

The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire: A Study of Reliability and Validity

Dr. Ayda BÜYÜKŞAHİN

SUMMARY: The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire: A Study of Reliability and Validity

Purpose: The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ) was developed to measure psychological tendencies associated with intimate relationships by Snell Schicke and Arbeiter (2002). The purpose of the present study was to investigate the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire.

Method: 480 university students from various faculties, with a history of involvement in an intimate relationship at present or in past (308 female, 172 male) participated in the study. The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was used for the criterion validity.

Results: In order to determine the construct validity of MRQ, factor analysis was conducted using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. The factor analysis resulted in eight factors; focus on relationship extremely, relational satisfaction, fear of relationship/relational anxiety, relational monitoring, relational esteem, external relational control, relational assertiveness, and internal relational control. The correlation coefficients of the MRQ with RAS were between -.41 and .69. The Cronbach's alpha for the MRQ was .81. The computed test-retest reliability coefficient was .80. MRQ subscales were found to show significant difference, with respect to sex of the participant, only in the subscale of "external relational control".

Conclusion: Analysis demonstrated that MRQ had a satisfactory level of reliability and validity in Turkish university students.

Key Words: The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ), reliability, validity

INTRODUCTION

In recent years adaptation, validity and reliability studies of many scales focused on relationships have been performed or new scales specific to Turkish socio-cultural living have been developed (Büyüksahin, 2004). Until now, adapted or newly developed scales generally aimed to measure a certain relational variant or one or more perspectives of close relationships. As far as we know, there is not any scale in Turkish which evaluates close relationships in a multidimensional and multivariable manner. In order to fulfill this absence, I aimed to adapt Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire which was developed by Snell, Schicke and Arbeiter (2002) to Turkish culture.

In development process of this scale Snell and colleagues first determined various psychological variants related with close relationships (2002). These were; relational esteem: positive evaluation tendency of own skills and capacity in close relationships; relational preoccupation: obsession to close relationships and continuously thinking about them; internal relational control: belief that close relationships are derived from own behavior and self control; relational consciousness: perception capacity of negative and positive aspects of close relationships; relational motivation: wish for close relationships; relational anxiety: worrying about sentimental relationships with opposite gender; relational assertiveness: initiative towards close relationships; relational depression: discourage, unhappiness and disappointment about close relationships; external relational control: belief that close relationships are out of control, by chan-

ce or fate; relational monitoring: consider external evaluation as important; fear of relationship: fear from building up a close relationship with someone else; relational satisfaction: satisfaction and being happy of close relationship.

Based upon these variables which were thought to be effective on close relationships, Snell and colleagues developed Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (2002). This is a five stage Likert type scale which includes 60 questions. At one end there is the term "absolutely not convenient for me" which receives one point and at the other end there is the term "just convenient for me" which receives five points. Subscales of the original form are named as "relational esteem", "relational preoccupation", "internal relational control", "relational consciousness", "relational anxiety", "relational assertiveness", "relational depression", "external relational control", "relational monitoring", "fear of relationship", "relational satisfaction" and "relational motivation". Participants answer the questions according to considering their latest or current partner. Twelve separate points are learned from the scale and the points increase parallel with related entity.

Validity and reliability study of the original scale was performed with 386 university students. Validity of the scale was evaluated by comparison of MRQ subscales with total points of Relationship Satisfaction Scale (RSS) which has been developed by Hendrick (1988). These values were found to change between -.66 and .71. Moreover, the relationship between MRQ subscales and scales of Clark, Milberg, Oulette and Powell (1987) which were on the basis of social exchange was taken into consideration and these values were found to differ from -.17 to .30. These values were significant and as expected.

In order to determine the reliability level of original scale, coefficients of internal consistency and test-retest reliability were calculated. Internal consistency coefficient of the scale (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated separately for each subscale and found to change between .70 and .92. Test-retest reliability coefficient was calculated as .72. These correlation coefficients were significant at the level of .05. The study of Snell and colleagues revealed that MRQ had significant validity and reliability coefficients (2002).

Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire evaluates close relationships from the point of multidimensional and different variables. The relation between these variables and others like reaction against stressful events (Snell, Sebby and Wenta, 2002), connection styles (Mikulincer, Florian, Cowan P, Cowan C, 2002), close relationship experiences of premature and term births in adulthood (McNamara, 2002) and family characteristics (Kikuchi and Snell, 2002) were evaluated in different studies. In a study which evaluated the relation between family characteristics and control tendencies in close relationships of university students, the ones who had the belief that close relationships were out of control and by chance or fate (external relational control) were found to perceive their families less friendly and sentimental (Kikuchi and Snell, 2002). Moreover, this study revealed that external control in close relationships was related with presence of in-family arguments and success focused family members. There was not any relation between internal control in close relationships and family characteristics like devotion, emotion, argument or independence. In his study which he evaluated close relationship experiences of premature and term births in adulthood by using Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire, McNamara showed that premature births were related with being more anxious and ashamed (2002). But, studies using Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire were limited.

In adaptation studies of Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire to Turkish culture, the scale was translated to Turkish by one social psychologist and one expert of linguistics together at the first stage. Later shared and uncommon parts of these translations were combined together. Then original form and translations were given to five judges and necessary adjustments were made according to their recommendations. So, Turkish version of the scale was on hand.

METHOD

Sampling

Sampling population of the study was made up of 480 university students from various faculties who had current or previous close relationships. Of the participants, 308 (64%) were females and 172 (36%) were males. Mean age was 21.48 (S=1.85) for females and 22.59 (S= 2.24) for males. Two hundreds and fifty participants (52%) reported

TABLE 1. Factorial Structure of Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire and the Correlation Between Each Item and Total Points** (r).

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	r
I am confident of myself as a partner in close relationships					.66				.72
I continuously think about close relationships	.65								.65
I excessively think about close relationships	.63								.69
I want/am motivated to be in a close relationship very much	.71								.67
Close relationships make me feel angry and anxious			.65						.62
I feel depressive about close relationships			.49						.52
Generally my close relationships develop by chance						.71			.74
I am excessively interested in thoughts of others about my relationships				.81					.83
I am afraid a bit of being in a close relationship			.69						.70
I am satisfied about the way my needs are met in my current relationship		.73							.72
I consider myself as a good partner in close relationships					.71				.76
I think about close relationships more than anything else	.68								.72
Generally my behaviors are characteristic in my close relationships								.57	.69
Generally I spend sometimes to think about my close relationships	.57								.65
I am very willing/motivated to spend time and effort for a close relationship	.59								.67
I am a bit awkward and anxious in close relationships			.54						.66
I directly express my choices in close relationships							.69		.80
*I feel myself unhappy about close relationships		.66							.74
I give importance to presentation/appearance of my close relationships				.82					.87
I am sometimes afraid of close relationships			.64						.71
I am very happy/satisfied about my close relationships		.73							.78
I am better than many people in close relationships					.62				.77
My mind is busy with close relationships	.54								.63
Generally relationship control is in my hands								.71	.79

that they had a current close relationship and 230 (48%) of them reported that they had such an experience in the near past. Mean numbers of close relationships were 2.08 (S=1.29) for females and 2.99 (S=2.32) for males. Mean durations of close

relationships were 18.12 months (S=21.40) for females and 18.16 months (S=22.77) for males.

Data Handling Instruments

In this study Relationship Assessment Scale

TABLE 1 in Devami.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	r
I want to be in a close relationship very much	.68								.61
I feel anxious about being in a close relationship with opposite gender			.64						.72
*I am a bit passive to express my wishes in close relationships							.57		.76
* I feel discouraged in close relationships		.56							.73
Chance plays an important role in my close relationships						.81			.85
I am generally worried about the impression of my relationship on other people				.73					.83
Sometimes I am afraid to be in a close relationship with someone			.58						.72
My basic needs are met in my close relationship		.75							.77
I consider myself as a preferred partner for close relationships					.63				.78
I continuously think about being in a close relationship	.66								.66
My performance has basic influence on close relationships								.64	.73
To be in a close relationship is very important for me	.73								.72
I am more anxious than many people in close relationships			.55						.64
I do not hesitate to express my wishes in close relationships							.68		.82
*I feel myself disappointed about close relationships		.69							.78
I believe the role of chance (negative/positive) in close relationships						.83			.88
Generally I am sensitive to reactions of other people about my close relationships				.83					.87
I am not much afraid of being in a close relationship			.45						.59
My close relationships are better than many others		.57							.65
I trust myself in close relationships					.57				.77
I spend many times to think about close relationships	.68								.72

was used besides Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire for data handling purposes. Moreover, duration and number of relationships was asked to participants besides demographical characteristics like age or gender.

Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS): RAS was developed by Hendrick in order to evaluate satisfaction level in romantic relationships (1988). It is Likert type scale consisting 7 stages of seven items. Turkish adaptation was realized by Curun with 140 university students who had romantic relationships (2001). Factor analysis revealed that

the scale gathered under one single factor. Internal consistency coefficient was .86. Two items of the scale were given inverse points, i.e. higher points showed higher levels of satisfaction.

Procedure

Scales were given volunteer participants in their classes and personal information was not asked. The participants were informed about the objectives of the study and answering instructions before the procedure. The procedure was completed in approximately 30-35 minutes.

TABLE 1 in Devami.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	r
My close relationships are under my control and responsibility								.67	.76
I want much to be in and carry on a close relationship	.58								.62
I feel myself ashamed and hesitated in close relationships			.50						.69
I generally express my wishes about close relationships							.72		.82
* I feel upset when I think of close relationships		.67							.74
I think that a close relationship is a matter of fate/chance						.64			.75
Reactions of other people to my relationship are important for me				.84					.88
Close relations part of my life is very satisfactory		.66							.74
Announced variance	10.70	9.47	9.23	7.35	5.67	5.18	5.13	4.93	
Own value	5.67	5.02	4.89	3.90	3.00	2.75	2.72	2.61	

*reverse coding is required

** All r values are significant at 0.05 level

FINDINGS

Findings Related with Validity

In original study the structure of factors was not taken into consideration, but in our study factor analysis via principal components and varimax axis rotation methods was performed in order to examine structural validity of the scale. As a result of the analysis, 13 factors which had self values over one were determined. Second analysis with varimax axis rotation method revealed eight factorial structure of the scale. Factorial loads of the items and the correlation between items and total points are presented in Table-1.

The first factor was responsible from 10.70% of the variance. The same rate was 9.47% for the second, 9.23% for the third, 7.35% for the fourth, 5.67% for the fifth, 5.18% for the sixth, 5.13% for the seventh and 4.93% for the eighth factor. All factors together explained 57.67% of the variance. In this study factors were named as follows; 1st, "focusing on relationship extremely", 2nd, "relational satisfaction", 3rd, "fear of relationship/relational anxiety", 4th, "relational monitoring", 5th, "relational esteem", 6th, "external relational control", 7th, "relational assertiveness", and 8th, "internal relational control".

Factor analysis revealed that 7 items might not be considered under any of the factors. Moreover, test correlation values of these items were lower

as well. So, these items were excluded from the scale. Consequently, the scale included 12 items in focusing on relationship extremely, 9 items in relational satisfaction, 10 items in fear of relationship/relational anxiety, 5 items in relational monitoring, 5 items in relational esteem, 4 items in external relational control, 4 items in relational assertiveness, and 4 items in internal relational control (totally 53 items). Five items of the scale required reverse coding (see Table 1).

Correlation coefficients between these factors are presented in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, focusing on relationship extremely subscale was positively correlated with relational monitoring, fear of relationship/relational anxiety, relational esteem and internal relational control subscales. Conversely, relational satisfaction subscale was negatively correlated with relational monitoring, fear of relationship/relational anxiety and external relational control subscales as expected. Moreover, there was a positive correlation between relational satisfaction, relational esteem, relationship assertiveness and internal relationship control subscales. As expected, fear of relationship/relational anxiety subscale was negatively correlated with relational esteem, relational assertiveness and internal relationship subscales and positively correlated with relational monitoring and internal relational control subscales. Relational monitoring subscale was positively

TABLE 2. Correlation Coefficients Between MRQ Subscales (N=480).

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Focusing on Relationship Extremely (1)	--	.08	.10*	.24*	.31*	.15*	.04	.13*
2. Relational Satisfaction (2)		--	-.56*	-.30*	.46*	-.33*	.42*	.25*
3. Fear of Relationship/Relational Anxiety (3)			--	.41*	-.39*	.42*	-.52*	-.15*
4. Relational Monitoring (4)				--	-.18*	.31*	-.31*	.02
5. Relational Esteem (5)					--	-.09*	.48*	.42*
6. External Relational Control (6)						--	-.24*	.08
7. Relational Assertiveness (7)							--	.34*
8. Internal Relational Control (8)								--

*Significant at $p < .05$ level

correlated with external relational control subscale and negatively correlated with relational esteem and relational assertiveness subscales. There was a positive correlation between relational esteem, relational assertiveness and internal relational control subscales, but the correlation between relational esteem and external relational control subscales was negative. Finally, external relational control and relationship assertiveness subscales were negatively, relational assertiveness and internal relational control subscales were positively correlated.

In order to determine validity of the scale, Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) which was developed by Hendrick (1988) and adapted to Turkish by Curun (2001) was used. Correlations between subscales of RAS and MRQ are presented in Table 3.

As seen in Table 3, total points of relational satisfaction were positively correlated with relational satisfaction, relational esteem, internal relation control and relationship assertiveness subscales in both males and females. As expected, there was negative correlation between total points of relational satisfaction and fear of relationship/relational anxiety, relational monitoring, external relational control subscales. Different from males, points of relational satisfaction were positively correlated with focusing on relationship extremely in females. When developing original questionnaire, Snell and colleagues used Relationship Assessment Scale to evaluate test validity (2002) and their results were consistent with my.

Findings Related with Reliability

In order to determine reliability level of the scale Cronbach alpha in consistency coefficient,

reliability of two halves and test-retest reliability coefficients were calculated. The scale was administered to 117 participants twice with an interval of 15 days for test-retest reliability. As a result, test-retest reliability coefficient was found as .80. In consistency (Cronbach's alpha) coefficient was .81 for 480 university students. Reliability of two halves of the scale was .83. In consistency coefficient, reliability of two halves and test-retest reliability coefficients of each subscale are shown in Table 4.

As seen in Table 4, Cronbach's alpha in consistency coefficients varied between .73-.91, reliability of two halves coefficients varied between .72-.90 and test-retest reliability coefficients varied between .63-.86 in MRQ subscales.

Comparison of MRQ Subscales According to Gender

In order to determine whether or not there was a difference between males and females in points of MRQ subscales, t-test analysis was performed. Mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis results of males and females in points of MRQ subscales are presented in Table 5.

As seen in Table 5, females differed from males in only "external control in relationship" subscale (mean for females=11.60, mean for males=10.49, $t=2.89$, $p < 0.05$). The meaning of this difference was females more prominently believed the role of fate and chance in their relationships. There was not any difference between two genders in other MRQ subscales.

DISCUSSION

In this study, it was concluded that Multidimen-

TABLE 3. Correlation Coefficients Between MRQ Subscales and Total Points of RAS

Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire Subscales	Relational Satisfaction		
	Females (n=308)	Males (n=172)	All participants (N=480)
1. Focusing on Relationship Extremely	.14*	.08	.12*
2. Relational Satisfaction	.69*	.63*	.67*
3. Fear of Relationship/Relational Anxiety	-.41*	-.35*	-.39*
4. Relational Monitoring	-.17*	-.26*	-.20*
5. Relational Esteem	.34*	.36*	.35*
6. External Relational Control	-.17*	-.19*	-.17*
7. Relational Assertiveness	.29*	.20*	.26*
8. Internal Relational Control	.15*	.16*	.15*

*Significant at $p < .05$ level

sional Relationship Questionnaire was valid and reliable enough to measure variable psychological trends of university students about close relationships.

Reliability findings of Turkish version of MRQ were taken by calculation of Cronbach's alpha in consistency coefficient, reliability of two halves and test-retest reliability coefficients. Cronbach's alpha in consistency coefficients varied between .73-.91, reliability of two halves coefficients varied between .72-.90 and test-retest reliability coefficients varied between .63-.86 in MRQ subscales. In original form, in consistency (between .70-.92) and test-retest reliability coefficients (.72) were consistent with my findings.

In order to determine structural validity of MRQ, factor analysis via varimax axis rotation method was used. As a result of the analysis, items were found to gather under eight factors and this finding was different from original study. In original study "relational anxiety" and "fear of relationship" were evaluated as separate subscales, but

they were combined in my study under "fear of relationship/relational anxiety" factor. Two subscales of original scale, "relational depression" and "relational satisfaction", were combined under a single factor in my study. But reverse coding for items of relationship depression was required. This factor was called as "relational satisfaction". Increase in points of this subscale meant that satisfaction from relationship increased. In Turkish culture, relational depression was expressed as dissatisfaction from relationship and the reason for aforementioned difference might be due to this perception. Moreover, "relational preoccupation", relational awareness" and "relational motivation" subscales which were taken into consideration separately in original study were combined under same factor in my study. Following evaluation of verbal structures of relational motivation (e.g., I wish to be in a close relationship very much), relational consciousness (e.g., I think about my close relationships very much) and relational preoccupation (e.g., I continuously think about being in a close relationship), they were considered to be

TABLE 4. Reliability Coefficients of Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire Subscales

	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability of two halves	Test-retest reliability
1. Focusing on Relationship Extremely	.88	.86	.83
2. Relational Satisfaction	.89	.90	.86
3. Fear of Relationship/Relational Anxiety	.85	.83	.85
4. Relational Monitoring	.91	.90	.81
5. Relational Esteem	.81	.79	.85
6. External Relational Control	.82	.79	.74
7. Relational Assertiveness	.81	.81	.79
8. Internal Relational Control	.73	.72	.63

TABLE 5. Mean, Standard Deviation and t values of MRQ Subscales

	Females (N= 308)		Males (N= 172)		T
	X	S	X	S	
1. Focusing on Relationship Extremely	38.96	8.56	38.66	8.81	.36
2. Relational Satisfaction	31.77	8.23	32.53	7.12	-.101
3. Fear of Relationship/Relational Anxiety	22.41	7.17	21.88	7.21	.77
4. Relational Monitoring	11.74	4.78	12.02	5.08	-.61
5. Relational Esteem	19.04	3.48	18.95	3.45	.27
6. External Relational Control	11.60	4.05	10.49	3.93	2.89*
7. Relational Assertiveness	15.16	3.56	15.12	3.06	.14
8. Internal Relational Control	13.43	2.73	13.75	2.79	-1.21

* Significant at $p < .05$ level

combined under “focusing on relationship extremely” subscale. The presence of high grade correlation between these items supported the idea of combining them under one single factor. As a result, it may be concluded that concepts like fear of relationship and relational anxiety; relational consciousness, relational motivation and relational preoccupation did not differ from each other in Turkish culture. Additionally, it was shown as a result of factor analysis that “relational monitoring”, “relational esteem”, “external relational control”, “relational assertiveness” and “internal relational control” were separate factors and this finding was consistent with the original study. With another saying, the items gathered under same factors in both study.

Snell and colleagues evaluated the correlation between subscales of MRQ and RAS in order to determine the validity of the scale in their original study and found that it varied between .66-.71. In my study the correlation between MRQ and RAS was also evaluated and it was found to vary between -.41 and .69. When the correlation between subscales of MRQ and RAS was examined, it was shown that relational satisfaction increased in parallel with the increase in relational esteem, relationship assertiveness and internal relational control. Some previous studies from our country revealed that there was a positive relation between relational esteem and internal relational control (Büyükşahin, 2001; Karakurt, 2001; Sümer and Güngör, 1999). Moreover, in this study it was shown that relational satisfaction decreased by the increase of fear of relationship/relational anxiety, relational monitoring and external relational control. Observing expected relations similar with the

findings of Snell and colleagues was interpreted as an indicator of the validity of the scale. But in this study it was found that focusing on relationship extremely subscale was significantly in positive relation with relational satisfaction and this finding was not present in original study of Snell and colleagues. This finding was consistent with some previous studies from our country (Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu, 2004; Büyükşahin, Hasta and Hovardaoğlu, 2004; Demirtaş, 2004) and may be explained with overload of relational variants in our country like jealousy, relational preoccupation and excessive thoughts about relationship.

When subscales of MRQ were compared for gender variance, there was a difference between genders in only external relational control item. Females felt external control in their relationships more prominently. This difference revealed that females believed the effect of external factors like fate or chance more prominently than males.

As a result, it may be concluded that Turkish version of MRQ was valid and reliable to measure close relationships of university students for different variants. Moreover, by using this scale nature and problems of the relationship and causes of conflict may be better understood. Consequently couples may steer their relationships, increase the level of awareness, better understand themselves and relationships and increase the quality of the relationship.

REFERENCES

- Büyükşahin, A., Hovardaoğlu, S (2004) Çiftlerin aşka ilişkin tutumlarının Lee'nin çok boyutlu aşk biçimleri kapsamında incelenmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 19(54): 59-72.
- Büyükşahin, A (2004) Türkiye'de uyarlama çalışmaları yapılmış ya da Türk kültüründe geliştirilmiş ikili ilişkiler kapsamındaki ölçeklerin kısa tanıtımı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 19 (53), 129-143.
- Büyükşahin, A., Hasta, D., Hovardaoğlu, S. (2004) İlişki İstikrarı Ölçeği (İİÖ): Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Unpublished study report.
- Büyükşahin, A. (2001). Yakın ilişki kuran ve kurmayan üniversite öğrencilerinin çeşitli sosyal psikolojik etkenler yönünden karşılaştırılması. Ankara: A.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Unpublished Master Thesis.
- Clark, M.S., Milberg,S., Ouelett,R., Powell,M.C.(1987). Recipient's mood relationship type, and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 94-103.
- Curun, F. (2001). The effects of sexism and sex role orientation on relationship satisfaction. Unpublished Master Thesis, M.E.T.U. Ankara
- Demirtaş, 2004. Yakın ilişkilerde kıskançlık (bireysel, ilişkisel ve durumsal değişkenler). Ankara: A.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Unpublished bachelor Thesis.
- Hendrick, S.S., (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50, 93-98.
- Karakurt, G. (2001). The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy, Unpublished Master Thesis, METU. Ankara.
- Kikuchi, M., Snell, Jr .(2002). Chapter 6: Family environment variables and locus of control in intimate relationships. . In W.E. Snell, Jr. (Ed). In W. E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *Student Research in psychology at Southeast State University*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications.
- McNamara, D. (2002). Preterm birth tied to later relationship problems- Fewer friends, more anxious and shy. *OB/GYN News*.
- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., Cowan P., Cowan. C (2002). Attachment security in couple relationships: A systemic model and its implications for family dynamics. *Family Process*, 41, 3, 405-434.
- Snell, W. E., Jr., Schicke, M., & Arbeiter, T. (2002). The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire: Psychological dispositions associated with intimate relations. In W. E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *New Directions in The Psychology of Intimate Relations: Research and Theory*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications.
- Snell, W.E., Sebbby, R.A., Wentta, T.R. (2002). Chapter 21: Stressful intimate experiences in close relationships. In W.E. Snell, Jr. (Ed). In W. E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *New Directions in The Psychology of Intimate Relations: Research and Theory*. Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications
- Sümer, N., Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örnekleme üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(43),71-109.