Fate or Schema Chemistry? Which one does bring and hold mates together?[1]

Serdar KÖRÜK[2], Nilüfer ÖZABACI[3]

[2] *PhD, Yeditepe University,* *serdarkoruk1989@gmail.com*

[3] *Prof. Dr. , Yeditepe University,* *niluferozabaci@hotmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to analyze marital adjustment within the scope of Schema Theory and early maladaptive schema domains. The study group consisted of 77 married Turkish couples. In the data collection process which was conducted as online survey, the volunary spouses were asked to use a pseudonym and they used the same pseudonym in their scales. Thus, they could be included in the analysis as husband and wife. Marital adjustment was measured by Perceived Adjustment Scale in Close Relationships and early maladaptive schema domains of the participants was measured by Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form-3. In the data analysis, firstly, the descriptive statistics of schema domains were conducted. Then, the correlations between schema domains and marital adjustment were analyzed. Afterwards, the participants were divided into two groups as the ones showing high levels and low levels of related schema domain and each group's marital adjustment mean scores were examined. Lastly, the spouses were divided into two groups as high levels and low levels of marital adjustment mean scores, and the dyadic schema domain distributions of the spouses in each group were examined. Findings revealed that impaired autonomy, disconnection, and other-directedness schema domains had negative correlation with marital adjustment and participants having low level of schema domains had more marital adjustment scores. Dyadic schema domain distribution of spouses showed that there were repetitive schema domain matches among spouses in both high-adjusted group and low-adjusted group which can be interpreted that schema chemistry can have an effect on dyadic marital adjustment.

Keywords: Early maladaptive schemas, marital adjustment, schema chemistry

[1] This article was prepared from the PhD thesis named "The Analysis of Dyadic Marital Adjustment within the Context of Early Maladaptive Schemas and Family Functions: A Study of Structural Modelling" written by Serdar Körük under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Özabacı

1. INTRODUCTION

In the psychology literature, the cognitive schema is defined as abstract cognitive images that act as a guide for solving problems and interpreting newly learned knowledge. When a schema is triggered, experiences and knowledge about that schema are recalled and these associations affect the individual's current evaluations, cognitive and emotional processes (Beck, 1963). Schema theory integrated Beck's (1963) concept of cognitive schemas with psychoanalytic theory, Bowlby's (1969) attachment theory (internal working models) and transactional analysis. According to schema theory, individuals have psychological and physiological needs to be met in the early stages of life, and meeting these needs leads to the development of positive schemas about the individual and the outside world. Otherwise, on the basis of insecure attachment, unmet needs due to various traumatic experiences and unhealthy parental styles exposed lead to the development of maladaptive schemas (Young & Lindeman, 1992). The formation of early maladaptive schemas is examined under three basic sources (Rafaeli, Bernstein & Young, 2011). In the first source, which is named as not meeting core emotional needs, five basic needs are mentioned. These are a sense of safety and being securely attached to others, a sense of self-identity and autonomy, the freedom to express how you feel and ask for what you need from others, the ability to play and be spontaneous, and safe, age-appropriate limits and boundaries. The second source, which is named as early life experiences, includes traumatic life experiences such as being harmed and victim, exposing abusive or overprotective parental attitudes. In the third source, which is named as emotional temperament, there are temperament elements that the child brings from birth biologically. Each child has a unique temperament. Some children are more reserved, some of them are angrier and some of them are more aggressive than other ones. Different temperaments can cause similar life events to have different effects on children (Young, Klosko & Weishaar, 2003).

Young, Klosko and Weishaar (2003) defined 18 maladaptive schemas and five schema domains in which these schemas are classified.

Disconnection/rejection domain includes abandonment/instability, mistrust/abuse, emotional deprivation, defectiveness/shame and social isolation/alienation schemas. Individuals with a high level of disconnection/rejection schema domain often experience lack of trust in interpersonal relationships. These individuals believe that their needs for stability, security, care, love and belonging will not be met. Having traumatic childhood experiences, abusive and emotionally depriving parental attitudes are likely to be seen (Cecero, Nelson & Gillie, 2004; Simeone-DiFrancesco, Roediger & Stevens, 2017; Young et al., 2003).

Impaired autonomy and performance domain includes dependence/incompetence, vulnerability to harm or illness, enmeshment/underdeveloped self and failure schemas. Individuals with a high level of impaired autonomy and performance schema domain believe that they are inadequate in achieving something independently, taking initiative and demonstrating their potential. These individuals are likely to come from overprotective families who have done everything for them and have not given them much autonomy (Calvete, Orue & Hankin, 2015; Simeone-DiFrancesco et al., 2017; Young et al., 2003).

Impaired limits domain includes entitlement/grandiosity and insufficient self-control/self-discipline schemas. Impaired limits schema domain expresses a lack of sense of responsibility and self-discipline, insufficient interpersonal boundaries, low tolerance to frustration, and difficulties in respecting the rights of others. Individuals with a high level of this domain have difficulties in fulfilling their responsibilities and respecting others (Simeone-DiFrancesco et al., 2017; Young et al., 2003).

Other-directedness domain includes subjugation, self-sacrifice and approval-seeking/recognition-seeking schemas. Individuals with a high level of other-directedness schema domain focus on meeting others' needs rather than their own needs in order to establish a bonding relationship with others. They believe that others can love them conditionally. The most distinctive feature of the origin families of them is the conditional love and acceptance (Cecero et al., 2004; Young et al., 2003).

Over vigilance and inhibition domain includes negativity/pessimism, over control/emotional inhibition, unrelenting standards/hyper criticalness and punitiveness. The schema domain of over vigilance and inhibition refers to living in accordance with the strict and internalized rules created by the individual about life. Individuals obey their strict rules and values by suppressing their emotions and needs (Bayrami, Bakhs & Esmaeili, 2012; Simeone-DiFrancesco et al., 2017; Young et al., 2003).

Schema chemistry describes the emotional transference between spouses (Simeone-DiFrancesco et al., 2017). The relationships established by individuals with attachment objects in their early stages of life form internal working models about whom they will love and feel close to them in the following years (Roediger, Behary & Zarbock, 2016). Therefore, the quality of the relationships established in early stages of life affects the quality of the close relationships established in the following years. Young and Gluhoski (1997) described the repetition and reoccurrence of these familiar feelings and the tendency of maladaptive schemas to validate them on a romantic partner as schema chemistry. Schema chemistry can also be addressed in the Complementary Needs Theory, a theory that explains mate selection. Complementary Needs Theory focuses on the individuals' needs, and highlights mutual needs and complementarity in choosing a partner (Knox & Schacht, 2008). This theory emerged as a result of the work carried out by Winch (1955) with married couples and has psychodynamic elements. In this theory, it is stated that dyadic harmony and dyadic complement of individual differences strengthen the marital relationship.

The relationship between early maladaptive schemas/schema domains and marital adjustment/couple adjustment attracts researchers' interest and a number of studies (Dumitrescu & Rusu, 2012; Güner, 2014; Manzary, Makvandi & Khoshli, 2014; Mohammadi & Soleymani, 2017; Nia et al., 2015; Özabacı & Körük, 2018; Soysal, 2017; Yıldız, 2018; Yiğit & Çelik, 2016) were conducted on this issue in recent years. In these studies, the maladaptive schemas of individuals and these schemas' relationships with relationship satisfaction/adjustment, marital satisfaction/adjustment were analyzed within an individual context. However, dyadic components were not examined. On the other hand, Winch's (1955; 1967) Complementary

Needs Theory suggests that relationship/marital satisfaction is related to meeting dyadic internal needs.

In this respect, the importance of dyadic examination of individual elements emerges in explaining marital adjustment. The aim of this research is to analyze marital adjustment within the scope of Schema Theory and early maladaptive schema domains. Research questions are determined as follows;

1. What is the distribution of the early maladaptive schema domains and marital adjustment in spouses?
2. Do early maladaptive schema domains and marital adjustment of spouses differ by gender?
3. Is there a significant relationship between marital adjustment and early maladaptive schema domains for both males and females?
4. When considering the spouses having high and low levels of each schema domain, what are the marital adjustment mean scores of these individuals for each group?
5. When considering the spouses having high and low levels of marital adjustment mean score, what is the dyadic schema domain distribution of spouses?

2. METHOD

2.1. Design

In this study, which was conducted as quantitative research, correlational design was used to examine whether there is a significant relationship between marital adjustment and early maladaptive schema domains. Online survey was used for data collection process. Demographic form and related scales were transferred to online and shared on various social media platforms with their explanations indicating that voluntaryspouses should fill the scales.

2.2. Study Group

The study group consisted of 77 married Turkish couples. In the data collection process, the couples were asked to use a pseudonym and they used the same pseudonym in their scales. Thus, they could be included in the analysis as husband and wife. Demographics related to the study group is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographics

Pseudonym	Husband age	Wife age	Marriage period (year)	Number of children	Marital adjustment mean score
Life is short	53	53	23	1	4,94
Giallarosso	31	29	0,25	-	4,94
Sherlock	35	35	4	-	4,92
Spike	26	22	0,92	-	4,91
Success	30	30	1,5	-	4,87
Respect and love	53	45	22	2	4,86
Petiş	30	30	3	1	4,86
Lion	35	33	13	1	4,80

Sinsirella	32	30	11	-	4,80
Cis	29	25	0,17	-	4,80
Twins	35	35	13	2	4,77
Breeze	27	25	3	-	4,76
Arda (*Turkish name*)	47	45	19	1	4,75
Colorfast	51	45	23	2	4,74
Luck	35	30	10	3	4,71
Sofa	37	38	13	1	4,70
Svrn	31	30	1	-	4,70
Yavuz (*Turkish name*)	28	28	0,25	-	4,68
Smile	52	49	33	2	4,67
Dessert	38	30	0,10	-	4,64
Tymandos	38	32	11	2	4,64
Love	26	27	2	-	4,64
Cactus	43	41	18	1	4,61
Water	33	29	11	2	4,60
Flower	29	27	3	-	4,60
Bright	27	25	1	-	4,58
Firefly	31	25	2	1	4,56
Blue bead	29	23	4	-	4,55
Aadik	32	32	9	2	4,52
Hard	53	48	23	2	4,49
Hero	41	39	13	2	4,47
Chgzn	30	29	5	1	4,47
Grape	28	20	1,5	-	4,46
Judge of the night	30	29	3	-	4,45
Parentheses	36	35	8	-	4,41
Daisy	52	50	26	2	4,39
Love	65	45	15	3	4,38
Yellow	29	28	1,75	-	4,37
Diver	54	53	30	1	4,36
Couple not able to meet	29	28	1	-	4,34
Behzat Ç (*Turkish name*)	35	30	0,13	-	4,33
Galatasaray (*Turkish Football Club*)	27	27	2	-	4,31
Orka (*Turkish name*)	34	34	8	1	4,27
Smile	26	26	3	1	4,26
Without pseudonym	31	26	0,10	-	4,25
Legolas	29	29	5	1	4,24
Summer	56	50	0,33	2	4,21
Sweet sour chicken	39	34	5	1	4,19
Crazy	27	27	0,25	-	4,18

Siirt (*Turkish city*)	28	28	0,10	-	4,15
Darling	31	28	3	-	4,14
Cute	30	29	4	-	4,13
Sunlight	29	29	0,10	-	4,13
Honey beetle	47	38	14	2	4,10
Honey	35	32	10	2	4,05
Donna	30	30	1	-	4,02
Feza (*Turkish name*)	44	38	15	2	3,92
Yellow flower	40	34	15	1	3,91
Aylı (*Turkish name*)	36	30	10	1	3,91
Pear	48	48	24	3	3,85
Happiness	46	43	17	2	3,85
Hazan (*Turkish name*)	27	25	3	-	3,80
Aliarin (*Turkish name*)	36	36	4	2	3,76
Çakır (*Turkish name*)	28	26	2	-	3,69
Magus	38	41	12	-	3,61
Mira	37	37	7	2	3,59
Limpid	35	33	10	1	3,52
Sweet hard	42	39	15	2	3,48
Darling	36	37	7	1	3,48
Cef	45	45	17	1	3,47
Crazy	46	41	19	2	3,37
Vaveyla	36	34	7	1	3,24
Spring	55	49	30	2	2,70
Sycamore	34	34	3	1	2,55
Rocket team	27	27	2	-	2,55
Grizzly bear	38	32	5	1	2,17
Soil	30	30	4	-	2,11
X	36.47	33.87	8.66	.91	4.20 (ss=.64)

In the calculation of the marital adjustment mean score, the mean score perceived by each spouse from their own marriage was calculated and then this score was summed up with the other spouse's score and divided into two. On the axis where the highest score is 5.00, the range of points varied between 4.94-2.11.

The <u>high marital adjustment</u> level is determined as follows; the arithmetic mean score of 77 married couples was found 4.20 and the standard deviation was found .6. A standard deviation above the arithmetic mean of the unit was determined as 4.80 points cross-section and above this point was determined as high level.

The low marital adjustment level is determined as follows; the arithmetic mean score of 77 married couples was found 4.20 and the standard deviation was found .6. A standard deviation

below the arithmetic mean of the unit was determined as 3.60 points cross-section and below this point was determined as low level.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

There were three measurement tools in the study namely; Demographics Form, *Perceived Adjustment Scale in Close Relationships (PASCR) and Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3).*

Demographics Form: Participants' demographic characteristics were gathered by Demographics Form which included the questions related to pseudonym, education level, age, monthly total income, marital period and number of children.

Perceived Adjustment Scale in Close Relationships (PASCR): Perceived Adjustment Scale in Close Relationships (PASCR) which was developed by Körük (2020) consists of 33 items and is scored as five-point Likert (1-Definitely disagree, 5-Definitely agree). The scale measures the partners' perceived adjustment in close relationships (romantic relationship, engagement and marriage). The increase in the score obtained from the scale indicates an increase in the perceived adjustment of the individual in related sub-factor. During the development of the scale, two studies were carried out. In the first study, the scale development process was carried out on 308 adult individuals (108 male, 200 female; 220 married, 24 engaged, 64 in a romantic relationship). The exploratory factor analysis, which was conducted on the 83-item five-Likert draft scale prepared according to theoretical and cultural literature and related researches, showed that the scale had 33-item with six-factor structure. These six factors were named as relationship satisfaction, sexual adjustment, cognitive adjustment, social adjustment, origin family relationship, and conflict/compromise adjustment. The Cronbach-alpha internal consistency coefficient was found. 95 for the whole scale while for the sub-factors ranged between .63 and .95. In the second study, which was conducted on a new study group of 392 adult individuals (119 male, 273 female; 276 married, 26 engaged, 87 in a romantic relationship), the six-factor structure was tested by confirmatory factor analysis and the fit indices were examined. The fit indices determined that the factor structure of the scale was acceptable (x2/df: 2.23, RMSEA: .056, CFI: .94, NFI: 90). In this study, the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found .95. for the whole scale while for the sub-factors ranged between .68 and .96.

Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form-3 (YSQ-SF3): The original scale developed by Young et al. (2003) is scored as six-Likert, (1 = totally wrong for me, 6 = describes me perfectly). It consists of 90 items and measures a total of 18 maladaptive schemas distributed over seven

schema domains. The increase of the score obtained from the relevant maladaptive schema indicates the degree of having of that schema. The Turkish adaptation study conducted by Soygüt et al. (2009) on 1071 university students between the ages of 17-35 showed that the scale has a structure that measures 14 maladaptive schemas distributed in five schema domains in Turkish culture. The schema domains explained by the scale and the schemas contained in these domains are specified as follows; impaired autonomy: enmeshment/dependency, abandonment, failure, pessimism, vulnerability to harm and illness; disconnection: emotional deprivation, emotional inhibition, social isolation, and defectiveness; unrelenting standards: unrelenting standards and approval seeking; impaired limits: entitlement/insufficient self-control; other-directedness: self-sacrifice and punitiveness. In the adaptation study, the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient was found between .63 and .80 for 14 maladaptive schemas whereas for the schema domains this value was found between .53 and .81. In the test-retest reliability study conducted with 150 university students at three-week intervals, the test-retest reliability coefficient of 14 maladaptive schemas ranged between .66 and .82, while the coefficient of the schema domains ranged between .66 and .83. In this study, the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient was found between .63 and .78 for 14 maladaptive schemas whereas for the schema domains this value was found between .60 and .88.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

The findings related to research question of "What is the distribution of the early maladaptive schema domains and marital adjustment in spouses in general and do they differ by gender?" was presented in this section. The mean scores of the maladaptive schema domains and marital adjustment and the T-test findings of these variables in 154 married participants was presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Variables	Gender	N	*Mean*	*p*
Impaired autonomy	Male	77	1.74	
	Female	77	1.82	.38
	Sum	154	1.78	
Disconnection	Male	77	1.94	
	Female	77	1.75	.10
	Sum	154	1.84	
Unrelenting standards	Male	77	3.03	
	Female	77	3.08	.91
	Sum	154	3.05	

Impaired limits	Male	77	3.34	
	Female	77	3.40	.29
	Sum	154	3.37	
Other-directedness	Male	77	3.21	
	Female	77	3.17	.85
	Sum	154	3.19	
Marital adjustment	Male	77	4.15	
	Female	77	4.24	.30
	Sum	154	4.19	

When Table 2 was examined, it was seen that none of the schema domains and marital adjustment differed according to gender (p> .05). While the schema domain that the participants had at the highest level was determined as the impaired limits (M= 3.37; SD= .98), the mean perceived marital adjustment score of females (M = 4.24 SD= .64),) was found to be higher than that of males (M = 4.15 SD= .73).

3.2. Correlations

The findings related to research question of "How does marital adjustment correlate with the early maladaptive schema domains for both males and females?" was presented in this section. Correlations between schema domains and marital adjustment for males were presented in Table 3 while they were presented in Table 4 for females.

Table 3. Correlations between schema domains and marital adjustment (Male)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Impaired autonomy	1	.71**	.53**	.15	.58**	-.43**
2-Disconnection	-	1	.47**	.15	.45**	-.55**
3-Unrelenting standards	-	-	1	.37**	.59**	-.10
4-Impaired limits	-	-	-	1	.23*	-.03
5-Other-directedness	-	-	-	-	1	-.26*
6-Marital adjustment	-	-	-	-	-	1

*p< .05, **p< .01, n= 77*

While disconnection (r=-.55, p<.01), impaired autonomy (r=.-43, p<.01) and other-directedness (r=-.26, p<.05) schema domains showed negative correlation with marital adjustment in married malesthe highest negative correlation with marital adjustment was found to be disconnection.

Table 4. Correlations between schema domains and marital adjustment (Female)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Impaired autonomy	1	.66**	.43**	.19	.54**	-.33**
2-Disconnection	-	1	37**	.33**	.41**	-.42**
3-Unrelenting standards	-	-	1	.27*	.54**	-.06

4-Impaired limits	-	-	-	1	.36**	-.03
5-Other-directedness	-	-	-	-	1	-.13
6-Marital adjustment	-	-	-	-	-	1

*p< .05, **p< .01, n= 77*

While disconnection (r=-.42, p<.01) and impaired autonomy (r=-.33, p<.01) schema domains showed negative correlation with marital adjustment in married females, the highest negative correlation with marital adjustment was found to be disconnection.

3.3. Marital Adjustment Mean Scores to Schema Domain Levels

The findings related to research question of "When considering the spouses having high and low level of each schema domain, what is the marital adjustment mean score of these individuals for each group?" was presented in this section. By calculating the mean and standard deviation of each schema domain, the group with a high schema domain level (above one unit standard deviation) and the group with a low schema domain level (below one unit standard deviation) were determined. Afterwards, the mean marital adjustment scores of the determined groups were calculated and presented in Table 5 (high group) and Table 6 (low group).

Table 5. Marital adjustment mean scores to schema domain levels (High group)

Schema Domain (ScD)	ScD Mean (*M*)	SD	Schema domain high group (Male) marital adjustment mean scores	Schema domain high group (Female) marital adjustment mean scores
Impaired autonomy	1.78	.59	3.55 (ScD *M*> 2.37, n= 11)	4.02 (ScD *M*> 2.37, n= 15)
Disconnection	1.84	.70	3.57 (ScD *M*> 2.54, n= 15)	3.44 (ScD *M*> 2.54, n= 8)
Unrelenting standards	3.05	1.04	4.16 (ScD *M*> 4.09, n= 13)	4.47 (ScD *M*> 4.09, n= 13)
Impaired limits	3.37	.98	4.43 (ScD *M*> 4.35, n= 9)	4.21 (ScD *M*> 4.35, n= 15)
Other-directedness	3.19	.92	3.74 (ScD *M*> 4.11, n= 11)	4.13 (*M*> 4.11, n= 12)

Having a high level of schema domain is psychologically unhealthy and is expected to negatively affect the individual's marital adjustment. This situation is reflected in Table 5. The

mean marital adjustment scores of participants who have high levels of disconnection and impaired autonomy schema domains in both males and females were found to be at the lowest level.

Table 6. Marital adjustment mean scores to schema domain levels (Low group)

Schema Domain (ScD)	ScD Mean (M)	SD	Schema domain low group (Male) marital adjustment mean	Schema domain low group (Female) marital adjustment mean
Impaired autonomy	1.78	.59	4.56 (ScD M< 1.19, n= 19)	4.70 (ScD M< 1.19, n= 6)
Disconnection	1.84	.70	4.58 (ScD M< 1.14, n= 9)	4.67 (ScD M< 1.14, n= 13)
Unrelenting standards	3.05	1.04	4.40 (ScD M< 2.01, n= 15)	4.41 (ScD M< 2.01, n= 12)
Impaired limits	3.37	.98	4.52 (ScD M< 2.39, n= 9)	4.40 (ScD M< 2.39, n= 14)
Other-directedness	3.19	.92	4.29 (ScD M< 2.27, n= 12	4.31 (ScD M< 2.27, n= 13

Having a low level of schema domain is a psychologically healthy condition and it is expected to have a positive reflection on the individual's marital relationship. This situation can be seen in Table 6. Compared to Table 5, the decrease in the scores of the schema domains increased the mean marital adjustment scores in both males and females in all groups.

3.4. Spouses' Dyadic Schema Domains

The findings related to research question of "When married couples are divided into two groups as high and low group according to spouses' dyadic marital adjustment mean scores, what is the distribution of dyadic schema domain of spouses?" was presented in this section. Spouses' dyadic schema domain distribution with mean scores for each domain was presented in Table 7 for the high-adjusted couples while in Table 8 for the low-adjusted couples.

Table 7. High-adjusted married couples' dyadic schema domain distribution

Pseudonym	Education / Age (H)	Education / Age (W)	Monthly total income (Turkish liras)	Marital period (year)	Number of children	Marital adjustment mean	Husband schema domains (mean)	Wife schema domains (mean)
							Unrelenting standards (4.67)	Unrelenting standards (3.83)
							Impaired limits (4.43)	Other-directedness (2.72)
Giallorosso	Primary school / 31	Secondary school / 29	3600	.25	-	4.94	Other-directedness (3.77)	Impaired limits (2.43)
							Impaired autonomy (3.03)	Impaired autonomy (1.50)
							Disconnection (2.78)	Disconnection (1.30)
							Other-directedness (3.25)	Impaired limits (3.86)
							Impaired limits (3.14)	Other-directedness (1.92)
Life is short	Bachelor / 53	PhD / 53	9565	23	1	4.94	Unrelenting standards (2.67)	Impaired autonomy (1.20)
							Disconnection (1.36)	Disconnection (1.00)
							Impaired autonomy (1.00)	Unrelenting standards (1.00)
							Impaired limits (4.29)	Other-directedness (4.82)

							Unrelenting standards (3.83)	Unrelenting standards (4.17)
Sherlock	Graduate / 35	PhD / 35	11000	4	-	4.92	Other-directedness (3.08)	Impaired autonomy (2.69)
							Impaired autonomy (2.32)	Impaired limits (2.14)
							Disconnection (1.46)	Disconnection (1.83)
							Unrelenting standards (2.67)	Unrelenting standards (3.58)
							Impaired limits (2.43)	Other-directedness (3.08)
Spike	Bachelor / 26	Associate degree / 22	6000	.92	-	4.91	Other-directedness (1.83)	Impaired limits (3.00)
							Disconnection (1.00)	Impaired autonomy (1.55)
							Impaired autonomy (1.00)	Disconnection (1.11)
							Other-directedness (2.55)	Impaired limits (3.57)
							Impaired limits (2.00)	Other-directedness (2.48)
Success	Bachelor / 30	Graduate / 30	10000	1.5	-	4.87	Unrelenting standards (1.67)	Unrelenting standards (1.75)
							Disconnection (1.11)	Impaired autonomy (1.23)
							Impaired autonomy (1.08)	Disconnection (1.07)
							Impaired limits (4.00)	Unrelenting standards (5.33)

							Unrelenting standards (2.75)	Impaired limits (5.14)
Petiş	PhD / 30	PhD / 30	40000	3	1	4.86	Other directedness (2.43)	Other-directedness (4.45)
							Disconnection (1.30)	Impaired autonomy (1.92)
							Impaired autonomy (1.00)	Disconnection (1.77)
							Impaired limits (6.00)	Impaired limits (4.71)
							Unrelenting standards (3.58)	Other-directedness (3.52)
Respect and love	Bachelor / 53	Bachelor / 45	9200	22	2	4.86	Other-directedness (2.78)	Unrelenting standards (2.83)
							Impaired autonomy (1.14)	Impaired autonomy (1.30)
							Disconnection (1.00)	Disconnection (1.09)
							Unrelenting standards (3.33)	Unrelenting standards (3.50)
							Other-directedness (3.08)	Other-directedness (3.25)
Lion	High school / 35	High school / 33	5000	13	1	4.80	Impaired limits (1.71)	Impaired limits (1.71)
							Disconnection (1.00)	Disconnection (1.00)
							Impaired autonomy (1.00)	Impaired autonomy (1.00)
							Impaired limits (3.71)	Impaired limits (3.14)
							Other-directedness (3.50)	Unrelenting standards (2.25)

Pseudonym	Education / Age (H)	Education / Age (W)	Monthly total income (Turkish liras)	Marriage period (year)	Number of children	Marital adjustment mean	Husband schema domains (mean)	Wife schema domains (mean)
Cis	Bachelor / 29	Bachelor / 25	7000	.17	-	4.80	Unrelenting standards (3.00) Disconnection (1.98) Impaired autonomy (1.82)	Other-directedness (1.35) Disconnection (1.07) Impaired autonomy (1.07)
Sinsirella	Associate degree / 32	High school / 30	6000	11	-	4.80	Unrelenting standards (3.08) Other-directedness (2.03) Impaired limits (2.00) Impaired autonomy (1.47) Disconnection (1.19)	Unrelenting standards (4.58) Other-directedness (2.72) Impaired limits (2.00) Impaired autonomy (1.40) Disconnection (1.15)

Table 8. Low-adjusted married couples' dyadic schema domain distribution

Pseudonym	Education / Age (H)	Education / Age (W)	Monthly total income (Turkish liras)	Marriage period (year)	Number of children	Marital adjustment mean	Husband schema domains (mean)	Wife schema domains (mean)
Mira	Graduate / 37	Graduate / 37	10000	7	2	3.59	Other-directedness (5.65) Unrelenting standards (4.58) Impaired limits (3.29) Impaired autonomy (2.24) Disconnection (2.08)	Impaired limits (4.57) Other-directedness (3.37) Unrelenting standards (2.25) Disconnection (1.41) Impaired autonomy (1.34)

Limpid	Graduate / 35	Graduate / 33	10500	10	1	3.52	Unrelenting standards (1.75) Disconnection (1.54) Impaired limits (1.43) Other-directedness (1.33) Impaired autonomy (1.30)	Impaired limits (4.57) Unrelenting standards (3.83) Other-directedness (2.48) Impaired autonomy (1.69) Disconnection (1.67)
Sweet hard	Bachelor / 42	Bachelor / 39	13000	15	2	3.48	Other-directedness (4.85) Unrelenting standards (4.00) Disconnection (2.82) Impaired limits (2.71) Impaired autonomy (1.89)	Unrelenting standards (2.67) Impaired limits (2.57) Other-directedness (2.02) Impaired autonomy (1.65) Disconnection (1.21)
Darling	Bachelor / 36	Bachelor / 37	10000	7	1	3.48	Unrelenting standards (3.75) Impaired limits (3.71) Other-directedness (3.23) Disconnection (2.95) Impaired autonomy (1.96)	Impaired limits (3.14) Unrelenting standards (2.92) Other-directedness (2.62) Impaired autonomy (1.34) Disconnection (1.00)

							Unrelenting standards (4.17)	Unrelenting standards (4.00)
							Disconnection (4.15)	Impaired limits (3.57)
Cef	High school / 45	Bachelor / 45	10000	17	1	3.47	Impaired limits (3.57)	Other-directedness (3.15)
							Other-directedness (3.35)	Impaired autonomy (1.64)
							Impaired autonomy (2.24)	Disconnection (1.39)
							Other-directedness (3.07)	Unrelenting standards (4.75)
							Impaired limits (2.57)	Impaired limits (4.57)
Crazy	Graduate / 46	Graduate / 41	15000	19	2	3.37	Unrelenting standards (2.42)	Other-directedness (4.33)
							Disconnection (2.15)	Disconnection (1.87)
							Impaired autonomy (1.16)	Impaired autonomy (1.68)
							Other-directedness (3.35)	Other-directedness (3.97)
							Impaired limits (3.29)	Impaired limits (2.71)
Vaveyla	Graduate / 36	PhD / 34	8000	7	1	3.24	Unrelenting standards (2.25)	Impaired autonomy (2.02)
							Disconnection (1.71)	Disconnection (1.85)
							Impaired autonomy (1.56)	Unrelenting standards (1.50)

							Disconnection (4.31)	Other-directedness (4.43)
							Other-directedness (4.25)	Unrelenting standards (3.50)
Spring	Secondary school / 55	High school / 49	3000	30	2	2.70	Impaired limits (4.00)	Disconnection (3.14)
							Unrelenting standards (3.67)	Impaired autonomy (2.19)
							Impaired autonomy (2.93)	Impaired limits (2.00)
							Disconnection (3.37)	Unrelenting standards (3.42)
							Impaired limits (3.14)	Other-directedness (3.03)
Sycamore	Bachelor / 34	Bachelor / 34	5250	3	1	2.55	Impaired autonomy (3.01)	Disconnection (3.01)
							Unrelenting standards (2.75)	Impaired limits (2.86)
							Other-directedness (2.67)	Impaired autonomy (2.60)
							Other-directedness (3.83)	Other-directedness (3.62)
							Unrelenting standards (3.58)	Impaired limits (3.00)
Rocket team	Bachelor / 27	Bachelor / 27	8600	2	-	2.55	Impaired limits (3.43)	Unrelenting standards (2.75)
							Impaired autonomy (2.00)	Disconnection (1.78)
							Disconnection (1.94)	Impaired autonomy (1.70)
							Impaired limits (4.29)	Impaired limits (4.00)

							Other-directedness (3.60)	Unrelenting standards (3.92)
Grizzly bear	Bachelor / 38	Bachelor / 32	5000	5	1	2.17	Disconnection (3.33)	Disconnection (3.81)
							Unrelenting standards (2.83)	Impaired autonomy (3.27)
							Impaired autonomy (2.57)	Other-directedness (3.13)
							Other-directedness (5.30)	Impaired limits (3.57)
							Impaired autonomy (3.25)	Unrelenting standards (3.25)
Soil	High school / 30	Bachelor / 30	4400	4	-	2.11	Impaired limits (3.14)	Other-directedness (2.93)
							Unrelenting standards (3.02)	Disconnection (1.86)
							Disconnection (2.38)	Impaired autonomy (1.76)

4. DISCUSSION

When the general distribution of the schema domains in married couples was examined, it was seen that the highly owned domains were impaired limits, other-directedness, and unrelenting standards and that none of the schema domains and marital adjustment differed to gender. Impaired limits, other-directedness and unrelenting standards schema domains can be examined as the domains triggered by the marital relationship in Turkish culture. In the study conducted by Özabacı, Körük, and Kara (2019) on 110 individuals, 20 individuals out of 48 married individuals defined marriage as a metaphor category under the theme of togetherness/solidarity (productivity, realism, effort-labor-struggle, reciprocity-expectation, and togetherness-solidarity) while 17 individuals defined marriage as a metaphor category under the theme of anxiety (frustration-deprivation, uncertainty-ambiguity, and risk). The togetherness/solidarity theme can be associated with the unrelenting standards schema domain, while the anxiety theme can be associated with impaired limits and other-directedness schema domains. In another study conducted by Özabacı, Körük, and Kara (2018) in which the meaning attributed to marriage was investigated, two different categories were reached; positive meanings (devotion, intimacy, complementarity, struggle and cooperation) and negative meanings (frustration, risk and compliance expectancy) attributed to marriage. Complementarity, effort and cooperation in particular can be associated with the unrelenting standards schema domain, impaired limits can be seen as a compensation for frustration, and the other-directedness as a surrender or avoidance of compliance expectancy. It can be interpreted that cognitive patterns and collective cultural transmissions about marriage affect marital relations and trigger maladaptive schemas, which are internal working models of individuals and shaped in early life.

When the findings of research question two and three were examined as a whole, it was seen that disconnection, impaired autonomy, and other-directedness schema domains were significantly negatively correlated with marital adjustment for males while only disconnection and impaired autonomy were significantly negatively correlated with marital adjustment for females and spouses who had these schemas at a high level had lower marital adjustment scores. When the literature is examined, in the study conducted by Yiğit and Çelik (2016) on 434 married and single individuals who have romantic relationship, it was determined that the disconnection schema domain significantly predicted relationship satisfaction negatively in both married individuals and single individuals with romantic relationships. In a study conducted by Altun (2015) on 158 married individuals, it was found that maladaptive schemas of emotional deprivation, social isolation, self-sacrifice and punitiveness negatively predicted marital satisfaction. While the emotional deprivation and social isolation maladaptive schemas are in the disconnection schema domain, self-sacrifice and punitiveness schemas form the other-directedness schema domain. In the study conducted by Tunçel (2019) on 140 married individuals, negative correlations were observed between emotional deprivation,

enmeshment/dependency, abandonment and defectiveness and marital adjustment. The enmeshment/dependency schema is classified under impaired autonomy and performance schema domain. The disconnection schema domain is related to the ability to give and receive emotions in interpersonal relationships, and the impaired autonomy schema domain is related to the ability to achieve something and the individual's sense to feel sufficient. The domain of other-directedness is related to the individual's giving more importance to the needs of others than their own needs in expense to have acceptance, care, and emotional support (Young et al., 2003). Considered in this context, it can be argued that married individuals who have these schema domains intensely experience emotional problems in their marital relations, feel inadequate towards their partners and attach more importance to the needs of their partners than their own. This situation negatively affects marital adjustment.

When the dyadic schema domain distribution of ten couples, whose dyadic marital adjustment mean scores are calculated at a high level, are examined, it was determined that there are matches as unrelenting standards-unrelenting standards, and other-directedness (H)-impaired limits (W) or impaired limits (H)-other-directedness (W).

The schema domain of unrelenting standards indicates the internalized high standards and the need to perform excessively accordingly. There are internal pressures and criticisms of the individual (Simeone-DiFrancesco et al., 2017). A relationship in which both partners are guided by this domain can be seen as a relationship that proceeds towards external rational goals, where the dynamics of the couple are shaped in terms of instrumental earnings, social status and success, and that these external returns increase the adjustment by satisfying couples.

The other-directedness schema domain is used to define the regressive position in the relationship. Individuals having intense other-directedness schema domain focus on meeting the needs of others rather than their own, in order to establish attachment relationships with others (Cecero et al., 2004). In contrast, the impaired-limits schema domain can be used to describe the overly progressive style in the relationship. Individuals with high in this domain have low tolerance to frustration. They tend to push interpersonal boundaries and have trouble respecting the rights of others (Young et al., 2003). According to the Complementary Needs Theory (Winch, 1967), which deals with dyadic complementarity in romantic relationships from a psychodynamic perspective, four different complementary styles are mentioned in the spouse relationship. These are; dominant husband-submissive wife, dominant wife-submissive husband, nurturing husband-receptive wife and nurturing wife-receptive husband. According to this theory, the internal relational needs are shaped based on the early life experiences with attachment objects, and meeting these needs during in a couple relationship in a dyadic way strengthens the couple relationship in adulthood. Wagner (1975) stated that successful marriages can only be possible through dyadic fulfillment of each other's internal needs, and has examined some complementary styles accordingly. These styles are; care-taking/care-giving, seeking-admire/giving-admire, accusing/surrendering, and social-establishing-relationships/avoiding social interactions.

When the dyadic schema domain distribution of the twelve couples whose dyadic marital adjustment score mean were calculated at a low level are examined, the most prevalent schema domains were found other-directedness and disconnection for husbands and impaired-limits and unrelenting standards for wives. These prominent schema domains define the relationship profiles, in which the husband is more self-sacrificing, feels emotional insecurity towards his wife, and the woman takes a more active, controlling and guiding position. Other-directedness schema domain involves over-focusing on the wishes, feelings and reactions of others at the expense of their own needs in order to receive love and approval, to maintain a sense of attachment (Young et al., 2003). It can be explained by the gender roles why these marital relationships, in which men are more regressive and women are more progressive, result in low marital adjustment. When the gender roles developed by Bem (1974) are examined, it is stated that the masculine social gender role includes aggression, independence, leadership, success, ambitiousness, high self-esteem and dominance. The feminine gender role includes being compassionate, sensitive and emotional. In the study conducted by Ünüvar and Tagay (2000) on 241 married Turkish women, it was determined that the feminine role and life satisfaction positively predicted marital adjustment and explained the 38% variance of marital adjustment. According to the Attribution Theory described by Bradbury and Fincham (1990), spouses use two different attribution styles in their interactions and solving problems. While causality attributions are attributions to explain and discover why a problem has occurred, responsibility/accusation attributions are attributions to responsibility, accusation and accountability. When this situation is analyzed according to gender, it is stated that the marital satisfaction of women who make responsibility/accusation attributions against their husband in their marriage decreases (Bradbury, Beach, Fincham & Nelson, 1996).

In conclusion, the most important result that stands out is that although maladaptive schema domains have negative effects on marital adjustment in individual context, some complementary dyadic schema domain interactions between spouses may have positive effects on marital adjustment.

One of the limitations of this study is seen as the number of couples in the group with high and low marital adjustment. Another limitation is that only maladaptive schema domains were measured in this study, schema coping styles and schema modes were not measured. In similar studies to be conducted, it is recommended to include more married couples and measure schema coping styles and schema modes in addition to schema domains. The study group of this study consists of heterosexual married couples. In future studies that will investigate schema chemistry, it is recommended to include non-heterosexual couples in the study group.

REFERENCES

Altun, G. (2015). *The relationship of marital satisfaction with attachment styles and early maladaptive schemas in married individuals* (Unpublished master's thesis). Üsküdar University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey.

Bayrami, M., Bakhshipor, A., & Esmaeili, A. (2012). The relationship between coping styles and early maladaptive schemas in disconnection-rejection and over vigilance-inhibition in young's schema model. *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine, 2*(4), 178-81.

Beck, A. T. (1963). Thinking and depression: I. Idiosyncratic content and cognitive distortions. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 9*(4), 324-333. Doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1963.01720160014002

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment, vol. 1 of Attachment and loss*. London: Hogarth Press.

Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 3-33.

Bradbury, T. N., Beach, S. R., Fincham, F. D., & Nelson, G. M. (1996). Attributions and behavior in functional and dysfunctional marriages. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*(3), 569-576. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.64.3.569

Calvete, E., Orue, I., & Hankin, B. L. (2015). A longitudinal test of the vulnerability-stress model with early maladaptive schemas for depressive and social anxiety symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 37*(1), 85-99.

Cecero, J. J., Nelson, J. D., & Gillie, J. M. (2004). Tools and tenets of schema therapy: toward the construct validity of the early maladaptive schema questionnaire–research version (EMSQ-R). *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy: An International Journal of Theory & Practice, 11*(5), 344-357. doi: 10.1002/cpp.401

Dumitrescu, D., & Rusu, A. S. (2012). Relationship between early maladaptive schemas, couple satisfaction and individual mate value: An evolutionary psychological approach. *Journal of Evidence-Based Psychotherapies*, 12(1), 63-76.

Güner, K., Z. (2014). *Early maladaptive schemas, cognitive processes in relationships, attributions, marital coping efforts relation with marital adjustment* (Unpublished master's thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey.

Knox, D., & Schacht, C. (2008). *Choices in relationships: An introduction to marriage and the family*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Körük, S. (2020). *The analysis of dyadic marital adjustment within the context of early maladaptive Sschemas and family functions: A study of structural modelling* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir, Turkey.

Manzary, L., Makvandi, B., & Khajevand Khoshli, A. (2014). Comparison between maladaptive schemas, marital conflicts and sexual satisfaction in nearly-divorced, divorced and normal Individuals. *Journal of Psychology & Behavioral Studies, 2*(1), 39-49.

Mohammadi, B., & Soleymani, A. (2017). Early maladaptive schemas and marital satisfaction as predictors of marital commitment. *International Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 11*(1), 16-22.

Nia, K. M., Ghiasi, M., ShirinIzadi, & Forooshani, S.R. G. (2015). Study early maladaptive schemas as predictors of marital dissatisfaction in India and Iran-role of conditional schemas as a mediator and moderator. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 5*(11), 590-597.

Özabacı, N., & Körük, S. (2018, October). *An investigation of the relationships between early maladaptive schemas and marital adjustment: A meta-analysis*. Paper presented at 20th International Congress of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Samsun, Turkey.

Özabacı, N., Körük, S., & Kara, A. (2018). The development of the Scale of Meaning of Marriage (SMM): A study of validity and reliability. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 8*(50), 235-259.

Özabacı, N., Körük, S., & Kara, A. (2019). A metaphoric examination of the meaning of marriage. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 48*(1), 693-736.

Rafaeli, E., Bernstein, D. P., & Young, J. E. (2011). *Schema therapy: Distinctive features*. New York: Routledge.

Roediger, E., Behary, W.T., & Zarbock, G. (2016). *Demek ki oluyormuş* (N. Azizlerli, Trans.). İstanbul: Psikonet.

Simeone-DiFrancesco, C., Roediger, E., & Stevens, A. B. (2017). *Çiftlerle şema terapi klinisyenin ilişkileri iyileştirme rehberi*. (I. G. Danışman, Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.

Soygüt, G., Karaosmanoğlu, A., & Çakır, Z. (2009). Assessment of early maladaptive Schemas: A Psychometric study of the Turkish Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry, 20*(1), 75-84.

Soysal, E. (2017). *Predictive role of early maladaptive schemas, cognitive distortions in relationships and attributions of married individuals on marital adjustment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Necmettin Erbakan University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Konya, Turkey.

Tunçel, T. (2019). *The relationship among early maladaptive schemas, schema-related coping behavior, perceived parental attitudes, and marital adjustment: An examination through the schema therapy model* (Unpublished master's thesis). Üsküdar University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey.

Ünüvar, P., & Tagay, Ö. (2015). Employed married women: Gender roles, life satisfaction, job satisfaction and marital adjustment. *Woman 2000, 16*(2), 21-44.

Wagner, R. V. (1975). Complementary needs, role expectations, interpersonal attraction, and the stability of working relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(1), 116-124.

Winch, R. F. (1955). The theory of complementary needs in mate-selection: Final results on the test of the general hypothesis. *American Sociological Review, 20*(5), 552-555.

Winch, R. F. (1967). Another look at the theory of complementary needs in mate-selection. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29*(4), 756-762.

Yıldız, Z. Ö. (2018). *Antecedants and consequences of marital satisfaction: Depression, anxiety and early maladaptive schemas* (Unpublished master's thesis). Işık University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey.

Yiğit, İ., & Çelik, C. (2016). Assessment of relationship satisfaction in terms of early maladaptive schemas, interpersonal styles, and self-perception. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, *19*(38), 77-87.

Young, J., & Gluhoski, V. (1997). A schema-focused perspective on satisfaction in close relationships. In R. J. Sternberg, M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.

Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy*. New York: Guilford Press.

Young, J. E., & Lindemann, M. D. (1992). An integrative schema-focused model for personality disorders. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy, 6*(1), 11-23.