

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NARCISSISM, PERCEIVED
PARENTAL ATTITUDES, ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS AND
SEXUAL ATTITUDES

BURÇAK ÖZDEMİR
110627001

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
KLİNİK PSİKOLOJİ YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

YRD. DOÇ. DR. AYTEN ZARA
2014

The Relationship Between Narcissism, Perceived Parental Attitudes,
Romantic Relationships and Sexual Attitudes

Narsisizm, Algılanan Aile Tutumları, Romantik İlişkiler ve Cinsel
Tutumlar Arasındaki İlişkiler

Burçak Özdemir
110627001

Ayten Zara, Yrd. Doç. Dr.

Levent Küey, Doç. Dr.

Nilüfer Kafesçioğlu, Yrd. Doç. Dr.

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih :

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı:

A-Zara
Küey, Levent

Kafesçioğlu

01.09.2014

137

Anahtar Kelimeler
(Türkçe)

- 1)Narsisizm
- 2)Algılanan Aile Tutumları
- 3)Romantik İlişkiler
- 4)Aşk Tutumları
- 5)Cinsel Tutumlar

Anahtar Kelimeler
(İngilizce)

- 1)Narcissism
- 2)Perceived Parental Attitudes
- 3)Romantic Relationships
- 4)Love Attitudes
- 5)Sexual Attitudes

Abstract

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between narcissism, perceived parental attitudes and, romantic relationships and sexuality. The second aim was to determine whether the respondent demographics (gender, relational satisfaction) influenced narcissism, perceived parental attitudes and, romantic relationships and sexuality. In the present study, a sample which was consisted of 267 young adults between ages 19 to 38 was investigated. Results revealed that gender differentiated the groups on love attitudes and sexual attitudes. Moreover, relational satisfaction had significant associations with love attitudes, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes. A series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to examine the association between narcissism and, romantic relationships and sexuality after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes. Results revealed that narcissism moderately related with romantic relationships and sexuality. The findings, limitations of the study and implications for future research were discussed.

Özet

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, narsisizm, algılanan aile tutumları, romantik ilişkiler ve cinsellik arasındaki bağlantıların incelenmesidir. Çalışmanın ikinci bir amacı da, demografik bilgilerin (cinsiyet, ilişki doyumu gibi) narsisizm, algılanan aile tutumları, romantik ilişkiler ve cinsellik üzerinde bir etkisi olup olmadığını belirlemektir. Çalışmaya, yaşları 19 ve 38 arasında değişen, 267 genç yetişkin katılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda, cinsiyetler arasında, aşka ve cinselliğe ilişkin tutumlar açısından anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, ilişki doyumu ile aşka ve cinselliğe ilişkin tutumlar ve romantik ilişki özellikleri arasında anlamlı bağlantılar saptanmıştır. Algılanan aile tutumlarının olası etkileri kontrol edilirken, narsisizm, romantik ve cinsel ilişkiler arasındaki bağlantıları saptamak amacıyla, hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri uygulanmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, narsisizm ile romantik ilişkiler ve cinsellik arasında kısmi olarak anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Çalışmanın sonuçları, sınırlılıkları ve gelecekte yapılabilecekler, tartışılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisors Ayten Zara and Levent Küey for their insightful advices, feedbacks and emotional support. I am also grateful to my jury member, Nilüfer Kafesçioğlu for her helpful comments. Their academic guidance helped me to write this thesis in the best way that I can.

I would like to thank Ryan Macey Wise for his guidance in statistical analysis and emotional support even though he was not obligated to do.

I appreciate the support of TÜBİTAK by providing a generous scholarship during my master years.

I would like to express my gratitude to my family members for always believing me. They have always supported and helped me get through the difficult times. My friends Yeşim Selçuk and Melisa Çimen have supported me emotionally and created a breathing space in whole process, without their support, I would not have been able to complete this thesis.

I am indebted to Aybars Akakıncı for his helps both emotionally and academically. I am also thankful to Emre Bozkurt and Mete Köse to their special efforts during data collection process.

Last but not least, I am grateful to all faculty members of Istanbul Bilgi University Clinical Psychology MA Program over the years for helping me become a clinical psychologist.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Özet.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures.....	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Narcissism.....	2
1.1. Historical Review of Narcissism.....	2
1.2. Different Views about Healthy Narcissism, Narcissistic Defenses and Narcissistic Disorders	7
1.3. Clinical Patterns of Narcissistic Disturbances.....	10
1.4. Subtypes in Narcissistic Personality	13
1.5. Narcissism and Attachment.....	16
1.6. Narcissism and Romantic Relationships	18
2. Parental Attitudes.....	23
2.1. Parental Care/Warmth and Parental Overprotection	23
2.2. Previous Studies on Parental Attitudes and Psychopathology	24
2.3. Romantic Relationships and Parental Attitudes	25
3. Romantic Relationships	26
3.1. Conceptualization of Love.....	26
3.2. Theories of Love.....	29
3.3. Romantic Relationships and Attachment	31

4. Sexuality	33
4.1. Sexuality and Narcissism.....	33
4.2. Sexual Attitudes.....	35
4.3. Sexual Attitudes and Attachment	36
5. Objectives of The Current Study	38
METHOD	41
1. Participants	41
2. Measures	44
2.1. Demographic Information Form.....	44
2.2. Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI).....	45
2.3. Parental Bonding Inventory (PBI).....	46
2.4. Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) Short Form	47
2.5. The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ)	48
2.6. The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (BSAS).....	50
3. Procedure	51
4. Design	52
RESULTS	53
1. Descriptive Analyses of The Sample	53
2. Testing Group Differences	55
2.1. Narcissism.....	55
2.2. Perceived Parental Attitudes.....	55
2.3. Love Attitudes	56
2.4. Romantic Relationship Characteristics.....	56
2.5. Sexual Attitudes.....	57

3. Prediction of Love Attitudes, Romantic Relationship Characteristics and Sexual Attitudes: Narcissism and Perceived Parental Attitudes as Predictor Variables	57
3.1. Perceived Parental Attitudes.....	58
3.2. Love Attitudes	59
3.3. Romantic Relationship Characteristics.....	62
3.4. Sexual Attitudes.....	71
DISCUSSION	75
1. Narcissism, Perceived Parental Attitudes, Romantic/Sexual Relationships and Demographic Information.....	75
2. Narcissism and Love Styles.....	77
3. Narcissism and Romantic Relationship Characteristics	78
4. Narcissism and Sexual Attitudes	80
5. Limitations and Future Directions	81
6. Clinical Implications.....	84
References.....	85
APPENDICES	101
APPENDIX A.....	102
APPENDIX B.....	104
APPENDIX C.....	107
APPENDIX D.....	111
APPENDIX E	114
APPENDIX F	117
APPENDIX G.....	121

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants.....	42
Table 2. Family History and Traumatic Life Events	43
Table 3. Information about Romantic Relationship	44
Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Continuous Variables	54
Table 5. Pearson Correlations between NPI and PBI	58
Table 6. Pearson Correlations between NPI and LAS.....	59
Table 7. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Eros.....	60
Table 8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Pragma.....	61
Table 9. Pearson Correlations between NPI and MRQ	62
Table 10. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Anxiety	64
Table 11. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Esteem.....	65
Table 12. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Monitoring	67
Table 13. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Monitoring	68
Table 14. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Assertiveness	70
Table 15. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Focus.....	71

Table 16. Pearson Correlations between NPI and BSAS	72
Table 17. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Sexual Permissiveness	73
Table 18. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Sexual Communion	74

List of Figures

FIGURE 1. Lee's (1973) Conceptualization of Love.....	30
---	----

INTRODUCTION

Narcissism has become a main focus on psychoanalytic psychology. Theoreticians have emphasized different definitions of narcissism and used them in diverse ways. As a consequence, narcissism has remained a difficult concept to understand. In general, despite the difference between theorists, narcissism is commonly described as self-love. However, this description no longer explains narcissism entirely (Pulver, 1970).

A number of theorists have attempted to define and explain individuals with narcissistic disturbances. In general, narcissism is defined as arrogance, extreme self-centeredness, a great need to be loved and admired by others, grandiose fantasies as well as envy, lack of interest and empathy for others (Kernberg, 1970).

Individuals with narcissistic vulnerabilities may function very well in their social or work lives but they have significant problems in their romantic and sexual relationships. When reviewing the literature, it can be said that, empirical research on narcissists' romantic and sexual relationships are limited in Turkey. In the current study, the relationship between narcissism and intimate relationships will be investigated.

The aim of the present study is two-fold. The first aim is to understand and describe the relationship between narcissism and different aspects of romantic/sexual relationships. In addition to that, parental

attitudes have major effects on romantic/sexual relationships. The second aim is to analyze the associations between parental attitudes and romantic/sexual relationships. Therefore, associations between narcissism and romantic/sexual relationship are analyzed after controlling the possible effects of parental attitudes. In the first part of the thesis, a detailed literature review about narcissism, romantic and sexual relationships, and perceived parental attitudes will be presented. In the following section, the methodology and hypothesis of the study will be listed followed by the presentation of the results. Finally, discussion about the study will be presented.

1. Narcissism

1.1. Historical Review of Narcissism

The term “narcissism” has a long history in psychoanalytic literature. Name of the concept comes from a Greek myth. According to this myth, Narcissus was a quite handsome young man. All nymphs fell in love with him, but he did not requite their love. One nymph, named Echo, also fell in love with him, but he rejected her rudely. Because of her grief and shame, she faded away and perished. She left behind her responsive voice. Then gods decided to punish Narcissus with unrequited love in order to get Echo’s revenge. One day Narcissus saw his own reflection in a clear mountain pool and fell in love with it. He thought that he was looking at a beautiful water spirit. However, he could not get any response and he was

consumed by melancholia. He gradually pined away and one day he died (Cooper, 1986).

Psychoanalytic school has made a major theoretical and practical contribution to concept of narcissism (Gottschalk 1988). Firstly Havelock Ellis (1898; cited in Pulver, 1970) described a kind of sexual perversion with the Greek name Narcissus. To him, perverted individuals take themselves as sexual objects. Freud also regarded narcissism as a sexual perversion and he borrowed this term from Ellis. Sadger (1910; cited in Pulver, 1970) defined narcissism as a normal developmental stage and he stated that narcissism was an essential way for sexuality. Rank (1911; cited in Pulver, 1970) mentioned the defensive nature of self-love. If a woman thought that men were not capable of love and they could not comprehend the worth of her, she would then return her narcissistic state and love only herself. Ernest Jones (1913; cited in McWilliams, 1994/2010) was the first analyst who described the grandiose narcissistic patients in his article named "God Complex ". He evaluated narcissistic disorders on the line between psychotic and healthy mental state and described narcissistic patients with exhibitionism, omnipotence fantasies and judgmental attitudes.

Freud kept revising his theory of narcissism throughout his life. Freud (1910; cited in Quinodoz, 2006) regarded narcissism as a type of object choice made by homosexuals. He thought that people took their parents of the opposite sex as a model, when they were choosing their sexual partner. However, future inverts identify themselves with a woman (usually with mothers) and take themselves as their sexual partner. Then

Freud (1914) wrote an article in which narcissism is discussed and elaborated. In this article, he described narcissism as "the attitude of a person who treats his own body in the same way in which the body of a sexual object is ordinarily treated – who looks at it, that is to say, strokes it and fondles it till he obtains complete satisfaction through these activities" (Freud, 1914, p. 73). On the other hand, he regarded narcissism as an intermediate psychosexual developmental stage, between autoeroticism and object love stage. When he elaborated the developmental aspect of narcissism, he conceptualized the two types of narcissism; primary narcissism and secondary narcissism. Primary narcissism was defined as libidinal investment of self, whereas secondary narcissism was defined as libidinal reinvestment of self because of the withdrawal from external objects. Additionally, Freud mentioned the regressive nature of narcissism. Schizophrenic patients have two prominent characteristics; megalomania and diversion of interest from external world. They withdraw their libidinal investment from external world and direct to their own selves. Megalomania is also defined with fundamental characteristics such as omnipotence thoughts, belief in the magical power and over-estimation of power of wishes. In addition to them, he linked the narcissistic libido with self-regard (Freud, 1914).

Freud (1914) accepted the complexity of the term narcissism and described different ways of studying narcissism. For instance, a person who is suffering from an organic illness withdraws all his libidinal investment from external world or love-objects and directs it to his own self. In a

similar way, hypochondriacs withdraw their interests from the outer world and direct it to their organs that are giving them pain. Individual's romantic and erotic life also enables us to study narcissism.

Horney (1939; cited in Cooper, 1986) described narcissism as an unrealistic self-inflation. Narcissistic patient admires himself and expects admiration from others for qualities that he does not possess. This type of self-inflation is a consequence of child's alienation from others provoked by hostility and fears. Narcissistic patient's emotional ties to others are always fragile and he suffers from a loss of love capacity. He loses his real self in these circumstances and creates unreal self that leads to painful humiliations.

Kohut made useful practical and theoretical contributions on narcissism (Gottschalk, 1988). Narcissistic pathology can be regarded as an attempt to repair insufficient parental empathic and mirroring functions. The self development bases on the relationship between self and selfobjects. Selfobjects are internalized representations of significant others who are experienced as a part of the self. There are three types of selfobjects: mirroring selfobject is the object that responds and confirms the child's inner sense of grandiosity whereas idealized parent imago is the image, whom the child admires and merges as an object of omnipotence and calmness (Kohut and Wolf, 1978). Twin ship or alter ego selfobject is a type of relationship that enables to experience similarity with another person (Kohut, 1984; cited in Miller, 1992). Normal development of self requires the presence of empathic and responsive selfobjects as well as optimal

frustration. In this way, transmuting internalization process provides crystallization of self. Some parents are not at peace with their own narcissistic needs thus they are not capable of meeting the child's narcissistic needs. They cannot be emphatic and mirroring when they respond the child's grandiose and idealizing needs. These chronic and critical failures might result in injured self-development and narcissistic disturbances (Kohut and Wolf, 1978).

Miller (1979) has similar thoughts about narcissistic disturbances with Kohut. She argues that, every child has narcissistic needs that should be understood and respected by mother. If a child grows up with a mirroring and emphatic mother who allows her/him to be used as a function of the child's narcissistic development, the child can develop a healthy self-feeling. In this way, the child will experience his feelings and wishes as a part of himself and develop self-esteem. However, if the mother gratifies her narcissistic needs through her child, in other words if she invests her child narcissistically, the child cannot be herself/himself and develop a new self which meets the mother's needs.

According to Kernberg (1970), pathological fusion of ideal self, ideal object and actual self-images is a defense against of narcissistic patient's intolerable relationships such as abandonment. In order to avoid dependency on external objects, he identifies himself with his own ideal images. In this way, inflated self-concept is built up and he protects himself from dependence on others. Moreover, the unacceptable parts of the self-images are repressed or projected onto others. Cold, rejecting parental figure

with nonverbal and spiteful aggression is frequent feature of the family background of narcissistic patients. Cold and rejected mother usually uses her child for her narcissistic needs and makes him special with admirable features. These admirable features may arouse the others' envy. Other people's envy reinforces the patient's distrust of others, arrogance and feelings of being unloved.

1.2. Different Views about Healthy Narcissism, Narcissistic Defenses and Narcissistic Disorders

The concept of narcissism varies in a wide range, from healthy narcissism to narcissistic personality disorder. On the other hand, it is hard to determine the line between healthy and unhealthy narcissism (Gottschalk, 1988).

The narcissistic features can be an essential part of healthy development (McNeal, 2008). However, the important point here is that, the healthy narcissism should be distinguished from pathological narcissism. Freud (1914) explained the primary narcissism as a normal part of infant's development, which involves megalomaniac characteristics such as omnipotence thoughts, belief in the magical power and over-estimation of power of wishes.

Kohut and Wolf (1978) also regarded narcissism as an essential part of healthy development. They saw the normal and pathological narcissism on the same continuum. On this continuum, critical and chronic failures of

self-object functions lead to fixation at primitive level of development, in other words, narcissistic disturbances.

However, for Kernberg (1974), normal narcissism is not on the same spectrum with pathological narcissism. Pathological narcissism is not a fixation or regression to normal infantile narcissism but rather pathological ego and superego development.

Masterson (1988; cited in McNeal, 2008) also distinguished the pathological and normal narcissism. Healthy narcissism is essential for the development of self-esteem, self-assertion and pursuit of ideals, expectations and ambitions. On the other hand, individuals with pathological narcissism always need to promote false self and need other people, to mirror their grandiosity.

Narcissism might be conceptualized with different dimensions. For instance, Emmons (1984) proposed four dimensions of narcissism, namely exploitation/entitlement, leadership/authority, superiority/arrogance and self-absorption/self-admiration. Specific dimensions of narcissism can be considered adaptive because they are positively related with self-esteem, extraversion, dominance, and independency, on the other hand, negatively related with self-ideal discrepancy, neuroticism and social anxiety (Emmons, 1984). However, exploitation/entitlement dimension of narcissism is related with pathological narcissism (Emmons, 1987), narcissistic personality disorder, lack of empathy (Watson, Grisham, Trotter & Biderman, 1984), anxiety, depression and low self-esteem (Watson &

Biderman, 1993). In short, some dimensions might be evaluated as healthy part of narcissism whereas other dimensions might be evaluated as maladaptive form of narcissism.

In psychodynamic view, the therapist evaluates the patient with the features of his personality structure with more than just DSM criteria. Personality structure does not refer the DSM diagnosis of personality disorder. The difference between personality disorder and personality structure is based on the patient's level of functionality. Patients with narcissistic personality structure are characterized with excessive need for narcissistic extension to support self-esteem. People who have these features do not have to fulfill the DSM criteria of narcissistic personality disorder. In addition to personality structure, stressful life events might injure individuals' self-esteem and sense of identity. During these life events, people may give narcissistic reactions and develop narcissistic defenses. People who use narcissistic defenses in reaction to stressful life events are not always evaluated as patients with narcissistic personality structure or disorder (McWilliams, 1994/2010).

Narcissistic personality disorder is a Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) category, which might be regarded as more arrogant kind of narcissistic disturbance (Reich, 1933; cited in, PDM Task Force, 2006). Narcissistic personality disorder can be seen as really high level of narcissism. Some traits such as self-esteem or extraversion are seen as a part of narcissistic system. If the narcissistic system works well, narcissism will not be seen as a disturbance. However, if the narcissistic

system does not work well and social relationships of the individuals as well as self-respect begin to be disrupted, the result will be narcissistic disorder (Campbell & Foster, 2007). Because of increasing rate of clinical cases, by 1980s, American Psychiatric Association has introduced the narcissistic personality disorder as a diagnostic category in DSM-III (Kızıltan, 2000).

1.3. Clinical Patterns of Narcissistic Disturbances

Diagnostic criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder are described by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed., text rev.; *DSM-IV-TR*; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) as the following:

A pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration, and lack of empathy, begin by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following:

1. has a grandiose sense of self-importance (e.g. exaggerates achievements and talents, expects to be recognized as superior without commensurate achievements)
2. is preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love
3. believes that he or she is "special" and unique and can only be understood by, or should associate with, other special or high-status people (or institutions)
4. requires excessive admiration

5. has a sense of entitlement, i.e., unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance with his or her expectations
6. is interpersonally exploitative, i.e., takes advantage of others to achieve his or her own ends
7. lacks empathy: is unwilling to recognize or identify the feelings and needs of others
8. is often envious of others or believes that others are envious of him or her
9. shows arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes.

Beyond the diagnostic criteria of Narcissistic Personality Disorder in DSM-IV, different theorists described the individuals with narcissistic disturbances in various ways. Nunberg (1979; cited in Cooper, 1986) has given an overall description of narcissistic patients. He has connected the narcissistic features with Narcissus and described narcissism with arrogance, grandiosity, lack of sympathy and empathy, extreme self-centeredness as well as distorted self and object boundaries, lack of psychological substance. Additionally, interpersonal domination, fantasies of superiority and vulnerability to conditions can be seen as the other indicators of narcissistic disturbances (Kelly & Ogrodniczuk, 2014).

In psychodynamic view, narcissism varies in a range from neurotic level of personality structure to more severe disturbed personality types. Toward the neurotic end of spectrum, individuals with narcissistic personality structure are socially appropriate, successful and attractive although they have difficulty in the capacity for intimacy. At the most

pathological levels, individuals suffer from the disintegration of identity, lack of sense of inner-directed morality and self-destructive behaviors (PDM Task Force, 2006).

Kernberg (2010) gives a detailed description of people with narcissistic personality. He classifies narcissistic personalities according to psychological functioning. In the mildest level, the individuals are at neurotic level. Their functional level is well at the surface. However, they have significant problems in long-term intimate relationships and in work or professional lives. At the second level, patients with functioning problems are more apparent. At the third level, the patients are at borderline level. Another group of patients at third level do not show borderline features but present antisocial activities. All the patients at third level have chronic failures in their intimate relationships and work lives. For Kernberg (1970), narcissistic patients may present socially appropriate behaviors on the surface. However, they present inordinate degree of self-reference in their relationships. They need to be loved and admired by others. If others do not praise their values such as success, beauty or intelligence, they cannot obtain enjoyment from life. They are unable to experience depressive feelings. When abandoned or disappointed by others, they experience anger and resentment with revengeful wishes rather than genuine sadness for the loss of a person whom they appreciated. Their relationships are frequently exploitative. They tend to control and manipulate other people in relationships. They need others to be admired but they do not experience empathy and they fail to understand the complex emotions of others.

Although they are considered to be dependent on others in order to gain approval and adoration, they are not able to build genuine attachment because of their distrust. They envy others who seem to have things they do not own or those who seem to enjoy their lives.

Individuals with pathological narcissism frequently use primitive defenses such as splitting, primitive forms of projection, projective identification, devaluation or withdrawal. Their primary defense is splitting, which keeps apart the grandiose self from the real self. Therefore, grandiose self dominates the inner world and reveals the clinical patterns of pathological narcissism (Švrakić, 1986).

A great number of studies attempted to describe the narcissistic personalities over the years. Narcissism was found to be positively related with extraversion and openness to experience and negatively related with agreeableness (Mathieu, 2013) and neuroticism (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992). Narcissistic people perceive themselves as more intelligent (Gabriel, Critelli & Ee, 1994) and more confident than non-narcissists (Campbell, Goodie & Foster, 2004). On the other hand, they show unstable self-esteem (Rhodewalt, Madrian & Cheney, 1998) and their self-esteem is sensitive to external validation (Hill, Clark & Pickard, 2008). They report delinquency, overt aggression and relational aggression (Lau, Marsee, Kunimatsu & Fassnacht, 2010).

1.4. Subtypes in Narcissistic Personality

Kohut and Wolf (1978) describe five narcissistic personality types:

(1) Mirror-hungry personality compulsively needs selfobjects' admiring and confirming responses in order to nourish his famished self.

(2) Ideal-hungry personality searches for selfobjects that can evoke his admiration for their power, beauty, intelligence or moral values.

(3) Alter ego personality needs the relationship with selfobjects that conform the self's opinions, values and confirm the reality of self.

(4) Merger-hungry personality needs to control others in order to meet his needs for the inner structure in the outside world.

(5) Contact-shunning personality avoids others because of his desperate need for others and sensitivity to rejection.

Bursten (1973) classifies four types of narcissism:

(1) Craving personality is characterized with passive aggressive attitudes, neediness and dependent relationships.

(2) Patients with paranoid personality are litigious, envious and argumentative but they are not psychotic.

(3) Patients with manipulative personality are characterized by deception, lack of feeling guilt and superficial relationships.

(4) Phallic narcissistic personality is characterized by reckless attitudes, exhibitionism and self-centeredness.

Bleiberg (1994) also discusses three subtypes of narcissistic disturbances:

(1) Histrionic-exhibitionistic narcissistic patients' self-organization is around the one's beautiful, talented or charming features as well as excessive need for admiration.

(2) Psychopathic narcissistic subtype's predominant features are dissociation and denial of pain and vulnerability, ruthless exploitation and manipulation of others.

(3) Masochistic narcissistic patients' self-organization is around the being victimized, which is an attempt to hide conviction of power, control and superiority.

In psychodynamic view, narcissism is classified in two basic dimensions –arrogant/entitled narcissism and depressed/depleted narcissism. Arrogant/entitled narcissistic people are characterized by overt sense of entitlement, devaluation of others as well as attention seeking behaviors, vain, manipulative and commanding attitudes. Depressed/depleted narcissistic people are characterized by, dissatisfaction, shame, hypersensitivity to criticism, devaluation of self and envy to others (PDM Task Force, 2006). Wink (1991) also identifies two dimensions of narcissism - grandiose narcissism refers to extraversion, self-assurance, exhibitionism and aggression whereas vulnerable narcissism refers to defensiveness, anxiety and vulnerability.

Studies have shown that two basic types of narcissism have quite different features in many ways. For instance, grandiose narcissism is associated with dramatic traits of narcissistic, histrionic and antisocial

personality disorders whereas vulnerable narcissism is associated with traits of avoidant personality disorder. People with grandiose personality also deny interpersonal problems whereas people with vulnerable personality report high interpersonal distress (Dickinson, 2003). A recent study showed that grandiose narcissism is associated with high self-esteem and independent self-construal whereas vulnerable narcissism is associated with low self-esteem and interdependent self-construal (Rohmann, Neumann, Herner & Bierhoff, 2012).

1.5. Narcissism and Attachment

Attachment theory is one of the most important theories which emphasize the effects of parental attitudes on psychopathology and future relationships. Bowlby (1969)'s attachment theory arose from his observations of the children's responses to separation or loss of their mother-figures. He noticed a series of emotional reactions and defined the attachment behaviors on the basis of these emotional reactions. Attachment behaviors grow during the first years, however importance of attachment process continues throughout the lifespan. Primary function of this attachment process is to protect the infant from external dangers. Ainsworth and her colleagues (1978; cited in Bowlby, 1969) performed a study in order to observe the infants' reactions to mother's presence, absence and return in a strange situation. According to this study, they have determined the common patterns of attachment and classified infants into two groups; secure and insecure (anxious/resistant and avoidant). Securely attached infant, whose mother is consistently responsive and sensitive to his needs,

can explore the strange situation using his mother as a secure base. He shows awareness of his mother's absence and welcomes the mother's return. Anxious/fearless infant, whose mother is frequently inconsistent to respond his needs, shows ambivalent attitudes toward his mother. He wants more contact but shows angry behaviors when his mother attempts to give attention to him. Avoidant infant, whose mother rejects his attempts to establish contact, is prone to avoid interaction with his mother. He may treat a stranger more friendly than his own mother.

Bartholomew (1990) suggested a new model of adult attachment, which is based on the relationship between the image of self and others. He has argued that adults with secure attachment orientation hold positive view of self and others and they feel comfortable with intimacy. Adults with preoccupied attachment orientation have negative view of self and positive view of others and they are characterized with preoccupations with intimate relationships. Adults with dismissive attachment orientation hold positive view of self and negative view of others and dismiss intimacy. Adults with fearful attachment orientation hold negative view of self and others and they avoid closeness in order to prevent disappointment.

As discussed above, parenting practices have been accepted as preliminary factor in the narcissistic development as the attachment styles are strongly related to self-esteem and self-protection thus narcissism should be evaluated within the frame of attachment system. In this sense, different forms of insecure attachment might be construed as a narcissistic defense mechanism in intimate relationships. In preoccupied attachment, narcissistic

vulnerability is managed through merger with idealized partner who bolsters feeling of worth. In avoidant attachment, defensive strategy is to distance the romantic partner in order to prevent potential narcissistic injuries (Pistole, 1995). A few studies which have investigated the relationship between attachment patterns and narcissism suggested that vulnerable narcissism is related with attachment anxiety (Besser & Priel, 2009; Rohmann, et al., 2012; Smolewska & Dion, 2005). However, some studies on the relationship between grandiose narcissism and attachment have provided conflicted associations. A recent study has indicated that grandiose narcissism is negatively correlated with attachment avoidance (Rohmann, et. al., 2012), whereas others found positive correlation between narcissism and attachment avoidance (Ettensohn, 2013) and positive correlation between narcissism and preoccupied attachment (Lyons, Morgan, Thomas & Hashmi, 2013)

1.6. Narcissism and Romantic Relationships

As it can be seen, primary effect of pathological narcissism may be on the relationships. Individual with narcissistic difficulties at neurotic level may function very well in their social lives, but they have significant problems in their intimate relationships. Some of the patients who have narcissistic injuries have already demanded psychotherapy due to relationship problems.

Freud (1914) mentioned narcissism's significant indications from intimate relationships. He explained narcissism as a type of object choice in

his classical paper, 'On Narcissism'. The infant experiences the first autoerotic sexual satisfaction in connection with basic self-preservation functions. When sexual satisfaction differs from these functions, the infant can develop a real attachment with the prime caretaker person. The mother or a substitute will become the infant's sexual object. This type of object choice is called as *anaclitic*. In some instances, libidinal development has suffered from a disturbance such as perverts and homosexuals. They do not choose their mothers as models but they take themselves as sexual objects. This type of object choice is called *narcissistic*. He has summarized the two types of object choice as follows: A person may love

"(1) According to narcissistic type; (a) what he himself is (i.e. himself), (b) what he himself was, (c) what he himself would like to be, (d) someone who was once part of himself. (2) According to anaclitic (attachment) type; (a) the woman who feeds him, (b) the man who protects him" (Freud, 1914, p.33).

Both kinds of object choice are open to each person and people are not divided into two different groups depending on the type of object choice. However, there are fundamental differences between genders. Most women tend to choose a love-object according to narcissistic type, whereas most men tend to choose love-object according to anaclitic type. Men with anaclitic object choice display over-valuation of loved women whereas women with narcissistic object choice love the men for their need of being loved. Further, people with narcissistic personality easily attract others who

have renounced part of their own narcissistic state and in search of object love (Freud, 1914).

Kernberg (1995/2011) argues that people with narcissistic personality frequently idealize and devalue their partners. They are attracted to individuals who have admiring traits such as beauty, attractiveness, success or fame. Because of the identification with these traits, they gain narcissistic satisfaction. Even if they praise with their partners, they envy and direct aggression toward partners' traits as well. Oedipal competition, aggression, distrust and envy are the major components of the narcissistic patients' intimate relationships. They are afraid of being dependent to romantic partners. They do not respect the partners' need and they want to be admired by their partners. Their relationships are characterized by analysis of the pros and cons of potential partners' attributes. Their psychological capability of curiosity and interest in their partners' inner life is absent. When they cannot reach the desired love object, they become passionate lovers. Once they reach unattainable object, they will totally lose interest. Their escape from the 'conquered' object is also an effort to protect these objects from their unconscious destructive instinct. Additionally, when they are in a relationship, they get bored with their partners easily (Kernberg, 2011).

Boyd (1968) pointed out that, the neurotic narcissistic people have difficulties in accepting the boundaries between themselves and their partners. They are prone to possess the other as an unrealistic object thus they deny other's nature as a separate person. They cannot accept the natural

boundaries of relationships and become angry because of limited gratification. Their fantasy of limitless omnipotence results with the pain of loneliness and alienation. In order to avoid the awareness of this pain, they might develop some dysfunctional defenses depending on their early relationships.

Some of the theorists have emphasized the narcissism's positive impacts on intimate relationships. They have noted that functioning relationships need narcissistic space in order to prevent relational conflict and alienation. According to Van Der Waals (1965; cited in Bergmann, 1988), well-matched couples satisfy each other's narcissistic needs. Additionally, Gruenberger (1971; cited in Bergmann, 1988) claimed that, narcissistic enhancement is a significant element of sexual satisfaction. However, pathological narcissism is commonly seen as an impediment to love relationships. Narcissistic personalities do not pay attention to their partners because they tend to love only themselves. However, their impairment capacity for love includes not only love for others but the capacity for self-love (Kealy & Ogrodniczuk, 2014). According to different views, narcissistic personalities have a capacity to love others but they love others as bad as they love themselves (Kernberg, 1995/2011).

Rosegrant (2012) indicated the sadomasochistic nature of narcissistic relationships. He claimed that people with narcissistic personality develop sadomasochistic relationships in order to protect themselves from abandonment and to manage their vulnerability. They usually attempt to dominate others or submit to others in their relationships.

When reviewing the literature, rich empirical researches on narcissists' romantic relationships can be seen. Studies have presented that grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism have different relationship patterns. Grandiose narcissistic people look for immediate attraction. They tend to show infidelity and look for seduction and sexual adventure primarily. Additionally, they consider the advantages and utilities that might be obtained from the relationship. On the other hand, vulnerable narcissists are more prone to sacrifice and to develop romantic feelings toward their partners and express a more possessive love style. (Rohman et al., 2012). Grandiose narcissists tend to choose perfect targets as their romantic partners whereas vulnerable narcissists do not show a significant preference (Feng, Zhou, Liang & Li, 2012). They express less desire for intimacy and more desire for power (Carroll, 1987) and inability to empathy for others (Zhou & Zhang, 2010). Narcissistic people display less commitment and attention toward alternative partners that mediate the link between commitment and narcissism (Campbell & Foster, 2002). Their relationships have a game-playing pattern and this pattern which is result of a need for power and autonomy (Campbell, Foster & Finkel, 2002). They are attracted by individuals who can enhance the narcissistic sense of self-worth but less attracted by caring individuals (Campbell, 1999). They tend to give stronger reactions to perceived rejections than non-narcissists (Besser & Priel, 2009) and feel more anxious because of their incapacity to cope with their negative view of self (Smolewska & Dion, 2005). Additionally, they are less empathic to their partners (Hui, Hui & Bao, 2010). In compatible with their

incapability to establish empathy, individuals, who are in a relationship with narcissistic partners, are less satisfied with their relationships because of the large discrepancies between narcissists' perception of their own feelings and their partners' feelings (Lam, 2012).

2. Parental Attitudes

2.1. Parental Care / Warmth and Parental Overprotection

Parental attitudes, parenting practices and parenting styles have been proposed as the main factors in the development of psychological disturbances and relationships.

Parental care refers to involvement, acceptance, child-centeredness and responsiveness (Horton, Bleau & Drwecki, 2006). The consequences of parental care, warmth and acceptance might be positive social and emotional health. Caring parents love their children, approve their personalities as well as take an interest in their activities and well-being. Rejective parents are generally physically unsympathetic, cold or distant, emotionally unavailable as well as prone to neglect their children's needs and wishes. Parental rejection results with a set of personality traits such as hostility, aggression, dependency, low self-esteem, low self-adequacy, emotional unresponsiveness and negative view of world. Additionally infant has to be loved in order to learn how to give love. Therefore parental warmth and rejection have a crucial role on future relationships (Rohner, 1975).

Parental overprotection refers to excessive control attempts to the child's development and autonomy (Horton et al., 2006). Overprotective behaviors go beyond the parents' normative attempts to protect children from external dangers. Overprotection is characterized by parents who have difficulty in separation from the child, discourage the child's independent behaviors and have highly supervising attitudes (Thomasgard & Metz, 1993).

2.2. Previous Studies on Parental Attitudes and Psychopathology

Studies indicate the parental attitudes crucial role on personality and psychological disturbances. Narcissism is found to be positively related with parental control and negatively related with parental warmth (Horton et al., 2006). Entitled/exploitative features of narcissism are related with low security, high parental discipline and high threats of separation whereas grandiose features of narcissism are related with peer affectional support and parental discipline (Cater, Zeigler & Vonk, 2011). Permissive attitudes of parents are associated with immature grandiosity and authoritarian attitudes of parents are associated with inadequate idealization (Watson, Little & Biderman, 1992). High level of overprotection and low level of parental care might be associated with neurotic depression (Parker, 1979; Parker, Kiloh & Hayward, 1987), anxiety (Parker, 1981), bulimia (Pole, Waller, Stewart & Parkin-Feigenbaum, 1988) and antisocial personality traits (Reti et al., 2002). Maternal overprotection is related to alcoholism whereas paternal overprotection is related to narcotic addiction (Bernardi, Jones & Tennant, 1989). Unhealthy lifestyle habits in women are related

with overprotective attitudes of parents (Toda, Kawai, Takeo, Rokutan & Morimoto, 2008). All of these studies indicated that, parents' lack of care and overprotective attitudes pose a risk of emotional disturbances and psychopathology.

2.3. Romantic Relationships and Parental Attitudes

Past parental relationships seem to be principle determinative of the later intimate relationships. A great number of studies has indicated several characteristics of family relations as precessor of romantic relationships (Surjadi, Lorenz, Conger & Wickrama, 2013).

In a recent study, it has been found that responsive caregiving to romantic partner is positively associated with authoritative parenting styles and negatively associated with authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (Millings, Walsh, Hepper & O'Brian, 2013). Poor romantic competence in romantic relationship is also related with emotionally unavailable parents (Steinberg & Davilla, 2008). Another study has indicated that marital adjustment in women is associated with caring father whereas marital adjustment in men is associated with caring mother (Kitamura et al., 1995). Moreover, lower quality of support from parents is related with weak-link with partner in romantic relationships (Oriña et al., 2011).

3. Romantic Relationships

3.1. Conceptualization of Love

Humanity is prone to seek out and maintain close relationships. Romantic relationship is the major aspect of close relationships. Love can be considered as a way to make life more meaningful. The definition of love varies from culture to culture or from person to person. In the simplest term, romantic love may be defined as a particular component of personal relationship or an emotion that someone feels for another person (Atak & Taştan, 2012). Love has been examined by philosophers, artists and poets for many years. Several social science disciplines such as anthropology, family studies, sociology and psychology have made contributions to our understanding of intimate relationships (Simpson & Tran, 2006). Initiation, maintenance and dissolution of relationships, phases and components of romantic love are the major subjects which have been investigated in various subareas of psychology.

The foremost explanation of love in psychoanalytic literature belongs to Freud who regarded the love as sublimation of sexual instincts. According to Freud (1905; cited in Quinodoz, 2006), romantic and sexual relationships are under the influence of early object choices. Because of incest ban, the child has to give up early love objects represented by the mother or father. However, none of us can escape the influence of the past incestuous object choices. In some cases, individual remains fixed to his past love object thus refuses to a partner's element which is derived from

the love object. For instance a man who remains fixed to mother, may fall in love only with older women or only with women who have partial resemblances (such as hair color or voice) with his mother (Hitschmann, 1952).

Erik Erikson (1950) brought a new perspective to Freud's psychosexual stages and conceptualized the psychosocial stages of human life cycle. Once individuals develop the reasonable sense of identity, they can establish the real intimacy with other people. Intimacy versus isolation stage occurs at young adulthood. If this is completed successfully, individuals can develop mature love and sexual relationships. If not, sense of isolation from others may occur.

Erich Fromm (1956/2007) conceptualized the love as an art, which requires effort and knowledge. Most people think that, there is nothing to learn about love and to make an effort to be loved rather than to love. Men try to be successful, powerful and rich, whereas women try to be beautiful and attractive in order to make themselves more lovable. In this sense, people generally experience love as a way of receiving, not giving which result in alienation. However, true love, which has four basic elements such as care, responsibility, respect and knowledge, is the only way to overcome this existential problem. In order to reach true love, the person has to overcome his dependency and narcissistic omnipotence.

Kernberg (1995/2011) investigated the pathology and normality in love relationships. Romantic love involves the love relationship which was

directed to other person; aggressive energy, which was converted to sexual desire, as well as idealization of other person. Love can be seen as a mourning process related with growing and being independent. Although individuals eventually leave behind the childhood objects, they reenact the past scenarios via projective identification. Therefore, the quality of the past relationships with childhood objects, in other words oedipal relationships, may determine the characteristics of future romantic relationships. For instance, unresolved oedipal conflicts in women lead to inability to maintain healthy relationships or to be attached to men who cannot satisfy a partner. Unresolved oedipal conflicts in men lead to hostile feelings toward women because of the lack of feeling of trust to women.

Kernberg (2011) suggested that, capacity of love has some aspects such as; ongoing curiosity and interest in partner's inner life, trust, authentic forgiveness, humility, gratitude for the existence of other person, common ego ideal established by couple, mature dependency, permanence of sexual passion as well as acceptance of loss, jealousy and boundary protection. Kernberg (1976; cited in Bergmann, 1988) also classified the individuals and explained the love relationships on this classification. Narcissistic personalities are on the lowest phase and they are not capable of loving, due to malignant feelings of envy and greed. Borderline personalities can invest their libido to others nevertheless their sexual life is chaotic and perverse. At neurotic level, the people are capable of loving, but they combine love and sexuality with the feeling of guilt. The final group can integrate love and sexuality because of the total capacity to object relations. They can

identify with each other and their need of idealization transform to mature commitment.

3.2. Theories of Love

Some theorists of psychology attempted to establish love theories in order to comprehend the nature of intimate relationships. Although number of theories has been established, it can be said that two dominant love theories take part in literature.

Sternberg (1986) conceptualized Triangular Theory of Love. According to Triangular Theory, romantic love has three components. Intimacy component refers to closeness, connectedness and boundedness feelings in romantic relationship. Passion component refers to sexual drives which lead to physical attraction and sexual intercourse whereas decision/commitment component refers to decision that one loves another in the short term and the wishes the maintenance of the relationship. The three components interact with each other and characteristics of loving relationship depends on these interactions. The interaction between three components also changes over the course of relationship.

One of the most inclusive love theory has been established by Lee (1973; cited in Fisher, 2004) who used the analogy of a color and conceptualized six love styles. The conceptualization of love is summarized on Figure 1:

Figure 1

Lee's (1973) Conceptualization of Love

Love Style	Explanation of Love Style
Eros	Passionate, erotic and joyful love
Mania	Obsessive, jealous, possessive and dependent love
Ludus	Game playing love; playful, unserious and uncommitted
Storge	Friendly love with lack of romantic feelings
Agape	Selfless and all-giving love
Pragma	Logical and shopping-list love.

A great deal of study has been investigated the relationship between these love styles and several variables. These research findings indicated that, Eros is positively, Ludus is negatively related with relational satisfaction (Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988). Women are more prone to display Storge whereas men are more prone to display Ludus (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1995). Another study which focused on the love styles in Turkey also found that men are more prone to endorse Agape than women, whereas dating couples are more prone to endorse Mania than married or engaged couples. Relational satisfaction is positively associated with Eros and Agape whereas negatively associated with Ludus. Moreover, having trouble in relationships is positively associated with Ludus and Mania whereas

negatively correlated with Eros and Agape (Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu, 2004). Masculinity is associated with Agape love style whereas femininity is associated with Pragma love style (Walsh, 1993). Self-esteem is positively related with Eros and negatively with Mania, Storge and Agape. On the other hand, impulsivity is positively related with Mania and Ludus (Mallandain & Davies, 1994). Ludus is associated with absence of concern for partner fidelity, short and uncommitted relationships and positive feelings about dissolution of relationship whereas Agape, Mania and Eros are associated with negative feelings about dissolution of relationship (Hammock & Richardson, 2011). Shyness is positively related with Eros and negatively with Mania (Erwin & Pressler, 2011). Lastly, a recent study, which explored the relationship between individual level values and love attitudes, indicated that, Ludus, Storge, Pragma and Mania are significantly higher among Turkish participants. Additionally Agape is positively correlated with self-transcendence, Ludus is positively correlated with self-enhancement and pragma is positively correlated with conservation (Sanrı & Goodwin, 2013).

3.3. Romantic Relationships and Attachment

Hazan and Shaver (1987) expanded the attachment theory and conceptualized the adult romantic love as an attachment process. In other words, adults' romantic relationships are formed by earlier bonds between infant and primary caregiver. They determined that people with different attachment orientations show different kinds of romantic relationship patterns. Their study proved that securely attached people's relationships are

characterized by happiness as well as friendly and trusting bonds. They emphasized the sense of acceptance and support in their relationships. Avoidant attached people's relationships are characterized by fear of intimacy and of jealousy. People with anxious attachment orientation tend to experience love as an obsession, desire to form closer relationships and extreme sexual attraction and jealousy. Insecure group also reported history of shorter intimate relationships.

A considerable amount of research has investigated the relationship between attachment style and romantic relationships. It is shown that, secure attachment is linked with positive relationship characteristics whereas avoidant attachment is associated with less satisfying and intimate relationships (Levy & Davis, 1988). Further, individuals with secure attachment are more responsive to their partners' needs whereas individuals with insecure attachment are less responsive to their partners' needs (Feeney, 1996). Avoidant and anxious/ambivalent attachment is found to be related with negative relationship characteristics. A recent study has shown that secure attached women report more positive and satisfying relationship histories than insecure attached women (McCarthy & Maughan, 2010). A more recent study indicated that, compared with anxious attachment, avoidant attachment style is more negatively linked with general satisfaction, connectedness and general support in romantic relationships whereas anxious attachment is positively related with general conflict in romantic relationships (Li & Chan, 2012). Another study has proved that secure attachment is related with relational satisfaction, commitment and

intimacy (Madey & Rodgers, 2009). A study which investigated the relationship between attachment style and dissolution of romantic relationships has shown that, secure attachment is related with more amicable breakup, less concern for seeing ex-partner again, less blame to the partner for breakup whereas insecure attachment is related with less amicable breakup and greater distress from breakup (Madey & Jilek, 2012).

4. Sexuality

One major component of love relationships is sexuality which should be studied together. Although people's sexual attitudes, beliefs and ways of living sexuality differ from each other, sexual life has a crucial role in the life of all human beings. Various issues about sexuality such as sex roles, sexual attitudes, sexual experience, sexual identity as well as sexual disorders, psychosexual development are the basic subjects of psychology.

4.1. Sexuality and Narcissism

Ledermann (1986) pointed out the role of pathological psychosexual development and future sexuality in narcissistic disturbances. The narcissistic patients develop oral self-satisfying activities like prolonged thumb-sucking, drug addiction, alcoholism or eating disorder due to defective oral experiences in early childhood. Due to the oedipal conflicts narcissistic patients are prone to develop triangular relationships and destroy the couple relationships. Sado-masochism is a frequent feature of their sexual life (Ledermann, 1986). Furthermore, the narcissistic individuals place greater importance upon physical pleasure rather than emotional

intimacy due to lack of commitment capacity (Foster, Shrira & Campbell, 2006).

Kernberg (1995/2011) stated that the narcissistic patient's sexual life is characterized by envy, twin ship fantasy, sexual permissiveness and sexual impotence due to the conflicted early mother figure. Both men and women might idealize and devalue their partners as sexual objects thus they are prone to having permissive attitudes towards sexuality. Narcissistic men experience sexual desire towards women as a repetition of the relationship with mother that unconsciously results hatred in women. This hatred may damage the sexual arousal capacity and lead to sexual impotence.

Sexual narcissism is used in order to identify narcissistic features in sexuality. Sexual narcissism is characterized by inflated sense of sexual skills, promiscuity, egocentric patterns of sexual behavior, conservative or traditional gender-role orientation as well as sexual preoccupation, compulsivity. Moreover, sexual narcissism is related with sexual boredom, sexual dissatisfaction and decreased capacity to experience emotional intimacy and empathy (Hurlbert & Apt, 1991; Hurlbert, Apt, Gasar, Wilson & Murphy, 1994). Individuals with sexual narcissism are prone to report exaggerated number of sexual partners (Wryobeck & Wiederman, 1999). The frequency of sexual aggression (unwanted sexual contact, sexual coercion and attempted/completed sexual rape) is also increased in sexual narcissism (Widman & McNulty, 2009).

4.2. Sexual Attitudes

In a relationship, each partner's sexual attitudes have a profound effect on their romantic relationships (Sprecher, 2006). Sexual attitudes toward different aspects of sexuality such as masturbation, gay/lesbian/bisexual relations, abortion and pornography have been a popular research area for social scientists (Sümer, 2013). One of the most important topics in the area of sexual attitudes is sexual permissiveness (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote & Foote, 1985). Sexual permissiveness refers to acceptance of casual sex with many partners (Hendrick, Hendrick & Reich, 2006). Researches have shown that sexual permissiveness is related with gender roles (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote & Foote, 1985), self-esteem (Herold & Goodwin, 1979) and quality of family interaction (Taris, Semin & Bok, 1998). Sprecher (2006) has also argued that sexual permissiveness is the attitudes toward the extramarital, extra dyadic and premarital sexuality which have been studied in a wide range of studies.

Attitudes toward birth control have been another research area related with sexual attitudes. Some people, who have sexual intercourse, may use medical or non-medical contraception methods whereas others may use no methods. It will be necessary to use medical and effective contraception methods consistently in order to prevent unintended pregnancies. Studies investigating the attitudes toward birth control become

important in scientific literature (Herold & Goodwin, 1980). Individuals' attitudes towards safe sex are linked with their capacity to take responsibility for birth control thus this issue provides an area for psychological researches.

Hendrick and Hendrick constructed Sexual Attitude Scale in order to measure sexual attitudes in multidimensional fashion. This scale attempts to measure the individual's tendency of permissiveness (casual sexuality), birth control (responsible sexuality), communion (idealistic sexuality) and instrumentality (biological sexuality) (Hendrick, Hendrick & Reich, 2006). This scale has been used in a wide range of psychological study. For instance, a study investigating the relationship between sexual attitudes and love attitudes has shown that, permissiveness and instrumentality are related with game-playing love whereas communion is related with passionate and altruistic love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987). Another study showed that men are more prone to have permissive, instrumental and control/power oriented attitudes toward sexuality whereas women are more prone to have responsible, conventional and idealistic sexual attitudes (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote & Foote, 1985).

4.3. Sexual Attitudes and Attachment

Profound relationship between romantic relationships and attachment has been discussed above. One of the major aspects of romantic relationship is sexuality. Shaver, Hazan and Bradshaw (1988) also argued that, adult romantic relationships involve integration of three behavioral

systems, namely attachment, caregiving and sexual mating. Therefore, sexual attitudes should be discussed within the frame of attachment system.

Literature reports on this issue have indicated that, discomfort with closeness and anxiety over relationships is related with external locus of control for sexual outcomes and with use of drugs before sexual intercourse. Additionally, anxiety over relationships is associated with unsafe sex and negative attitudes to condom whereas discomfort with closeness is associated with more cautious approach to sexual risk-taking (Feeney, Peterson, Gallois & Terry, 2000). People with anxious attachment have an early first intercourse, more infidelity and take more sexual precautions such as condom (Bogaert & Sadava, 2002). They have unwanted but consensual sexual experiences and more negative affects about sexual experiences (Gentzler & Kerns, 2004). Moreover, they believe that sex should be experienced in a committed relationship (Brennan & Shaver, 1995). Avoidant attachment is related with engagement in casual sex (great number of sexual partners or lower percentage of partners within committed relationships) (Gentzler & Kerns, 2004) and with the acceptance of casual sex (Brennan & Shaver, 1995) and anxious and avoidant attachment are related with lower sexual satisfaction (Butzer & Campbell, 2008).

In addition to these findings, attachment style is found to be related with characteristics of sexual fantasies (Birnbaum, 2007). Secure attached people tend to believe that sex should be experienced in a committed relationship (Brennan & Shaver, 1995). Attachment style is also found to be related with the attitudes toward sexual and emotional infidelity.

Preoccupied men select emotional infidelity as more distressing whereas avoidant women select sexual infidelity as more distressing (Treger & Sprecher, 2011).

As discussed above, narcissism has an effect on the romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes whereas attachment styles have on narcissism, romantic relationships and sexual attitudes. Starting from this point of view, it has been predicted that parental attitudes, which can be regarded as a determiner of attachment style, influence the relationship between narcissism, romantic relationships and sexual attitudes.

5. Objectives of the Current Study

The major aim of the present study is to examine the relationship between narcissism, romantic relationships and sexual attitudes. As mentioned in previous sections, one of the primary effects of narcissism is on close relationships. Moreover, parental attitudes also have strong effects on romantic and sexual relationships. Therefore, the association between narcissism and romantic/sexual relationships will be examined after controlling the possible effects of parental attitudes. Addition to that, the relationship between parental care, parental overprotection and romantic/sexual relationships will also be investigated.

In the literature, there is evidence that narcissism and parental attitudes are closely related with romantic and sexual affairs. As a result of these studies, it has been seen that, higher levels of narcissism is related with less healthy relationships. In this study, narcissistic personalities'

romantic relationships will be described in details. Therefore, this study will contribute the literature on narcissism and its relation with romantic and sexual relationships. Moreover, majority of the studies have focused on the relationship between pathological narcissism and relationships. However, the term “narcissism” will be used in a variety of ways from normal narcissism to pathological (grandiose) narcissism in the present study. Therefore, the association between narcissism and close relationships might be investigated in non-clinical group. Addition to that, this study will be one of the limited empirical studies, which explore the relationship between narcissism and romantic/sexual affairs in Turkey.

Results of the present study might be helpful to understand the romantic/sexual relationships of clients with narcissistic vulnerabilities as well as higher rates of divorces and relational conflicts. In addition to these, the present study might be also useful to understand the parental attitudes and the effects of these attitudes on intimate relationships.

The hypotheses of the present study are stated below:

1) Gender will differentiate the participants on narcissism, perceived parental attitudes, love attitudes, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes.

a. Male participants will get higher scores on narcissism and Ludus than female participants.

b. Female participants will get higher scores on birth control and sexual permissiveness. (Note that, higher scores on the sexual permissiveness scale indicate lower permissive attitudes)

2) Relational satisfaction will associate with love attitudes, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes.

a. Individuals who have higher scores on Eros, relational esteem, internal relational control and sexual communion will have more satisfactory relationships.

b. Individuals who have higher scores on Ludus and relational anxiety will have less satisfactory relationships.

3) Narcissism will be positively related with Eros, Pragma and Ludus after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes.

4) Narcissism will be positively related with relational fear/anxiety, relational esteem, relational assertiveness, internal relational control and relational monitoring after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes.

5) Narcissism will be negatively related with sexual communion and sexual permissiveness after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes (Note that, higher scores on the sexual permissiveness scale indicate lower permissive attitudes).

METHOD

1. Participants

The booklet of questionnaires was administered to 276 individuals who were young adults. There were 170 female (61.6%) and 106 male (38.4%) participants. The majority of the participants ($n = 230$) fulfilled online survey forms and 16.7% ($n = 46$) fulfilled paper and pencil survey forms. The participants' ages ranged from 19 to 38 years ($M = 25.85$, $SD = 3.58$).

The detailed information about participants is given in tables 1, 2 and 3 below:

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variables		N	%
Marital Status	Single	269	97.8
	Widowed/divorced	6	2.2
Educational Level	Primary school	0	0
	Secondary school	1	.4
	High school	8	2.9
	University	174	63.3
	Postgraduate	86	31.3
	Doctorate	6	2.2
SES	Lower	9	3.3
	Middle	229	83.6
	Upper	36	13.1
Current Residency	Family	157	56.9
	Friend/relative	51	18.5
	Girl/boyfriend	12	4.3
	Alone	56	20.3

Table 2

Family History and Traumatic Life Events

Variables	N	%
Mother loss	3	1.1
Father loss	29	10.5
Family divorce	34	12.3
Family conflict	74	26.9
Psychiatric Disorder in Family	27	9.8
Chronic Illness in Family	40	14.5
Alcohol/Substance Abuse in Family	23	8.3
Sexual/Physical Abuse from Family Member	11	4.0
Sexual/Physical Abuse from Other People	15	5.5

Table 3

Information about Romantic Relationship

Variables		N	%
Relationship Status			
In a relationship	Female	97	57.1
	Male	40	37.7
Single	Female	73	42.9
	Male	66	62.3
Sexual Intercourse			
Yes	Female	118	69.8
	Male	92	86.8
No	Female	51	30.2
	Male	14	13.2
		N	SD
Relationship satisfaction*			
(1-10)	Female	7.74	1.62
	Male	7.52	1.88

*(Note that, participants gave points between 1 (lowest satisfaction) and 10 (highest satisfaction))

2. Measures

2.1. Demographic Information Form:

Demographic information form was used to collect background data such as age, gender, educational level, marital status, work, family information and psychiatric history.

Demographic information form also included information about the relationship history and the self-evaluation of participant's relationship.

Because of the relationship of traumatic life events with narcissism and close relationships, the participants were asked to indicate whether they had any past traumatic history in order to assess possible effects of trauma.

2.2. Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI):

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) was developed Raskin and Hall (1979) to assess narcissism on the nonclinical population. First version of NPI had 54 items. Raskin and Hall made some changes on the NPI and reduced the item number to 40 (Kızıltan, 2000). Each item has two statements and the participant will choose one of each statement. NPI includes factors that indicate basic components of narcissism – authority, exhibitionism, superiority, vanity, exploitation, entitlement and self-sufficiency (Raskin & Terry, 1988).

Kızıltan (2000) adapted the NPI to Turkish. Language equivalence was found as .90. Alpha coefficient's for the total scale was found as .84. Test-retest reliability was also found as .89. In order to evaluate construct validity, the relationship between Eysenck Personality Inventory – extraversion subscale and NPI was examined. Construct validity of NPI was found as .55.

In the present study, internal consistency of NPI was found as .83.

2.3. Parental Bonding Inventory (PBI):

Parental Bonding Inventory (PBI) was constructed by Parker, Tupling and Brown (1979). The PBI has two forms (mother form and father form) and each form has 25 items. It is required that participants rate the four- point Likert type scale according to first 16 years of his/her life. The PBI is developed on the base of Bowlby's attachment theory. Bowlby associated the pathological/insufficient parentage with care and control/protection. In this direction, perceived parent behaviors are assessed in PBI with two factors – care and control/protection. Total points of care dimension vary between 0-36. High points of care dimension indicate the perception of accepting, warm and understanding behaviors whereas low points indicate the perception of cold and rejecting attitudes. Total points of control/protection dimension vary between 0-39. Low points of control/protection dimension indicate the perception of overprotective parent attitudes (Kapçı and Küçüker, 2006).

The reliability and validity study of original version of PBI was conducted by Parker and friends (1979). The test-retest reliability of PBI was found as .76 for care dimension and .63 for control/overprotection. Split half reliability of PBI was also found as .88 and .74 respectively. Interjudge reliability of PBI was .85 and .69 respectively. In order to evaluate construct validity, PBI scores and observer scores were examined. Correlational coefficient of care subtest was found as .77 whereas control/overprotection subtest was found as .50 (Kapçı and Küçüker, 2006).

Turkish adaptation of PBI was performed by Kapçı and Küçük (2006). Factor analysis showed that control behaviors are loaded on the care factor. Therefore, two new factors are called as care/control and overprotection dimensions in Turkish version. In order to evaluate construct validity, the relationship between Parental Attitude Style Inventory, Parental Style Inventory and PBI was examined. The results indicated that PBI has construct validity. In order to evaluate internal consistency the Cronbach alpha values were calculated. The Cronbach alpha was .87 for mother and .89 for father form. The overprotection subscale's Cronbach alpha value was .70 for both forms whereas care/control subscale's value was .90 for mother, .91 for father form. Test-retest reliability was found as .90 for mother and .89 for father form. Test-retest reliability of care/control subscale was .91 for mother and .90 for father form whereas it was found that the reliability of overprotection subscale was .64 for mother and .78 for father form.

In the present study, internal consistency was found as .91 for mother form and .92 for father form. Internal reliability of care/control subscale was .92 for mother form and .94 for father form. Internal reliability of overprotection subscale was .78 for mother form and .77 for father form.

2.4. Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) Short Form:

Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) was constructed by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986). LAS aims to determine love attitudes. The short form has 24 items and 6 subscales. Participants rate each question on five-point

Likert-type scale. Items range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It based on Lee's six love styles. These love styles are Eros (passionate love), Mania (possessive dependent love), Pragma (logical, 'shopping list' love), Agape (all-giving, selfless love), Ludus (game-playing love) and Storge (friendship love).

The reliability and validity study of LAS short form was conducted by Hendrick, Dicke and Hendrick (1998; cited in Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu, 2004). The reliability of each subscale ranged between .62 and .88. The validity of scale was also found satisfactory.

Turkish adaptation of LAS-short form was performed by Büyükşahin and Hovardaoğlu (2004). The factor analysis resulted with six factors that consistent with original form. They reported internal consistency reliability with Cronbach alpha was .70 and split-half reliability was also .70. Cronbach alpha coefficients of 6 subscales were found as following: mania ($\alpha = .82$), storge ($\alpha = .77$), eros ($\alpha = .66$), pragma ($\alpha = .62$), agape ($\alpha = .52$) and ludus ($\alpha = .39$).

In the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficients of 6 subscales were found as following: agape ($\alpha = .80$), storge ($\alpha = .80$), eros ($\alpha = .68$), pragma ($\alpha = .67$), mania ($\alpha = .55$) and ludus ($\alpha = .29$).

2.5. The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ):

The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ) was developed by Snell, Schicke and Arbeiter (2002; cited in Büyükşahin, 2005). MRQ aims to assess the psychological variables related to affiliation.

It has 60 items with five-point Likert-type scale. Items range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It has 12 subscales – relational esteem, relationship preoccupation, relational satisfaction, internal relational control, relationship consciousness, relationship motivation, relationship anxiety, relationship assertiveness, relationship depression, external relationship control, relationship monitoring and fear of relationship.

The reliability and validity study of original form of MRQ was conducted by Snell and friends (2002; cited in Büyükşahin, 2005). In order to evaluate construct validity, the relationship between The Relationship Satisfaction Scale (RAS) and MRQ was examined. The correlation coefficients of MRQ and RAS were between -.66 and .71. Internal consistency of MRQ subscales ranged between .70 and .92. Test-retest reliability was also .72.

Büyükşahin (2005) adapted the MRQ to Turkish. She reported internal consistency with Cronbach alpha was .81 and test-retest reliability coefficient was .80. Split-half reliability was .83. In order to evaluate construct validity, the relationship between RAS and MRQ was examined in the way that original study. The correlation coefficients of MRQ and RAS were found between -.41 and .69. The factor analysis also resulted in 53 items and 8 factors – relational esteem (evaluate own capacity positively to relate intimately with others), internal relational control (the belief that the relationship is determined by one's own control), external relational control (the belief that the relationship is determined by outside influences outside of one's own control), relational assertiveness (the tendency to be assertive

about intimate relationships), relational monitoring (the tendency to be aware of the others' judgment about one's own relationship), relational anxiety/fear (the tendency to feel anxious and fearful about intimate relationship), relational satisfaction (highly satisfied with intimate relationship) and focus on relation extremely (the tendency to focus on intimate relationship).

In the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficients of subscales were found as following: focus on relation extremely ($\alpha = .93$), relationship satisfaction ($\alpha = .91$), relational assertiveness ($\alpha = .87$), relational monitoring ($\alpha = .85$), relational anxiety/fear ($\alpha = .84$), external relational control ($\alpha = .81$), relational esteem ($\alpha = .80$) and internal relational control ($\alpha = .76$).

2.6. The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (BSAS):

The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (BSAS) developed by Hendrick, Hendrick and Reich (2006). BSAS aims to assess the sexual attitudes. It is comprised 23 items with five-point Likert-type scale. Items range from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). BSAS has four subscales – permissiveness, birth control, communion and instrumentality. Permissiveness subscale indicates acceptance of casual sex with many partners. Birth control subscale represents responsible sexuality. Communion subscale indicates idealistic sexual attitudes regarding sex as a closest form of communication. Instrumentality subscale represents self-centered and physical orientation to sexuality.

First version of SAS had 58 items and 5 factors. Brief version of SAS had 23 items and 4 factors. The internal reliability of BSAS is satisfactory. Cronbach alpha coefficients of 4 subscales were found as following: Permissiveness ($\alpha = .93$), birth control ($\alpha = .84$), communion ($\alpha = .71$) and instrumentality ($\alpha = .77$) (Hendrick, Hendrick and Reich, 2006).

Karaçam, Totan, Korkmaz and Koyuncu (2012), adapted the BSAS to Turkish. They use %40 and %60 percentile for cross validation. The validation of BSAS was found acceptable. Internal consistency of BSAS was found as .85. Cronbach alpha coefficients of 4 subscales were found as following: permissiveness ($\alpha = .86$), birth control ($\alpha = .84$), instrumentality ($\alpha = .69$), communion ($\alpha = .66$).

In the present study, internal consistency of BSAS was found as .74. Cronbach alpha coefficients of coefficients of 4 subscales were found as following: permissiveness ($\alpha = .89$), birth control ($\alpha = .84$), communion ($\alpha = .66$) and instrumentality ($\alpha = .64$).

3. Procedure

Prior to data collection, the ethics approval of the current study was taken from Istanbul Bilgi University Ethics Committee. All subjects participated the study voluntarily. Minor part of the data was collected from psychology department of Istanbul Bilgi University via the help of Ayten Zara. Students fulfilled the paper-pencil survey package during lecture. Completion of survey package took approximately 20-25 minutes. Each participant were given brief information about study, the informed consent

form, and assured the confidentiality of their answers. They wrote their names onto informed consent form but not onto the data sheets. After collecting the informed consent forms, data sheets were given to participants.

The greater part of the participants fulfilled the online survey package. Online data was collected using an online survey tool, www.surveeey.com. Additionally, online survey link was sent to mail groups (psikobilgi yahoogroups, PSY-1 yahoogroups and psikoalan yahoogroups) and shared in social media (Facebook, Twitter).

4. Design

There are five main variables in the current study. The predictor variables are narcissism and perceived parental attitudes. The criterion variables are love attitudes, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes. The design of this study is correlation.

RESULTS

The following chapter presents and analyses the data that was obtained through the administration of survey package. The result of the present study will be presented in three sections. Descriptive analysis of the sample with mean, standard deviation and range will be presented. Group differences depending on gender and relational satisfaction using independent samples t-test and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient will be provided. A series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses and Pearson correlation tests will be conducted in order to investigate the relationships between narcissism, romantic relationships and sexual attitudes after controlling the possible effects of parental attitudes.

1. Descriptive Analysis of the Sample

Before the main analyses, descriptive characteristics of the sample were investigated. Descriptive analyses for the sample can be found in Table 4:

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Continuous Variables

Variables	M	SD	Range
Age	25.85	3.58	19-38
Relationship Satisfaction	7.67	1.71	1-10
NPI	13.73	6.18	0-33
PBI-Mother care	39.59	9.60	8-54
PBI-Mother overprotection	12.40	4.56	0-21
PBI-Father care	35.27	11.97	1-54
PBI-Father overprotection	13.98	4.52	0-21
LAS-Eros	14.05	2.93	4-20
LAS-Ludus	10.79	2.81	4-19
LAS-Pragma	10.10	3.28	4-20
LAS-Agape	12.08	3.39	4-20
LAS-Storage	11.75	3.79	4-20
LAS-Mania	13.07	2.89	4-20
MRQ-Satisfaction	29.89	8.13	10-45
MRQ-Anxiety	23.32	6.93	11-46
MRQ-Esteem	18.76	3.31	10-25
MRQ-Monitoring	11.53	4.57	5-25
MRQ-External control	11.60	3.83	4-20
MRQ-Internal control	12.99	2.55	6-20
MRQ-Assertiveness	14.63	3.44	4-20
MRQ-Focus	38.71	9.37	14-60
BSAS-Permissiveness	28.56	8.84	10-50
BSAS-Communion	11.94	2.57	4-18
BSAS-Instrumentality	14.39	3.30	5-25
BSAS-Birth control	13.34	1.77	6-15

2. Testing Group Differences

With regards to the hypothesis 1 and 2, the present investigation examined whether a difference exists between the groups on variables, which are narcissism, perceived parental attitudes, love styles, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes using independent sample t-test, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Due to low number of cases, family history, traumatic life events, socioeconomic status and education were not analyzed.

2.1. Narcissism

Whether gender $t(273) = -1.24, p = .215$ makes a difference between groups on the scores of NPI was tested through independent samples t test. Results revealed that gender did not make a difference ($M = 13.36, SD = 6.26$ for females; $M = 14.31, SD = 6.05$ for males).

2.2. Perceived Parental Attitudes

Independent samples t-test revealed that gender did not make a difference on the scores of mother overprotection, $t(272) = 1.42, p = .156$, ($M = 12.71, SD = 4.80$ for females; $M = 11.90, SD = 4.14$), mother care/control, $t(272) = -.07, p = .943$, ($M = 39.56, SD = 10.19$ for females; $M = 39.65, SD = 8.61$ for males), father overprotection, $t(269) = -1.25, p = .214$, ($M = 13.72, SD = 4.63$ for females; $M = 14.42, SD = 4.32$ for males) and father care/control, $t(269) = .20$, ($M = 35.38, SD = 12.31$ for females, $M = 35.09, SD = 11.42$ for males). (Note that, lower scores on the parental overprotection indicated higher overprotective attitudes).

2.3. Love Attitudes

Results of Pearson correlation test revealed that relationship satisfaction level was positively related with Eros, $r(143) = .63, p = .000$ and negatively related with Ludus, $r(143) = -.30, p = .000$.

Independent sample t-test revealed that, gender was found to be significant for Ludus, $t(271) = -3.56, p = .000$ and Agape, $t(271) = -6.46, p = .000$. That is, males got higher scores on Ludus ($M = 11.54, SD = 2.75$) and Agape ($M = 13.63, SD = 3.34$) than females on Ludus ($M = 10.32, SD = 2.74$) and Agape ($M = 11.10, SD = 3.04$).

2.4. Romantic Relationship Characteristics

Results of Pearson correlation test revealed that relationship satisfaction level was negatively related relational anxiety, $r(143) = -.24, p = .003$ whereas positively related with relational esteem, $r(143) = .30, p = .000$ and internal relational control, $r(143) = .17, p = .042$.

Independent samples t-test revealed that, gender did not make a difference on the scores of relational focus, $t(272) = .866, p = .38, (M = 39.10, SD = 9.61$ for females; $M = 38.09, SD = .88$ for males), relational satisfaction, $t(273) = -.37, p = .71, (M = 29.74, SD = 8.87$ for females; $M = 30.11, SD = 6.86$ for males), relational anxiety, $t(274) = -.32, p = .75, (M = 23.21, SD = 6.86$ for females; $M = 23.49, SD = 7.07$ for males), relational monitoring, $t(274) = -1.18, p = .24, (M = 11.27, SD = 4.60$ for females; $M = 11.94, SD = 4.51$ for males), relational esteem, $t(272) = .61, p = .54, (M = 18.86, SD = 3.38$ for females; $M = 18.61, SD = 3.21$ for males), external

control, $t(274) = .14, p = .89$, ($M = 11.63, SD = 3.86$ for females; $M = 11.56, SD = 3.80$ for males), internal control, $t(274) = -1.74, p = .08$, ($M = 12.77, SD = 2.57$ for females; $M = 13.32, SD = 2.48$ for males) and relational assertiveness, $t(274) = -.23, p = .82$, ($M = 14.59, SD = 3.37$ for females; $M = 14.69, SD = 3.58$ for males).

2.5. Sexual Attitudes

Results of Pearson correlation test revealed that relationship satisfaction level was positively related with sexual communion, $r(266) = .21, p = .013$.

Results of independent samples t test revealed that, gender differentiated the groups on sexual permissiveness, $t(271) = 6.33, p = .001$ and birth control, $t(274) = 3.09, p = .002$. That is, females ($M = 31.07, SD = 8.11$) got higher scores on sexual permissiveness than males ($M = 24.55, SD = 8.52$). Moreover females ($M = 13.60, SD = 1.59$) got higher scores on birth control than males ($M = 12.93, SD = 1.97$).

3. Prediction of Love Attitudes, Romantic Relationship Characteristics and Sexual Attitudes: Narcissism and Perceived Parental Attitudes as Predictor Variables

Prior to regression analyses, a series of Pearson correlation analyses were calculated in order to determine the association between narcissism and other variables in the present study.

In order to see whether participants' narcissism scores predicted the love and sexual attitudes as it was hypothesized in the present study, hierarchical regression analyses were performed separately with different variables. A two stage hierarchical regression was conducted for each criterion variables. For these analyses, narcissism and perceived parental attitudes were the predictors, whereas love attitudes, romantic relationship characteristics and sexual attitudes, which had significant correlation with narcissism, were the criterion variables.

3.1. Perceived Parental Attitudes

Table 5 illustrates the Pearson correlations between narcissism and perceived parental attitudes. None of the variables had significant correlation with narcissism.

Table 5

Pearson Correlations between NPI and PBI

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. NPI	1.0	-.036	-.051	-.023	-.053
2. Mother Overprotection		1.0	.42**	.44*	.25**
3. Mother-care			1.0	.31**	.50**
4. Father Overprotection				1.0	.29**
5. Father-care					1.0

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

3.2. Love Attitudes

Table 6 illustrates the Pearson correlations between narcissism and love attitudes. Eros and Pragma were significantly correlated with narcissism.

Table 6

Pearson Correlations between NPI and LAS

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. NPI	1.0	.14*	.10	.007	.17**	.02	-.05
2. Eros		1.0	-.14*	.40**	.09	.03	.21**
3. Ludus			1.0	.04	.18**	.16*	.04
4. Storge				1.0	.15*	.06	.15*
5. Pragma					1.0	.26**	.27**
6. Mania						1.0	.37**
7. Agape							1.0

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The hierarchical regression analysis for Eros revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .027$, $F(4,259) = 1.76$, $p = .137$. At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .042$, $F(5,258) = 2.29$, $p = .047$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 1.6% of the variance, $t(258) = 2.07$, $\beta = .13$, $p = .040$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher Eros scores. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting Eros can be seen in Table 7:

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Eros

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.16	.027	.027
Mother Overprotection	.07	.94			
Mother care/control	.08	1.06			
Father Overprotection	-.11	-1.57			
Father care/control	.08	1.17			
Step 2			.21	.042	.016*
Mother Overprotection	.08	1.06			
Mother care/control	.08	1.07			
Father Overprotection	-.11	-1.62			
Father care/control	.09	1.26			
Narcissism	.13	2.07*			

* $p < .05$

The hierarchical regression analysis for Pragma revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .062$, $F(4, 259) = 4.25$, $p = .002$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Father overprotection was the only significant predictor of Pragma at stage one, $t(259) = -2.91$, $\beta = -.19$, $p = .004$. That is, lower father overprotection was associated with higher Pragma scores (Note that, lower scores on the parental overprotection

indicate higher overprotective attitudes) At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .096$, $F(5,258) = 5.46$, $p = .000$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 3.4% of the variance, $t(258) = 3.11$, $\beta = .19$, $p = .002$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher Pragma scores. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting Pragma can be seen in Table 8:

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Pragma

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.25	.062	.062**
Mother Overprotection	-.12	-1.64			
Mother care/control	.09	1.25			
Father Overprotection	-.19	-2.81**			
Father care/control	.11	1.50			
Step 2			.31	.096	.034***
Mother Overprotection	-.10	-1.49			
Mother care/control	.09	1.27			
Father Overprotection	-.19	-2.91			
Father care/control	.11	1.7			
Narcissism	.19	3.11**			

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.3. Romantic Relationship Characteristics

Table 9 illustrates the Pearson correlations between narcissism and romantic relationship characteristics. According to these results, except relational satisfaction and external relational control, the variables significantly correlated with narcissism.

Table 9

Pearson Correlations between NPI and MRQ

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.NPI	1.0	.11	-.17*	.34**	.13*	.00	.31**	.24**	.15*
2.Satisfaction		1.0	-.57*	.49**	-.25*	-.32**	.35**	.35**	.19**
3.Anxiety			1.0	-.49**	.47**	.38**	-.23**	-.45**	.26*
4.Esteem				1.0	-.13*	-.13*	.46**	.40**	.23**
5.Monitoring					1.0	.31**	-.09	-.30*	.39**
6.External						1.0	-.04	-.15*	.24**
7.Internal							1.0	.40**	.11
8.Assertiveness								1.0	-.04
9.Focus									1.0

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The hierarchical regression analysis for relational anxiety revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .066$, $F(4,260) = 4.59$, $p = .001$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Mother overprotection was

the only significant predictor of relational anxiety at stage one, $t(265) = -3.01$, $\beta = -.21$, $p = .003$. That is, lower mother overprotection was associated with higher relational anxiety. (Note that, lower scores on the parental overprotection indicate higher overprotective attitudes). At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .101$, $F(5,259) = 5.80$, $p = .000$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 3.5% of the variance, $t(265) = -3.16$, $\beta = -.19$, $p = .002$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with lower relational anxiety. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting relational anxiety can be seen in Table 10:

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Anxiety

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.26	.066	.066**
Mother Overprotection	-.20	-2.8**			
Mother care/control	-.04	-.59			
Father Overprotection	-.05	-.72			
Father care/control	-.03	-.43			
Step 2			.32	.101	.035***
Mother Overprotection	-.21	-3.01			
Mother care/control	-.04	-.60			
Father Overprotection	-.05	-.68			
Father care/control	-.04	-.57			
Narcissism	-.19	-3.16**			

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The hierarchical regression analysis for relational esteem revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .013$, $F(4,258) = .86$, $p = .487$. At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .126$, $F(5,257) = 7.44$, $p = .000$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 11.3% of the variance, $t(263) = 5.77$, $\beta = .34$, $p = .000$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher relational esteem. The summary of

hierarchical analysis of variables predicting relational esteem can be seen in

Table 11:

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Esteem

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.12	.013	.013
Mother Overprotection	.04	.59			
Mother care/control	.08	1.05			
Father Overprotection	-.07	-1.03			
Father care/control	-.04	.48			
Step 2			.36	.126	.113***
Mother Overprotection	.07	.94			
Mother care/control	.08	1.10			
Father Overprotection	-.08	-1.18			
Father care/control	.05	.73			
Narcissism	.34	5.77***			

*** $p < .001$

The hierarchical regression analysis for relational monitoring revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .060$, $F(4,260) = 4.15$, $p = .003$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Mother overprotection was the only significant predictor of relational monitoring at stage one, $t(265) = -2.93$, $\beta = -.21$, $p = .004$. That is, lower mother

overprotection was associated with higher relational monitoring. (Note that, lower scores on the parental overprotection indicate higher overprotective attitudes). At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .081$, $F(5,259) = 4.56$, $p = .001$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 2.1% of the variance, $t(265) = 2.42$, $\beta = .15$, $p = .016$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher relational monitoring. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting relational monitoring can be seen in Table 12:

Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Monitoring

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.25	.060	.060**
Mother Overprotection	-.22	-3.04**			
Mother care/control	.06	.82			
Father Overprotection	-.09	-1.33			
Father care/control	.08	1.19			
Step 2			.28	.081	.021**
Mother Overprotection	-.21	-2.93			
Mother care/control	.06	.83			
Father Overprotection	-.09	-1.38			
Father care/control	.09	1.30			
Narcissism	.15	2.42*			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The hierarchical regression analysis for internal relational control revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .036$, $F(4,260) = 2.44$, $p = .048$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Mother care/control was the only significant predictor of internal relational control at stage one, $t(265) = 1.99$, $\beta = .14$, $p = .048$. That is, higher mother care/control was associated with higher internal relational control. At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .124$,

$F(5,259) = 7.33, p = .000$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 8.8% of the variance, $t(265) = 5.10, p = .000$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher internal relational control. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting internal relational control can be seen in Table 13:

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Internal Relational Control

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.19	.036	.036*
Mother Overprotection	.02	.24			
Mother care/control	.14	1.90*			
Father Overprotection	-.03	-.50			
Father care/control	.08	1.11			
Step 2			.35	.124	.088***
Mother Overprotection	.04	.52			
Mother care/control	.14	1.99			
Father Overprotection	-.04	-.60			
Father care/control	.09	1.38			
Narcissism	.30	5.10***			

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

The hierarchical regression analysis for relational assertiveness revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed

significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .056$, $F(4,260) = 3.89$, $p = .004$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Mother overprotection was the only significant predictor of relational assertiveness at stage one, $t(265) = 2.69$, $\beta = .19$, $p = .008$. That is, higher mother overprotection was associated with higher relational assertiveness (Note that, higher scores on the parental overprotection indicated lower overprotective attitudes). At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .124$, $F(5,259) = 7.33$, $p = .000$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 6.8% of the variance, $t(265) = 4.47$, $\beta = .26$, $p = .000$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with higher relational assertiveness. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting relational assertiveness can be seen in Table 14:

Table 14

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Assertiveness

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.24	.056	.056**
Mother Overprotection	.17	2.38**			
Mother care/control	.07	1.01			
Father Overprotection	.06	.91			
Father care/control	-.02	-.34			
Step 2			.35	.124	.068***
Mother Overprotection	.19	2.69			
Mother care/control	.07	1.05			
Father Overprotection	.06	.87			
Father care/control	-.01	-.16			
Narcissism	.26	4.47***			

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The hierarchical regression analysis for relational focus revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .037$, $F(4,258) = 2.50$, $p = .043$. However not all of the predictors were significant in the analysis. Mother overprotection was the only significant predictor of relational focus at stage one, $t(263) = -2.76$, $\beta = -.20$, $p = .006$. That is, lower mother overprotection was associated with higher relational focus. (Note that, lower scores on the parental overprotection indicate higher overprotective attitudes). At stage two, narcissism did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $R^2 =$

.051, $F(5,257) = 2.75$, $p = .057$. The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables relational focus can be seen in Table 15:

Table 15

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Relational Focus

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.19	.037	.037*
Mother Overprotection	-.21	-2.85*			
Mother care/control	.001	.02			
Father Overprotection	.02	.24			
Father care/control	.03	.44			
Step 2			.23	.051	.057
Mother Overprotection	-.20	-2.76			
Mother care/control	.002	.02			
Father Overprotection	.01	.20			
Father care/control	.04	.53			
Narcissism	.12	1.91			

* $p < .05$

3.4. Sexual Attitudes

Table 16 illustrates the Pearson correlations between narcissism and sexual attitudes. According to these results, sexual communion and sexual permissiveness significantly correlated with narcissism.

Table 16

Pearson Correlations between NPI and BSAS

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1.NPI	1.0	-.26**	.05	.12*	-.10
2.Permissiveness		1.0	-.14*	-.07	.29**
3. Birth control			1.0	-.04	-.20**
4.Communion				1.0	-.08
5.Instrumentality					1.0

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The hierarchical regression analysis for sexual permissiveness revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .016$, $F(4,259) = 1.04$, $p = .387$. At stage two, narcissism contributed significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .078$, $F(5,258) = 4.35$, $p = .001$. According to these results, narcissism contributed the regression model with small effect size and explained the 6.2% of the variance, $t(264) = -4.17$, $\beta = -.25$, $p = .00$. That is, higher narcissism was associated with lower sexual permissiveness scores. (Note that, lower scores on sexual permissiveness indicate higher permissive attitudes). The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting sexual permissiveness can be seen in Table 17:

Table 17

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Sexual Permissiveness

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.13	.016	.016
Mother Overprotection	.07	.90			
Mother care/control	.05	.63			
Father Overprotection	-.13	-1.88			
Father care/control	-.03	-.35			
Step 2			.28	.078	.062**
Mother Overprotection	.05	.71			
Mother care/control	.05	.65			
Father Overprotection	-.13	-1.83			
Father care/control	-.04	-.55			
Narcissism	-.25	-4.17***			

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The hierarchical regression analysis for sexual communion revealed that, at stage one, perceived parental attitudes did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .019$, $F(4,259) = 1.28$, $p = .278$. However among perceived parental attitudes, father overprotection had a significant relationship with sexual communion, $t(264) = -2.02$, $\beta = -.14$, $p = .045$. That is, higher father overprotection was associated with lower sexual communion. (Note that, higher parental overprotection score indicates less overprotective attitudes). At stage two, narcissism did not contribute

significantly to the regression model, $R^2 = .027$, $F(5,258) = 1.43$, $p = .213$.

The summary of hierarchical analysis of variables predicting sexual communion can be seen in Table 18:

Table 18

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Sexual Communion

Variable	β	t	R	R^2	R^2 change
Step 1			.14	.019	.019
Mother Overprotection	-.003	-.04			
Mother care/control	.04	.49			
Father Overprotection	-.14	-1.99*			
Father care/control	-.02	-.31			
Step 2			.16	.027	.008
Mother Overprotection	.003	.04			
Mother care/control	.04	.49			
Father Overprotection	-.14	-2.02			
Father care/control	-.02	-.25			
Narcissism	.09	1.42			

* $p < .05$

DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to explore the relation between narcissism, perceived parental attitudes, love attitudes and sexual attitudes. In this section, the main points of the results, limitations and clinical implications will be discussed.

1. Narcissism, Perceived Parental Attitudes, Romantic/Sexual Relationships and Demographic Information

The first and second hypotheses addressed the group differences depending on gender and relational satisfaction. Results revealed that gender did not make a difference between groups on the scores of narcissism but males got higher scores on narcissism than females. This result is consistent with previous researches (Eren, 2012; Gabriel, Critelli & Ee, 1994; Lau et al., 2010), which revealed that narcissism scores of males were significantly higher than scores of females. Moreover, gender did not make a difference on perceived parental attitudes.

Consistent with Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu (2004) and Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler (1988), participants, who placed importance on passionate and erotic feelings in their relationships, had more satisfactory relationships. On the other hand, participants, who had game-playing love style, had less satisfactory relationships. This finding suggests that, romantic relationship styles effect the relational satisfaction. Participants who endorsed Ludus, might have uncommitted relationships with different partners at the same time. Therefore, they might have some relational

problems and get less satisfaction. Additionally, males were prone to experience uncommitted relationships or to have selfless attitudes than females. In Turkish culture, males tend to distinguish their partners with generalizations such as those they are in love with, ones they will get married to, or those they are just having a good time with for the time being with no future plans. The differences in the way they consider their significant others are very sharp and this creates an illusion or an ignorant sensibility of a right choice of path for relationships. Therefore, some males aim towards relationships in which they can or have to commit less, which results in higher Ludus scores. Another portion of males choose to be self-sacrificing for the ones they think they are in love with, resulting in higher Agape scores. Moreover, all of these findings are compatible with the studies of Büyükşahin & Hovardaoğlu (2004) and Hendrick & Hendrick (2005).

Consistent with the study of Büyükşahin (2005), participants, who evaluate themselves more positively in their relationships and who believe their own control on relationships, had more satisfactory relationships. However, participants, who feel anxious about relationships, had less satisfactory relationships.

Results of the sexual attitudes revealed that, participants, who had idealistic sexual attitudes, had more satisfactory relationships. This finding suggests that, sexual relationship attitudes effect the relational satisfaction. Moreover, males tend to accept casual sex with multiple partners than females and females tend to emphasize the importance of birth control than

males. These findings are consistent with the study of Hendrick, Hendrick and Reich (2006).

2. Narcissism and Love Styles

The third hypothesis addressed the association between narcissism and love attitudes. The results of the correlation analyses revealed that, participants, who had high scores on the narcissism, described themselves more pragmatic in their romantic relationships. They consider the potential partners' educational level, family history and job status. Consistent with this finding, Kernberg (2011) claimed that, narcissistic people analyze the pros and cons of the potential romantic partners. Addition to that, participants, who had high scores on the narcissism, reported more Eros. This finding implied that, they tend to emphasize romantic feelings and passionate in their romantic relationships. They idealize their partners and place greater importance upon physical attraction. All of these findings are consistent with Rohmann et al. (2012)'s study which compared the distinction between love styles of vulnerable and grandiose narcissism. In contrast to previous findings, there was no relationship between narcissism and Ludic love style. This result is inconsistent with the narcissistic game playing concept. There are possible explanations for this result. Firstly, internal consistency of Ludus subscale was found very low. Therefore, this finding should be carefully evaluated. Moreover, Emmons (1984, 1987) proposed the more adaptive and pathological dimensions of narcissism. However total scores of narcissism were analyzed in the current study. Ludic love style refers game playing love style which indicates

uncommitted and unserious relationships. Total points of NPI might refer healthier patterns of narcissism, thus higher scores on the NPI might not be related with unhealthier love attitudes.

The results of the regression analyses revealed that, after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes, narcissism predicted the Eros and Pragma with small size effects. Addition to that, participants, who perceived their fathers overprotective, tend to describe themselves more pragmatic in their romantic relationships. This finding suggests that, fathers' overprotective attitudes might prevent children from developing autonomous personality. They might expect to feel secure in their romantic relationships. Therefore, they tend to choose partners depending on their partners' job, family or education rather than emotions.

3. Narcissism and Romantic Relationship Characteristics

The fourth hypothesis addressed the association between narcissism and romantic relationship characteristics. The results revealed that, participants, who have high scores on the narcissism, tend to evaluate their own relational capacity more positive and to be more assertive about romantic relationships. They tend to believe that their relationships are determined by their own control and they are aware of other people's judgments about their relationships. These findings are consistent with Aydogdu (2010)'s study which found an association between extraversion and relational assertiveness, relational esteem and relational monitoring. Additionally, participants, who had high scores on the narcissism, tend to

focus on intimate relationships. Addition to these findings, participants, who have high scores on the narcissism, tend to feel less anxious and fearful about close relationships. This finding is not consistent with Smolewska & Dion (2005)'s study which propounded that narcissistic people tend to feel anxious because of their incapacity to cope with their negative view of self in romantic relationships. Moreover, Kernberg (2011) suggested that narcissistic people feel anxious about being dependent to their romantic partners. In consistent with the previous section, all of these findings indicate that, narcissism scores might refer more adaptive form of narcissism in the current study.

Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that, after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes, narcissism predicted the relational esteem, relational monitoring, internal relational control, relational assertiveness and relational anxiety with small size effects. Addition to that, maternal overprotection predicted relational anxiety, relational monitoring and relational assertiveness with small size effects. Participants, who perceived their mothers overprotective, tend to feel anxious about intimate relationships and to be aware of other people's judgments about their romantic relationships. Additionally participants, who did not perceive their mothers overprotective, tend to be assertive in romantic relationships. These findings suggest that, mother's overprotective attitudes might prevent the child from feeling self-confidence in the future relationships. Primary relationship, which is characterized by insecurity and dependency, might be generalized to the future intimate relationships.

Addition to these findings, participants, who perceived their mothers more caring, tend to believe their own control on romantic relationships.

All of these results revealed that, after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental control, narcissism had significant relationships with romantic relationship characteristics. Additionally, paternal attitudes had no significant relationship with romantic relationships, whereas maternal attitudes were the significant predictor of romantic relationships. These findings are consistent with the views of Freud (1905; cited in Quinodoz, 2006), Hitschmann (1952) and Kernberg (1995/2011) who propounded the importance of the first relationships between primary caregiver and baby on intimate relationships. In Turkish families, mothers are usually perceived as primary caregiving thus maternal attitudes might be prominent determinative of the future relationships.

4. Narcissism and Sexual Attitudes

The last hypothesis addressed the association between narcissism and sexual attitudes. The results of the correlation analyses showed that, participants, who had high scores on the narcissism, tend to accept of casual sex with many partners. This finding is consistent with Kernberg (1995/2011) who pointed that narcissistic people's sexual permissiveness. On the other hand, participants, who had high scores on the narcissism, tend to experience sexuality with emotional commitment. This finding is not compatible with Foster et al. (2006) who propounded that narcissistic people place greater importance upon physical pleasure rather than

emotional intimacy. There are possible explanations for this result. As mentioned above, this result might be related with the adaptive form of narcissism. When individuals with healthy narcissism choose their romantic partners, they might tend to place importance to emotional commitment. Additionally, the items of the sexual communion subscale include questions such as 'Sex is the closest form of communication between two people' or 'Sex is a very important part of life.' These questions might refer sexuality as a central of all romantic relationships rather than sexuality with emotional intimacy.

Hierarchical regression analyses showed that after controlling the possible effects of perceived parental attitudes, narcissism predicted the sexual permissiveness and sexual communion with small size effects. Perceived parental attitudes did not significantly predict sexual attitudes but father overprotection was associated with sexual communion. According to this result, participants, who perceived their fathers overprotective, tend to experience sexuality without emotional commitment.

5. Limitations and Future Directions

The findings of this study should be interpreted with the limitations. First limitation is based on narcissism scale. Original form of narcissism scale has 7 subscales. Some of the subscales refer more pathological part of narcissism whereas other subscales refer adaptive part of narcissism. However, factor structures have been changed and only total scores can be considered in Turkish scale. Total scores involve the questions which

investigate the both of pathological and adaptive parts of narcissism.

Therefore it can be seen that, the results of the present study are limited due to lack of subscales. In the future researches, different scales should be used in order to analyze the possible effects of different subscales on intimate relationships.

As mentioned in previous sections, narcissism is quite comprehensive and complex notion. Narcissism can be regarded as healthy narcissism, pathological narcissism, narcissistic defenses or narcissistic vulnerability. In the present study, narcissism was measured by only one scale. Because of the narrow operationalization of narcissism, the results are limited. In order to enhance generalizability, narcissism might be assessed by several scales in the future researches. Moreover vulnerable narcissism was found more significant predictor of intimate relationships (Rohnar et al, 2006). Therefore vulnerable narcissism and grandiose narcissism might be compared in the future studies.

A third limitation based on the sample characteristics. Majority of the participants comprised female students from middle and high socioeconomic status. The sample might not be representative of larger population. Moreover majority of the sample was between the ages of 21 to 29, thus the results might not reflect the more mature romantic relationships. In order to make more meaningful deductions, men, nonstudent and married population might be focused in the future researches. Addition to that, group differences depending on socioeconomic status, education, family history and traumatic life events could not be analyzed due to low number of cases.

In the future researches, larger sample size should be used in order to analyze possible effects of traumatic life events and family history on the narcissism and romantic relationships.

The other limitation refers self-report measures. The reliability of the answers to love attitudes and sexual attitudes might be evaluated suspiciously. Even if confidentiality assured, the participants might tend to give more social acceptable answers to questions with regard to love and sexual attitudes.

The main aim of the current study was to investigate the relationship between narcissism and romantic/sexual relationships. However regression analyses revealed that, the predictable effects of narcissism on romantic and sexual relationships were limited. Historical backgrounds such as, family conflict, parental divorce or sexual/physical abuse might have significant effects on romantic and sexual relationships. Therefore, traumatic life events and family history should be analyzed as the predictor variables of romantic and sexual relationships in the future researches.

Finally, the current study was correlational thus causation between narcissism and romantic relationships were not investigated. In conclusion, this study was the one of the limited empirical studies, which explore the relationship between narcissism and romantic/sexual affairs in Turkey and extended the psychology literature by showing the possible associations between narcissism, perceived parental attitudes, romantic relationships and sexual attitudes.

6. Clinical Implications

The findings of the current study have important clinical implications. At first, couple therapists should focus on identifying partners' love styles. In this way, couples can understand their partners' relational tendencies and prevent possible relational problems. Moreover, some relational characteristics, such as relational anxiety, relational esteem, internal relational control and sexual communion, are associated with relational satisfaction. Psychologists should help the couples to gain insight about their relational dissatisfaction and to find the ways to improve relational satisfaction. Addition to these implications, findings of the present study might be helpful to understand the association between narcissistic vulnerabilities and intimate relationships. Psychologist working with narcissistic disorders should be careful about the clients' relational dynamics. Their pragmatist relational tendencies and permissive sexual attitudes might lead them to have less satisfactory relationships. Besides, psychologists, working with couples, should identify the narcissistic tendencies of partners and prevent the possible relational risks. Lastly, maternal overprotection was found a significant predictor of romantic relationships. Therefore psychologist should not ignore the influence of maternal overprotection on intimate relationships.

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.) Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Atak, H., & Taştan, N. (2012). Romantik ilişkiler ve aşk. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, 4(4), 520-546.
- Aydoğdu, İ. (2010). *Romantik ilişkilerin kişilik özellikleri açısından incelenmesi*. Unpublished master thesis. Gazi Üniversitesi: Ankara.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7(2), 147-178.
- Bergmann, M.S. (1988). Freud's three theories of love in the light of later developments. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 36, 653-672.
- Bernardi, E., Jones, M., & Tennant, C. (1989). Quality of parenting in alcoholics and narcotic addicts. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 154, 677-682.
- Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2009). Emotional responses to a romantic partner's imaginary rejection: The roles of attachment anxiety, covert narcissism and self-evaluation. *Journal of Personality*, 77(1), 287-325.
- Birnbaum, G. E. (2007). Beyond the borders of reality: Attachment orientations and sexual fantasies. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 321-342.

- Bleiberg, E. (1994). Normal and pathological narcissism in adolescents. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 48(1), 30-51.
- Bogaert, A.F., & Sadava, S. (2002). Adult attachment and sexual behavior. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 191-204.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol 1. Attachment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Boyd, H. (1968). Love versus omnipotence: The narcissistic dilemma. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 5(4), 272-277.
- Bradlee, P.M., & Emmons, R.A. (1992). Locating narcissism within the interpersonal circumplex and the five-factor model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(7), 821-830.
- Brennan, K.A., & Shaver, P.R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation and romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(3), 267-283.
- Bursten, B. (1986). Some narcissistic personality types. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 377-403). New York: New York University Press.
- Butzer, B., & Campbell, L. (2008). Adult attachment, sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction: A study of married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 15, 141-154.

- 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. (2005). Çokboyutlu ilişki ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 16(2), 97-105.
- Campbell, W.K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1254-1270.
- Campbell, W.K., Foster, C.A., & Finkel, E.J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 340-354.
- Campbell, W.K., & Foster, C.A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(4), 484-495.
- Campbell, W.K., Goodie, A.S., & Foster, J.D. (2004). Narcissism, confidence and risk attitude. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 17(4), 297-311.
- Campbell, W.K., & Foster, C.A. (2007). The narcissistic self: Background, an extended agency model and ongoing controversies. In Sedikides, C., & Spencer, S.J (Eds), *The self: Frontiers of social psychology*, (pp. 115-138). New York: Psychology Press.
- Carroll, L. (1987). A study of narcissism, affiliation, intimacy and power motives among students in business administration. *Psychological Reports*, 61(2), 355-358.

- Cooper, A.M. (1986). Narcissism. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 112-144). New York: New York University Press.
- Cater, T.E., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Vonk, J. (2011). Narcissism and recollections of early life experiences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(8), 935-939.
- Dickinson, K.A. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorder*, 17(3), 188-207.
- Emmons, R.A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 43(3), 291-300.
- Emmons, R.A. (1987). Narcissism: theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 11-17.
- Erikson, E.H., (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton Press.
- Erwin, P.G., & Pressler, S.J. (2011). Love styles, shyness and patterns of emotional self-disclosure. *Psychological Reports*, 108(3), 737-742.
- Ettensohn, M.D. (2013). The relational roots of narcissism: Exploring relationships between attachment style, acceptance by parents and peers and measures of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 73(10-B)(E).
- Feeney, J.A. (1996). Attachment, caregiving and marital satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 3(4), 401-416.

- Feeney, J.A., Peterson, C., Gallois, C., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Attachment style as a predictor of sexual attitude and behavior in late adolescence. *Psychology and Health, 14*, 1105-1122.
- Feng, C., Zhou, H., Liang, Y., & Yi, L. (2012). Two faces of narcissism and romantic attraction: Evidence from a collectivistic culture. *Psychological Reports: Mental & Physical Health, 111*(1), 1-12.
- Fisher, H. (2004). *Why we love: The nature and chemistry of romantic love*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Foster, J.D., Shrira, I. & Campbell, W.K. (2006). Theoretical models of narcissism, sexuality and relationship commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*(3), 367-386.
- Freud, S. (1914). On narcissism: An introduction. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 17-44). New York: New York University Press.
- Fromm, E. (2007). *Sevme sanatı*. (2nd ed.). (Ö.S. Karadana, Trans.). İzmir: İlya. (Original work published 1956).
- Gabriel, M.T., Critelli, J.W., & Ee, J.S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality, 62*(1), 143-155.
- Gentzler, A.L., & Kerns, K.A. (2004). Associations between insecure attachment and sexual experiences. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 249-265.

- Gottschalk, L.A. (1988). Narcissism: Its normal evolution and development and the treatment of its disorders. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 42(1), 4-27.
- Hammock, G., & Richardson, D.S. (2011). Love attitudes and relationship experience. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(5), 608-624.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M.J., & Foote, F.H. (1985). Gender differences in sexual attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1630-1642.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 392-402.
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Multidimensionality of sexual attitudes. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 23(4), 502-526.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N.A. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction and staying together. *Journal of Personality*, 54(6), 980-988.
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick C. (1995). Gender differences and similarities in sex and love. *Personal Relationships*, 2(1), 55-65.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., & Reich, D.A. (2006). The brief sexual attitudes scale. *Journal of Sex Research*, 43(1), 76-86.
- Herold, E.S., & Goodwin, M.S. (1979). Self-esteem and sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 35(4), 908-912.

- Herold, E.S., & Goodwin, M.S. (1980). Development of a scale to measure attitudes toward using birth control pills. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 110*, 115-122.
- Hill, V.Z., Clark, B., & Pickard, J.D. (2008). Narcissistic subtypes and contingent self-esteem: Do all narcissists base their self-esteem on the same domains. *Journal of Personality, 76*(4), 753-774.
- Hitschmann, E. (1952). Freud's conception of love. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 33*, 421-428.
- Horton, R.S., Bleau, G., & Drwecki, B. (2006). Parenting narcissus: What are the links between parenting and narcissism? *Journal of Personality, 74*(2), 345-376.
- Hui, Z., Hui, Z., & Bao, Z. (2010). Relationships among narcissism, empathy and prosocial behaviors. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18*(2), 228-231.
- Hurlbert, D., & Apt, C. (1991). Sexual narcissism and abusive male. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 17*(4), 279-292.
- Hurlbert, D., Apt, C., Gasar, S., Wilson, N., & Murphy, Y. (1994). Sexual narcissism: A validation study. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 20*(1), 24-34.
- Kapçı, E.G., & Küçüker, S. (2006). Ana babaya bağlanma ölçeği: Türk üniversite öğrencilerinde psikometrik özelliklerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 17*(4), 286-295.

- Karaçam, Ö., Totan, T., Korkmaz, Y.B., & Koyuncu M. (2012). Hendrick cinsel tutum ölçeği kısa formunun türkçeye uyarlanması, geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Journal of Psychiatry*, 13, 138-144.
- Kealy, D., & Ogrodniczuk, J.S. (2014). Pathological narcissism and the obstruction of love. *Psychodynamic Psychiatry*, 42(1), 101-120.
- Kernberg, O. (1970). Factors in the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personalities. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 213-245). New York: New York University.
- Kernberg, O. (1974). Further contributions to the treatment of narcissistic personalities. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 245-293). New York: New York University Press.
- Kernberg, O. (2010). Narcissistic personality disorder. In Clarkin, J.F., Fonagy, P., & Gabbard, G.O. (Eds). *Psychodynamic psychotherapy for personality disorders: A clinical Handbook* (pp. 257-289). London: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Kernberg, O. (2011). *Aşk ilişkileri*. (3rd ed.). (A. Yılmaz, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı. (Original work published 1995).
- Kernberg, O. (2011). Limitations to the capacity to love. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92, 1501-1515.
- Kızıltan, H. (2000). Narcissistic personality inventory (NPI) ölçeğinin türkçe formu dil eşdeğerliliği, güvenirlik ve geçerlilik çalışmaları. (Unpublished master thesis). İstanbul University: İstanbul.

- Kitamura, T., Watanabe, M., Aoki, M., Fujino, M., Ura, C., & Fujihara, S. (1995). Factorial structure and correlates of marital adjustment in a Japanese population: A community study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 117-126.
- Kohut, H., & Wolf, E.S. (1978). The disorders of the self and their treatment: An outline. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 175-197). New York: New York University Press.
- Lam, Z.K.W., (2012). Narcissism and romantic relationship: The mediating role of perception discrepancy. *SS Student E-Journal*, 1, 1-20.
- Lau, K.S.L, Marsee, M.A., Kunimatsu, M.M., & Fassnacht, G.M. (2010). Examining associations between narcissism, behavior problems and anxiety in non-referred adolescents. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 40, 163-176.
- Ledermann, R. (1986). Pathological sexuality and paucity of symbolisation in narcissistic disorder. *Journal of Analytic Psychology*, 31, 23-43.
- Levy, M.B., & Davis, K.E. (1988). Lovestyles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5(4), 439-471.
- Li, T., & Chan, D.K.S (2012). How anxious and avoidant attachment affect romantic relationship quality differently: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 406-419.
- Lyons, M., Morgan, K., Thomas, J., & Hashmi, A.A. (2013). Patterns of parental warmth, attachment and narcissism in young women in United Arab

- Emirates and the United Kingdom. *Individual Differences Research*, 11(4), 149-158.
- Madey, S.F., & Rodgers, L. (2009). The effect of attachment and Sternberg's triangular theory of love on relationship satisfaction. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(2), 76-84.
- Madey, S.F., & Jilek, L. (2012). Attachment style and dissolution of romantic relationships: Breaking up is hard to do, or is it. *Individual Differences Research*, 10(4), 202-210.
- Mallandain, I., & Davies, M.F. (1994). The colours of love: Personality correlates of love styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17(4), 557-560.
- Mathieu, C. (2013). Personality and job satisfaction: The role of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(6), 650-654.
- McCarthy, G., & Maughan, B. (2010). Negative childhood experiences and adult love relationships: The role of internal working models of attachment. *Attachment & Human Development*, 12(5), 445-461.
- McNeal, S. (2008). Healthy narcissism and ego state therapy. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 56(1), 19-36.
- McWilliams, N. (2010). *Psikanalitik tanı: Klinik süreç içinde kişilik yapısını anlamak*. (2nd ed.) (E. Kalem, Trans.). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. (Original work published 1994).

- Miller, A. (1979). Depression and grandiosity as related forms of narcissistic disturbances. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed), *Essential Papers on Narcissism* (pp. 323-348). New York: New York University Press.
- Miller, I. (1992). Interpersonal vulnerability and narcissism: A conceptual continuum for understanding and treating narcissistic psychopathology. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, Training*, 29(2), 216-224.
- Millings, A., Walsh, J., Hepper, E., & O'Brian M. (2013). Good partner, good parent: Responsiveness mediates the link between romantic attachment and parenting style. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(2), 170-180.
- Oriña, M. M., Collins, W.A., Simpson, J.A., Salvatore, J.E., Haydn, K.C., & Kim, J.S. (2011). Developmental and dyadic perspectives on commitment in adult romantic relationships. *Psychological Sciences*, 22(7), 908-915.
- Parker, G. (1979). Parental characteristics in relation to depressive disorders. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 134, 138-147.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L.B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52(1), 1-10.
- Parker, G. (1981). Parental representations of patients with anxiety neurosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 63(1), 33-36.
- Parker, G., Kiloh, L., & Hayward, L. (1987). Parental representations of neurotic and endogenous depressives. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 13(1), 75-82.

PDM Task Force (2006). Psychodynamic diagnostic manual. Silver Spring, MD:

Alliance of Psychoanalytic Organization.

Pistole, M.C. (1995). Adult attachment style and narcissistic vulnerability.

Psychoanalytic Psychology, 12(1), 115-126.

Pole, R., Waller, D.A., Stewart, S.M., & Parkin-Feigenbaum, L. (1988). Parental

caring versus overprotection in bulimia. *International Journal of Eating*

Disorders, 7(5), 601-606.

Pulver, S.E. (1970). On narcissism: An introduction. In Morrison, A.P. (Ed),

Essential Papers on Narcissism (pp. 17-44). New York: New York

University Press.

Raskin, R., & Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological*

Reports, 46, 55-60.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic

personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal*

of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(5), 890-902.

Reti, I.M., Samuels, J.F., Eaton, W.W., Bienvenu, O.J., Costa, P.T., & Nestadt, J.G.

(2002). Adult antisocial personality traits are associated with experiences of

low parental care and maternal overprotection. *Acta Psychiatrica*

Scandinavica, 106, 126-133.

Rhodewalt, F., Madrian, J., & Cheney, S. (1998). Narcissism, self-knowledge

organization and emotional reactivity: The effect of daily experiences on

self-esteem and affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(1), 75-87.

Rohmann, E., Neumann, E., Herner, M.J., & Bierhoff, H.W. (2012). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: Self-construal, attachment and love in romantic relationships. *European Psychologist*, 17(4), 279-290.

Rohner, R.P. (1975). *They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection*. US: Hraf Press.

Rosegrant, J. (2012). Narcissism and sadomasochistic relationships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 68(8), 935-942.

Shaver, P.R., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R.J. Sternberg & M. Barnes (Eds), *The psychology of love* (pp. 68-99). New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Smolewska, K., & Dion, K.L. (2005). Narcissism and adult attachment: A multivariate approach. *Self and Identity*, 4, 59-68.

Surjadi, F.F., Lorenz, F.O, Conger, R.D., & Wickrama, K.A.S (2013). Harsh, inconsistent parental discipline and romantic relationships: Mediating processes of behavioral problems and ambivalence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(5), 762-777.

Steinberg, S. J., & Davilla, J. (2008). Romantic functioning and depressive symptoms among early adolescent girls: The moderating role of parental

- emotional availability. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 27(2), 350-362.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93(2), 119-135.
- Sanrı, Ç., & Goodwin, R. (2013). Values and love styles in Turkey and Great Britain: An intercultural and intracultural comparison. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(5), 837-845.
- Simpson, J.A., & Tran, S. (2006). The needs, benefits and perils of close relationships. In Nodler, P. & Feeney, J.A. (Eds), *Close relationships. Functions, forms and processes* (pp. 3-25). New York: Psychology Press.
- Sprecher, S. (2006). Sexuality in close relationships. In Nodler, P. & Feeney, J.A. (Eds), *Close relationships. Functions, forms and processes* (pp. 267-285). New York: Psychology Press.
- Sümer, Z.H. (2013). Effects of gender and sex-role orientation on sexual attitudes among Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41(6), 995-1008.
- Švrakić, D.M. (1986). The real self of narcissistic personalities: A clinical approach. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 219-229.
- Quinodoz, J.M. (2006). *Reading Freud*. (D. Alcorn, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

- Taris, T.W., Semin, G.R., & Bok, I.E. (1998). The effect of quality of family interaction and intergenerational transmission of values on sexual permissiveness. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 159*(2), 237-250.
- Thomasgard, M., & Metz, W.P. (1993). Parental overprotection revisited. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 24*(2), 67-80.
- Toda, M., Kawai, T., Takeo, K., Rokutan, K., & Morimoto, K. (2008). Parental rearing attitudes and health – related lifestyle of university students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(4), 551-558.
- Treger, S., & Sprecher, S. (2011). The influences of sociosexuality and attachment style on reactions to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*(5), 413-422.
- Walsh, A. (1993). Love styles, masculinity/femininity, physical attractiveness and sexual behavior: A test of evolutionary theory. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 14*(1), 25-38.
- Watson, P.J., Grisham, S.O., Trotter, M.V., & Biderman, M.D. (1984). Narcissism and empathy: Validity evidence for the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 301-305.
- Watson, P.J., Little, T., & Biderman, M.D. (1992). Narcissism and parenting styles. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 9*(2), 231-244.
- Watson, P.J., & Biderman, M.D. (1993). Narcissistic personality inventory factors, splitting and self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*(1), 41-57.

- Widman, L., & McNulty, J.K. (2010). Sexual narcissism and the perpetration of sexual aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behaviors*, 39, 926-939.
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4), 590-597.
- Wryobeck, J.M., & Wiederman, M.W. (1999). Sexual narcissism: Measurement and correlates among college men. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 25, 321-331.
- Zhou, H., & Zhang, B. (2010). Relationships among narcissism, empathy and prosocial behaviors. *Chinese Journals of Clinical Psychology*, 18(2), 228-231.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent Form

Bilgi ve Onay Formu

Bu araştırmanın amacı, aşk ilişkileri, cinsellik ve algılanan aile tutumlarının belli kişilik özellikleri açısından değerlendirilmesidir.

Araştırma sırasında elde edilen bilgiler anonim olarak ve grup halinde değerlendirilecektir. Bu araştırmaya katıldığınız bilgisi kimse ile paylaşılmayacak, kişisel bilgileriniz tez çalışmasında ya da herhangi bir sunum/yayında açıklanmayacaktır. Ad soyad gibi kişisel bilgileriniz yalnızca bu form üzerinde yer alacak ve bu form, diğer anketlerden ayrı bir yerde saklanacaktır. Anket formları üzerinde, her katılımcıya verilen numaralar yer alacaktır.

Bu araştırmaya katılımınızın size herhangi bir zarar vereceği öngörülmemektedir. Çalışmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Şimdi ya da çalışmanın başka bir bölümünde, çalışmaya devam etmeme hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışma yaklaşık 20-25 dk. sürmektedir. Çalışmanın güvenilirliği açısından, hiçbir soruyu boş bırakmadan anketleri tamamlamanız beklenmektedir.

Bu araştırma İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans program öğrencilerinden Burçak Özdemir'in yüksek lisans bitirme tezi için yürütülmektedir. Araştırmanın danışmanı, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Psikoloji bölümü öğretim üyesi Yrd. Doç. Dr Ayten Zara'dır. Çalışmaya katılım ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa ya da çalışmaya katılımınızdan sonar araştırma ile ilgili bilgi almak isterseniz Burçak Özdemir (burcak.ozdemir@yahoo.com.tr) ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya katkıda bulunduğunuz için teşekkür ederiz.

Yukarıdaki açıklamayı okudum. Bu çerçevede, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının adı-soyadı:

Katılımcının imzası:

Tarih:

APPENDIX B

Demographic Information Form

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

Kişisel Bilgiler

Yaş:

Cinsiyetiniz: ☐ Kadın ☐ Erkek

Medeni Haliniz: ☐ Evli ☐ Bekar ☐ Dul/Boşanmış

Eğitim durumunuz

İlkokul ☐ Ortaokul ☐ Lise ☐ Üniversite ☐ Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

Çalışıyorsanız;

Mesleğiniz: _____

Şu anda kimlerle yaşıyorsunuz?

☐ Eş ve çocuklar ☐ Anne baba ☐ Arkadaş/Akraba ☐ Sevgili ☐ Yalnız

☐ Diğer

Ekonomik Durumunuz: ☐ Alt ☐ Orta ☐ Üst

Aile Bilgisi

Babanızın;

Annenizin;

Kardeş(ler);

Yaşı:

Yaşı:

Yaş(lar)ı:

Mesleği:

Mesleği:

Aşağıdaki durumlardan ailenizde mevcut olan(lar) varsa lütfen işaretleyiniz.
Eğer bu durumu yaşıyorsanız, o sırada kaç yaşında olduğunuzu belirtiniz.

☐ Anne kaybı Yaş: _____

☐ Baba kaybı Yaş: _____

☐ Kardeş kaybı Yaş: _____

☐ Anne baba boşanması Yaş: _____

Aşağıdaki durumlardan sizde mevcut olan(lar) varsa lütfen işaretleyiniz. O sırada tahmini olarak hangi yaş döneminde olduğunuzu belirtiniz.

() Anne ve baba arasında uzun süreli yoğun çatışma yaşanması

Yaş: _____

() Anne ya da babada psikiyatrik bir rahatsızlığın olması

Yaş: _____

() Anne, baba, kardeş ya da kendinizde kronik/hayatı riske sokan bir hastalığın bulunması (kanser, MS, böbrek hastalığı, diyabet gibi)

Yaş: _____

() Anne ya da babanın alkol / madde kötüye kullanımı

Yaş: _____

() Bir aile üyesi tarafından fiziksel ya da cinsel tacize uğrama

Yaş: _____

() Bir yabancı tarafından fiziksel ya da cinsel tacize uğrama

Yaş: _____

İlişki Bilgisi

Şu anda romantik bir ilişki yaşıyor musunuz? ()Evet () Hayır

Şu ana dek hiç cinsel ilişkide bulundunuz mu? ()Evet () Hayır

Eğer şu anda romantik bir ilişki içerisindeyseniz;

Bu ilişkiniz ne kadar zamandır sürüyor? Lütfen belirtiniz. _____

Bu ilişkinizde ne derece mutlu olduğunuzu düşünüyorsunuz? Lütfen işaretleyiniz.
(1- Hiç mutlu değilim, 10 – Çok mutluyum)

1 () 2 () 3 () 4 () 5 () 6 () 7 () 8 () 9 () 10 ()

Eğer şu anda bir romantik ilişki içerisinde değilseniz;

En son romantik ilişkinizi ne zaman yaşamıştınız? Lütfen belirtiniz.

Son ilişkiniz ne kadar sürmüştü? _____

APPENDIX C

Narcissistic Personality Inventory

Aşağıdaki her bir tutum çifti içinden, size en uygun olanını seçiniz. Yanıtınızı her bir maddenin yanındaki boş bırakılmış yere, A ya da B yazarak işaretleyiniz. Her bir tutum çifti için yalnızca bir yanıtı işaretleyiniz ve lütfen hiçbir maddeyi atlamayınız.

- _____ 1. A İnsanları etkileme konusunda doğal bir yeteneğe sahibim.
B İnsanları kolay etkileyemem.
- _____ 2. A Alçakgönüllülük bana yakışmaz.
B Temelde alçakgönüllü bir insanım.
- _____ 3. A Cesaretimi kanıtlamak uğruna hemen her şeyi yapabilirim.
B Oldukça temkinli bir insanım.
- _____ 4. A İnsanlar bana iltifat ettiklerinde bazen utanırım.
B İyi biri olduğumu biliyorum, çünkü herkes böyle söylüyor.
- _____ 5. A Dünyayı yönetme düşüncesi ödümü koparır.
B Ben yönetseydim dünya daha iyi bir yer olurdu.
- _____ 6. A Genellikle konuşarak her beladan kurtulabilirim.
B Davranışlarımın sonuçlarını kabul etmeye çalışırım.
- _____ 7. A Kalabalık içinde herhangi biri olmayı tercih ederim.
B İlgi merkezi olmayı severim.
- _____ 8. A Çok başarılı olacağım.
B Başarı benim için en önde gelen şey değildir.
- _____ 9. A Pek çok insandan ne daha iyi ne de daha kötüyüm.
B Özel biri olduğumu düşünüyorum.
- _____ 10. A İyi bir lider olabileceğimden emin değilim.
B İyi bir lider olduğumu düşünüyorum.
- _____ 11. A Düşünce ve isteklerimi kolaylıkla ifade edebilirim.
B Keşke düşünce ve isteklerimi daha kolay ifade edebilseydim.
- _____ 12. A Vücudumla hava atmak çok hoşlandığım bir şey değildir.

- B Vücudumla hava atmaktan hoşlanırım.
- ___ 13. A İnsanların içini bir kitap gibi okurum.
B Bazen insanları anlamak güçtür.
- ___ 14. A Sıradan bir mutluluk bana yeter.
B Başkalarının gözünde önemli bir yerim olsun isterim.
- ___ 15. A Vücudum öyle ahım şahım değildir.
B Vücuduma bakmaktan hoşlanırım.
- ___ 16. A Gösteriş yapmaktan kaçınırım.
B Genellikle fırsat bulduğumda gösteriş yaparım.
- ___ 17. A Her zaman ne yaptığımın bilincindeyimdir.
B Bazen ne yaptığımdan emin olamıyorum.
- ___ 18. A İşlerin yapılmasında bazen başkalarına ihtiyaç duyarım.
B İşlerin yapılmasında başkalarına nadiren ihtiyaç duyarım.
- ___ 19. A Bazen anlattıklarım ilgi çeker.
B Herkes benim anlattıklarımı dinlemekten hoşlanır.
- ___ 20. A İnsanlardan çok şey beklerim.
B Başkaları için bir şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanırım.
- ___ 21. A Hak ettiğim her şeyi elde edene kadar tatmin olmam.
B Hayatın sunduğu tatminler bana yeter.
- ___ 22. A İltifatlar beni utandırır.
B Bana iltifat edilmesinden hoşlanırım.
- ___ 23. A Güç sahibi olmak benim için çok önemlidir.
B Güç sahibi olmak, kendi başına bir amaç olarak, beni o kadar çok ilgilendirmez.
- ___ 24. A Aynada kendimi seyretmekten hoşlanırım.
B Aynada kendimi seyretmek, özellikle ilgimi çeken bir şey değildir.
- ___ 25. A İlgi merkezi olmak çok hoşuma gider.
B İlgi merkezi olmak beni rahatsız eder.

- ____26. A Hayatımı istediğim biçimde yaşayabilirim.
B İnsanlar hayatlarını her zaman istedikleri doğrultuda yaşayamazlar.
- ____27. A **Otorite olmak benim için pek anlam taşımaz.**
B **Öyle görünüyor ki insanlar her zaman benim otoritemi kabul ederler.**
- ____28. A Lider olmayı tercih ederdim.
B Lider olup olmamak arasında benim açımdan pek bir fark yoktur.
- ____29. A **Büyük bir insan olacağım**
B **Başarılı olacağımı umut ediyorum.**
- ____30. A Ben doğuştan liderim.
B Liderlik geliştirilmesi uzun zaman alan bir niteliktir.
- ____31. A **Günün birinde birinin hayat öykümü yazmasını dilerdim.**
B **İnsanların hangi sebeple olursa olsun hayatıma burunlarını sokmalarından hoşlanmam.**
- ____32. A İnsanların arasına girdiğim zaman beni fark etmediklerinde bozulurum.
B İnsanların arasına girdiğimde kalabalık içinde herhangi biri olmak beni rahatsız etmez.
- ____33. A **Diğer insanlardan daha becerikliyim.**
B **Diğer insanlardan öğrenebileceğim çok şey var.**
- ____34. A Herkes gibi biriyim.
B Olağanüstü biriyim.

APPENDIX D

Love Attitudes Scale Short Form

Sizden genel olarak, birlikte olduğunuz kişiyi düşünerek her ifadeyi değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir. **Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup ilişkilerinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne derece yansıttığını, her ifadenin karşısında bulunan ve sizin için en uygun olan boşluğu işaretleyiniz.**

	Kesinlikle yanlış	Yanlış	Kararsızım	Doğru	Kesinlikle doğru
1. Birlikte olduğum kişi bana ilgi göstermediğinde, kendimi baştan aşağıya hasta hissedirim.					
2. Birlikte olduğum kişi diğer insanlarla yaptığım bazı şeyleri bilseydi, bozulurdu.					
3. Onun benimle ilgili bilmediği şeylerin onu incitmeyeceğine inanıyorum.					
4. Birlikte olduğum kişi için her şeye katlanırım.					
5. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken göz önünde bulundurduğum temel şey, ailem üzerinde nasıl bir etki bırakacağıdır.					
6. Birlikte olduğum kişinin başka biriyle de birlikte olduğundan kuşkulanırsam, rahat edemem.					
7. Arkadaşlığımız zamanla aşka dönüştü.					
8. Birlikte olduğum kişi ve ben fiziksel olarak tam bir uyum içerisindeyiz.					
9. Birlikte olduğum kişinin mutluluğunu kendi mutluluğumun önüne koymadıkça mutlu olamam.					
10. Ona aşık olduğumdan beri başka herhangi bir şey üzerinde yoğunlaşmakta güçlük çekiyorum.					
11. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken dikkate aldığım faktörlerden biri, mesleki yaşantım üzerinde nasıl bir etkisi olacağı idi.					

12. Birlikte olduğum kişi ideal fiziksel güzellik/ yakışıklılık standartlarıma uygun.					
13. Birlikte olduğum kişinin isteklerini yerine getirebilmesi için genellikle kendi isteklerimden özveride bulunmaya hazırım.					
14. Aşk ilişkimiz iyi bir arkadaşlıktan doğduğu için çok doyum vericidir.					
15. Birlikte olduğum kişi bir süre bana ilgi göstermezse bazen ilgisini tekrar çekmek için aptalca şeyler yaparım.					
16. Birbirimizi gerçekten anlıyoruz.					
17. Birlikte olduğum kişi ve çok sayıda başkalarıyla 'aşk oyunu' oynamaktan hoşlanırım.					
18. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle yoğun bir ilişkiye girmeden önce çocuk sahibi olmamız durumunda onun kalıtsal özellikleri ile benimkinin ne kadar uyumlu olduğunu bulmaya çalışırım.					
19. Bazen onun öteki sevgililerim hakkında bilgi edinmesini engellemek zorunda kalırım.					
20. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi seçerken en önemli faktör, onun iyi bir ana baba olup olamayacağı idi.					
21. Birlikte olduğum kişiye acı çektirmektense kendim acı çekmeyi tercih ederim.					
22. Uzun süreli bir arkadaşlıktan doğduğu için aşkımız aşkların en iyisidir.					
23. Birbirimiz için yaratıldığımızı düşünüyorum.					
24. Aşkımız gizemli, mistik bir duygu değil, gerçek bir arkadaşlıktır.					

APPENDIX E

The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale

Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup, her ifadenin karşısında bulunan ve sizin için en uygun olan boşluğu işaretleyiniz.

	A: Kesinlikle katılıyorum	B: Katılıyorum	C: Kararsızım	D: Katılmıyorum	E: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1. Birisiyle seks yapmak için ona bağlanmak zorunda değilim.	A	B	C	D	E
2. Rastgele seks, kabul edilebilir bir olaydır.	A	B	C	D	E
3. Çok sayıda partnerle seks yapmaktan hoşlanırım.	A	B	C	D	E
4. Tek gecelik ilişkiler, bazen çok eğlenceli olabilir.	A	B	C	D	E
5. Belli bir zamanda birden fazla kişiyle cinsel birliktelik yaşamak, normal bir şeydir.	A	B	C	D	E
6. Her iki taraf da aynı fikirdeyse seksi zevklerin paylaşımı olarak görebiliriz.	A	B	C	D	E
7. En iyi seks, kuralların olmadığı sekstir.	A	B	C	D	E
8. İnsanlar daha özgürce seks yapabilse hayat daha kolay olurdu.	A	B	C	D	E
9. Çok sevmediğin birisiyle seks yapıp bundan hoşlanmak mümkündür.	A	B	C	D	E
10. Seksin yalnızca iyi bir fiziksel rahatlama niteliğini taşıması mümkündür.	A	B	C	D	E
11. Doğum kontrolü, sorumluluk taşıyan cinselliğin bir parçasıdır.	A	B	C	D	E
12. Bir kadın, doğum kontrolü sorumluluğunu paylaşmalıdır.	A	B	C	D	E
13. Bir erkek, doğum kontrolü sorumluluğunu paylaşmalıdır.	A	B	C	D	E
14. İki kişi arasında en yakın iletişim tarzı sekstir.	A	B	C	D	E
15. Birbirini çok seven iki kişi arasındaki cinsel ilişki, en üst düzeydeki insan etkileşimidir.	A	B	C	D	E

16. Seks iyi bir nitelikte olursa, iki ruhun birleşmesine benzer.	A	B	C	D	E
17. Seks, yaşamın çok önemli bir parçasıdır.	A	B	C	D	E
18. Seks, genellikle yoğun ve insanı adeta ezip geçen bir yaşantıdır.	A	B	C	D	E
19. En iyi seks, kendi zevkine odaklandığın sekstir.	A	B	C	D	E
20. Seks, öncelikle başka birinden zevk almaktır.	A	B	C	D	E
21. Seksin temel amacı zevk almaktır.	A	B	C	D	E
22. Seks, öncelikle fiziksel bir şeydir.	A	B	C	D	E
23. Seks, esasen yemek yemek gibi bir beden işlevidir.	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX F

The Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire

Aşağıda yakın (romantik) ilişkilerle ilgili çeşitli ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Sizden genel olarak, yakın ilişkilerinizde yaşadıklarınızı dikkate alarak aşağıdaki ifadeleri değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir.

	Benim için HİÇ uygun değil	Benim için ÇOK AZ uygun	Benim için BİRAZ uygun	Benim için OLDUKÇA uygun	Benim için ÇOK uygun
1. Yakın ilişkilerde bir partner olarak kendime güvenirim.					
2. Sürekli yakın ilişkiler üzerine düşünürüm.					
3. Yakın ilişkilerimle ilgili çok fazla düşünürüm.					
4. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olma isteğim/güdüm çok fazla.					
5. Yakın ilişkiler kendimi sinirli ve kaygılı hissetmeme neden olur.					
6. Yakın ilişkilerimle ilgili kendimi depresif/çökkün hissederim.					
7. Yakın ilişkilerim yoğunlukla şansa bağlı/tesadüfi olaylarla gelişmiştir.					
8. Başkalarının yakın ilişkilerim konusunda ne düşündüğüne aşırı önem veririm.					
9. Birisiyle yakın ilişkiye girmek beni biraz ürkütür.					
10. Yakın ilişkiyle ilgili gereksinimlerimin şu anki karşılanma biçiminden memnunum.					
11. Yakın bir ilişkide iyi bir partner olduğumu düşünüyorum.					
12. Yakın ilişkileri, başka her şeyden daha çok düşünürüm.					
13. Yakın ilişkilerimde, kendi davranışlarım yoğunlukla belirleyici bir rol oynar.					
14. Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda düşünmeye genellikle zaman ayırırım.					
15. Yakın bir ilişkiye zaman ve emek vermek konusunda çok istekliyim/güdülüyüm.					
16. Yakın ilişkilerde biraz acemi ve					

gerginimdir.					
17. Yakın ilişkilerimde, tercihlerimi doğrudan dile getiririm.					
18. Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda kendimi mutsuz hissediyorum.					
19. Yakın ilişkilerimin başkalarına nasıl görüldüğüne/sunulduğuna aşırı önem veririm.					
20. Bazen yakın ilişkilerden korkarım.					
21. Yakın ilişkilerimden çok memnunum/doyum alıyorum.					
22. Yakın ilişkilerde pek çok insana göre daha iyiyimdir.					
23. Yakın ilişkiler zihnimi meşgul eder.					
24. Yakın ilişkilerimde kontrol daha çok benim elimdedir.					
25. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmayı çok arzu ediyorum.					
26. Karşı cinsten biriyle duygusal bir yakınlık/etkileşim kurmak bende gerginlik yaratır.					
27. Yakın ilişkilerde isteklerimi dile getirmede biraz pasifimdir.					
28. Yakın ilişkiler konusunda cesaretimin kırıldığını hissediyorum.					
29. Yakın ilişkilerim üzerinde şansın büyük etkisi var.					
30. Yakın ilişkilerimin başkaları üzerinde bıraktığı izlenim konusunda sıklıkla endişe duyarım.					
31. Zaman zaman, birisiyle yakın bir ilişkiye girmekten korkarım.					
32. Yakın ilişkilerim temel beklentilerimi karşılıyor.					
33. Kendimi yakın bir ilişki için oldukça tercih edilen bir partner olarak değerlendiririm.					
34. Sürekli olarak yakın bir ilişki içinde olmayı düşünürüm.					
35. Yakın ilişkilerimi etkileyen temel şey benim kendi yaptıklarımdır.					
36. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmak benim için çok önemlidir.					
37. Yakın bir ilişkide birçok insana göre daha kaygılıyım.					

38. Yakın bir ilişkide isteklerimi dile getirmekten çekinmem.					
39. Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda kendimi hayal kırıklığına uğramış hissediyorum.					
40. Yakın ilişkilerimin büyü koranda şans (iyi ya da kötü anlamda) meselesi olduğuna inanıyorum.					
41. Genellikle başkalarının yakın ilişkilerime yönelik verdikleri tepkilere duyarlıyım.					
42. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmak beni fazla korkutmaz.					
43. Yakın ilişkilerim, diğer pek çok ilişki ile karşılaştırıldığında, çok daha iyidir					
44. Yakın bir ilişki içinde kendime oldukça güvenirim.					
45. Zamanımın büyük bir bölümünü yakın ilişkileri düşünerek geçiririm.					
46. Yakın ilişkilerim benim sorumluluğum ve kontrolüm altındadır.					
47. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olup, bunu sürdürmeyi çok isterim.					
48. Yakın bir ilişki içinde kendimi tutuk ve utangaç hissederim.					
49. Yakın ilişkiler söz konusu olduğunda, isteklerimi genellikle ifade ederim.					
50. Yakın ilişkilerimi düşündüğümde üzülüyorum.					
51. Yakın ilişkilerimin gerçekten de bir kader/kısmet işi olduğunu düşünüyorum.					
52. Başkalarının yakın ilişkiye nasıl tepki verdiklerine/vereceklerine dikkat ederim.					
53. Yaşamımın yakın ilişkiler yönü, benim için çok doyurucudur.					

APPENDIX G
Parental Bonding Inventory

Aşağıda, ana-babanızın çeşitli tutum ve davranışlarına ilişkin ifadeler yer almaktadır. 16 yaşınıza kadar olan dönemde **annenizi** hatırlamaya çalışarak, her bir ifadeye en uygun seçeneğin karşısındaki paranteze X işareti koyunuz.

	Tamamen böyleydi	Kısmen böyleydi	Pek böyle değildi	Hiç böyle değildi
1. Benimle yumuşak ve arkadaşça bir tarzda konuşurdu.	()	()	()	()
2.İhtiyaç duyduğum kadar yardım etmezdi.	()	()	()	()
3. Hoşlandığım şeyleri yapmama izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()
4. Duygusal olarak bana karşı soğuk görünürdü.	()	()	()	()
5. Sorunlarımı ve endişelerimi anlıyor görünürdü.	()	()	()	()
6. Bana karşı sevgi doluydu.	()	()	()	()
7. Kendi kararlarımı vermemden memnuniyet duyardı.	()	()	()	()
8. Büyümemi istemezdi.	()	()	()	()
9. Yaptığım her şeyi kontrol etmeye çalışırdı.	()	()	()	()
10. Mahremiyetime müdahale ederdi.	()	()	()	()
11. Olan-bitenler hakkında benimle konuşmaktan keyif alırdı.	()	()	()	()
12. Genellikle bana karşı	()	()	()	()

güler yüzlüydü.				
13. Bana, bebekmişim gibi davranma eğilimi vardı.	()	()	()	()
14. İhtiyaçlarımı ve isteklerimi anlamıyor gibiydi.	()	()	()	()
15. Kendimle ilgili kararları almama izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()
16. İstenmediğimi hissettirirdi.	()	()	()	()
17. Üzgün olduğum zamanlarda kendimi daha iyi hissetmemi sağlardı	()	()	()	()
18. Benimle pek fazla konuşmazdı.	()	()	()	()
19. O'na bağımlı olduğum duygusunu yaşatmaya çalışırdı.	()	()	()	()
20. Annem yanımda olmadığı zaman, kendime bakamayacağımı hissederdim.	()	()	()	()
21. İstediğim kadar özgürlük tanırdı.	()	()	()	()
22. İstediğim zaman dışarı çıkmama izin verirdi	()	()	()	()
23. Bana karşı aşırı koruyucuydu.	()	()	()	()
24. Beni övmezdi.	()	()	()	()
25.İstediğim gibi giyinmeme izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()

Aşağıda, ana-babanızın çeşitli tutum ve davranışlarına ilişkin ifadeler yer almaktadır. 16 yaşınıza kadar olan dönemde **babanızı** hatırlamaya çalışarak, her bir ifadeye en uygun seçeneğin karşısındaki paranteze X işareti koyunuz.

	Tamamen böyleydi	Kısmen böyleydi	Pek böyle değildi	Hiç böyle değildi
1. Benimle yumuşak ve arkadaşça bir tarzda konuşurdu.	()	()	()	()
2.İhtiyaç duyduğum kadar yardım etmezdi.	()	()	()	()
3. Hoşlandığım şeyleri yapmama izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()
4. Duygusal olarak bana karşı soğuk görünürdü.	()	()	()	()
5. Sorunlarımı ve endişelerimi anlıyor görünürdü.	()	()	()	()
6. Bana karşı sevgi doluydu.	()	()	()	()
7. Kendi kararlarımı vermemden memnuniyet duyardı.	()	()	()	()
8. Büyümemi istemezdi.	()	()	()	()
9. Yaptığım her şeyi kontrol etmeye çalışırdı.	()	()	()	()
10. Mahremiyetime müdahale ederdi.	()	()	()	()
11. Olan-bitenler hakkında benimle konuşmaktan keyif alırdı.	()	()	()	()
12. Genellikle bana karşı güler yüzlüydü.	()	()	()	()
13. Bana, bebekmişim gibi davranma eğilimi vardı.	()	()	()	()

14. İhtiyaçlarımı ve isteklerimi anlamıyor gibiydi.	()	()	()	()
15. Kendimle ilgili kararları almama izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()
16. İstenmediğimi hissettirirdi.	()	()	()	()
17. Üzgün olduğum zamanlarda kendimi daha iyi hissetmemi sağlardı	()	()	()	()
18. Benimle pek fazla konuşmazdı.	()	()	()	()
19. O'na bağımlı olduğum duygusunu yaşatmaya çalışırdı.	()	()	()	()
20. Babam yanımda olmadığı zaman, kendime bakamayacağımı hissederdim.	()	()	()	()
21. İstediğim kadar özgürlük tanırdı.	()	()	()	()
22. İstediğim zaman dışarı çıkmama izin verirdi	()	()	()	()
23. Bana karşı aşırı koruyucuydu.	()	()	()	()
24. Beni övmezdi.	()	()	()	()
25.İstediğim gibi giyinmeme izin verirdi.	()	()	()	()