to condone or minimize the issues of conflicts. The perception of partners’ conflict concept by either discussing or staying away from clashes is a significant demonstrator of relationship satisfaction rather than the experience of conflict itself (Guerrero et al., 2011).

In the literature, it is reported that involvement in a relationship, satisfaction and the quality of relationship are associated to subjective well-being and happiness across life-span (Myers, 2000). Also, it is underlined that romantic partners are the sources of intimacy, support and companionship (Hand & Furman, 2006). Considering these findings, relationship satisfaction has an important role in shaping healthy intimate relationships. There are several predictors of relationship satisfaction including demographic variables (i.e., gender, relationship duration and perception of relationship as long term) which might be influential during emerging and young adulthood periods.

### **1.1.1 Demographic Variables and Relationship Satisfaction**

#### **1.1.1.1 Emerging Adulthood and Relationship Satisfaction**

The developmental period followed by late adolescence period has recently been defined as 'emerging adulthood' in the literature (Arnett, 2000). Many people in this age period do not feel they have reached adulthood completely in which they are in the process of completing education. Distinctively, young adults believed that they have reached full adulthood and have more a stable occupational path. The transition from emerging adulthood to young adulthood cannot be identified with age and emerging adults can reach adulthood at different ages (Arnett, 2000).

Furthermore, emerging adults start to make their own decisions in a variety of situations that might have a significant impact for the rest of their lives (Zarrett & Eccles, 2006). This is an age period in which their previous and current experience combines to form career choices about educational or vocational training. Most of the time, emerging adults feel like they are independent, but their parents still influence their career choices or opportunities and long term goals (Arnett, 2004).

Besides the importance of life task for emerging adults, romantic relationships are reported as significant relational factors in individuals' development (Collins, 2003).

During this period, emerging adults explore their choices in love and gain experience in a relationship. Arnett (2004) suggested that emerging adults can experience different romantic relationship and these could be unstable and self-focused. As individuals' life trajectories are linked with one another, those choices, options and possibilities could have a significant impact for later life trajectories. Therefore, it is important to develop stable and satisfy relationship for emerging adults' later development. It is suggested that the quality and the satisfaction of the relationship are one of the key factors linked to happiness across the life-span (Myers, 2000). It is also emphasized that not only satisfaction and quality in a relationship but also being in a romantic relationship and involvement was found to be associated with well being for university students (Dush & Amato, 2005; La Greca & Harrison, 2005).

The role of age is also found to have an impact on relationship satisfaction. A study found a negative relation between age and relationship satisfaction in which older individuals reported less satisfaction in their relationships (Jose & Alfons, 2007). Contrarily, Argyle and Furnham (1983) indicated that age has a positive role on satisfaction such that older individuals reported greater satisfaction. Also, one other study found no significant relationship between age and relationship satisfaction (Hill, 2008).

The role age periods might play in the feeling of relationship satisfaction has not been fully examined between emerging and young adults in the literature. Therefore,



it is important to fill this gap by examining the role of emerging and young adulthood on relationship satisfaction.

### **1.1.1.2 Gender and Relationship Satisfaction**

Numerous studies have evaluated the perception of partner's relationship satisfaction based on their gender. Studies revealed that women were less satisfied in their relationship compared to men (Cunningham, Braiker, & Kelley, 1982; Fowers, 1991). Other studies indicated no significant differences between men and women in their relationship (Hamamcı, 2005).

Relationship satisfaction can be related with gender roles in the relationship such that being comfortable with traditional gender roles might have an effect on relationship satisfaction. A study done by Burn and Ward (2005) examined men's conformity to masculine norms and relation with relationship satisfaction. The result found that men who conformed to society's idea of traditional masculine roles decreased the level of relationship satisfaction in the relationship which was reported by both men and women. Research has shown that partner support and relationship equality has become a contributing factor in relationship satisfaction (Acitelli & Antonucci, 1994). Individuals who perceived their relationship as equitable reported more self-disclosure, more commitment and more assurances (Guerrero et al., 2011). Also, greater femininity for both men and women was shown to be positively correlated with relationship satisfaction (Aube, Norcliffe, Craigh & Koestner, 1995; Langis, Sabourin, Lussier, & Mathieu, 1994).

Therefore, studies revealed that relationship satisfaction for both men and women was related with femininity and equality in the romantic relationship (Acitelli & Antonucci, 1994; Burn & Ward, 2005; Langis et al., 1994).

### **1.1.1.3 Relationship Variables and Relationship Satisfaction**

Certain relationship variables such as relationship duration, number of children and education have been indicated in changes in the level of satisfaction. First of all, the length of relationship has been investigated as to whether there are any differences between short-term and long term relationships. In one study, differences in relationship satisfaction for short-term relationships (categorized between 1 to 11 months) and long-term relationships (described as 31 and 74 months), were assessed and no significant differences were reported between couples in short-term and long-term relationship on relationship satisfaction (Lewandowski & Schrage, 2010). A meta-analysis of 25 studies demonstrated that romantic love in both short and long-term relationships was significantly associated with relationship satisfaction. It was suggested that romantic love was about the same in new and long term relationship and relationship duration was not a predictor of relationship satisfaction (Stewart, 2012). Moreover, Jose and Alfons (2007) showed a negative association between length of marriage and relationship satisfaction in which they indicated that married couples in their early and later years tended to report higher satisfaction levels compared to middle years.

It has been also stated that identity formation in emerging adulthood affects beliefs about marriage and long-term relationships (Arnett, 2000). Attitudes toward marriage are seen as critical because they reflect future behavior surrounding longevity of marriage (Clarkberg, Stolzenberg & Waite 1995). It has been found that emerging adults have positive attitudes toward marriage in all three measure of relationship attitudes (desire for marriage, desire for long term relationships and importance for marriage and long relationships) (Hippen, 2016). Also, such behaviors regarding long term relationships or marriage are found to be predictors of happiness, health

and life satisfaction. Consequently, attitudes toward marriage and long term relationships during emerging adulthood can have a positive effect on relationship satisfaction. One particularly important factor that is influential in relationship satisfaction, is jealousy within a romantic relationship.

## **1.2 Jealousy**

Jealousy is described as one of the prevalent and intense feelings in romantic relationships. It is known that romantic jealousy is a common emotion in a couple's world that occurs toward a third party or an imaginary rival (De Silva, 2004).

White (1981) defined jealousy as “a complex of thoughts, feelings and actions which follows threats to self-esteem and/or threats to the existence or the equality of the relationship, when those threats are generated by the perception of a real or potential attraction between one's partner” (p.24).

Although jealousy is defined as a sign of a love for one's partner it includes combination of diverse emotions such as anger, guilt, fear, envy and sadness (Salovey & Rodin, 1986). It was stated that there are diverse emotions involved in the experience of jealousy and broad explanation for the expression of jealousy can be confusing (Parrott, 1991). Parrott (1991) emphasized that “variety of cognitive symptoms that characterize the jealous person, including suspiciousness, inability to concentrate on other matters, ruminations and preoccupations, fantasies of the partner and rival enjoying a wonderful relationship and an oversensitivity to sleights or hints of dissatisfaction by the partner” (p.19).

White's jealousy conceptualization is agreed by Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) and believed that one face of jealousy leads to the experience of another face of jealousy

which is called “parallel interactive model”. Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) were operationalized this model and developed Multidimensional Jealousy scale (MDJS) which includes cognitive, emotional and behavioral subscales. Cognitive jealousy assesses distress related with a partner’s possible attraction to someone else and suspicious thoughts, behaviors and worries about a partner’s behaviors. Emotional jealousy includes combination of different emotions such as hurt and anxiety accompanied by jealousy and this makes it difficult to distinguish from the true emotions being experienced. Lastly, behavioral jealousy includes behaviors such as checking or snooping from a real or perceived relationship threats.

### **1.2.1 Gender and Jealousy**

In term of gender differences, men and women may show dissimilarities in the level of jealousy towards specific types of situations. From an evolutionary perspective, men and women differ inherently as a consequence of evolution. This approach states that jealousy is a kind of motivation that is used by individuals to protect their romantic relationship from certain types of threats and therefore, potentially increase their chances of reproductive success (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992). It underlines that males and females have sexually two different jealousy mechanism that cause different types of infidelity. Specifically, this theory emphasizes that women will be more jealous toward their partner’s emotional involvement with opponent, whereas men will show more jealousy about their partner’s sexual straying.

Alternatively, social cognitive theory views sex differences in romantic jealousy as a result of proximal mediators for instance self-concept, cultural norms and diverse sex roles (Harris, 2003). According to this perspective, jealousy occurs when an opponent outdoes someone in particular domains that are significant for the self,

involving valued relationship. This theory explains that behaviors are influenced by socialization into masculinity and femininity and attaching these roles. In line with this perspective, it was reported that women are more likely to experience emotional jealousy which is showing more distress to their partners' emotional relationship with another person. In contrast, men feel more sexually jealous such as showing distress for the partner's sexual relations with other opponents (Ward & Voracek, 2004).

Despite the fact that there are theoretical explanations for experiencing jealousy in both genders, studies show inconsistent gender differences in the three sub-factor of jealousy (cognitive, behavioral and emotional). Some studies indicated that there were no gender differences in the level of jealousy (Alpay, 2009; Miller & Maner, 2009) or the expression of jealousy for men and women were more similar than differing (Carpenter, 2012). In contrast, Aylor and Dainton (2001) found that men were more likely to experience cognitive jealousy than women. This study also demonstrated that casual daters experience more cognitive jealousy than serious daters. In a Turkish study, relationship between gender was explored as functions of married individuals' multidimensional level of jealousy (Kemer, Bulgan & Yıldız, 2015). The results showed that men's emotional jealousy level were higher than women's jealousy level.

The experience of jealousy by gender of the person is not the sole variable to determine what type of jealousy is used where; relationship status, individual personalities, relationship expectation and cultural background can influence jealousy (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). In a study, relationship status and length of the relationship were studied in undergraduate students and found that participants are

more jealous in newer romantic relationships (less than 1 year) compared to more established relationships (more than 1 year) (Knox, Zusman, Mabon, & Shriver, 1999). Also, Melamed (1991) reported that, participants were less likely feel jealous if they are in more stable relationship but, those in less stable relationships were more likely to feel jealous.

### **1.2.2 Age and Jealousy**

Much of the research have not included a broad age range so, there was a lack of research that examines the relation between age and jealousy. Generally, studies have found negative association between age and the jealousy level (Demirtaş & Dönmez, 2006; Pines & Aronson, 1983). According to Erikson (1968), the achievement of adulthood criteria tended to be related with positive romantic relationship qualities, where it was suggested that identity exploration and achievement interdependence associated with higher quality intimate relationships with an intimate partner. The significant association is also consistent with the relationship maturity which includes self-focused, role-focused and individuated-connected. As Sullivan (1953) suggested jealousy decreased as the age increased, because of maturation. Similarly, another study reported that older individuals felt less jealous about their partner's unfaithful behaviors and suspicious behavior (Dijkstra, Barelds & Groothof, 2010). A likely explanation for this result suggested that, individuals who have longer relationship experience with less relationship insecurity and trust more in their partner (Dijkstra, Barelds & Groothof, 2010). This might also explain that with age, couples learn how to overcome infidelity problems. As a consequence of that they may feel less jealousy and less suspicious to their partner.

### **1.2.3 Jealousy and Relationship Satisfaction**

The role of jealousy in relationship satisfaction has been well explored. When jealousy occurs in an appropriate context or in low levels, it can result in constructive relational outcomes. Research has also shown that jealousy in romantic relationships can be positively linked to romantic love (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Jealousy can be considered as a desired, exemplary and necessary emotion required for the expression of love within romantic relationships (DeSteno, Valdesolo & Bartlett, 2006). Nevertheless, when jealousy occurs in high levels, frequently or imagined situations, it can have a detrimental effect on relationship satisfaction.

Although studies revealed the negative relation between multidimensional jealousy and relationship satisfaction, there are also studies reported positive association. Firstly, Guerrero and Eloy's (1992) findings demonstrated that individuals' emotional, cognitive and behavioural jealousy was negatively related with dyadic adjustment among a sample of married individuals. The effect of gender was not accounted in their study. Secondly, Anderson, Eloy, Guerrero and Spitzberg (1995) used a sample of participants who are in a long-term or married relationship. The results showed that one's cognitive jealousy level is a predictor of relationship satisfaction more than emotional jealousy as evaluated by the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS). The results also found no significant gender differences. Lastly, a research looked at the relation between jealousy and relationship satisfaction from a sample of 134 heterosexual dating participants (Dugosh, 2000). The participants completed self assessment of relationship satisfaction, dispositional jealousy and love. The results showed jealousy as a predictor of relationship satisfaction.

Jealousy is also stated as a significant factor in aggression, partner violence and murder (Gage & Hutchinson, 2006). A year of tracking Turkish newspaper reports revealed that jealousy was one of the experienced issues that leads relationship failure, decreased self-perception, violence, aggression and even murder (as cited in Kemer, Bulgun, & Yıldız, 2015). Hence, it is important to understand the relationship with individuals' attitudes towards IPV and its association with relationship satisfaction.

### **1.3 Intimate Partner Violence**

The definition of violence by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2002) in the World report on violence and health (WRVH) stated “the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation”. The definition underlines that in order to be classified as violent, a person or group of people must intentionally use ‘physical force or power’ towards a person or group. This definition also draws attention to the use of physical force but at the same time to the power relationship. The WRVH classified violence under three different categories; self-directed, interpersonal and collective violence and, divides into four categories according to the nature of violence; physical, psychological, sexual and deprivation.

Relatedly, Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) mainly occurs between partners even if they do not live together in the same place, and this can continue after partners are separated. IPV is highly prevalent in dating relationships, cohabiting and separated couples (McCue, 1995). IPV constitute of behaviors causing psychological, physical and/or sexual harm by an intimate partner (WHO, 2013). Physical violence mainly



involves hitting, kicking, slapping and beating whereas sexual violence involves attempt of a sexual act or sexual coercion; and finally psychological abuse involves constant humiliation, insults and treats and controlling behaviors for instance social isolation, restriction and monitoring movements (WHO, 2013).

At the end, the consequence of IPV is that it leaves a destructive impact including physical and mental health problems (Black, 2011). Victims who report these forms of violence experience depression, phobias, suicide attempts, low self-esteem, increases in the substance use and increases the risk of sexually transmitted infections (Black, 2011; Campbell, 2002). Not only mental and health problems are caused by physical and sexual abuse but also psychological abuse causes serious problems on victim's health conditions (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008). Despite the detrimental effect of IPV on mental and physical health, individuals are still less aware of the effects on psychology and also seen as less severe and more tolerated in honor cultures (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003). It should be noted that IPV is widely seen and experienced in countries regardless of cultural groups, religion or socioeconomic status (Gracia, 2014) therefore, more research should be concentrated on IPV, love and jealousy triangle to increase awareness of destructive part of jealousy related violence.

### **1.3.1 Gender and IPV**

A vast majority of the studies have concentrated on heterosexual couples and aggression from males to females and these studies showing that women face with a higher rate of partner abuse than men. A meta-analytic review of 82 IPV studies demonstrated that women are more likely reported as being severely injured, fear for their lives and need support for medical health care service than man (Archer, 2000). Recent global data results showed that almost one third (35%) of women have

experienced some form of sexual and/or physical violence either by intimate partner or non-partner (WHO, 2013). Globally, the prevalence reports of IPV against women have been reported as sexual and/or physical violence, with the highest rates in Africa, Eastern Mediterranean and some parts of Asia with 36-37%. Furthermore, globally 38% of female victims are killed by their intimate partners. The highest prevalence of violence exposure was reported among young women aged 15-19 and then, the highest rates hits between 40-44 years old and the lowest prevalence of exposure to violence was reported at the age 50 and above aged women (WHO, 2013).

In line with these findings around the world, studies have also provided evidence of the prevalence of IPV in Turkish speaking population. Many studies revealed that one in three women experienced violence from their parents and the life time prevalence of IPV was around 34 and 58.7 % (Alper, Ergin, Selimoğlu & Bilgen, 2005; Aksan & Aksu, 2007; Yanikkerem & Saruhan, 2005). Based on the results of the different studies, 9.7 to 36.4 % of females were beaten by their male partner during the pregnancies (Karaoğlu et al., 2005; Yanikkerem, Karadaş, Adıgüzel & Sevil, 2006). Additionally, in North Cyprus, it was shown that IPV is mostly reported in the form of psychological abuse around 54.5% and it is followed by physical violence approximately 36.7% (Çakıcı, Düşünmez, & Çakıcı, 2007). The results showed that women who had experienced violence is mostly at the ages of 20-45 years old. Another study conducted in North Cyprus evaluated police officers' knowledge and attitudes toward domestic violence against women. The results indicated that police officers had least knowledge and supported domestic violence against women in which domestic violence was regarded as an internal affair and was not worthy of police intervention (Mertan et al., 2012). The main problem was

that domestic violence was seen as a private family issue rather than criminal and health issues. Therefore, victims of domestic violence prevented from getting the necessary legal action after they experiencing violence by a partner or someone else.

Yet, despite studies state that women are more likely experiencing IPV in their life time, researchers have reported that there are also females who perpetrate IPV as much as men. Studies including meta-analysis examined female to male aggression and showed that partners use bi-directional patterns of violence in diverse forms like physical, verbal and sexual (Archer, 2000, 2006; Straus, 2008). This pattern in both sexes is found to be shown directly or indirectly at the same amount in their relationship. The use of direct and physical violence is reported as the most commonly used ones between females and males in all ages (Archer, 2000, 2006). However, Archer (2006) underlined that committing physical violence for both sexes is not seen in non-Western countries in which, this draws attention to cultural differences in use of aggressive behaviors. Although these results show a bi-directional pattern of violence, the consequences of violence and motivation for violence differs for both sexes (WHO, 2002). In the same report, it was stated that women are more likely experience serious injury than men in both Western and non-Western countries. The motivation behind the violence for women is related with the male perpetration; meaning that after men initiate the violence, the female partner uses violence for defending against abuse or escaping from a violent partner (Allen, Swan, & Raghavan, 2008). Some studies also argued that women are perpetrators of violence especially in Western countries and their motivation is not always in the form of self-protection (Hines & Saudino, 2002; Stets & Straus, 1990). On the other hand, gender inequality in non-Western countries show differences in gender

motivations. It was reported that men's perpetration of violence is related with social norms and beliefs that support and accept violence against women (WHO, 2013).

There are many factors that relates to violent behaviors and these complex factors allow us to understand violence. For example, individual and demographic differences, interpersonal relationships, as well as societal and environmental conditions shape attitudes towards IPV (WHO, 2002). This thesis however focuses on developmental processes and relationship dynamics, such as jealousy. Therefore, it is important to understand young adulthood period in relation to IPV.

### **1.3.2 Age and IPV**

Many researchers have studied IPV and its effects in the overall population, however, there is a little research that specifically evaluates abuse between 18-29 years old, i.e., emerging adulthood.

Emerging adulthood period provides a unique opportunity for researchers to explore romantic relationship and violence patterns (Arnett, 2000). A study evaluated the IPV prevalence by age and found that women in emerging adulthood period had the highest rate (around 24.1%) of relationship abuse compared to other age groups (Breiding, Black & Ryan, 2008). In a study, it was found that 36.7% of women reported experiencing abuse from their intimate partner in their life time and 8.2% of the sample stated that they exposed to violence in the last year (Snow Jones et al., 1999). According to these studies, a high rate of IPV was experienced by women who are 18-29 years of age but in some studies, it has the highest prevalence rates than any age groups.

A longitudinal study also investigated experiences in adolescence such as family aggression foster aggressive response style among youth and resulted higher rates of IPV outcomes in emerging adulthood relationship (Cui, Durtschi, Donnellan, Lorenz, & Conger, 2010). This shows that exposure to inter-parental violence is associated to aggressive behavior, victimization and intimate partner violence perpetration. Another research examined the development of IPV in emerging adulthood and found that early dynamics in the relationship such as jealousy, cheating and verbal conflict are related with IPV later in the relationship (Giordano et al., 2010).

### **1.3.3 Jealousy and IPV**

Romantic jealousy is one of the frequently experienced negative social emotions in a relationship. Mainly, it includes beliefs that romantic partner has engaged romantic infidelity. Research reported that jealousy has been associated with negative relational outcomes and this can lead to aggression, conflict and violence in a relationship (Easton & Shackelford, 2009; Puente & Cohen, 2003). Approximately one third of intimate murders are triggered by jealousy (Serran & Firestone, 2004). As a result of jealousy and proprietary behaviors, both women and men are capable to start IPV. It was shown that jealousy is one of the motive for women's IPV in which results showed that men reported greater abuse from their partner due to jealousy, emotional hurt, verbal abuse and control over their partner (Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd & Sebastian, 1991). In a study, a strong correlation was reported between jealousy and IPV (Martinez, 2015). The result indicated that participants who report higher jealousy have a need of control over their partner.

According to The Family Structure Survey, jealousy is reported as the most commonly experienced relationship problems by married Turkish couples (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2006). Until now, there is a limited research conducted on the

topic of jealousy and IPV for the Turkish society. However, frequent news about wife beating, honor killings due to jealousy behavior on the Turkish media shows a higher level of jealousy resulted to IPV for the Turkish couples (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003).

Although jealousy is indicated as a one of the major triggers of conflict or domestic violence, it can be perceived as a sign of love. Puento and Cohen (2003) demonstrated that jealousy related violence was perceived different than other kind of violence in which, the relation of jealousy and being in a romantic relationship change the meaning of violence. It has been shown that participants' attribution for jealousy related abuse including emotional and sexual is seen as normal and more understandable than non-jealousy situations. Moreover, several studies explained the link between acceptances of jealousy related violence and sex role stereotypes by emphasising unequal social power between men and women (Sugarman & Frankel, 1996; Chen, Fiske, & Lee, 2009).

#### **1.3.4 IPV and Relationship Satisfaction**

IPV is a main problem in relationships in which, reports have suggested both men and women used the same amount of violence in their relationships (Fiebert, 1997). Research finding on the relation between IPV and relationship satisfaction was inconsistent.

In recent study, male and female physical IPV victimization has found to be associated to low relationship satisfaction in dating couples (Kaura & Lohman, 2007). In a meta-analytic review of 32 studies, it is demonstrated that female victims of IPV report lower relationship satisfaction than males (Stith, Green, Smith & Ward,

2008). However, other studies showed that, couples who have experienced violence are more satisfied in their relationship (O’Leary, Smith Slep & O’Leary, 2007).

Furthermore, researchers have investigated the role of attitudes and beliefs about beating in the occurrence of IPV in Turkish speaking culture. A study conducted by Hüsnü and Mertan (2015) found that positive beliefs about beating, experiencing partner abuse and endorsing traditional gender myths were predictive of individual’s own reported abuse to his or her partner. Another study examined IPV attitudes in marriage and result showed that female participants had more tolerant attitudes for verbal abuse by their intimate partner which was predicted when they showed high ambivalent sexism (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003). Hence, women who accept traditional gender roles and sexist attitudes about their own gender see IPV as normal and therefore accept or tolerate verbal abuse by their intimate partner. These attitudes underline inequality and male-domination in the relationship, family and also society and existence of cultural acceptance of partner beating (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003). In other words, for individuals whose traditional gender ideologies fitted in their real relationship might not reported conflict because they see inequality to be justified in their relationship. This shows that acceptance of gender roles and norms create an ‘ideal women’ for men and women’s perspective. In a study, it was reported that women who accepted their traditional gender roles were more likely reported satisfaction in their relationship (Van Yperen & Buunk, 1991). Also, this study indicated that women with egalitarian roles were less likely to be satisfied in their relationship. The reason for this was stated as women being more likely to compare their roles to their partner and more satisfied in an equal status.

## **1.4 Current Study**

To date, limited research has examined the role of jealousy, partner violence and relationship satisfaction through emerging and young adulthood period. The current study covered Turkish speaking population including both Turkish speaking Cypriots and Turkish citizens from Turkey. Turkey is considered to be a collectivistic society with familial cohesion, male dominance, mutual dependence in the family and female submissiveness (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; 2005). Due to unique geographical and sociocultural location, Turkey includes both combinations of traditionalism and modernism. While holding collectivistic values, individualistic attitudes have been experienced however, mainly in the well-educated part of the society (İmamoğlu, 1998). Traditionally, Turkish families hold patriarchy in their family structure where men are seen as the head of the family and women is accepted to be dependent on their partner and responsible to take care of the family members (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; 2005). Both female and male assimilate their own gender roles due to diverse socialization experiences in the family and society (Sakallı & Curun, 2001). In the Turkish culture, both females and males accept traditional gender roles despite experiencing westernization, modernization and industrialization. Turkey cannot be characterized as egalitarian gender role attitudes in every part of social functioning (Sakallı-Uğurlu, Yalçın & Glick, 2007). Therefore, it is more likely to observe duality of both modern and traditional beliefs and attitudes in the Turkish culture (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992).

Cultural norms may seem to influence men and women's perceptions of situations and behaviors, this is particularly the case in relationships (Croucher, DeMaris, Oyer, Yartey & Ziberi, 2012). It is hypothesized that the expression of jealousy for both



sexes are related to traditional gender roles in which, it is influenced by their social power in the society. Specifically, men may be more likely to express jealousy than women because they have more social power in the society. Although a higher level of jealousy might result in conflict or even verbal abuse, Turkish women who generally accept traditional gender roles (Glick et al., 2002) may be more likely to tolerate abuse by their intimate partner because they perceive it as normal and also as a sign of love (Kemer, Bulgan & Yıldız, 2015). It can be seen that combination of traditional gender roles and IPV attitudes provides conditions to shape social beliefs towards normalizing and justifying violence in the environment (Flood & Pease, 2009) as a result of this individuals may show violence-supportive behaviors and satisfaction in their relationship.

Previous studies have underlined the importance and impact of IPV in a relationship; therefore, focusing on individuals' attitudes becomes a significant category to determine the actual behaviors and acceptance of other various behaviors (Flood & Pease, 2009). It is vital to understand IPV attitudes in different societies to investigate prevention program in order to get more effective results from them.

The current study aimed to examine the roles of gender, romantic jealousy and intimate partner violence on relationship satisfaction during emerging and young adulthood period in Turkish speaking community. The results enlighten whether jealousy expression and IPV attitudes predict relationship satisfaction for heterosexual unmarried individuals. Based on the literature above, the hypotheses of this study were as follows:

1. There will be a positive relationship between jealousy and relationship satisfaction.
2. Positive IPV attitudes will be related to lower relationship satisfaction.
3. There will be positive relationship between IPV attitudes and all jealousy type.
4. Men will show higher jealousy, negative IPV attitudes and more relationship satisfaction than women.
5. No specific hypothesis was made for differences between emerging and young adulthood, hence differences in age periods will be explored for jealousy, relationship satisfaction and IPV attitudes.

## Chapter 2

### METHOD

#### 2.1 Participants

This study used 230 Turkish speaking volunteers with 149 female and 81 male participants who are in a heterosexual romantic relationship. All the participants were selected by using snowballing technique and opportunistic, convenient sampling method. Additionally, an online survey was designed to recruit participants. Majority of the participants ( $N= 144$ ) were collected via internet while the rest of the participants ( $N= 86$ ) completed questionnaires by using paper and pencil. The mean age of the sample was 23.43 ( $SD = 2.59$ ) ranging from 18 to 30 years old; women with a mean age of 23.58 ( $SD = 2.58$ ) and men with a mean age of 23.14 ( $SD = 2.62$ ). In the study, 149 of participants described themselves as having reached adulthood in some ways, but not completely feeling like an adult (i.e., emerging adults) and 81 of them defined as they feel like a fully adult (i.e., young adults).

Participants' relationship duration was between 1 month to 72 months ( $M = 24.17$ ,  $SD = 18.29$ ). In the study, 32 participants reported that their current relationship was their first relationship and 198 of them reported as not their first relationship. Additionally, 207 of them evaluated their relationship as a long term relationship and 23 of participants have not considered their relationship as long term.

Furthermore, this study was based on Turkish speaking community and anyone who identified as native Turkish speaker and eligible for the inclusion criteria which was being in a heterosexual romantic relationship, between 18-30 years old and not married were invited to participate in the study. Mainly, participants were Cypriots living in the North Cyprus ( $N = 123$ ) and the rest of the participants were Turkish from Turkey ( $N= 107$ ).

## **2.2 Materials**

### **2.2.1 Demographics**

The demographic questionnaire was filled by the participants in order to obtain basic information such as age, gender and education level. Then, relationship status, relationship duration, number of children and sexual orientation were asked to differentiate inclusion criteria for each participant. Also, a question was asked which sentences define themselves best. Participants who described themselves best with “most of the times, I feel like I have reached adulthood in some ways, but in other ways I do not feel so” were in emerging adulthood category and for those who defined best with fully adult were considered in young adulthood period (see appendix A).

### **2.2.2 Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MDJS)**

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MDJS) was used to measure jealousy which was developed by Pfeiffer and Wong (1989). The 24-item scale consisted of three subscales named as cognitive, behavioral and emotional. The first 8 items measure emotional jealousy that assesses participants’ feelings in threatening jealousy-provoking situations such as “My partner shows a great deal of interest or excitement in talking to someone of the opposite sex”. Then, 8 items measure cognitive jealousy by asking participants’ suspicious thoughts regarding the threatening situations in

their romantic relationship such as "I suspect that my partner may be attracted to someone else". The last, 8 items from the behavioral jealousy assess the occurrence of the controlling or snooping behaviors from their partners such as "I look through my partner's drawers, handbag, or pockets". Participants were asked to think about their romantic partner while answering the questions and rated their degree of agreement on a 7-point Likert type scale ranging from (1) *not at all upset* to (7) *very upset* (see appendix B).

The scale was adapted to Turkish culture by Karakurt (2001). The alpha reliabilities for the cognitive, behavioral and emotional jealousy subscales were .83, .76 and .78, respectively. Higher score from the scale is indicative of higher jealousy.

### **2.2.3 Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale (IPVAS)**

To assess intimate partner violence, the "Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale" was used (Smith, Thompson, Tomaka & Buchanan, 2005). There are 20 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. This scale included three subscales; abuse (e.g., "It is okay for me to blame my partner when I do bad things"), violence (e.g., "I think it is wrong to ever damage anything that belongs to a partner") and control (e.g., "I would never try to keep my partner from doing things with other people") subscales. Items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 19 are reversed from the scale. Translation to Turkish language along with a back translation was conducted by Parlan (2015). Reliability was found to be high/acceptable at  $\alpha = .87$  (see appendix C).

### **2.2.4 Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)**

Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) is a 7-item measurement to evaluate relationship satisfaction (e.g. "How many problems are there in your relationship?").

Participants evaluate their relationship on a 5-point Likert scale starting from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicate higher level of satisfaction. Fourth and seventh items from the scale are reversed.

The scale was adapted to Turkish culture by Çelik (2014) which unlike the original scale, is designed on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strong disagreement to (7) strong agreement. The reliability of the scale for this study was  $\alpha = .85$  (see appendix D).

### **2.3 Design**

The independent variables were gender, emerging adulthood, multidimensional jealousy, intimate partner violence attitudes and dependent variable was relationship satisfaction. This study was cross-sectional, using a questionnaire design.

### **2.4 Procedure**

This study was conducted after receiving approval from Ethics Committee of Psychology Department (see appendix E). Participants were recruited with a snowball technique, opportunistic and convenient sampling strategy among Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) students as well as the general population. The scales were completed in various places like home, class, office, school where the participant felt comfortable. Before obtaining consent form from the participants, they were informed about the study aims and made clear that participation was voluntary. Additionally, an online survey was designed to recruit participants by using “typeform” website. The same procedure was applied for the online survey. Participants who were interested to participate in this research were informed before the consent form. Then, if they wished to participate in this study, they pressed an option (‘START SURVEY’) and the research questionnaires were displayed.

Completing questionnaires took approximately 17 minutes. Participants had the option of withdrawing from the study or exiting the web page any time they wanted. Participants received a debrief form after completing the questionnaires. At the end of data collection, statistical analysis was conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) computer program version 21.

## Chapter 3

### RESULTS

The aim of the study was to find the relationship between jealousy, intimate partner violence and relationship satisfaction among Turkish speaking individuals. Also, the roles of gender and emerging adulthood were also examined. An independent sample t-test, correlations between variables and standard multiple regression were analysed for men and women separately.

#### 3.1 Gender Differences

An independent sample t-test was conducted in order to assess any differences between men and women. The means, standard deviations and t-values are presented in Table 1.

The results of the independent sample t-test demonstrated that there was a marginal difference between men and women in the violence subscale of the IPV. The results showed that women ( $M = 2.35, SD = .97$ ) showed more positive attitudes toward violence than men ( $M = 2.08, SD = 1.09$ ),  $t(228) = 1.91, p = .06$ . Similarly, women ( $M = 3.12, SD = .79$ ) were found to have significantly more positive attitudes on the subscale of abuse compared to men ( $M = 2.88, SD = .74$ ),  $t(228) = 2.11, p = .04$ . In the control subscale, there was no significant difference between men and women,  $t(228) = 1.32, p = .18$ , suggesting men and women are equally controlling in their use of this type of violence.



In the assessment of multidimensional jealousy, the results demonstrated no gender differences on emotional, behavioral and cognitive jealousy subscales,  $t(228) = .99$ ,  $p = .37$ ,  $t(228) = 1.25$ ,  $p = .22$  and  $t(228) = -.58$ ,  $p = .55$ , respectively.

Finally, t-test was conducted to analyse gender differences on relationship satisfaction, the results showed no statistical significance between men and women  $t(228) = -1.22$ ,  $p = .22$ .

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of multidimensional jealousy subscales (MDJ), relationship satisfaction (RAS) and intimate partner violence subscales (IPV) according to gender

Variables	Men	Women	<i>t-value</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	
Emotional Jealousy	5.94 (0.72)	5.94 (1.00)	.99
Behavioral Jealousy	5.05 (1.18)	5.25 (1.31)	1.25
Cognitive Jealousy	5.97 (1.04)	5.87 (1.21)	-0.58
Relationship Satisfaction	5.96 (0.83)	5.81 (0.91)	-1.22
Abuse Attitudes	2.88 (0.74)	3.11 (0.80)	2.11*
Violence Attitudes	2.08 (1.09)	2.35 (0.97)	1.91 <sup>†</sup>
Control Attitudes	2.97 (0.82)	3.13 (0.91)	1.31

Note: \* $p < .05$ , <sup>†</sup> $p = .06$ ; MDJ scores ranged from 1 to 7; IPV and RAS scores ranged from 1 to 5. Higher scores indicate higher jealousy, supportive attitudes and satisfaction.

### 3.2 Differences in Age Period

In order to assess any differences between emerging adulthood and young adulthood, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The summary of t-test results are given in Table 2.

The result showed that there was a non-significant differences on behavioral jealousy  $t(227) = .02, p = .99$ , emotional jealousy  $t(227) = .54, p = .59$  and cognitive jealousy  $t(227) = -.52, p = .60$ .

In the assessment of relationship satisfaction, nonsignificant result was found between emerging adulthood and young adulthood  $t(227) = 1.27, p = .21$ .

When t-test conducted on the IPV attitudes subscale, the results indicated no statistical significant differences on violence  $t(227) = -.23, p = .82$ , abuse  $t(227) = -.74, p = .46$  and control  $t(227) = -.61, p = .54$  subscales.

Table 2: Means and standard deviations of all variables for emerging adulthood and young adulthood

Variables	Emerging Adulthood	Young Adulthood	<i>t-value</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	
Emotional Jealousy	5.88 (0.80)	5.95 (0.88)	.54
Behavioral Jealousy	5.18 (1.11)	5.18 (1.25)	.02
Cognitive Jealousy	5.93 (1.09)	5.85 (1.28)	-.52
Relationship Satisfaction	5.80 (0.90)	5.96 (0.85)	-1.27
Abuse Attitudes	3.05 (0.77)	2.97 (0.81)	-.74
Violence Attitudes	2.27 (0.98)	2.23 (1.11)	-.23
Control Attitudes	3.10 (0.86)	3.02 (0.92)	-.61

Note: MDJ scores ranged from 1 to 7; IPV and RAS scores ranged from 1 to 5. Higher scores indicate higher jealousy, supportive attitudes and satisfaction.

### 3.3 Correlational Analyses

Simple correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between jealousy, relationship satisfaction and IPV. Correlation coefficients of all variables are presented in Table 3.

First of all, the results revealed that there was a positive correlation between relationship satisfaction and cognitive jealousy ( $r = .33, p = .00$ ) and behavioral jealousy ( $r = .19, p = .00$ ).

Next, the relationship between IPV abuse subscale and other variables were examined. Results demonstrated a negative correlation between abuse and emotional jealousy ( $r = -.13, p = .05$ ) whereas a positive correlation was found between IPV abuse subscale and behavioral jealousy ( $r = .14, p = .04$ ).

The correlations between the subscales of the IPV scale were also found to be correlated, such that those individuals who reported high controlling attitudes, also reported high abuse ( $r = .61, p = .00$ ) and high violence ( $r = .49, p = .00$ ). Similarly abuse and violence attitudes were also positively correlated ( $r = .67, p = .00$ ).

3: Correlation coefficients values (Pearson) of all variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
emotional Jealousy	-					
behavioral Jealousy	-.17**	-				
ognitive Jealousy	-.05	.40**	-			
relationship Satisfaction	.07	.19**	.33**	-		
ontrol Attitudes	-.01	.10	-.02	-.01	-	
louse Attitudes	-.13*	.14*	.02	.06	.61**	-
violence Attitudes	-.05	.04	-.10	-.05	.49**	.67**

\*. Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

### 3.4 Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction

Hierarchical regression was used to assess multidimensional jealousy which consist of behavioral, emotional, cognitive jealousy and IPV attitudes including abuse, control and violence subscales after controlling for gender, emerging adulthood, relationship status ('is the relationship considered to be a long term relationship?') and duration to predict relationship satisfaction among Turkish speaking couples. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedascity.

For the analysis, gender, emerging adulthood criteria, first relationship, long term relationship and relationship duration were entered in step 1, explaining 13.4% of the variance in relationship satisfaction. After the entry of emotional, cognitive behavioral jealousy and intimate partner attitudes on abuse, violence and control in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 24%  $F = (11, 218) = 6.24, p = .00$ . The six factors explained an additional 11% of the variance in relationship satisfaction, after controlling for gender, emerging adulthood criteria, first relationship, long term relationship and relationship duration,  $R$  square change = .11,  $F$  change  $(6, 218) = 5.03, p = .00$ . In the final model, three measures were statistically significant, namely cognitive jealousy ( $\beta = .21, p = .00$ ) abuse attitudes ( $\beta = .19, p = .04$ ) and for those who evaluated their relationship as a long term relationship ( $\beta = -.31, p = .00$ ) whereas, there was a trend for behavioral jealousy ( $\beta = .12, p = .07$ ), emotional jealousy ( $\beta = .11, p = .08$ ) and gender ( $\beta = .11, p = .07$ ). Results of hierarchical regression are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Hierarchical regression analysis for relationship satisfaction

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	<i>β</i>
<b>Step 1</b>			
Gender	.17	.12	.10
Relationship duration	.00	.00	-.01
Emerging Adulthood	-.11	.12	-.06
Long Term	-1.00	.19	-.34***
First Relationship	-.30	.16	-.12 <sup>†</sup>
Step 1 statistics:	$R^2 = .13$		
<b>Step 2</b>			
Gender	.20	.11	.11
Relationship duration	.00	.00	-.00
Emerging Adulthood	-.13	.11	-.07
Long Term	-.91	.18	-.31***
First Relationship	-.23	.15	-.09
Emotional Jealousy	.11	.07	.11 <sup>††</sup>
Behavioral Jealousy	.09	.05	.12 <sup>†</sup>
Cognitive Jealousy	.16	.05	.21**
Abuse Attitudes	.21	.10	.19*
Violence Attitudes	-.10	.07	-.11
Control Attitudes	-.03	.08	-.03
Step 2 statistics	$R^2 = .24$		

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$ , <sup>†</sup> $p = .06$ , <sup>††</sup> $p = .08$

## **Chapter 4**

### **DISCUSSION**

Forming interpersonal relationships have been shown to be an essential component in a person's life. It is a basis for psychological, emotional and physical well-being (Burman & Margolin, 1992) and relationship satisfaction in a person's relationship has a tendency to be a central issue in the overall happiness (Young, Denny, Luquis & Young, 1998). The support from partner helps people to manage difficulties in life and the partner can play the role of barrier or supporter between an individual and the difficulties in life.

To sum up the findings, as expected, it was found that cognitive jealousy predicted relationship satisfaction where there was a trend prediction for emotional and behavioral jealousy. When participants showed higher jealousy their relationship satisfaction was also high. There were no gender differences in all jealousy types. Abusive attitudes toward IPV were found to be correlated with behavioral and emotional jealousy. Women showed more positive abusive attitudes compared to men. Participants with abusive attitudes were found to predict relationship satisfaction; when participants showed high abusive attitudes they reported more satisfaction. The results showed no significant differences between emerging and young adults in all variables.



This study therefore attempted to assess the relationship between gender, multidimensional jealousy (behavioral, emotional and cognitive) and attitudes towards IPV on relationship satisfaction among Turkish speaking heterosexual individuals. Also, the second aim of this study was to examine whether there was a significant difference between emerging adulthood and young adulthood period. The results of the study partially supported the hypotheses.

Since the literature in North Cyprus is very limited, the current study's results discussed below are in line with the literature of Turkey. Generally, the Turkish culture is considered to be collectivistic and traditional in nature (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005) and studies using Turkish Cypriot populations have found no significant differences between Turkish Cypriots and Turkish citizens from Turkey, most likely due to their similar social structures (Hüsni & Mertan, 2015). In light of such findings, in the current study both nationalities were combined as one group and referred to as the "Turkish speaking population" and discussions have been developed in this light.

The current study hypothesized to find gender differences in jealousy types and relationship satisfaction. However, the results showed no differences such that men and women report equal amounts jealousy levels (emotional, behavioral and cognitive jealousy) and relationship satisfaction. The majority of literature findings report inconsistent gender differences for the multidimensional jealousy (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Guerrero et al., 1993; Miller & Maner, 2009). The non-significant result might highlight that gender is not the sole variable to determine jealousy types such that relationship status, personality, relationship expectations and cultural background can change the level of jealousy expressed by men and women, to differing degrees. For example, a different cultural structure

(collectivistic/individualistic, non-egalitarian/egalitarian) might have an effect on the manifestation of gender differences in jealousy. In considering the nature of the Turkish culture, both females and males accept traditional gender roles which have traits of traditionalism, patriarchy and collectivism (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Sakallı, 2001). For instance, although jealousy related violence such as hitting or shouting are considered as a kind of violent act, in this culture it might be perceived as love, caring and desire. The reason no significant differences in all jealousy types can be associated with the feeling of love; therefore, jealousy or related violence is favored by both men and women (DeSteno et al., 2006; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Furthermore, many studies found that romantic satisfaction was related with gender roles (Burn & Ward, 2005; Langis, et al., 1994). Studies have shown that equality and femininity in a relationship were positive indicators of relationship satisfaction (Guerrero et al., 2011; Langis, et al., 1994). The reason for obtaining no gender differences for relationship satisfaction could be linked with femininity and masculinity but, this thesis did not measure gender roles.

It was hypothesized that multidimensional jealousy including emotional, cognitive and behavioral jealousy would predict relationship satisfaction. It was shown that cognitive jealousy significantly predicted relationship satisfaction, with a trend for emotional and behavioral jealousy. This finding was parallel with previous literature suggesting that partners who reported high level of jealousy expression are more likely to feel satisfaction in their relationship however, cognitive jealousy predicted relationship satisfaction as much as emotional and behavioral jealousy (Anderson et al., 1995; Dugosh, 2000). As discussed before, jealousy can be considered as an exemplary and necessary emotion required for the expression of love within romantic

relationships (DeSteno et al., 2006). Those who reported high level of jealousy might perceive jealousy as a safeguard for the relationship, serving as protection from potential relationship threats. The adaptive function of jealousy has been reported in romantic relationships where couples see jealousy as natural in a relationship and it can be shown as a sign of a healthy bond (Staske, 1999). In regards to the positive relation of jealousy with high level of relationship satisfaction, it has been stated that jealousy increases understanding the importance of partners' values and roles in a relationship and this leads to satisfaction in a relationship (Rydell, McConnell, & Bringle, 2004).

Contrary to the hypothesis, the result in the current study showed that women have positive attitudes towards intimate partner violence particularly abusive types compared to men. Majority of previous studies concentrated on aggression from males to females on heterosexual couples (Archer, 2000; Heru, 2007; WHO, 2013). Men's perpetration of violence was in relation with the social norms and beliefs that support and accept violence against women (WHO, 2013). Men are found to have more supportive attitudes toward IPV with diverse explanations of their abusive behavior such as being unfaithful or refusing to have sex with the partner (Glick et al., 2002; Sakalli, 2001). However, this study provides evidence of female-to-male aggression in which previous reports indicated that motivation behind high abusive attitudes for women is related with the male perpetration; meaning that after men initiate the violence, the female partner uses violence for defending against abuse or escaping a violent partner (Allen, Swan, & Raghavan, 2008). Sex differences in aggression have been found to be associated with cultural elements such as individualism and collectivism (Archer, 2006). This means that women's reactions of

violence are not always in the form of self-defence and they can equally be the sole perpetrators of violence in relationships. Turning to the structure of Turkish speaking societies research findings have shown that as the hierarchical structure among sexes increases, it encourages sexism and supportive attitudes towards IPV (Chen et al., 2009; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007). For instance, in the Turkish culture, men are seen as the head of the family who hold the power whereas women are accepted to be dependent on their partner and responsible to take care of the family members (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). According to this, the results are reasonable because women are more likely to accept their traditional gender roles within this culture (Glick et al., 2002) hence are more likely to excuse violence and accept or tolerate abuse by their intimate partner and in doing so are not aware of how much they support aggression. Consequently, such studies have indicated the bi-directional patterns of violence where both sexes accept violence and commit different forms of violence about the same rate in their relationship (Archer, 2000, 2006; WHO, 2002).

Based on the hypothesis regarding IPV, it was found that only abusive attitudes toward IPV was a predictor for relationship satisfaction. In line with many other studies, participants who have experienced violence are found to be more satisfied in their relationship (O'Leary et al., 2007; Williams & Frieze, 2005). As discussed before, the results are reasonable when it is explained with the endorsement of traditional gender role ideology and patriarchal attitudes in Turkish speaking society. According to the expected gender roles by the society, men are expected to hold authority and primary power over women while women are accepted to take care of family members (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). These attitudes

emphasize inequality and male-domination in the relationship and acceptance of IPV. Both female and male assimilate their own gender roles and creates an 'ideal women' in the both men and women's perspective (Sakallı & Curun, 2001). According to these results, it is not surprising to predict high relationship satisfaction for individuals' whose traditional gender ideologies fit their relationship because they perceive abuse and violence to be justified in their relationship (Van Yperen & Buunk, 1991).

In the literature, there is a limited research that has examined differences between emerging and young adults on attitudes toward IPV, jealousy and relationship satisfaction. The finding revealed that there were no differences in age period for all three variables. Although there are differentiating factors for emerging adults such as feeling in-between, identity exploration, self-focus and instability from young adulthood period (Arnett, 2000), the expression of jealousy, relationship satisfaction and IPV attitudes showed no significant differences between these two groups. The results show that in Turkish speaking population, emerging adulthood period may not apply to all individuals who are in their late teens to twenties; the distinct developmental stage for emerging adults may vary across culture and this period may be shortened or non-existent for some individuals. As Arnett (2000, 2006) stated emerging adulthood most likely exist in industrialized or postindustrial societies in which parenthood, marriage and adult responsibilities are postponed after education has ended. This means that transitions into adulthood in different cultures follow diverse developmental pathways for each individual (Hendry & Kloep, 2011). Even in certain cultures, individual differences might change the length and the content of emerging adulthood. For instance, researchers have emphasized the individual

variation to the transition to adulthood period by stating that some young individuals are forced to start their independent life from a very young age to take care of their family by supplementing family's income, while others are dependent on family even after getting married and parents treat their children over protectively (Bynner, 2005; Hendry & Kloep, 2007). Clearly, due to culture specific aspects in Turkish speaking population, transition to adulthood includes many individual variations and it may not apply for all young people at this period. It is suggested that growth and inconsistency of emerging adulthood within various cultures or societies should be studied more extensively in order to understand the developmental pathways at play in this culture.

Additionally, with regards to relationship demographic variables (including perceiving the relationship as short vs. long term; being the first relationship and the relationship duration) on relationship satisfaction, the results of the current study found that only perception of the relationship as 'long term' was positively related to relationship satisfaction. This is not surprising since prior research has shown that positive perceptions of the partner and relationship as long term can be viewed as including more investment and therefore have a positive effect on relationship evaluations and hence satisfaction (Fletcher, Simpson & Thomas, 2000). However, inclusive criteria in the current study (heterosexual daters with no children) might prevent significant changes in satisfaction, since some studies report that variables including duration and perceptions can change the level of happiness and satisfaction (Guo & Huang, 2005; Jose & Alfons, 2007).

The current study emphasized the importance of the role of jealousy, attitudes toward IPV on relationship satisfaction among Turkish speaking heterosexual individuals.

Nonetheless, similar with most studies, this study had some limitations that need to be considered which will be followed by implications for future studies.

One of the main limitations is that although two nationalities both Turkish speaking Cypriots from North Cyprus and Turkish citizens from Turkey were included, the results were discussed based on previous research conducted in Turkey and Turkish culture. This is because of the limited research that has been conducted on relational structure of Turkish Cypriots living in North Cyprus. Also, due to cultural similarities between two nationalities such as ethnicity, religion and language, it is difficult to distinguish the cultures of the two nationalities in the literature. However, the influence of British and Greek societies that have created some cultural differences between Cypriots from North Cyprus and Turkish citizens which should be taken into consideration for future research (Şahin, 2014).

There are number of weaknesses of using self-reports in the study for example, participants may predict the aims of the study and they may have answered the questions more in a socially desired way rather than their individual own responses. We can particularly assume the possibility of bias while reporting their attitudes toward IPV. Moreover, in order to separate individuals into emerging and young adults, Arnett (2014) asked emerging adults whether they feel that they have reached into adulthood and found that many emerging adults are more likely feel in between. Therefore, the current study asked this question to identify the stage of development; however, more questions that are more culture specific are necessary. Also, the measures that were used in the current study were based on Western societies, therefore developing measurements toward specific cultural structure can give more consistent and clear results related with the concerned issue.

The other potential limitation is the unequal number of gender division where female participants' number was nearly twice as the male participants and this may have an impact on the finding of gender differences. Further, these results cannot be generalized to the whole population where it can apply only for heterosexual Turkish speaking couples between 18 to 30 years old who are not married and do not have any children. Future studies should be conducted with a broader population to ensure the results are representative for individuals in different age groups. In order to increase generalization, rather than opportunistic and convenient sampling, randomly selecting participants could be used in future research.

Lastly, the data analysis was correlational in nature thus correlation between variables cannot allow for causation hence, scenario base questions or behavioral measures could be more effective to find more reliable or consistent results. We have examined the level of jealousy, IPV attitudes and relationship satisfaction by using self report because these topics are highly sensitive, individuals might prefer to answer questions in confidentiality.

Despite the limitations of the study, the results shed light to the role of jealousy and attitudes towards IPV on relationship satisfaction among heterosexual emerging individuals. The findings also provide a clear statement of how acceptance of cultural norms shapes people's perception in respect to relationship satisfaction, emphasizing the need for psycho-educational programs that can be designed to increase awareness and the importance of positive interactions between couples in order to increase healthy satisfying relationships. Therefore, it is important to cover subjective well-being in order to increase healthy, happy partners and parents in a society.



Emerging adulthood is a critical developmental stage in which gender role beliefs are mainly developed (Smith et al., 2003). During this phase individual starts to make their own decisions in a variety of situations that might have a significant impact for the rest of their lives. For example, as Straus (2008) stated violence is more prevalent in dating relationship than married couples therefore if individuals learn to accept physical and psychological abuse in a relationship, they start to tolerate such behaviors which can create or perpetuate more violence in future relationships. The consequence of violence is not only related to damaging effects but can be associated with more destructive forms of violence in future relationships and marital violence (Close, 2005). These results reveal the necessity of educational programs such as women's studies and gender psychology courses in university settings to combat attitudes that support IPV within couples, particularly dating younger generation. Considering this result on women's positive attitudes towards IPV, intervention program can be focused on particularly strengthening women roles in a society.

To date, several diverse prevention and intervention programs have been developed to reduce dating violence. Mainly, intervention programs inform people to increase awareness regarding subtle forms of sexism that is found in patriarchal societies. For example, showing damages of sexism by gender studies or psychology of gender demonstrated a reduction in the sexist beliefs as well as encouraged agreement of egalitarian and feminist beliefs (Case, 2007). Such programs increase awareness of sexism and discrimination toward women and lower the level of prejudice acts against women. For example, one effective prevention program in reducing aggression for adolescent dating violence is "Safe Dates" by Foshe et al. (1996) which showed a reduction in aggression over time in couples. However, more

cultural specific intervention programs need to be developed especially for youth population. For instance, in Turkish culture where endorsements of traditional gender roles are justified, it can be difficult to detect and prevent by programs. As partner violence is seen as a norm and acceptable and forms of jealousy thought to be a sign of love and affection, the education programs should target the micro system such as family, partner and peers in order to apply successful programs in whole population. Hence, it is time for the professionals and researchers to work cooperatively to provide effective prevention strategy to reduce prevalence of IPV in hopes to change the norms for future generations where individuals only experience love and intimacy in their relationship.

## REFERENCES

- Acitelli, L. K., & Antonucci, T. C. (1994). Gender differences in the link between marital support and satisfaction in older couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 688-698.
- Aksan, A. D., & Aksu, F. (2007). The training needs of Turkish emergency department personnel regarding intimate partner violence. *BMC Public Health*, 7, 350-359. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-7-350.
- Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2008). Gender symmetry, sexism, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11), 1816-1834. doi: 10.1177/0886260508325496.
- Alpay, A. (2009). *Yakın ilişkilerde bağışlama: Bağışlamanın; bağlanma, benlik saygısı, empati ve kıskançlık değişkenleri yönünden incelenmesi (Forgiveness in close relationship: The investigation of forgiveness in terms of attachment, self-esteem, empathy and romantic jealousy)* (Unpublished master thesis). Ankara University, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Alper, Z., Ergin, N., Selimoğlu, K., & Bilgel, N. (2005). Domestic violence: a study among a group of Turkish women. *European Journal of General Practice*, 11, 48-54.

- Anderson, S., Russell, C., & Schumm, W. (1983). Perceived marital quality and family life-cycle categories: a further analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *45*, 127-139.
- Anderson, P. A., Eloy, S. V., Guerrero, L. K., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Romantic jealousy and relational satisfaction: A look at the impact of jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, *8*, 77-85.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 651-680. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.651.
- Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*(2), 133-153. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1002\_3.
- Argyle, M., & Furnham, A. (1983). Sources of satisfaction and conflict in long-term relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *45*, 481-493.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 469-480.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for. *Child Development Perspective*, *1*, 68-73.

- Arnett, J. J. (2014). Presidential Address: The emergence of emerging adulthood: A personal history. *Sage Publications*, 2, 155-162. doi: 10.1177/2167696814541096.
- Aube, J., Norcliffe, H., Craigh, J., & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and adjustment-related outcomes: Questioning the masculinity model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 284-295.
- Aylor, B., & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy: experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communications*, 65(4), 370–391. doi:10.1080/10570310109374717.
- Berkman, L. F. (1995). The role of social relations in health promotion. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57, 245-254.
- Black, M. C. (2011). Intimate partner violence and adverse health consequences: Implications for clinicians. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 5(5), 428-439. doi: 10.1177/1559827611410265.
- Breiding, M. J., Black, M. C., & Ryan, G. W. (2008). Chronic disease and health risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence: 18 U. S. States/territories, 2005. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 18(7), 538-544.
- Burman, B., & Margolin, G. (1992). Analysis of the association between marital relationships and health problems: An interactional perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 39–63. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.39.

- Burn, S. M., & Ward, A. Z. (2005). Men's conformity to traditional masculinity and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 254-263, doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.6.4.254.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3, 251–255.
- Butzer, B., & Campbell, L. (2008). Adult attachment, sexual satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction: A study of married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 15, 141-154. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00189.x.
- Bynner, J. (2005). Reconstructing the youth phase of the life course; the case of emerging adulthood. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 8, 367-384.
- Çakıcı, M., Düşünmez, S., & Çakıcı, E. (2007). Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Kadına Yönelik Şiddet. *Kıbrıs Türk Ruh Sağlığı Yayınları*.
- Campbell, J. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*, 359, 1331-1336. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08336-8.
- Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008). Why do people blame victims of abuse? The role of stereotypes of women on perceptions of blame. *Sex Roles*, 59(11-12), 839-850. doi:101007/s11199-008-9488-1.
- Carpenter, C. J. (2012). Meta-analyses of sex differences in response to sexual versus

emotional infidelity: Men and women are more similar than different. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(1), 25–37. doi:10.1177/0361684311414537.

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: An intervention of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 426-435. doi: 10.1111/j1471-6402.2007.00391.x.

Çelik, E. (2014). Adaptation of relationship assessment scale to Turkish culture: Study of validity and reliability. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 1, 1-7.

Chen, Z., Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2009). Ambivalent sexism and power-related gender-role ideology in marriage. *Sex Roles*, 60, 765–778.

Clarkberg, M., Stolzenberg, R., & Waite, L. (1995). Attitudes, values, and entrance into cohabitational versus marital unions. *Social Forces*, 74, 609–632.

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

Croucher, S. M., DeMaris, A., Oyer, B. J., Yartey, F. N. A., & Ziberi, L. (2012). Jealousy in India and the United States: A cross-cultural analysis of three dimensions of jealousy. *Human Communication*, 15, 139–158.

- Cui, M., Durtschi, J. A., Donnellan, M. B., Lorenz, F. O., & Conger, R. D. (2010). Intergenerational transmission of relationship aggression: a prospective longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*, 688-697. doi: 10.1037/a0021675.
- Cunningham, J. D., Braiker, H., & Kelley, H. H. (1982). Marital-status and sex differences in problems reported by married and cohabiting couples. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6*(4), 415-427.
- De Silva, P. (2004). Jealousy in couple relationships. *Behavior Change, 21*, 1–13.
- Demirtaş, H. A., & Dönmez, A. (2006). Yakın ilişkilerde kıskançlık: Bireysel, ilişkisel ve durumsal değişkenler (Jealousy in close relationships: Personal, relational, and situational variables). *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 17*(3), 181–191.
- DeSteno, D., Valdesolo, P., & Bartlett, M. Y. (2006). Jealousy and the threatened self: Getting to the heart of the green-eyed monster. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(4), 626-641.
- Dijkstra, P., Barelds, D. P., & Groothof, H. A. (2010). Jealousy in response to online and offline infidelity: the role of sex and sexual orientation. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 4*, 328-336. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12055.



- Dugosh, J. W. (2000). On predicting relationship satisfaction from jealousy: The moderating effect of love. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 5, 254-263.
- Dush, C. M. K., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 607–627.
- Easton, J. A., & Shackelford, T. K. (2009). Morbid jealousy and sex differences in partner-directed violence. *Human Nature*, 20, 342-350.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1982). *The Life Cycle Completed, a Review*. New York: Norton.
- Fiebert, M. (1997). Annotated bibliography: References examining assaults by women on their spouses/partners. *Sexuality & Culture*, 1, 273-286. doi:10.1007/ s12119-013-9194-1.
- Fletcher, G. J., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). The measurement of perceived relationship quality components: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 340-354.
- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10, 125-142. doi: 10.1177/1524838009334131.

- Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations, 40*, 51–57.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, G. F., Bauman, K. E., Langwick, S. A., Arriaga, X. B., Heath, J. L., & McMahon, P. M. (1996). The Safe Dates Project: Theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 12*, 39–47.
- Fowers, B. J. (1991). His and her marriage: A multivariate study of gender and marital satisfaction. *Sex Roles, 24*, 209-221.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor, G.R. Adams, & G.P. Gullota (Eds.), *Advances in adolescent development: Relationships during adolescence* (pp. 168–175). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gage, A. J., & Hutchinson, P. L. (2006). Power, control and intimate partner sexual violence in Haiti. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 35*, 11–24.  
doi:10.1007/s10508-006-8991-0.
- Giordano, P. C., Soto, D., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). The characteristics of romantic relationships associated with teen dating violence. *Social Science Research, 39*, 863–874.
- Gleitman, H., Fridlund, A. J., & Reisberg, D. (2000). *Basic Psychology*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 292-297. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce: The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gracia, E. (October, 2014). Intimate partner violence against women and victim-blaming attitudes among Europeans. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/92/5/13-131391/en/>.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Eloy, S. V. (1992). Relational satisfaction and jealousy across marital types. *Communication Reports*, 5, 23-31.
- Guerrero, L. K., Anderson, P. A., & Afifi, W. A. (2011). *Close Encounters: Communication in Relationships* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Guo, B., & Huang, J. (2005). Marital and sexual satisfaction in Chinese families: Exploring the moderating effects. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 31, 21-29.
- Hamamcı, Z. (2005). Dysfunctional relationship belief in marital satisfaction and adjustment. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33, 313- 328.

- Hand, L. S., & Furman, W. (2006). Rewards and costs in adolescent other-sex friendships: Comparisons to same-sex friendships and romantic relationships. *Social Development, 18*(2), 270-287.
- Harris, C. R. (2003). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysical responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*(2), 102-128. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0702\_102-128.
- Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., & Traupmann, J. (1979). Equity theory and intimate relationships. In R. L. Burgess & T. L. Huston (Eds.), *Social exchange in developing relationships*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hawkins, J. L. (1968). Associations between companionship, hostility, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30*, 647-650.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 50*, 93-98.
- Hendry, L. B., & Kloep, M. (2007). Conceptualizing emerging adulthood: Inspecting the emperor's new clothes. *Child Development Perspectives, 1*, 74-79.
- Henton, J. M., Cate, R. M., Koval, J. E., Lloyd, S. A., & Christopher, F. S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 3*, 467-482. doi:10.1177/019251383004003004.

- Heru, A. M. (2007). Intimate partner violence: Treating abuser and abused. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment, 13*(5), 376-383. doi: 10.1192/apt.bp.107.003749.
- Hill, A. (2008). *Predictors of relationship satisfaction: The link between cognitive flexibility, compassionate love and level of differentiation* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Alliant International University.
- Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2002). Intergenerational transmission of intimate partner violence: A behavioral genetic perspective. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 3*(3), 210-225. doi: 10.1177/15248380020033004.
- Hippen, K. A. (2016). *Attitudes Toward Marriage and Long-term Relationships across Emerging Adulthood* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Georgia State University.
- Hortaçsu, N. (1999). The firstyear of family and couple-initiated marriages of a Turkish sample: A longitudinal investigation. *International Journal of Psychology, 34*, 29-41.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1981). *Americans and Chinese: Passages to differences*. Honolulu, CA: University Press of Hawaii, Sage.
- Hüsnü, S., & Mertan, B. E. (2015). The role of traditional gender myths and beliefs about beating on self-reported partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-18*, doi:10.1177/0886260515600879.

- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1998). Individualism and collectivism in a model and scale of balanced differentiation an integration. *The Journal of Psychology, 132*, 95–105. doi:10.1080/00223989809599268.
- Jose, O., & Alfons, V. (2007). Do demographics affect marital satisfaction. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 33*, 73-85.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 444-451.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1982). *The changing value of children in Turkey*. East West Population Institute Publication: Honolulu.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, C., & Sunar, D. (1992). Family and socialization in Turkey. In Roopnarine, J. L., & Carter, D. B. (Eds.), *Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures* (pp. 75-88). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy* (Unpublished master thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Karaoğlu, L., Celbis, O., Ercan, C., Ilgar, M., Pehlivan, E., Güneş, G., Genç, M. F., & Eğri, M. (2005). Physical, emotional and sexual violence during pregnancy in Malatya, Turkey. *European Journal of Public Health, 16*, 149-156. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cki161.

- Katz, J., Kuffel, S. W., & Coblenz, A. (2002). Are there gender differences in sustaining dating violence? An examination of frequency, severity, and relationship satisfaction, *Journal of Family Violence, 17*, 247-271. doi: 10.1023/A:1016005312091.
- Kaura, S. A. & Lohman, B. J. (2007). Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 367-381, doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9092-0.
- Kemer, G., Bulgan, G., & Çetinkaya, Y. E. (2015). Gender differences, infidelity, dyadic trust, and jealousy among married Turkish individuals. *Current Psychology, 1*, 1-14.e
- Knox, D., Zusman, M. E., Mabon, L. & Shriver, L. (1999). Jealousy in college student relationships. *College Student Journal, 33*(3), 328-329.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1992). Dimensionality of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale: Evidence from heterosexual and homosexual couples. *Journal of Family Psychology, 6*, 22-35.
- Kurdek, L. A. (2005). Gender and marital satisfaction early in marriage: A growth curve approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 68-84.

- La Greca, A. M., & Harrison, H. W. (2005). Adolescent peer relations, friendships and romantic relationships: Do they predict social anxiety and depression. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34*, 49-61.
- Lamanna, M. A., & Riedmann, A. (2009). *Marriages and families: Making choices in a diverse society*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Langis, J., Sabourin, S., Lussier, Y., & Mathieu, M. (1994). Masculinity, femininity, and marital satisfaction: An examination of theoretical models. *Journal of Personality, 62*, 393-414. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00303.x.
- Lewandowski, K., & Schrage, T. (2010). A comparison of Relationship Satisfaction and Sexual Satisfaction in Short-term and Long-term Relationships. *Journal of undergraduate Research*.
- Martinez, C. T. (2015). Endangered expressions of aggression: the role of gender, proprietary behaviors, and jealousy in intimate partner violence. *Violence and Gender, 2*, 112-118. doi:10.1089/vio.2014.0040.
- McCue, M. L. (1995). *Domestic Violence: A Reference Handbook Contemporary World Issues*, USA.
- Melamed, T. (1991). Individual differences in romantic jealousy: The moderating effect of relationship characteristics. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 455-461.



- Mertan, B., Maner, U., Bayraktar, F., Hüsnü, Ş., Pehlivan, G., & Çelik, D. (2012). Knowledge and attitudes towards domestic violence against women: The case of North Cyprus. *Women 2000. Journal for Women Studies*, 13, 47-60.
- Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2009). Sex differences in response to sexual versus emotional infidelity: The moderating role of individual differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 287-291.
- Miller, R. S., Perlman, D., & Brehm, S. S. (2007). *Intimate relationships*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist*, 55, 56-67.
- O'Leary, K. D., Smith Slep, A. M., & O'Leary, S. G. (2007). Multivariate models of men's and women's partner aggression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75, 752-764. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.75.5.752.
- Parlan, Y. (2015). *Intimate Partner Violence- Who is to blame?* (Unpublished master thesis). Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Parrott, W. G. (1991). The emotional experiences of envy and jealousy. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 3-30). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *6*, 181-196.
- Pines, A., & Aronson, E. (1983). Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Personality*, *51*(1), 108–136. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00857.x.
- Puente, S., & Cohen, D. (2003). Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology*, *29*, 449–460.
- Prigerson, H. G., Maciejewski, P. K., & Rosenheck, R. A. (1999). The effects of marital dissolution and marital quality on health and health service use among women. *Medical Care*, *7*, 858-873. doi: 10.1097/00005650-199909000-00003.
- Reis, H. T., Collins, W. A., & Berscheid, E. (2000). The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 844-872. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.6.844.
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, *5*, 357-391.
- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Bringle, R. G. (2004). Jealousy and commitment: Perceived threat and the effect of relationship alternatives. *Personal Relationships*, *11*, 451-468.

- Sabatelli, R. M. (1988). Exploring relationship satisfaction: A social exchange perspective on the interdependence between theory, research, and practice. *Family Relations*, 37, 217-222.
- Şahin, M., & Sarı, S. V. (2009). Basında “Facebook istismarı” ve toplumdaki yansımaları (Facebook abuse in press and its reflections on society). *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences*, 1(9), 51–69.
- Şahin, S. (2014). Open borders, closed minds: The discursive construction of national identity in Northern Cyprus. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33, 583–597.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması (Ambivalent sexism inventory: a study of reliability and validity). *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi (Journal of Turkish Psychology)*, 17, 47–58.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Ulu, S. (2003). Evlilikte kadına yönelik şiddete ilişkin tutumlar: Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, yaş, eğitim ve gelir düzeyinin etkileri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 6(11-12), 53-65.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, S. Z., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world and empathy as predictors of Turkish students’ attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57, 889-895. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9313-2.

- Sakallı, N., & Curun, F. (2001). Romantik ilişkilerle ilgili kalıp yargılara karşı tutumlar. *Tecrübi Psikoloji Çalışmaları*, 22, 31-45.
- Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1986). The differentiation of social-comparison jealousy and romantic jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1100- 1112.
- Serran, G., & Firestone P. (2004). Intimate partner homicide: A review of the male proprietariness and the self-defense theories. *Aggression Violent Behavior*, 9, 1–15.
- Smith, B. A., Thompson, S., Tomaka, J., & Buchanan, A. C. (2005). Development of the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale (IPVAS) with a predominantly Mexican American college sample. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 27, 442-454. doi: 10.1177/0739986305281233.
- Snow Jones, A., Gielen., A. C., Campbell J. C., Schollenberger, J., Dienemann, J. A., Kub, J., O'Campo, P. J., & Wynne, E. C. (1999). Annual and lifetime prevalence of partner abuse in a sample of female HMO enrollees. *Women's Health Issues*, 9, 295–305. doi:10.1016/S1049-3867(99)00022-5.
- Staske, S. A. (1999). Creating relational ties in talk: The collaborative construction of relational jealousy. *Symbolic Interaction*, 22, 213-246. doi: 10.1525/si.1999.22.3.213.

Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabitating and married couples. In M.A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American Families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 227-244). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Stewart, M. R. (2012). *The impact of length of relationship on conflict communication and relationship satisfaction in couples* (Unpublished master thesis). Iowa State University. Graduate Theses and Dissertation.

Stith, S. M., Green, N. M., Smith, D. B., & Ward, D. B. (2008). Marital satisfaction and marital discord as risk markers for intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 149-160, doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9137-4.

Straus, M. A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(3), 252-275. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004.

Sugarman, D. B., & Frankel, S. L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and wife-assault: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence, 11*(1), 13-40. doi: 10.1007/BF02333338.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory psychiatry*. NY: Norton.

Turkish Statistical Institute (2006). Family Structure Survey. Retrieved February 15,

2016 from [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb\\_id=41&ust\\_id=11](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=41&ust_id=11).

Van Yperen, N. W., & Buunk, B. P. (1990). A longitudinal study of equity and satisfaction in intimate relationships. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 287–309.

Ward, J., & Voracek, M. (2004). Evolutionary and social cognitive explanations of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 56*, 165–171. doi:10.1080/00049530412331283381.

White, G. L. (1981). Jealousy and partner's perceived motives for attraction to a rival. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 24–30.

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. *Sex Roles, 52*, 771-784.

World Health Organization. (2002). Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (Eds.). *World report on violence and health*.

World Health Organization. (November, 2013). Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>.

- Whiffen, V. E., & Aubé, J. A. (1999). Personality, interpersonal context, and depression in couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*, 369-383. doi: 10.1177/0265407599163005
- Yanikkerem, E., Karadaş, G., Adıgüzel, B., & Sevil, U. (2006). Domestic Violence during pregnancy in Turkey and responsibility of prenatal health care providers. *American Journal of Perinatology, 23*, 93-104. doi: 10.1055/s-2006-931802.
- Yanikkerem, E., & Saruhan, A. (2005). 15–49 yas evli kadınların aile içi şiddet konusunda görüşlerinin ve aile içi şiddete maruz kalma durumlarının incelenmesi (The investigation on the opinions of married women between the age of 15–49 on domestic violence and the circumstances they exposed to violence. *Medical Network Klinik Bilimler ve Doktor, 11* (2), 198-204.
- Young, M., Denny, G., Luquis, R., & Young, T. (1998). Correlates of sexual satisfaction in marriage. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 7*, 115-127.
- Zarrett, Z., & Eccles, J. (2006). The passage to adulthood: Challenges of late adolescence. *New Directions For Youth Development, 111*, 13-28.

## **APPENDICES**



## Appendix A: Demographic Information Sheet

### Kişisel Bilgi Formu

Çalışmaya başlamadan önce lütfen aşağıdaki soruları yanıtlayınız.

1. Yaşınız: .....

2. Cinsiyet: Kadın  Erkek

3. Uyruk: KKTC  TC  Diğer

4. Cinsel Yönelim: Heteroseksüel (karşı cinse ilgi duyan)

Homoseksüel (kendi cinsine ilgi duyan)

Biseksüel (hem kendi cinsine hemde karşı cinse ilgi duyan)

5. İlişki Durumu: Bekar

Evli

Boşanmış

a) Çocuğunuz var mı? Evet  Hayır

6. Evli değilseniz- Şu an sevgiliniz var mı? Evet  Hayır

Evetise ne kadar zamandan beridir sevgilisiniz: ..... Ay ..... Yıl

a) Şu anki Kız /Erkek arkadaşınız ilk sevgiliniz mi? Evet  Hayır

b) Bu sevgili ilişkisini uzun vadeli bir ilişki olarak değerlendirir misiniz?

Evet  Hayır

7. Eğitim Durumunuz:

Lise

Önlisans

Lisans

Yüksek Lisans/ Üzeri

8. Aşağıdaki cümlelerden hangisi sizi en doğru şekilde tanımlamaktadır?

a) Kendimi hiçbir açıdan tam bir yetişkin gibi hissetmiyorum.

b) Bazı açılardan kendimi bir yetişkin gibi hissediyorsam da, bazı açılardan hissetmiyorum.

c) Kendimi her açıdan tam bir yetişkin gibi hissediyorum.

## Appendix B: Multidimensional Jealousy Scale

Lütfen maddeleri okurken 'X' harfinin yerine romantik ilişkide bulunduğunuz kişinin adını hayal ediniz. Her bir maddenin ilişkinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılardaki 7 farklı ölçek üzerinde, daire içerisine alarak gösteriniz. Lütfen bütün soruları yanıtlayınız.

Sevinirim1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7 Üzülürüm

1. X size, karşı cinsten bir başkasının ne kadar iyi görüldüğü hakkında yorum yapıyorsa.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. X karşı cinsten birisiyle konuşmak için aşırı ilgi ve heyecan gösterirse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. X karşı cinsten birisine sıcak bir tavırla gülümserse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. X karşı cinsten birisiyle flört ederse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Karşı cinsten birisi X'le çıkarsa.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. X karşı cinsten birisini kucaklar ve öperse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. X size, karşı cinsten biriyle çok yakın çalışırsa.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Beni Tanımlıyor 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7 Beni Tanımlamıyor

8. X' in çekmecelerini, el çantasını ve ceplerini kontrol ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. X' i hiç beklemediği zamanlarda orada olup olmadığını anlamak için ararım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. X' e geçmişteki ve bugünkü romantik ilişkileri hakkında sorular sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Eğer X karşı cinsten birisine ilgi gösterirse onun hakkında kötü şeyler söylerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. X' i telefon konuşmaları hakkında sorgularım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. X' e nerede olduğu konusunda sorular sorarım	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. X' i ne zaman karşı cinsten birisiyle konuşurken görsem araya girerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Sadece yanında kim olduğunu görmek için X' e sürpriz ziyaretler yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. X' in karşı cinsten birisiyle gizlice görüştüğünden şüphe ediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Karşı cinsten birisinin X' in peşinden koşuyor olmasından kaygı duyuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. X' in başka birisinden etkilenmiş olmasından şüpheleniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. X' in benim arkamdan karşı cinsten bir başkasıyla fiziksel yakınlık kurmuş olmasında kuşkulaniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Karşı cinsten bazı insanların X' e romantik ilgi duyuyor olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. X' in gizlice karşı cinsten birisiyle romantik yakınlık kurmakta olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22. Karşı cinsten birisinin X'i ayarttığından endişe ediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. X'in karşı cinse aşırı tutkun olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix C: Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes Scale

Aşağıda bir dizi ifade verilmiştir. Lütfen verilen ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyup kendinize en uygun olan sayıyı daire içine alınız.

	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</i>	<i>Katılmıyorum</i>	<i>Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum</i>	<i>Katılıyorum</i>	<i>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</i>
1- Partnerim canımı yakmadığı sürece “tehditleri” kabul edebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
2- Gergin bir tartışma esnasında partnerimi incitmek için geçmişinden bir konuyu gündeme getirmek benim için kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
3- Partnerimi kıskandırmak ilişkimize yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
4- Partnerimin beni kıskandırmak için yaptığı şeyleri sorun etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
5- Gergin bir tartışma esnasında partnerimi sırf incitmek için bir şeyler söylemem kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
6- Başkalarının önünde partnerimin beni aşağılamasını sorun saymam.	1	2	3	4	5
7- Partnerimin yaptığı yanlışların suçunu kabullenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
8- Yanlış şeyler yaptığımda partnerimi suçlamak benim için kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
9- Başkalarının önünde partnerimi aşağılamak benim için uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
10- Beni incitmek amacıyla partnerimin geçmişimden bir şeyi gündeme getirmesi kabul edilemez.	1	2	3	4	5
11- Partnere bir nesne ile vurmak veya vurmaya çalışmak uygun olmaz.	1	2	3	4	5
12- Partnere tekme atmak, ısırarak, vurmaya çalışmak veya yumruklamak hiçbir şekilde uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
13- Partneri bıçak veya silahla tehdit etmek hiçbir zaman uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
14- Partnere ait herhangi birşeye zarar vermenin yanlış olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
15- Partnerimin başkalarıyla birşeyler yapmasını engellemeye çalışmam.	1	2	3	4	5
16- Partnerimin karşı cinsten biriyle konuşmamamı söylemesi gururumu okşar.	1	2	3	4	5
17- Beni başkalarıyla bir şeyler yapmaktan alıkoymaya çalışan bir partnerle birlikte olmam.	1	2	3	4	5
18- Partnerime karşı cinsten birileriyle konuşmamasını söylemek normaldir.	1	2	3	4	5
19- Partnerimin bana günün her dakikasını ne yaptığımı sorması hoşuma gitmez.	1	2	3	4	5

20- Partnerimin gn ierisinde neler yaptığını bana dakikası dakikasına anlatması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

## Appendix D: Relationship Assessment Scale

Aşağıda romantik ilişkilerden sağlanan doyuma ilişkin ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Romantik ilişkide bulunduğunuz kişiyi hayalederek cevaplandırınız. Her bir maddenin ilişkinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılardaki 7 farklı ölçeküzzerinde, daire içerisine alarak gösteriniz. Lütfen bütün soruları yanıtlayınız.

	Hiç Karşılamiyor						Çok iyi Karşılıyor
1. Sevgiliniz ihtiyaçlarınızı ne kadar iyi karşılıyor?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç memnun değilim						Çok memnunum
2. Genel olarak ilişkinizden ne kadar memnunsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Çok kötü						Çok iyi
3. Diğerleri ile karşılaştırdığında ilişkiniz ne kadar iyi?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiçbir zaman						Her zaman
4. Ne sıklıkla ilişkinize hiç başlamamış olmayı istiyorsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç karşılamiyor						Tamamen karşılıyor
5. İlişkiniz ne dereceye kadar sizin başlangıçtaki beklentilerinizi karşılıyor?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç sevmiyorum						Çok seviyorum
6. Sevgilinizi ne kadar seviyorsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç yok						Çok var
7. İlişkinizde ne kadar problem var?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix E: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter



Eastern  
Mediterranean  
University

The Department of Psychology  
Eastern Mediterranean University  
Research & Ethics Committee  
Senel Husnu Raman-Chairperson

Famagusta, Turkish Republic of  
Northern Cyprus  
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389  
Fax: +(90) 392 630 2475  
e-mail: senel.raman@emu.edu.tr  
Web:  
<http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology>

**Ref No.:** 16/01-02

Date: 22.01.2016

Dear Akile Yuzugulen,

Your ethics application titled '*The relationship between traditional gender role endorsement and jealousy on intimate partner violence and relationship satisfaction among Turkish speaking couples*' has been approved by the Ethics & Research Committee on 22.01.16 as there are no ethical violations in the application.

If any changes to the study described in the application or supporting documentation is necessary, you must notify the committee and may be required to make a resubmission of the application. This approval is valid for one year.

Good luck with the research.  
Yours sincerely,

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ilmiye Seer  
On Behalf of the Research & Ethics Committee  
Psychology Department  
Eastern Mediterranean University