

The Predictive Role of the Parenting Styles That Cause Early Maladaptive Schemas on Divorce Indicators*

Mustafa Kemal Yöntem

Tahsin İlhan

Abstract: This study aims to investigate the relationship between the parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas and divorce indicators of married and divorce people. While parenting styles are based on schema therapy, divorce predictors are based on the Gottman approach to couples therapy. Data have been obtained from 600 participants (316 male, 284 female) from 51 out of the 81 cities in Turkey. Of all the participants, 511 (85.3%) are married while 89 (14.7%) are divorced. Parenting styles have been measure using the Young Parenting Inventory, and divorce indicators have been measured using the Divorce Predictors Scale. The data were analyzed with SPSS 22.0. Correlation and hierarchical multiple regression analyses have been used to examine the research questions. The correlation analysis shows divorce indicators to be significantly associated with all parenting styles from both mothers and fathers. According to the results from the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, however, overly permissive/boundary-less, normative, emotionally depriving, and punitive parenting styles from both mothers and fathers significantly predict divorce indicators. The analyses have also revealed punitive and overly permissive/boundary-less parenting styles to be suppressor variables. The findings indicate that overly permissive/boundary-less, normative, emotionally depriving, and punitive parenting styles significantly predict divorce indicators. These findings show that parents should be neither too dominant nor too permissive while raising children and should enforce boundaries with their children for the children's adjustment to marriage in the future.

Keywords: Divorce, divorce predictors, perceived parenting styles, schema therapy.

Öz: Bu araştırmanın amacı evli veya boşanmış bireylerde kök ebeveynlik stilleri ile boşanma göstergeleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Ebeveynlik stilleri şema terapi kapsamında ele alınırken boşanma göstergeleri Gottman çift terapisi kapsamında ele alınmıştır. Araştırmada Türkiye'nin 51 ilinden 19-81 yaş aralığında 600 (316 erkek, 284 kadın) evli veya boşanmış katılımcıya ulaşılmıştır. Katılımcıların 511'i (%58.3) evli, 89'u (%14.7) boşanmıştır. Katılımcıların algılanan ebeveynlik stillerinin ölçülmesi amacı ile Young Ebeveynlik Ölçeği ve boşanma göstergelerinin ölçülmesi amacı ile Boşanma Göstergeleri Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Veriler SPSS ile analiz edilmiştir. Korelasyon analizi sonuçlarında anne ve babaların her ikisinde tüm ebeveynlik stilleri boşanma göstergeleri ile ilişkili çıkmıştır. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizi sonuçlarında ise anne ve babaların her ikisinde sınırsız, cezalandırıcı, kuralcı ve duygusal yoksun bırakıcı kök ebeveynlik stilleri boşanma göstergelerini anlamlı şekilde yordamaktadır. Ayrıca sınırsız ve cezalandırıcı ebeveynlik stillerinin baskılayıcı değişken olduğu bulgusuna rastlanılmıştır. Tüm bu bulgular bir arada düşünüldüğünde ebeveynlerin çocuk yetiştirirken baskıcı ya da sınırsız ebeveynlik stillerini benimsemeleri ve çocuklarla bağlarının zayıf olması gelecekte çocuklarının evlilik uyumlarını olumsuz yönde etkileyebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Boşanma, boşanma göstergeleri, algılanan ebeveynlik stilleri, şema terapi.

* This article is a part of the doctoral dissertation conducted by Prof. Dr. Tahsin İlhan.

@ Dr., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi. muskemtem@hotmail.com
Prof. Dr., Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi. tahsin.ilhan@gop.edu.tr

id http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0937-9961
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0981-257X

© İlmi Etüdler Derneği
DOI: 10.12658/M0382.
insan & toplum, 2020.
insanvetoplum.org

Başvuru : 06.08.19
Revizyon: 08.09.19
Kabul: 15.01.20
Online Basım: 26.01.20

Introduction

According to data from the Turkish Statistical Institute (TurkStat), 95,323 divorces occurred in 2002, while increasing by 49.42% to 142,448 in 2018. One of the most significant causes for divorce is problematic communication between spouses. When examining research on this issue, spouses' conflict resolution skills and relation patterns can be seen to be important predictors of marital adjustment (Gottman, 1993a, 1993b; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Levenson, Carstensen, & Gottman, 1993; Malkoç, 2001; Prado & Markman, 1999).

Gottman's studies on conflict and adjustment in marriage have a distinctive place in the literature (Gottman, 1994, 1999; Gottman, Shapiro, & Parthemer, 2004; Levenson & Gottman, 1985). John Gottman and Robert Levenson established a marriage research laboratory (Love Lab) in 1983 and observed hundreds of couples using video recordings. These records were then examined together with the participants (Gottman, 1999). In these studies, Gottman involved couples with different characteristics, such as couples with school-age children (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996), young couples (Levenson & Gottman, 1985), middle-aged couples (Levenson, Carsatensen, & Gottman, 1994), newlyweds (Gottman, Coan, Carrere, & Swanson, 1998), and couples from newlyweds to those long married (Gottman, 1994). He determined the criteria that should be present in a good marriage based on the findings obtained from the Love Lab. He combined these criteria in his theory on building a sound relationship house. The main goal of Gottman-based studies is to develop the skills present in the sound relationship house (Babcock, Gottman, Ryan, & Gottman, 2013; Barnacle & Abbott, 2009; Gottman, Shapiro, & Parthemer, 2004; Shapiro & Gottman, 2005; Shapiro, Nahm, Gottman, & Content, 2011).

The most important element of the theory of building a sound relationship house is the inter-spouse conflict model. In his Love Lab studies, Gottman concluded the negative patterns couples use during their discussions had caused divorce. Gottman characterized these patterns as the four horsemen of the apocalypse, conceptualizing them as: criticism, defensiveness, contempt, and stonewalling. *Criticism* involves negative expressions about the spouse's character instead of talking about the issue. *Defensiveness* means that one of the spouses never takes responsibility for problems and always uses the expression, "I'm innocent." *Contempt* occurs when one of the spouses feels superior to the other, and this is the most important predictor of divorce. *Stonewalling* occurs when one spouse withdraws itself from physical and mental interactions. Men are more likely to use stonewalling (Gottman & Gottman, 2012; Gottman & Silver, 2012).

Gottman revealed harsh startups and failed repair attempts to be important predictors of divorce in addition to the four horsemen of the apocalypse. Harsh startup occurs when one spouse leads off a discussion with criticism. The spouse who begins with a harsh startup speaks loudly and aggressively or humiliates the other (Gottman & Silver, 2012). Failed repair attempts occur when one spouse gets a negative response when trying to approach the other after a conflict or discussion (Gottman & Gottman, 2012).

According to the theory on building a sound relationship house, another predictor of divorce is the lack of creating shared meaning. Shared meaning is a common values system couples share through traditions, rituals, roles, and symbols. Moreover, how well spouses know each other and their needs is among the factors that predict divorce. Gottman conceptualized this situation using love maps, which show couples' awareness of each other's needs (Gottman & Gottman, 2012; Gottman & Silver, 2012). A body of research has revealed the relationship of these eight constructs in Gottman's theory on building the solid relationship house with marital adjustment (Archuleta, Grable, & Britt, 2013; Fowler & Dillow, 2011; Holman & Jarvis, 2003; Lute, 2015). This study approaches divorce indicators within the scope of Gottman couples therapy.

Another important aspect of studies on marriage is the effect from the unconscious processes that individuals' bring from their family histories. Freud argued parental origin to have a role in personality that is an important factor in marital adjustment (as cited in Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 2008). The main goal of psychoanalytic family therapy is to resolve family members' unconscious conflicts and reorganize familial communication (Nichols & Schwartz, 2001). Bowen family therapy, which has psychoanalytical roots, indicates the positive and negative things individuals get from their parents to be important factors in family relations (Bowen, 1978). The Gottman model argues problems in relationships to generally be associated with personality problems (Gottman, 2012). Gurman (2008) argued that the concept of parental origin is an argued topic in marriages and that the Gottman conflict model should involve problems of parental origin.

Some studies on parental origin and marriage have stated individuals' relationships with their own parents to be effective in their marital relationship and relationship satisfaction. For example, Goodrov and Lim (1997) argued in their model that individuals' reactive and defensive attachments are associated with their relationships with their parents. Larson and Thayne (1998) found coalition and triangulation in parental origin to be associated with negative thinking and

emotions in marriage. Nelson and Wampler (2000) found in their study conducted with 96 couples that individuals whose spouses had been abused during childhood were also affected as if they had been abused; Nelson and Wampler expressed this situation as secondary trauma.

The current study discusses the assumptions from Gottman couples therapy, which is considered a cognitive therapy in context, and the concepts of schema therapy, which is also considered a cognitive therapy in context. In other words, divorce predictors have been based on Gottman couples therapy while parenting styles have been based on schema therapy. Early experiences create the schemas that help individuals make sense of the world. These schemas are seen as the constructs influencing human behavior (Rafaeli, Bernstein, & Young, 2011; Türkçapar, 2009). Emotional needs, emotional humor, and negative experiences during childhood affect the creation of schemas (Young, Kolosko, & Weishar, 2003). According to schema theory, early schemas vary in terms of parents' attitudes/parenting styles. Moreover, early maladaptive schemas are known to be associated with divorce (Yoosefi, Etemadi, Bahrami, Fatehizade, & Ahmadi, 2010), intimacy levels (Stiles, 2004), and sexual dysfunctions (Gomes & Nobre, 2012). Studies handled with different theoretical foundations are found on the relationship between marriage satisfaction and parenting styles (Chyung & Lee, 2008; Parmar, İbrahim, & Rohner, 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2008). However, limited research exists on how the parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemes predict marital success (Çolakoglu, 2012). With this current research, new findings will be revealed on how parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas affect marriage. Therefore, this study investigates the relationships between parenting styles as the origins of early maladaptive schemas and the predictors of divorce.

Method

This study aims to investigate the relationship between parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas and the predictors of divorce. The relational crosshatching model has been used to determine the relationships between these concepts.

Participants

The study uses the purposive sampling method. In this context, data have been collected from married and divorced persons. In order to increase the external

validity of the research results, data have been collected from different provinces in Turkey, reaching 600 participants (316 males, 284 females) from 51 out of Turkey's 81 cities. Of all the participants, 511 (85.3%) are married while 89 (14.7%) are divorced. The divorced participants have been asked to fill in the data collection forms in consideration of their previous marriage. While 265 married participants have never considered divorce, 168 married participants rarely have and 78 married participants often consider divorce. In addition, 270 participants (45%) were married by choice, while 330 (55%) had an arranged marriage. Participants' ages range from 19 to 70 ($M = 40.39$, $SD = 8.72$), and their monthly incomes range from 500 TL to 50,000 TL ($M = 4,296$ TL, $SD = 3,447.81$ TL).

Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form

The authors developed a personal information form to gather descriptive data from the participants. The form includes items regarding participants' gender, marital status, marriage type, and income level. This form has been used to describe the participants' demographic information.

Divorce Predictors Scale

The scale was developed by Yöntem and İlhan (2017, 2018) for measuring divorce predictors based on Gottman couples therapy. Exploratory factor analysis based on the principal component method has been performed on half the data set ($n = 250$) to show the structural validity of the scale. As a result of the analysis, 54 items have been found with factor loading values of .40 or greater. The total variance in the structure obtained through the five factors is 60.43%. Afterward, confirmatory factor analysis was carried out on the other half of the data set ($n = 250$). The goodness-of-fit values for the tested models are acceptable ($\chi^2 = 3,394.94$ [$p < .001$], $\chi^2 / SD = 2.49$, $NNFI = .95$, $GFI = .77$, $CFI = .95$, $RMSEA = .07$, $SRMR = .09$, $IFI = .95$). The Cronbach alpha value for the entire scale is .95, while the Cronbach alpha values for the factors vary between .78 and .96. The current study has found Cronbach alpha values for shared meaning and forgiveness, love map, negative conflicting behaviors (contempt, criticism, harsh startups), stonewalling, and defensiveness to be .96, .92, .88, .78, and .80, respectively.

Young Parenting Inventory (YPI)

The original scale was composed by Young (1994) and adapted into Turkish by Soygüt, Çakır, and Karaosmanoğlu (2008). The scale is scored separately for mothers and fathers. The Turkish scale has 10 factors whose Pearson correlation coefficients vary between .38 and .83 for the YPI-Mother Form and vary between .56 and .85 for the YPI-Father Form. Moreover, Cronbach's alphas of internal consistency vary between .53 and .86 for the YPI-Mother Form and between .61 and .88 for the YPI-Father Form. The current study has Cronbach alpha values for the factors of Overprotective/Anxious and Restricted/Emotionally Inhibited under .50. Moreover, these two dimensions failed to become factors in the adaptation study conducted by Şahin and Özer (2012). Therefore, the current study has excluded these two factors from the analyses. The Cronbach alpha values for the other factors range from .72 to .97.

Data Collection

Data was collected using Google Drive, by mail and in person. In addition, 60 fourth-year students from the counseling and guidance department helped to collect data. In this context, students who wanted to participate in the data collection process were divided into three groups. Each group was then given 20 minutes of training during which the data collection tools were explained and information was given about the issues to consider while collecting data.

Data Analysis

The personal information form, Divorce Predictors Scale, and Young Parenting Inventory have been administered to all participants in the study. The alpha value for the study is determined to be .05, as suggested by Cohen (1998). A total of 600 individuals were reached while collecting data. The data were entered into SPSS 22.0. Firstly, outliers for each variable were checked. Data obtained from 13 participants were excluded from the dataset based on the univariate outlier analysis. Regression analysis has been used to find answers to the research questions. Prior to the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, correlations among variables were examined using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. As this study examines mother and father parenting styles separately, the subsequent analyses include mother parenting styles and father parenting styles separately.

Findings

Firstly, correlations of the father parenting styles with each other and divorce predictors were examined. Then, mother parenting styles' correlations with each other and divorce predictors were examined. Correlation analysis results for father parenting styles can be seen in Table 1 and in Table 3 for mother parenting styles.

Table 1

Relationships Among Fathers' Parenting Styles and Its Dimensions

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	M	SD
1. Divorce	1									81.58	40.66
2. Normative	.58**	1								38.43	15.29
3. Belittling/ Criticizing	.75**	.73**	1							16.71	12.01
4. Emotionally depriving	.52**	.41**	.65**	1						24.81	7.96
5. Exploitative/ Abusive	.74**	.61**	.88**	.65**	1					12.83	8.12
6. Conditional/ Achievement focused	.38**	.68**	.47**	.15**	.39**	1				18.98	6.55
7. Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.69**	.58**	.82**	.53**	.80**	.39**	1			13.82	8.62
8. Pessimist/ Worried	.50**	.69**	.65**	.43**	.59**	.52**	.55**	1		8.48	4.03
9. Punitive	.68**	.72**	.83**	.52**	.75**	.54**	.73**	.67**	1	10.94	5.31

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, $n = 586$

As can be seen in Table 1, divorce predictors are significantly associated with all father parenting styles. Correlation coefficients vary between ($r = .75$, $p < .01$) and ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). In the other words, father parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas correlate with divorce predictors.

Table 2

Relationship Among Mothers' Parenting Styles and Its Dimensions

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	M	SD
1. Divorce	1									81.58	40.66
2. Normative	.59**	1								36.44	15.57
3. Belittling/ Criticizing	.75**	.77**	1							18.18	13.76
4. Emotionally depriving	.56**	.45**	.69**	1						23.25	7.92
5. Exploitative/ Abusive	.75**	.68**	.90**	.69**	1					11.99	7.76
6. Conditional/ Achievement focused	.38**	.69**	.48**	.18**	.44**	1				18.65	6.46
7. Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.70**	.64**	.82**	.59**	.81**	.41**	1			13.83	8.49
8. Pessimist/ Worried	.50**	.69**	.67**	.45**	.61**	.50**	.58**	1		8.40	4.13
9. Punitive	.65**	.74**	.82**	.55**	.76**	.55**	.73**	.68**	1	10.83	5.26

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, $n = 586$

As can be seen in Table 2, divorce predictors are significantly associated with all mother parenting styles. Correlation coefficients range between ($r = .75, p < .01$) and ($r = .38, p < .01$). In the other words, mother parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas are correlated with divorce predictors.

Before conducting the hierarchical *multiple* regression analysis, the assumptions were examined. Within this scope, correlation coefficients were reexamined. The examination reveals the correlation coefficient between belittling/criticizing and exploitative/abusive parenting styles to be .85 or greater in both analyses (Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, the variance inflation factors (VIF) for belittling/criticizing and exploitative/abusive parenting styles are greater than 5. Thus, belittling/criticizing and exploitative/abusive parenting styles have been excluded from the dataset as this situation indicates multicollinearity issues (Kline, 2016). The hierarchical *multiple* regression analysis was then carried out. Hierarchical *multiple*

regression analysis is preferred for examining the predictor power of each variable separately. As suggested in the literature (Gerber & Voelkl Finn, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), the order independent variables are entered in the regression is based on their correlations with the dependent variable. The predictive power of mother parenting styles on divorce indicators can be seen in Table 3, and the predictive power of father parenting styles on divorce indicators can be seen in Table 4.

Table 3

Predictive Power of Mother Parenting Styles on Divorce Indicators

	β	t	P	R^2	ΔR^2	F	p
Step 1:				.48	.49	558.87	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.70	23.64	.00				
Step 2:				.53	.53	331.11	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.48	11.69	.00				
Punitive	.30	7.30	.00				
Step 3:				.54	.54	228.69	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.45	10.74	.00				
Punitive	.22	4.48	.00				
Normative	.15	3.42	.00				
Step 4:				.56	.56	186.03	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.38	8.77	.00				
Punitive	.17	3.51	.00				
Normative	.15	3.46	.00				
Emotionally Depriving	.18	5.22	.00				
Step 5:				.56	.56	148.79	.00

Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.38	8.79	.00				
Punitive	.18	3.57	.00				
Normative	.16	3.48	.00				
Emotionally Depriving	.18	5.25	.00				
Pessimist/ Worried	-0.03	-0.69	.49				
Step 6				.56	.56	123.79	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.38	8.79	.00				
Punitive	.17	3.48	.00				
Normative	.15	2.94	.00				
Emotionally Depriving	.19	5.15	.00				
Pessimist/ Worried	-0.03	-0.70	.49				
Conditional/ Achievement- focused	.01	.22	.82				

n = 586

As can be seen in Table 3, the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style predicts divorce indicators significantly in each step ($p < .01$). Overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style's contribution to the total variance is 48% ($R^2 = .48$). Moreover, the punitive parenting style, which entered the model in Step 2, and the normative and emotionally depriving parenting styles, which entered the model in Steps 3 and 4 respectively, significantly predict divorce indicators in each step ($p < .01$). However, the pessimist/worried and conditional/achievement-focused parenting styles that entered the model in Steps 5 and 6 didn't contribute to model significantly. The contribution of all parenting styles to the model aside from the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style is 8% ($R^2 = .08$). In other words, the variable of overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style contributes most

to the model ($\beta = .38, t = 8.79, p < .01$). Emotionally depriving ($\beta = .19, t = 5.15, p < .01$), punitive ($\beta = .17, t = 3.48, p < .01$), and normative ($\beta = .15, t = 2.94, p < .01$) parenting styles also significantly contribute to the regression model.

Table 4

Predictive Power of Father Parenting Styles on Divorce Predictors

	B	t	P	R ²	ΔR^2	F	p
Step 1				.48	.48	5 2.71	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.69	23.29	.00				
Step 2				.54	.54	350.40	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.43	10.43	.00				
Punitive	.37	9.01	.00				
Step 3				.55	.55	243.12	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.41	10.02	.00				
Punitive	.28	5.87	.00				
Normative	.15	3.68	.00				
Step 4				.57	.57	191.88	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.36	8.74	.00				
Punitive	.24	5.08	.00				
Normative	.14	3.60	.00				
Emotionally Depriving	.14	4.18	.00				
Step 5				.57	.57	153.76	.00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.36	8.78	.00				
Punitive	.26	5.19	.00				
Normative	.16	3.73	.00				

Emotionally Depriving	.14	4.26	.00			
Pessimist/Worried	-0.04	-1.06	.29			
Step 6				.57	.57	127.92 .00
Overly permissive/ Boundary-less	.36	8.76	.00			
Punitive	.26	5.14	.00			
Normative	.16	3.35	.00			
Emotionally Depriving	.14	4.11	.00			
Pessimist/Worried	-0.04	-1.05	.30			
Conditional/ Achievement- focused	-0.01	-.10	.92			

n = 586

As can be seen in Table 4, the results from the regression analysis examining the predictive power of father parenting styles on divorce indicators resemble the predictive power of mother parenting styles on divorce indicators. When examining Table 4, the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style can be seen to significantly predict divorce indicators in each step ($p < .01$). The contribution of the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style to the total variance is 48% ($R^2 = .48$). Moreover, the punitive parenting style, which entered the model in Step 2, and the normative and emotionally depriving parenting styles, which respectively entered the model in Steps 3 and 4, significantly predict divorce indicators in each step ($p < .01$). However, the pessimist/worried and conditional/achievement-focused parenting styles, which entered the model in Steps 5 and 6, did not contribute to the model significantly. The contribution of all parenting styles to the model aside from the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style is 9% ($R^2 = .09$). In other words, the variable of overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style contributes most to the model ($\beta = .36, t = 8.76, p < .01$). Punitive ($\beta = .26, t = 5.14, p < .01$), normative ($\beta = .16, t = 3.35, p < .01$), and emotionally depriving ($\beta = .14, t = 4.11, p < .01$) parenting styles also significantly contribute to the regression model.

Discussion

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the predictive power of parenting styles on divorce indicators. According to correlation analysis results, parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas are significantly associated with divorce indicators. This finding is consistent with the literature (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 2002). Some studies (Amato, 1994; Amato & Soboleswski, 2001; Roberts & Bengton, 1993) have emphasized positive family-of-origin parental experiences to have a positive effect on marriages. For example, acceptance and rejection in one's parental relations have been stated to transfer to intimate relations (Varan, 2005) and perceived rejection in childhood to be associated with perceived rejection from spouse (Chyung & Lee, 2008; Parmar & Rohner, 2005, 2008).

The regression analysis has revealed the parenting styles of overly permissive/boundary-less, normative, emotionally depriving, and punitive to predict divorce indicators significantly for both mothers and fathers. These parenting styles are known to be associated with disconnection/rejection schemas (Sheffield et al., 2005; Çolakoğlu, 2012). The literature has shown disconnection/rejection schema areas the most to predict relation problems (Clifton, 1995; Nemati, 1996; Stiles, 2004). Disconnection/rejection schema areas involve the need for protection, safety, and care. Individuals whose needs aren't met in the early period can use commitment to schema, which is one of the mechanisms for coping with schemas (Young et al., 2003). Individuals who commit to disconnection/rejection schemas can choose uncaring, remote, cold, and disconnected spouses. Moreover, these individuals themselves may become the disconnected spouse by using the overcompensation schema mechanism (Young et al., 2003). Additionally, this finding is also supported Young and Gluhoski's (1997) model. According to the model, disconnection/rejection schema areas are associated with the failure to satisfy the need for secure attachment. Similarly, Young et al (2003) indicated this schema area to be associated with lack of love and care and argued that individuals with this schema area may have problems in their romantic relationships. When considering all of these within the context of divorce indicators, individuals with disconnection/rejection schema areas can be said to be more likely to experience problems in creating love maps, shared meaning, and forgiveness in their marriages.

One important finding of the study is that the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style is the most powerful predictor of divorce indicators for both mothers and fathers. Rafaeli et al. (2011) has indicated over satisfaction of needs to possibly cause early maladaptive schemas. This finding on the overly permissive/boundary-

less parenting style is consistent with Rafaeli et al.'s indication. Individuals raised with an overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style may show a tendency to use their spouse in accordance with their wills, just like they did with their parents.

Another finding from the study is the punitive-father and emotionally depriving-mother parenting styles are the most powerful predictors of divorce indicators aside from the overly permissive/boundary-less parenting style. This situation can be explained through gender roles (Blank-Mathieu, 2002). Accordingly, fathers are the figure of authority, while the mother represents care and tenderness (Blank-Mathieu, 2002; İmamoğlu, 1993; Koray, 2011). Therefore, those whose father had punitive and/or whose mother had emotionally depriving parenting styles in their early period might be an important factor in individuals' marriages in future years.

This study has also obtained some unexpected findings. For example, the pessimist/worried parenting style for both mothers and fathers and the conditional/achievement-focused parenting style for fathers positively correlate with divorce indicators. However, these variables do not significantly predict divorce indicators according to the regression analyses. Moreover, although positively correlated in the correlation analysis, these variables are negative in the regression analyses. This state is known as the suppressor variable effect in the literature (Friedman & Wall, 2005; Maassen & Bakker, 2001). The analyses reveal the punitive and overly permissive/boundary-less parenting styles to be suppressor variables. Punitive and overly permissive/boundary-less parenting styles represent two points in the same topic, though they appear as two different poles. Young, Klosko, and Weishaar (2003) indicated individuals with dominant relations to have most likely been exposed to excessive discipline or overindulgence during their childhood. Moudgil and Moudgil (2017) found a strong relationship for the overly permissive/boundary-less and excessively authoritarian parenting styles with aggression. Studies can also be encountered that associate authoritarian and overly permissive/boundary-less parenting styles with aggression level (Slicker, 1998; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Wu, 2009). Moreover, individuals who have been exposed to over-authoritarian and aggressive behaviors are known to be more likely to abuse their spouses (Giordano, Johnson, Manning, & Longmore 2016) and commit dating violence (Lavoie et al., 2002; Mumford, Liu, & Taylor, 2016). The dominant-relations style and aggression in relations bring the four horsemen of the apocalypse to mind (Gottman, 2012). When evaluating the findings within this framework, Young et al.'s (2003) arguments about parenting styles can be stated as being consistent with the Gottman model.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has focused on parenting styles that cause early maladaptive schemas; however, the predictive power and direct effect of early maladaptive schemas on divorce indicators were not examined. Future studies are recommended to investigate the relationship between schemas and divorce indicators. As a result of the study, adopting parenting styles that are the basis for divorce as well as disconnection/rejection schema areas have been determined to predict divorce indicators. Disconnection/rejection schema areas' association with divorce indicators calls attachment theory to mind. With reference to this, attachment can be stated to be able to significantly predict divorce indicators. Therefore, future studies are recommended that focus on the possible relationship between attachment styles and divorce indicators.

In conclusion, parenting styles have been observed to significantly predict divorce indicators. In particular, the overly permissive/boundary-less, punitive, emotionally depriving, and normative parenting styles have significant effects on divorce indicators. These findings show that parents should be neither too dominant nor too free while raising their children and should enforce boundaries with them. Therefore, these two issues may need to be handled more carefully in family education programs. The overly permissive/boundary-less, normative, emotionally depriving, and punitive parenting styles significantly predict divorce indicators for both mothers and fathers. These parenting styles are known to be associated with disconnection/rejection schemas. Therefore, these schemas in particular need to be addressed in family counseling. According to the study's findings, parenting styles in the family of origin are associated with divorce indicators. Thus, addressing the problems brought from the family of origin would be useful in family counseling studies.

References

- Amato, P. R. (1994). Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 56(4), 1031–1042. doi: 10.2307/353611
- Amato, P. R., & Sobolewski, J. M. (2001). The effects of divorce and marital discord on adult children's psychological well-being. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 900–921. doi: 10.2307/3088878
- Archuleta, K. L., Grable, J. E., & Britt, S. L. (2013). Financial and relationship satisfaction as a function of harsh start-up and shared goals and values. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 24(1), 3.
- Babcock, J., Gottman, J., Ryan, K., & Gottman, J. (2013). A component analysis of a brief psycho-educational couples' workshop: One-year follow-up results. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 35(3), 252–280. doi: 10.1111/1467-6427.12017

- Barnacle, R., & Abbott, D. (2009). Couple and relationship education update: the development and evaluation of a Gottman-based premarital education program: A pilot study. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 8(1), 64–82.
- Blank-Mathieu, M. (2002). *Kleiner Unterschied-große Folgen?: Geschlechtsbewußte Erziehung in der Kita*. Bavaria: E. Reinhardt Verlag.
- Bowen, S. H. (1978). Chromic acid in assimilation studies—A caution. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 107(5), 755–756.
- Chyung, L., & Lee, J. (2008). Intimate partner acceptance, remembered parental acceptance in childhood, and psychological adjustment among Korean college students in ongoing intimate relationships. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 42(1), 77–86.
- Clifton, J. A. (1995). *The effects of parenting style, attachment and early maladaptive schemas on adult romantic relationships*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Cohen, J. (1998). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Routledge Academic.
- Çolakoglu, E. T. (2012). *Self- concept, early maladaptive schemas, perceived parenting styles and interpersonal relations in young adults*. Unpublished master's thesis. Maltepe University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Fowler, C., & Dillow, M. (2011). Attachment dimensions and the four horsemen of the apocalypse. *Communication Research Reports*, 28(1), 16–26. doi: 10.1080/08824096.2010.518910
- Friedman, L., & Wall, M. (2005). Graphical views of suppression and multicollinearity in multiple linear regression. *The American Statistician*, 59(2), 127–136. doi: 10.2307/27643645
- Gerber, S. B., & Voelkl Finn, K. (2005). *Using SPSS for windows data analysis and graphics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Giordano, P. C., Johnson, W. L., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2016). Parenting in adolescence and young adult intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37, 443–465.
- Goldenberg, H., & Goldenberg, I. (2008) *Family therapy: An overview*. Monterey, CA, Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Gomes, A. L. Q., & Nobre, P. (2012). Early maladaptive schemas and sexual dysfunction in men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(1), 311–320. doi: 10.1007/s10508-011-9853-y
- Gottman, J. M. (1993a). A theory of marital dissolution and stability. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 7(1), 57–75.
- Gottman, J. M. (1993b). The roles of conflict engagement, escalation and avoidance in marital interaction: A longitudinal view of five types of couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1), 6–15. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.61.1.6
- Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gottman, J. M. (1999). *The marriage clinic: A scientifically based marital therapy*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Gottman, J. M., Coan, J., Carrere, S., & Swanson, C. (1998). Predicting marital happiness and stability from newlywed interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(1), 5–22. doi: 10.2307/353438
- Gottman, J. M., & Gottman, J. S. (2012). *Level 1 clinical training book. Gottman method couples therapy*. Istanbul, Turkey: Psikoloji Istanbul.
- Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., & Hooven, C. (1996). Parental meta-emotion philosophy and the emotional life of families: Theoretical models and preliminary data. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 10(3), 243–268.
- Gottman, J., Shapiro, A., & Parthemer, J. (2004). Bringing baby home: A workshop for new and expectant parents. *International Journal of Childbirth Education*, 19(3), 28–30.

- Gottman, J., & Silver, N. (2012). *What makes love last?: How to build trust and avoid betrayal*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Gurman, A. S. (2008). *Clinical handbook of couple therapy*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Stanley-Hagan, M. (2002). Parenting in divorced and remarried families. *Handbook of Parenting*, 3, 287–315.
- Holman, T. B., & Jarvis, M. O. (2003). Hostile, volatile, avoiding, and validating couple-conflict types: An investigation of Gottman's couple-conflict types. *Personal Relationships*, 10(2), 267–282. doi: 10.1111/1475-6811.00049
- İmamoğlu, O. (1993). Değişen dünyada değişen aile-içi roller. *Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 0(1).
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability. A review of theory, method and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3–34.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*(4th ed.).New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Koray, M. (2011). Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye'de "cinsiyet" eşitliği politikaları: Sol-feminist bir eleştiri. *Çalışma ve Toplum Dergisi*, 29, 13–53.
- Larson, J. H., & Thayne, T.R. (1998). Marital attitudes and personal readiness for marriage of young adult children of alcoholics. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 16, 59–73.
- Lavoie, F., Hébert, M., Tremblay, R., Vitaro, F., Vézina, L., & McDuff, P. (2002). History of family dysfunction and perpetration of dating violence by adolescent boys: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 30(5), 375–383.
- Levenson, R. W., Carstensen, L. L., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Longterm marriage: Age, gender and satisfaction. *Psychology and Aging*, 5, 301–313.
- Levenson, R. W., Carstensen, L. L., & Gottman, J. M. (1994). Influence of age and gender on affect, physiology and their interrelations: A study of long-term marriages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(1), 56–68.
- Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1985). Physiological and affective predictors of change in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 85–94.
- Lute, M. (2015). *The relationship between Gottman's four horsemen of the apocalypse, mindfulness, and relationship satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.
- Maassen, G. H., & Bakker, A. B. (2001). Suppressor variables in path models definitions and interpretations. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 30(2), 241–270.
- Malkoç, B. (2001). *The relationship between communication patterns and marital adjustment*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Moudgil, R., & Moudgil, N. (2017). Parenting styles and self-esteem as predictors of aggression. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 8(2), 168–172.
- Mumford, E. A., Liu, W., & Taylor, B. G. (2016). Parenting profiles and adolescent dating relationship abuse: Attitudes and experiences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(5), 959–972.
- Nelson, B. S., & Wampler, K. S. (2000). Systemic effects of trauma in clinic couples: An exploratory study of secondary trauma resulting from childhood abuse. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26(2), 171–184.
- Nemati, M. C. (1996). *Toward an understanding of relationships: A structural model of marital satisfaction*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Nichols, M. P., & Schwartz, R. C. (2001). *The essentials of family therapy*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parmar, P., & Rohner, R. P. (2005). Relations among perceived intimate partner acceptance, perceived parental acceptance, and psychological adjustment among young adults in India. *Ethos*, 33(3), 402–413.

- Parmar, P., & Rohner, R. P. (2008). Relations among spouse acceptance, remembered parental acceptance in childhood, and psychological adjustment among married adults in India. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 42(1), 57–66.
- Prado, L. M., & Markman, H. J. (1999). Unearthing the seeds of marital distress: What we have learned from married and remarried couples. In M. Cox & J. Brooks Gun (Eds.), *Conflict and cohesion in families: Causes and consequences* (2nd ed.; pp. 84-105). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum & Associates.
- Rafaeli, E., Bernstein, D. P., & Young, J. E. (2011). Şema terapi: Ayırıcı özellikler (M. Şaşıoğlu, Tran.). İstanbul, Turkey: Psikonet Yayınları.
- Roberts, R. E. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). Relationships with parents, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in young adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56(4), 263–277. doi: 10.2307/2786663
- Shapiro, A., & Gottman, J. (2005). Effects on marriage of a psycho-communicative-educational intervention with couples undergoing the transition to parenthood, evaluation at 1-year post intervention. *Journal of Family Communication*, 5(1), 1–24.
- Shapiro, A., Nahm, E.Y., Gottman J. M., & Content, K. (2011). Bringing baby home together: Examining the impact of a couple-focused intervention on the dynamics within family play. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01102.x
- Slicker, E. K. (1998). Relationship of parenting style to behavioral adjustment in graduating high school seniors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 27, 345–372.
- Soygüt, G., Çakır, Z., & Karaosmanoğlu, A. (2008). Ebeveynlik biçimlerinde değerlendirilmesi: Young ebeveynlik ölçeği'nin psikometrik özelliklerine ilişkin bir inceleme. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 11(22), 17–30.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Overtime changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents for authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 65, 754–770.
- Stiles, O. E. (2004). *Early maladaptive schemas and intimacy in young adult's romantic relationships*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Alliant International University, San Diego, CA.
- Şahin, N. H., & Özer, M. (2012). Young Ebeveynlik Ölçeği-Anne Formu (YEBÖ-A) psikometrik özelliklerinin bir grup ergen üzerinde değerlendirilmesi [Evaluating the Young Parenting Inventory-Maternal Form on the psychometric properties of an adolescent group]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 15(30), 37–49.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Taysi, E. T. (2010). Evlilikte başışlama: Evlilik uyumu ve yüklemelerin rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 25(65), 40.
- Türkçapar, M. H. (2009). *Bilişsel terapi: Temel ilkeler ve uygulamalar*. Ankara, Turkey: HYB Basım Yayın.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2002). Marriage and divorce statistics. Retrieved from www.tuik.gov.tr/IcerikGetir.do?istab_id=18
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2018). Marriage and divorce statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/turkiye/evlenmeler-azaldi-bosanmalar-artti/1406234>
- Varan, A. (2005). Relation between parental acceptance and intimate partner acceptance in Turkey: Does history repeat itself? *Ethos*, 33(3), 414–426.
- Wu, M. (2009). *The relationship between parenting styles, career decision self-efficacy, and career maturity of Asian American college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Yoosefi, N., Etemadi, O., Bahrami, F. Fatehizade, M. A. S., & Ahmadi, S. A. (2010). An investigation on early maladaptive schemas in marital relationship as predictors of divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 51(5), 269–292.
- Young, J. (1994). Young Parenting Inventory. Unpublished report

- Young, J. E. & Gluhoski, V. L. (1997). A schema-focused perspective on satisfaction in close relationships. In R. J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat, (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp. 356–381). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Young, J., Klosko, J. S. & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Şema terapi*. Istanbul, Turkey: Litera Yayıncılık.
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Yöntem, M. K., & İlhan, T. (2017). *Kök ebeveynlik biçimlerinin boşanma göstergeleri üzerindeki yordayıcı gücü*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey.
- Yöntem, M. K., & İlhan, T. (2018). Boşanma göstergeleri ölçeği: güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. Oral presentation. *10th International Congress of Educational Research*, Nevşehir, Turkey.