LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS

Ali IŞIKTAŞ[1]
ali.isiktas@nisantası.edu.tr.
0009-0001-9521-572X
NİŞANTAŞI ÜNİVERSİTESİ, NİŞANTAŞI MESLEK YÜKSEKOKULU, ÇOCUK
BAKIMI VE GENÇLİK HİZMETLERİ BÖLÜMÜ

Abstract
The overall objective of the research, representing young adults love forms as university students and it is to identify and examine problems relating to the ego type. More importantly, what is the relationship between university students and their personality characteristics with love forms? Are love shape and personality characteristics show meaningful differences according to demographic variables? Research is a descriptive working based on relational scanning model and its purpose is defining the relation between love styles and ego of young adults. Purposes of scanning models are descripting a situation as it is. Scanning method used in this research. This research applied to students who are from various faculties and departments and studied in Girne American University at 2023-2024. Totally 300 students participated to research as voluntarily. Simple random sampling method used in this research. Student Relational-Individualist-Collectivist Students Involved in Self Scale Individualism, Relational, Collectivism opinions on the bottom Size. Research within the scope of students" relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, collectivism on the subscales descriptive statistical dimensions of opinion was determined.
Keyword: Students, Love Forms, Ego Types.

---

[1] İstanbul Nişantaşı Üniversitesi, Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu, Öğretim Görevlisi,
ali.isiktas@nisantası.edu.tr.

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

INTRODUCTION

There are various variables in romantic relationships which are making closer individuals each other. Some of these variables are charm, desire to be together, love, comparing, liking, physical contact, care and protection (Hortaçsu, 1997). Relationships with opposite sex generally makes individual feel happy for lifetime. Individuals reflects their own characteristics with romantic relationships which are creates the special area of our life. Romantic relationships effect individuals positive or negative specially when they are at their adolescent time. Individuals starts to gain experience with romantic relationships and transfers these experiences to their own behavior style. Individuals can gain new behavior during relationship. On the other hand individuals need relationships to satisfy their various needs. These needs are happiness, love, sexuality, trust (Büyükşahin and Çevik, 2007).

Romantic relationships in university years which are involved transition to adult life, cognitive, social and emotional changes has a important role for improving individual. Individual who is developing adult roles and trying to find a place inside society is very important for rest of their life. According to Furman and Schaffer (2003), relationships in young adolescent period helps people to adopt adult life better.

Love or romantic relationship created by causes like, some people thinks that love puts meaning to their life and scientifically love has a function in human life. Love exists in all society , culture, and all the times and almost every human tastes it for at least one time or hopes to find it (Stemberg, 1999; Brown, 1994). Love is a center point for philosophy and specially literature and it started to be one of the center points for psychology. This interest is because of trying to understand how love effects human as socially and psychologically (Myers and Shurts, 2002; Neto, 2005). Love making humanity busy for years. Humans tried to solve mystery of love for years by refer to magic, potions, prays, witches (Pines, 2010). These efforts are not exist for one area or couple person. This emotional situation is exist in every culture. Cultures emphasizes love differently according to their foundations. In English love can be defined with one word but in Turkish love means loving someone, a thing or God and the other meaning of love is loving someone romantically or sexually.

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

Theory of love styles of Lee's (1997), theory of triangle of Stemberg's (1986), theory of attachment of Hazan and Shavers' (1987) are most important theories for psychology of love (Paludi, 2012). Sternberg's theory of triangle (1986) is one of the most known love theory. Sternberg claimed that love is like corners of a triangle. But this theory is not enough to explain love. Lee (1973, 1988) has a more comprehensive, detailed and still applying and still updated approach. Lee claimed that love is not a one kind of thing and approach love as multidimensional. If we evaluate Lee's six kind of love each of them has a specific build. This classification has there mayor kind; passionate love (Eros), love like a game (Ludus) and love like a friend (Storge). Lee says that if we mix these three kind of love we can create a second kind of love. Logical love (pragma) created by mix of love like a friend and love like a game. Possessive love (mania) created by mix of passionate love and love like a game; altruist love (agape) is created by mix of passionate love and love like a friend (act.Hovardaoğlu and Büyükşahin, 2004).

Davies (1996) claimed that love kinds and character specifics can be connected with some way. There are theories explains that mechanisms under personality and how can this mechanisms can define person's own behavior. There are six main theories to explain personality. Psychoanalytic theory, explains behavior difference between individuals with conscious process, biological theory explains it with genetic properties and physical processes. Hallmark approach explains individual's different personality and difference between individuals, Humanistic theory claims these differences are being by personal responsibility and self-approving. Behaviorist and Social Learning theory says difference between individuals are being by various conditions and expectations, Cognitive Theorists explains these differences by differences in information processing. Concepts of these six theories are not contradiction each other. We can claim that concepts are separating because of differences of behavior (Bacanlı and Aslan, 2007; Burger, 2006).

Young adult period for university students is very important if we look at personality and love together. Individual starts to create his/her own personality and depend on this starts to create love styles. University student who is out of identification problem and create

personality tries to make a close relationship with opposite sex. Expectation from young adult is choose a partner and make a family. The importance of love for university student cannot be denied. Snell and Finley claimed that ego has a important role on individual's close relationships (2002). According to Hetherington (2003) quality of close relationships effects psychological or physical goodness of individual and causes people see themselves as valuable or worthless and can be effective on self-esteem. Researches about love styles and personality made in a lot of country and these researches showed that student's personality effects their love styles.

If we look to researches in North Cyprus we cannot see any research about love style of young adults and problems about their identification. Because of this problem of this research is love styles and personality type of young adults.

Purpose of Research

The overall objective of the research, representing young adults love forms as university students and it is to identify and examine problems relating to the ego type. More importantly, what is the relationship between university students and their personality characteristics with love forms? Are love shape and personality characteristics show meaningful differences according to demographic variables? We will start to search answers for these questions. In line with this general purpose, sub-purpose and problem of research response is required located below the sub-problems.

- Is there a significant difference between genders personality traits and love styles of university students?
- Is there a significant difference according to age personality traits and love styles of university students?
- Is there a significant difference depending on the family situation personality and love styles of university students?
- What is the distribution of points for the love styles of young adults?

- Are love styles of young adults differentiated according to the status of the relationship?
- It love styles of young adults differentiated by education level?
- It love styles of young adults differentiated according to the personality type?

Importance of Research

One of the today's problems for individuals is start, maintain and end positively relationship. In high schools and universities a lot of individual cannot make friends and cannot adopt because they don't know how to start a relationship. Processes under these has to be investigated. Beside, failure of starting a relationship is only because of people don't know how to start a relationship? Or is there more problems ? It is very important to solve these questions. If we examine literature, researches about individual's romantic relationships and personality, these researches are not enough. Researches mostly examined affiliation, marital satisfaction, love forms, jealousy, perceived control, stress. With this research, effect of personality on romantic relationship is clarified and it will contribute to related literature.

Close relationships affects a person's entire life, at every stage of development to adapting to changing needs and circumstances. Personality development on having important effect to close relationships in individuals, to establish social relationships, to express himself, to be tolerant and learn safe behavior development. Particularly close relations as romantic togetherness constitutes an indispensable aspect and very meaningful of human life. Individuals need a healthy romantic relationship in their development period depending on this period. It is important aspects to achieve developmental tasks of the individuals and psychological support for young close relationships established in young adulthood period. According to Arnett (2000), romantic relationships for young adults not just sexual attraction also includes sharing values, beliefs, happiness, preferences, feelings, secrets and productivity. It is important to maintain a romantic relationship for young adults to establish a healthy identification.

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

Love is a phenomenon which is subjective and hard to define. Love is a positive and complicated experience and includes fundamentals like psychological, emotional, neurobiological, sensory. Generally, love accepted as strong, passionate feelings to other person (Crews, 1998). defines love as extreme feelings and emotion of loyalty (Turkish Language Institute, 2015). Love is often sexual relationship of individuals depend on this definition. Emotional engage to someone who desires him/her called love concept (Esch and Stefano, 2004). May examined history of love concept at Western cultures and he defined this concept in four type as libido (sexuality, lust), Eros (production/urge to create), filia (friendship/ brotherly love) and agape/caritas (love for other's welfare), and he also claimed that a real love experience can be created with mix of these four types (Nişanyan and Soyağacı, 2004).

Kernberg who examined love and like relations dynamically specified that a mature sexual love relationship can be a sexual stimulant which is transformed into erotic desire, a sexual object relationship includes passionate properties and made from super ego and it can be complicated emotional situation. Phenomenological view of love and love relations can be change over time and mutual attraction, romantizm, power struggles that can occur in relationships and as a mature love it probably represents the bottom rung (Hendrix, 2004). It may affect the proximity perception and nature of the area between two individuals in any love relationship. It has been suggested that dynamic of this area which varies continuously, as well as in the awareness of limits it was out of consciousness and it bears the traces of the couple's relationship history. A feature that can show gains pathological symbiosis of the couple's relationship with the disappearance of this area (Buber, 1996).

Both Turkish and west languages in terms of the origin of the word, cultural, dynamic and psychological sense a longing the resolve removal and it is obvious that the provision of a particular sensory stimulus. Therefore, "love" may be in a close relationship with both reward and pleasure associated images, as well as with the appetite and addictive behaviors. Accordance with this proposition, he has drawn attention recently with "love" phenomenon of biology, especially neurobiological aspects (Carter, 1998). It is known to be

important in health and disease love relations and the concept of attachment, which is closely related (Çalışır, 2009). In order to fully understand the concept of "love" firstly, it may also be necessary to take into consideration structural differences between male and female brains.Men has nucleus of the stria terminals of bed, nuclei in the anterior hypothalamus, the medial nucleus of the preoptic area, the corpus callosum and the anterior commissure is larger in women (Brizendine, 2010). Especially for males, in the medial preoptic area of the hypothalamus mutual connections with the amygdala may be associated with aggressive behavior. For women in the sex and related behaviors mostly the hypothalamus seems to be guided by the ventromedial nucleus (Tufan and Yalug, 2010). When we considered the importance of anterior commissure and the corpus callosum in terms of data exchange between the right and left cerebral hemispheres, women's relevant sexuality data more holistic than men.

When the love of measurement efforts are examined, Rubin (1970) is defining the concept of love, determine the difference between love and friendship the love and friendship relations is among the first studies on love felt emotions emphasize between different studies on love. According to her love is proximity, observe and as binding comprising three components of is an attitude. In later years Berscheid and Walster's (1974) passionate love, Walster and Walster's (1978) passionate love and friendly love classifications, the most common made for love and it is among the most important social psychological studies. Passionate love is intense desire to hear to be with other people, intense physical arousal (temperature, sweating, dizziness, etc.), after leaving the person feeling himself into space and It is associated with having anxiety. The friendly love is together to strive for happiness with other person, deal with it, mutually share experiences, understanding, love, supervisor, respect, compassion and including deep emotional intimacy defined as an emotional state (Hatfield, 1988). In the literature, another often referred model of Sternberg's (1986) theory of love triangle. According to this model there are three key elements of love. These are: passion, intimacy and decisions bind. Sternberg has pointed love components can be like three corners of the triangle. Therefore his theory called as love triangle theory.According to him all love relationships have different levels of passion, proximity and decisions-bind elements.

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

In this case love complex and multifaceted phenomenon (Berscheid and Meyers, 1996, Waller and Shaver, 1994), we faced descriptive rather than a theoretical concept. It is abstract and can not be observed directly; but it can be interpreted from observable behavior. There is no common, valid for all times and all cultures definition of love. Love can be affected by external factors. People that live in social context affects the experience of love and love definition for can be observed differences intercultural and inter-group from the same culture.

Love is a psychological phenomenon which can be different from one society to other society, one race to other race in same society. Different social systems creates different love forms. Love has various forms as with sexuality or without sexuality, melancholic, passionate (Ercan, 2008). Social value of love can be different as positive to negative; cultural norms can affect individual's expectations, experiences, attitudes, behavior from love (Ercan, 2008). We can see this clearly if we base our thoughts on today's societies and historical periods. The concept of love in a comprehensive way to be the subject of psychological research, have been proposed many new theories and models. Especially in the 1970 Rubin conducted a study about qualitative differences between love and liking. In later years, it began to appear in the literature as classification in passionate love friendly and love (Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Hatfield, 1988; Walster and Walster, 1978).

In the world of science one of the most fundamental questions; Is love recognized as a spontaneous trend or a social learning, both of them accepted. For example; according to ethnographic studies, cultural influences are more important than Individual differences in love. According to genetic studies while heredity is not effective in love style, heredity is partially effective in love. Several researches have been made to find the answer this question, is love a single factor or the question is composed of several factors. Consequently, it was concluded that there is a single fundamental factor of love including; various emotions, behavior and attitudes. Researchers are unite the opinion that kind of love much greater number of despite this unifying factor. If we examine the literature about love first attract attention is the difficulty raised by the researchers that differences in the

definition of the concept love the identification. Researchers who conducted study about love are faced a main problem; love expressing different things to different people. This situation has led researchers to the classification of the different types of love.

Rubin (1970) defines love as a cultural phenomenon and a kind of attitude which containing cognitive, affective and behavioral components. Rubin (1973), is felt to a friend like with love of the beloved one; but he includes that refers different feelings, thoughts and attitudes. Rubin has taken the first important step noting differences on love, like a friends between within love to a lover .According to Rubin there are three basic components love: caring, attachment and intimacy. Rubin (1970) has a scale development study in order to build bridges between theory and practice. He has obtained "Like and Love Scale" which has three factors. Scale factors: Needs love and devotion, ready to help and exclusiveness with return to integration. Rubin worked in laboratory to support validity of his scale with love high scores couples eye to eye look long time. Rubin's this work is considered the first scientific effort, aims to measure on empirical and love (Sternberg and Grajek, 1984). Rubin defines bind as seeing him emotional support can be combined with another. He has been explained of caring individual to care about the happiness of his own happiness; proximity is forming a strong bond with the other person with a different way than others sharing and reflection their thoughts and feelings (Rubin, 1970).

According to Hatfield and Walster passionate love is intense feelings desire to be with the other. When it is mutual, it is associated with a sense of integration and pleasure. When not seeing provisions, it leads feelings as nothingness, anxiety, jealousy, pain and despair. As result, passionate love is a deep psychological state of arousal. The scale was developed to measure the passionate love (Passionate Love Scale), this kind of love contains cognitive, emotional and behavioral determinants (Curun, 2004). These are: Cognitive components, involuntarily intense thoughts come to mind for dating and obsession. Relationship idealizing for other, recognition by request and recognize other. Emotional components, shooting for the other, in particular sexual attraction; experienced positive feelings when things go well. When things go bad experienced negative emotions. The desire to be

in love. Complete and permanent integration request. Psychological arousal. Behavioral components, to act to understand the feelings of other. Investigation of the partners. To serve the other. Establish physical proximity. It will be revealed passionate love as a result of interaction of these components. Maybe friendly love, the most important difference from passionate love about the concept of proximity. Passionate love, individuals in longed for intimacy while persons have achieved proximity friendly in love already. According to Hatfield (1988), proximity is the process of working people to be internally with the other; that discover their similarities, differences, thought, emotions and behavior. Proximity is also like passionate love, it contains component cognitive, emotional and behavioral (Curun, 2004).

Lovers, feel free each other to open many aspects of about their relationship. Close persons knows each other's histories, values, hopes, fears, strengths and weaknesses of interest. It would be better if you add this section to the emotional components and discuss emotions and cognition in love or take this out.

Close persons are concerned deeply with each other.Close relations are not a series of behaviors, they are series of interactions. In other words this view is not focusing on individuals it is focusing on the effects of individuals on each other. Therefore relations, arises from the interaction of people forming them. However, they have properties which cannot be explained with only person' behavior and characteristics. Also, every relationship takes place within a network of relationships are affected on the one hand and the other relationships hand it affects them. Close relationships can be defined in different dimensions. These dimensions are determined content of the interaction, diversity, the nature, and characteristics of the relative frequency of different interaction patterns, mutual complementarily in the behavior of individuals in relation to each other, similarity with themselves and the person they relate to perceptions and similar to the concept of the ideal person and the relationship of these perceptions, the continuation and development related to the commitment of people. Close Relationships are shaped according to these dimensions. In relationship, dimensions can either at least one of these sizes or some of them can be located (Sternberg, 1999). In intensive close

relations, people love more than anything to close ones. Close Relationship care very intensive with each other, therefore have the potential to alleviate the problems each other. Dark side of this love is the jealousy, depression and anger.

Close ones get extremely impressive to establish physical proximity with each other. Rubin said that this kind of love contains feel responsible for the other, giving care, self disclosure and to be independent of the external environment elements. Some scales he developed to measure friendly love; "I can do almost anything for him" "If I cannot be with him, I lost my hope." This theoretical approach separates passionate love from the friendly love. Passionate love is fed with pleasure and mystery while friendly love is only fed with pleasure. Passionate love fed with passionate experience, the friendly love is fed with positive experiences. However, in real life love includes both rewards and punishments. In that case, distinction between passionate love and friendly love which is associated with it is mainly active rather than absolute differences (Curun, 2004). Walst and Walst (1978) passionate love, are simulation individuals consuming flame of relation, the friendly love simulation brilliant coal the remaining after the great flame goes out.

Sternberg (1986) argues that love includes three important element proximity, passion and bind. According to Sternberg (1999), proximity means close friend and bind. It shows similarities Moss and Schwebell's (1993) five item with Sternberg (1999) theory of love triangle. Cognitive and emotional intimacy are similar to Sternberg' (1988), concept of proximity. Robert J. Sternberg said, love consists of three different elements and has developed the Love Triangle Theory based on It may be considered as a triangle. There are three components of love in Sternberg's theory: proximity, passion and decision/commitment. Proximity component; people's love affair includes subjects, sharing between individuals, self-disclosure, closeness and commitment. These feelings the feelings that led to the warm love between partners. Passion component is a component motivational. Romanticism creates feelings like physical attractiveness, sexuality and likes. Sexual Desires forms the aspect of the desire of many individuals. It is important to self-confidence of the people, ability to influence, and also on issues such as self-realization.

Decision and commitment components can be considered in two different ways. Short-term that the person who loves another person and the decision is in love with him. The long-term maintaining the stability of love. Both cannot act together. The combination of elements proximity, passion and commitment reveals defined in the Triangular Theory of Love eight different types of love (Papalia and Olds, 1988; Atkinson, 1999; Sternberg, 1988). Sternberg's Triangular Love Model can be summarized eight types of love as follows explained (Sternberg and Grajek, 1984; Sternberg, 1988).

The absence of commitment and passion components, can explained that the dominant component is proximity in this relations. Person feels close himself to another person. But there is no feelings like passion and commitment for long-term. This situation expresses feelings and experiences located exactly true definition of friendship (Sakallı and Curun, 2001).

"Love at first sight" is in this class. Passion is dominated component in this type. Actually, person is not in love with the person he is in love, but he obsessed to a person he created in his mind. Persons shows rapid stimulation properties according to mental and the physical objects.

The devoid passion and of affinity component, but decision / commitment components are dominant. It takes long years, but emotional and physical components will be destroyed over time (Şahin, 2001).

Decision / commitment is not required in this kind of love. There are intimacy and passion components in this relationships. Couples are attracted to each other, both physically and emotionally. This kind of love is uncertain for state of being together in the future. Some researchers says that romantic and madly love are similar.

Closeness and loyalty components rides provisions but there are not passion component. A lot of marriages transforms into friendly love after end of passion. Generally we can see this in long-term relations and in the later years of marriage. A lot of romantic love relationship can return to the friendly love relationship; proximity replaces to after disappearance of passion. Passion maybe turns into a deeply felt

commitment after a long time. Some people cannot accept friendly relationship, cannot live without romance. Can be seen search for new love to find romance again, but should know that friendly state loans of relationship (Şahin, 2001)

Passion and commitment is dominated components, and without intimacy component. According to Sternberg this kind of love is a Hollywood-style love, like we see in the movies people meets and marries in a short time. In the time growing element of proximity neglecting, created a commitment only based on passion. Stupid love, leads to the formation of stress because when the passion is lost or reduced there will be only remain commitment. But commitment component is developed and depth of winning companent over time; and commitment is weak at the beginning of the relationship. There is always a chance, for the development of proximity but couple's expectations prevents proximity instead of increase it. Marriage is considered to be out of heaven, whereas people can not aware fully what to do need to be in better condition the marriage. They place the passion to center of relationship, but they got disappointment when passion decreases. Only concentrating on passion and not giving enough importance too ther factors, this has created problems (Uğurlu, 2004). There are a balance between passion, proximity and bind components and includes all of them. Lots of people wants to experience this kind of love in romantic relationships. It is difficult to live in perfect love, and it is difficult to retain it than the living (Atalay, 2004). Sternberg called loveless the absence of any of the three components. This type of relationship is a good example for we know and living in interpersonal relationships. Such relationships includes our causal interaction, even not promise in this kind of friendship relations. These relationships are necessary relationship (Açıkel, 2013).

Lee (1973, 1977) used a typological model makers types with primary and secondary colors that relate to love. The first research and examinations, defined passionate love (eros) love like a game (ludus) and friendly love (storge) in 3 primary love and possessive love (Mania) selfless love (agape) and sensible love (pragma) as defined 3 secondary kind of love. Secondary kinds of love has different components from the primary component of its own. Secondary kind

of love, mixtures composed of two primary colors like yellow and red similarly to orange it has characteristics and own color. As secondary colors love is secondary, although the birth of the primary love are not seen mixture different characteristics in primary love. So there are three basic colors in nature: red, blue, yellow. All other colors, consists of different mixing ratio from these three basic colors. Similarly there are three basic / primary love none of which cannot be reduced to the other; Passionate love (eros), love like a game (ludus) and friendly love (storge). These dual compounds, reveals the secondary love styles: Friendly love and love like a game creates of sensible love (pragma), passionate love and love like game creates to adapt love (Mania), passionate love and friendly love creates altruist love (agape).Basic colors are not superior to other colors; it is not worthwhile less than red orange or more color and / or less or more. Lee (1988), has made a multi-dimensional classification types of love and argued that there is not only a form of love. According to Lee, there are three basic forms of love including passionate love (eros), love like a game (ludus) and friendly love (storge) (as cited in Ercan, 2008).

METHOD

Research Model

Research is a descriptive working based on relational scanning model and its purpose is defining the relation between love styles and ego of young adults. Purposes of scanning models are describing a situation as it is. Scanning method used in this research. According to Karasar (2000) scanning method is an approach which helps to descript a situation in past or present. Descriptive researches aims to interaction between situation and also considers past and present situations. Description method is usually a survey method and a wide study about group. It happens in a specific time and great number of object and subject. This research examined young adults' relation time and relation status with comparing against love styles and ego, sex, educational level and socio economic level, love styles and addition to this variables relation number and also handled love styles and ego types. Thus, relation between love styles and ego types described.

Work Group

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

This research applied to students who are from various faculties and departments and studied in Girne American University at 2023-2024. Totally 300 students participated to research as voluntarily. Simple random sampling method used in this research. Participant who has no relation with question in personal information form had been elected. Demographic properties of research on participants have been showed on

Table 1. Distribution of the identifying characteristics of respondents

Descriptive Characteristics	Number (n)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Woman	143	43
Male	157	57
Age		
18 years	123	23
19 years	23	23
20 years	124	24
21 years	14	14
22 and up	16	16
Number of relationships		
3 and under	158	58
4 and up	142	42
Regarding the status of		
Flirt	181	81
Married	119	19
The duration of the relationship		
3 month under	130	30
Between 3-6 months	14	14
Between 7-12 months	22	22
Over 12 months	134	34
The continuation of the situation regarding		
Continuing	139	39
The not continue	161	61
Total	300	100

LOVE FORMS AND EGO TYPES OF YOUNG ADULTS
Ali IŞIKTAŞ

As shown in Table 1 against sex research experience emotional relationships with 143 (43%) were female and 157 (57%) participated in a total of 300 young adult men. The age range of 18-22, and the highest 22% of these individuals ranging in age from above average; The lowest percentage is 18%. Participants in the number of relationships 3 and under are 158 people (58%); 4 and on the pantry; 142 people (42%). The status of the relationship of the participants, 181 (81%) dating; 119 (19%) is included as married.Time relationship participants it is located 3 months and under 130 (30%); Between three and six months 14 people (14%); Between 7 and 12 months, 22 people (22%); The 12 months and older; 134 people (34%). Concerning the continuation of the relationship status of participants continuing their relationship data 139 people (39%); Those who do not continue with the relationship are located; 161 people (61%).

Data Collection Tool

Purpose of data collection were used in this study with two tools. One of them is on the Love Attitude Scale (LAS), the other is "collectivist individualist Relational Self Scale" (RIC). These two measuring tool outside were requested to the participants fill out a personal information form. Personal information form developed by the researchers. In the first stage of the study Kashima and Hardie (2000) Inventory developed by the RIC engaged in efforts to adapt to Turkish Ercan (2008) is a adapted. In the second stage of the research it has been applied to both the scale and the personal information form specified sampling group. In the study "personal information form" according to students' eligibility; gender, age, number of relationships, relationship status, duration of the relationship, the continuation of the relationship situation demographic characteristics were determined for students to self-love styles and types taken into consideration. With these questions the participants aimed to determine the characteristics of the demographic variables and relationships. Thus, information in the form of a short research has generated a total of 6 items.

Regarding Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form; The first version of the scale of Lee's (1974) typology based on the theories of love Hendrick and Hendrick (1986, 1990) developed by the love in order to assess their individual styles. The original form of the scale consists of 42 items. Consisting of 24 items Regarding Love Attitudes Scale: Short

Form (LAS) by Hendrick, Hendrick and Dick (1998) is the abbreviated form of the scale developed to measure attitudes of love. However, in this study, the recommended characteristics in terms of scale (Buyuksahin and Hovardaoğlu, 2004) item short form is used.

Regarding love Attitude Scale, Lee's love for each format to take the base and scale consists of six subscales including four items: Passionate love, love as games, friendly love, rational love, possessive love and selfless love. Cronbach's alpha values of the original form of the scale for each subscale varies between .62 and .87 are all meaningful. Scale items were scored based on a five-point Likert scale basis. Attitude Scale Regarding love, Buyuksahin etc. Hovardaoğlu (2004) was adapted into Turkish. The scale it is obtained six points and at least 4 are taken up to 20 points for each subscale. In a subscale scores increase, that means the is preferred form of love. Love Attitude Scale Regarding of Short Form the validity and reliability study, was made by Buyuksahin and Hovardaoğlu (2004) over 867 university students. As a result of the scale construct validity study 6 factors were found: Passionate love, Games such as Love, Sociable Love, Logical Love, Possessive love, Altruistic love.In the research the reliability of internal consistency: Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .70 was found two half reliability of .70. These findings indicate acceptable levels of reliability of the scale.

Relational, Individual, Collective Self- Aspects ScaleScale, Kashima and Hardie (2000) by individualist, relational and communitarian been developed to assess the self-direction. Relational-individualist collectivist Self Scale (RIC) followed by each and every one of the items reflecting the three self-direction hosting 10 questions (total 30 items) as well. Is a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = I completely agree). Will be taken from each subscale scores may range between 10 and 70. Subscale scores of individuals across a range of situational it reveals an overall grade of each self-orientation. Kashima and Hardie (2000) scale validity and reliability study in Australia have made over 384 university students. To test the validity of the scale (1) ARC Scale , (2) Singelis Independent interdependent self Structure Scale (3) Takata independent / interdependent self Structure Scale, (4) Horizontal / Vertical Individualism / collectivism Scale, (5) Cheek Aspects of Identity

Questionnaire, (6) Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale, (7) Feeney, Noller, and Callan's Attachment Style Questionnaire and (8) Twenty Statements Test is looking at their relationship using. The relationship between the levels were high. To determine the reliability level of the scale made in the analysis Cronbach's alpha values of "individualism" .72 for the subscale "relational" .81 for the subscales and "collectivism" is calculated as .78 for the subscales. These values are acceptable levels. This study performed measurements concerning the validity and reliability of both scales and these measurements of in the framework, love styles first scale of Alba Coefficient 88 out; other scales, the relational self scale; according to the increased coefficient Alba and adopted compliance in terms of reliability.

Data Analysis

This study of obtained data descriptive statistical calculations were performed by using SPSS 20 software. This study within the framework of students' responses on the scale for comparing the obtained correlation score, t-test and univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) or analysis techniques were used. The correlation is made regarding the scale depending on the the existing dimensions the comparison between the scores they receive interrelated. The participants subscale in the research regarding the extent of personal information descriptive statistical case for the given place located arithmetic mean and standard percentage points.

RESULTS

This part includes two scales. The first scale, the "Love Attitude Scale", consists of data collected from university students studying in the KKTC during the 2023–2024 academic year. The second scale, the "Relational Collectivist–Individualist Self Scale", is based on data obtained from the same population during the same academic year.

4.1 Findings from "Relational Collectivist Individualist Self Scale" of university students

Below this headline we presented findings about "Relational collectivist individualist Self Scale" which applied by Girne American University (in KKTC connected to YOK and YODAK) students. Students' descriptive statistics values given at Table 2.

Table 2. Participants "Relational-Individualist-Collectivist Self Scale" their response of descriptive statistics.

Materials	x	s
1. I think the most important thing in life is being honest for myself and to everyone.	6,34	1,26
2. I think the most important thing in life is having good relationship with persons important for me.	6,07	1,33
3. I think the most important thing in life is working for benefits of my group (school, religion community, neighbors).	5,00	1,69
4. I teach my kids to know themselves and develop their potentials.	6,19	1,33
5. I teach my kids to concern for their friends and their needs.	5,92	1,28
6. I teach my kids to be loyal their group.	5,60	1,42
7. I saw myself as an individual who can take care himself.	5,43	1,51
8. I saw myself as a good partner and friend.	5,48	1,53
9. I saw myself as a good member of my group.	5,43	1,38
10. I think I can have honor only if I can be honest to myself.	5,85	1,31
11. I think I can have honor if I can be honest to persons I have relationship.	5,87	1,22
12. I thing I can have honor if I can be honest to my relatives, my study group, my religion and social group.	5,57	1,49
13. If a person can take responsibilities for duty, I accept him/her as a good employee.	5,46	1,55
14. If a person can associate and co-operate with other employees, I accept him/her as a good employee.	5,49	1,57
15. If a person working for goodness of their working group, I accept him/her as a good employee.	5,70	1,34
16. The most satisfying activity for me to doing something good for myself.	5,26	1,60
17. The most satisfying activity for me to doing something good for persons important to me.	5,68	1,25
18. The most satisfying activity for me to doing something good for me group.	4,94	1,35
19. When I have to make an important personal decision I ask myself what do I want to do most.	5,67	1,50
20. When I have to make an important personal decision I speak to my partner or my best friend.	5,44	1,53
21. When I have to make an important personal decision I speak to my family or relatives.	5,42	1,61
22. When I go to a concert I feel that enjoying music is a very personal experience.	5,60	1,64
23. When I go to a concert I can enjoy it if only my friends can enjoy it too.	5,53	1,56
24. When I go to a concert I feel good to be a part of group.	5,62	1,47
25. The most importing thing about me is my relation with myself.	5,45	1,36
26. The most importing thing about me is my relation with a special person.	5,42	1,61
27. The most importing thing about me is my relation with my group.	4,04	1,38

According to Table 2 when we investigate average points from "Relational collectivist individualist Self Scale" students gave "Strongly agree" as answer (X=5,14). When analyzed on the basis of Substances students most " I think the most important thing in life is being honest for myself and to everyone." According to (X= 6,34) item they gave "Strongly agree" as answer. When we look as item bases students gave "Agree" (X=4,04) as answer to "The most important thing for me in life is having a personal honesty/ being honest to myself" item, and less good item for students is " The most important thing for myself is my relation with my group". According to these answers important thing for students is honesty; but there is not enough control over their groups.

4.2. Findings about University Students' "Love Attitudes Scale"

Below this headline we presented findings about "Love Attitudes Scale" which applied by Girne American University students. Students' descriptive statistics values given at Table 2.

Table 3. the participants' Attitudes Regarding the scale of Love "given their answers are of descriptive statistics

Materials	x	s
1. If my partner don't take care of me I feel completely sick.	2,86	1,21
2. My partner may feel bad about me if he/she knows other people I'm with.	2,96	1,25
3. I believe things he/she doesn't know make them sorry.	3,28	1,22
4. I can tolerate everything for my partner.	3,40	1,26
5. The main thing when I choose my partner is how my family will feel about it.	3,33	1,27
6. I can't be ok if I doubt about my partners other relationships.	4,47	0,92
7. Our friendship turned into love with time.	3,46	1,22
8. I have a great physical harmony with my partner.	3,74	1,07
9. My partner's happiness is more important than my happiness..	3,33	1,19
10. I'm having a difficulty to concentrate to other thins since we were together.	2,89	1,23
11. One of the importing thins when I choose my partner was how he/she will affect my professional life.	2,80	1,39
12. My partner fits my beautiful/handsome standards.	3,81	1,11
13. I'm ready to sacrifice my own wishes to make my partner's wishes.	3,33	1,00

14. Our relationship is very satisfying because it was started as friendship.	3,37	1,16
15. I can do silly things to have attention from my partner.	3,03	1,14
16. We really do understand each other.	3,44	1,11
17. I like to play "love games" with my partner and other persons.	2,13	1,19
18. I try to find if my partner and mine genetics are compatible, if we decided to have kids in future.	2,80	1,26
19. Sometimes I have to prevent my partner if he/she tries to find information about my ex relationships.	3,06	1,40
20. The most important factor was being a good father/mother when I choose my partner.	3,55	1,21
21. I prefer to suffer than make my partner suffer.	2,93	1,30
22. Our love is best of all loves because it started with friendship.	3,03	1,16
23. I thing he/she was created for me.	3,21	1,20
24. Our love is not a mystery, mystic feeling, it is a real friendship.	3,19	1,09

Table 3, the students discussed the research dimension "Attitudes to the scale on Love" average scores resulting from expression of the scale for the examination, students (X = 3,40) with "Undecided" it was determined that responded. When we look at the materials most students some " I can't be ok if I doubt about my partners other relationships." (X= 4,47) on the matter "Agree" It was determined that responded. Likewise, when the material basis, students (X= 2,13) "Disagree" they at least participate by giving a response article substance has been. "I like to play "love games" with my partner and other persons". Thus there are times when students are suspected of association in relation to the situation they may be uncomfortable given importance; but they work or they have to be in relationship with as can play the game of love situation than others to say they can not be considered less close.

4.3. Student Relational-Individualist-Collectivist Students Involved in Self Scale Individualism, Relational, Collectivism opinions on the bottom Size

Research within the scope of students"relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, collectivism on

the subscales descriptive statistical dimensions of opinion was determined. In the research averages were determined those covered by the minimum and maximum levels.

Table 4 is shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 4. Participants " Relational-Individualist-Collectivist in Self Scale" Descriptive statistics on the size of the subscale located their score

Self Scale	Gender	n	X	s	t	P
Individualism	Female	143	52,07	6,19	0,94	0,35
	Male	157	50,63	8,49		
Relatedness	Female	143	52,19	6,12	1,43	0,16
	Male	157	49,93	8,85		
Collectivism	Female	143	48,95	6,81	1,96	0,05
	Male	157	46,09	7,56		

Table 4 concerning the individuality of the students who participated in the survey examined subscale female students taking the average score 52.07 ± 6.19; average male students 50.63 ± 8.49 taking the statements contained in this subscale "completely reflect" It was determined that responded. Students from female students taking the average relatedness subscale score 52.19 ± 6.12; average male students their score 49.93 ± 8.85 and " completely reflect " It was determined that responded. Students related to collectivism subscale the average score of points received by the female students taking 48.95 ± 6.81; male students taking the average of 46.09 ± 7.56 points the statements contained in this scale " completely reflect " It was determined that responded.

4.4. According to the Gender Variable students Relational-Individualist-Collectivist Students Involved in Self Scale

Individualism, Relational, Collectivism opinions on the bottom Size

The research located covered by the students' gender; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, their scores were compared collectivism of views on the sub size. Averages were determined according to the minimum and maximum levels those discussed in the research. Table 5 is shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 5. According to the gender the participants "rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" located comparing the scores obtained from the dimensions

Self Scale	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Individualism	Female	143	52,07	6,19	0,94	0,35
	Male	157	50,63	8,49		
Relatedness	Female	143	52,19	6,12	1,43	0,16
	Male	157	49,93	8,85		
Collectivism	Female	143	48,95	6,81	1,96	0,05
	Male	157	46,09	7,56		

According to Table 5; terms of gender of the students participating in the survey related individualism subscale of female by students on taking point average 52.07 ± 6.19; male students are taking an average 50.63 ± 8.49; points with no significant differences according to gender expressions in this subscale. Students relatedness subscale female students taking the average score 52.19 ± 6.12; male students are taking an average 49.93 ± 8.85 points with no significant differences according to gender expressions in this subscale. Students related collectivism subscale female students they receive average score of 48.95 ± 6.81; while the male students score by taking the average of 46.09 ± 7.56 subscale significant differences according to

gender, there is no place to express the field. Therefore, parallel to each other are said to reflect an opinion Related the gender subscales of the comparison.

4.5. Rational-Individualist-Collectivist students age by changing the scale Involved in Self Individualism, Relational, Collectivism Opinions on Old Size

The research located covered by the students' age variables; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational dimensions of views on the collectivism to compare their score is made. Those discussed in the research were determined avarages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 6 are shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 6. According to the age of the participants "Rational- individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" to compare the scores they receive from located subscales

Self Scale	Age	n	$\bar{x}$	S	Min	Max	F	P
	18	123	52,30	7,01	29	61	1,11	0,36
	19	23	51,78	5,78	40	61		
Individualism	20	124	51,88	6,89	35	62		
	21	14	47,36	11,77	14	60		
	22	16	51,44	6,98	37	62		
	18	123	53,43	4,22	43	59	1,30	0,28
	19	23	50,35	7,77	31	63		
Relatedness	20	124	51,50	6,74	37	61		
	21	14	47,79	11,86	13	58		
	22	16	49,88	8,86	29	60		
	18	123	49,78	5,78	37	58	1,16	0,34
	19	23	47,91	6,24	38	59		
Collectivism	20	124	46,46	6,33	34	57		
	21	14	45,50	11,43	17	56		
	22	16	45,81	7,69	32	57		

According to Table 6; variable in terms of age of the students participating in the survey individualism subscales to average of 18 years 52.30 ± 7.01; average age of 19 years 51.78 ± 5.78; average age of 20 years 51.88 ± 6.89; average age of 21 years 47.36 ± 11.77; average age of 22 years 51.44 ± 6.98; there are no significant differences according to age variable points, taking the statements contained in this subscale. Students for relatedness subscale average age of 18 years 53.43 ± 4.23; average age of 19 years 50,35±7,77; average age of 20 years 51,88±6,89; average age of 21 years 51,50±6,74; average age of 22 years 49,88±8,86; there are no significant differences according to age variable points, taking the statements contained in this subscale. Students related collectivism to subscale average age of 18 years 49,78±5,78; average age of 19 years 47,91±6,24; average age of 20 years 46,46±6,33; average age of 21 years 45,50±11,43; average age of 22 years 45,81±7,69; there are no significant differences according to age variable points, taking the statements contained in this subscale. Therefore, age of the opinion that the comparison of subscales relating to the variable argue that there is parallel to each other.

4.6. Students Inhabited According to the total number of variables Relations Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale location Individualism, Relational, Collectivism Opinions on Old Size

The research within the scope of relations based on the total number of variables inhabited by students; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, their scores were compared collectivism of views on the subscales. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 7 is shown the opinions

expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 7. In relation to the total number the participants in which they live "Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" Located comparing the scores obtained from subscales

Self Scale	Number of relationships	n	$\overline{x}$	s	t	p
Individualism	3 and under	158	52,47	6,31	1,91	0,06
	4 and up	142	49,57	8,87		
Relatedness	3 and under	158	52,55	6,37	2,54	0,01*
	4 and up	142	48,62	9,10		
Collectivism	3 and under	158	48,78	6,12	2,38	0,02*
	4 and up	142	45,31	8,44		

*$p<0,05$

According to Table 7; students participated in the survey living total number of relationship in terms variable the number of students who individualism relations subscale 3 and under on the average by 52.47 ± 6.31; 4 and up taking students the number of relationships on average 49.57 ± 8.87; points the total number of relationships they have with the sub scale of the statements there is no significant difference between the variables. According to relatedness subscale students they live in terms of the total number of variable relations 3 and under the number relation of students taking the average of 52.55 ± 6.37; 4 and up the number relation of students on taking average 48.62 ± 9.10 points, significant differences were found with these subscales according to gender in the statements. This situation reveals that PR = 0.01; p <0.05 criterion that is the extent of the significant differences. According to the collectivism subscale of students they live in terms of the total number of variable relations 3 and under students, the number of relationship taking the average 48.78 ± 6.12; 4 and up the number of students on relationship taking an average 45.31 ± 8.44; points total number of relationships they have with these

subscales are significant differences in the statements by the variable. This situation reveals that PR = 0.02; p <0.05 criterion that is the extent of the significant differences.

4.7. According to the type of relationship they live Students Rational- individualist-collectivist in Self Scale location Individualism, Relational, Collectivism Opinions on Old Size

It participated in this study based on the type of students they lived relationship; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, their scores were compared collectivism of views on the subscales. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 8 is shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 8. According to the participants by the type of relationship they live "Rational- individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" located comparing the scores obtained from subscales

Self Scale	Type of relationship	n	$\overline{x}$	s	t	p
Individualism	Flirt	181	51,70	7,96	1,24	0,22
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	49,32	5,47		
Relatedness	Flirt	181	51,37	7,68	1,24	0,22
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	48,89	8,43		
Collectivism	Flirt	181	47,86	7,54	1,54	0,13
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	45,00	6,11		

According to Table 8; students participated in the survey depending on the type of relationship the individualism subscale of students flirt on average by 51.70 ± 7.96 points; while Married / Engaged /Verbal taking the average students 49.32 ± 5.47 points, there are no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had

with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related relational subscale living flirt students taking an average 51.37 ± 7.68; while Married / Engaged / Verbal students taking the average score 48.89 ± 8.43; point there are no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related collectivism subscale living flirt student taking average scores of 47.86 ± 7.54; while Married / Engaged / Verbal student taking average 45.00 ± 6.11; points there are no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Therefore, variables related to the types of relationships in which they live views are said to paralleled each other in the comparison of subscales.

4.8. The students Regarding their living by Time Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale Location Individualism, Relational, Collectivism Opinions on Old Size

The research within the scope of students' by the time they had relationship; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, their scores were compared collectivism of views on the subscale. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 9 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 9. According to the participants by the time they live relationship "Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" Located comparing the scores obtained from subscales

Self Scale	Relationship time	N	$\bar{x}$	s	Min	Max	F	p
	3 month under	130	49,97	8,25	14	59	1,68	0,18
Individualism	3-6 months between	14	49,86	5,75	37	57		
	7-12 months between	22	50,27	9,30	29	62		
	12 months over	134	53,59	6,01	38	62		
	3 month under	130	50,80	8,76	13	59	1,77	0,16
Relatedness	3-6 months between	14	50,86	5,19	40	59		
	7-12 months between	22	48,00	8,66	29	61		
	12 months over	134	52,88	7,01	36	63		
	3 month under	130	46,10	7,95	17	58	1,74	0,16
Collectivism	3-6 months between	14	47,43	5,60	32	54		
	7-12 months between	22	45,55	7,35	32	57		
	12 months over	134	49,50	7,17	34	59		

According to Table 9; According to the time of the relationship experienced by the students participated in the survey; the individuality subscale for 3 months and under the the relationship average time of 49.97 ± 8.25; between 3-6 months relations the average time of 49,86±5,75; between 7-12 months relations the average time of 50,27±9,30; 12 months and up relations taking the average time of 53,59±6,01; points there are no significant differences depending on the duration of the relationship they have with these subscales in the statements. Students from relatedness subscale 3 month under relations the average time of 50,80±8,76; between 3-6 months relations the average time of 50,86±5,19; between 7-12 months relations the average time of 48,00±8,66; 12 months and up relations taking the average time of 52,88±7,01; points there are no

significant differences depending on the duration of the relationship they have with these subscales in the statements. Students related collectivism subscale 3 month under relations the average time of 46,10±7,95; between 3-6 months relations the average time of 47,43±5,60; between 7-12 months relations the average time of 45,55±7,35; 12 months and up relations taking the average time of 49,50±7,17; points there are no significant differences depending on the duration of the relationship they have with these subscales in the statements. Therefore, according to the duration of the relationship experienced by students it said that in view of the comparison of subscales shown parallel to each other.

4.9. The students Regarding where they live According to Resume Status Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale Location Individualism, Relational, Collectivism Opinions on Old Size

The research within the scope of students' they live in relationship continue based on the case; "relational self-individualist-collectivist scale" in located individualism, relational, their scores were compared collectivism of views on the subscale. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 10 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 10. Continued relationship the situation in which they live by the participants "Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" Located comparing the scores obtained from subscales

Self Scale	Continuation of the relationship	N	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Individualism	Continuing	139	50,00	8,65	-1,32	0,19
	Not continuing	161	52,05	6,77		
Relatedness	Continuing	139	50,23	8,56	-0,68	0,50
	Not continuing	161	51,33	7,39		
Collectivism	Continuing	139	46,46	7,69	-0,93	0,35
	Not continuing	161	47,87	7,13		

According to Table 10; student participated in the survey according on the case to continue the relationship in which they live individualism subscale students continuing the relationship they live on taking average by 50.00 ± 8.65; they live in relationship not continuing students taking an average 52.05 ± 6.77; points there is no significant difference in this subscale according to the state to continue the relationship they had with the statements contained. Students from relatedness subscale continuing students the relationships in which they live taking an average 50.23 ± 8.56; they live in relationship not continuing students taking an average 51.33 ± 7.39; points there is no significant difference in this subscale according to the state to continue the relationship they had with the statements contained. Students related collectivism subscale continuing students the relationships in which they live taking an average 46.46 ± 7.69; they live in relationship not continuing students taking an average 47.87 ± 7.13; point there is no significant difference in this subscale according to the state to continue the relationship they had with the statements contained. Therefore, the subscales relationship to the situation relationships experienced by students It said that in view of the comparison showed parallels to each other.

4.10. Students According to Changing Gender Located in Attitudes Scale Regarding Love Altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

The research within the scope of students according to gender; "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, such as game and their scores were compared possessive of views on the subscale. Those discussed in the research

were determined averages   according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 11 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 11. According to the sex of the participants "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the subscale comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale Regarding Love	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	s	t	P
Altruist	Female	143	13,51	2,49	0,82	0,41
	Male	157	13,05	2,94		
Friendly	Female	143	12,79	3,71	-0,66	0,51
	Male	157	13,25	3,18		
Passionate	Female	143	13,95	3,06	-0,74	0,46
	Male	157	14,39	2,77		
Sensible	Female	143	12,65	3,35	0,44	0,66
	Male	157	12,35	3,45		
As the game	Female	143	10,65	3,03	-2,34	0,02*
	Male	157	12,02	2,79		
Possessive	Female	143	13,51	2,49	0,83	0,41
	Male	157	13,05	2,94		

$p<0,05$

According to Table 11; terms of gender of the students participating in the survey for the selfless subscale female students taking the average score 13.51 ± 2.49; male students taking the average 13.05 ± 2.94 points subscale significant differences according to gender, there is no place to express the field. Students related friendly subscale female students taking the average score 12.79 ± 3.71; male students taking the average 13.25 ± 3.18 points subscale significant differences according to gender, there is no place to express the field. Students related passionate about subscale received by the female students taking the average score of 13.95 ± 3.06; while the male students Taking an average of 14.39 ± 2.77 subscale significant differences according to gender, there is no place to express the field. Students related logical subscale female students taking the average score of

12.65 ± 3.35; male students taking the average of 12.35 ± 3.45 points; subscale significant differences according to gender, there is no place to express the field. Students related the subscales game received by the female students taking; The average score of 10.65 ± 3.03; male students taking the average 12.02 ± 2.79 points subscale significant differences according to gender are included in the statements. This situation reveals that PR = 0.02; p <0.05 criterion that is the extent of the significant differences. Student related possessive subscale received by the female students taking the average score of 13.51 ± 2.49; male students taking the average 13.05 ± 2.94 points, subscale significant differences according to gender, there is no place to express the field.

4.11. According to the changing age students Attitudes toward the scale Coverage of altruistic love, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

Research within the scope of students' According to the variable age; "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, such as game and their scores were compared possessive of views on the lower size. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 12 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 12. According to the age of the participants "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the lower size comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale Regarding Love	Age	n	$\bar{x}$	s	Min	Max	F	P
Altruist	18	123	13,61	3,01	8	18	0,49	0,74
	19	23	12,96	2,51	9	18		
	20	124	12,38	3,02	6	18		
	21	14	14,29	2,79	9	20		
	22	16	13,56	2,00	10	17		
Friendly	18	123	13,00	3,38	5	18	0,23	0,92
	19	23	12,61	2,76	6	17		
	20	124	12,96	3,57	7	19		
	21	14	13,43	3,96	4	20		
	22	16	13,56	3,83	4	19		
Passionate	18	123	14,13	2,60	9	19	0,62	0,65
	19	23	14,96	2,58	8	20		
	20	124	14,08	3,09	8	20		
	21	14	13,50	3,01	9	20		
	22	16	14,00	3,41	8	20		
Sensible	18	123	12,91	3,73	7	19	0,58	0,68
	19	23	11,61	2,52	8	16		
	20	124	12,46	4,06	6	19		
	21	14	13,07	3,12	7	16		
	22	16	12,63	3,28	7	18		
As the game	18	123	11,09	3,52	4	16	0,45	0,77
	19	23	11,57	3,03	7	18		
	20	124	11,29	2,73	4	16		
	21	14	11,07	2,34	8	15		
	22	16	12,25	3,00	8	18		
Possessive	18	123	13,61	3,01	8	18	1,34	0,26
	19	23	12,96	2,51	9	18		
	20	124	12,38	3,02	6	18		
	21	14	14,29	2,79	9	20		
	22	16	13,56	2,00	10	17		

According to Table 12; the students participating in the survey variable in terms of age of related in the subscale selfless 18 years age of average 13.61 ± 3.01; 19 years age of average 12.96 ± 2.51; 20 years age of average 12.38 ± 3.02; 21 years age of average 14.29 ± 2.79; 22 years age of average taking to 13.56 ± 2.00 point subscale significant differences according to the age, there is no variable with the statements contained. Student related friendly subscale 18 years age of average $13,00\pm3,38$; 19 years age of average $12,61\pm2,76$; ; 20 years age of average $12,96\pm3,57$; 21 years age of average $13,43\pm3,96$; 22 years age of average taking to $13,56\pm3,83$; point there are no significant differences according to age variable the statements contained in this subscale. Students related passionate subscale 18 years age of average $14,13\pm2,60$; 19 years age of average $14,96\pm2,58$; 20 years age of average $14,08\pm3,09$; 21 years age of average $13,50\pm3,01$; 22 years age of average taking to $14,00\pm3,41$ points there are no significant differences according to age variable the statements contained in this subscale. Students related to logical subscale 18 years age of average $12,91\pm3,73$; 19 years age of average $11,61\pm2,52$; 20 years age of average $12,46\pm4,06$; 21 years age of average $13,07\pm3,12$; 22 years age of average taking to $12,63\pm3,28$; point there are no significant differences according to age variable the statements contained in this subscale. Students related subscales game 18 years age of average $11,09\pm3,52$; 19 years age of average $11,57\pm3,03$; years age of average $11,29\pm2,73$; 21 years age of average $11,07\pm2,34$; 22 years age of average taking to $12,25\pm3,00$; point there are no significant differences according to age variable the statements contained in this subscale. Students related possessive subscale 18 years age of average $13,61\pm3,01$; 19 years age of average $12,96\pm2,51$; 20 years age of average $12,38\pm3,02$; 21 years age of average

14,29±2,2,79; 22 years age of average taking to 13,56±2,00 point there are no significant differences according to age variable the statements contained in this subscale. Therefore, the age of the opinion that the comparison of subscales relating to the variable argue that there is parallel to each other.

4.12. They live by Total Number of Student Relations Attitudes toward the scale Coverage of altruistic love, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

Research within the scope of students' Research within the scope of students' "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, such as game and their scores were compared possessive of views on the lower size. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 13 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 13. Total number of relationships in which they live according to the participants"Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the lower size comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale Regarding Love	Number Relationship	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Altruist	3 month under	158	13,47	2,77	0,92	0,36
	4 and over	142	12,95	2,72		
Friendly	3 month under	158	13,29	3,62	0,84	0,40
	4 and over	142	12,71	3,09		
Passionate	3 month under	158	14,34	3,28	0,59	0,56
	4 and over	142	14,00	2,27		
Sensible	3 month under	158	12,72	3,52	0,84	0,40
	4 and over	142	12,14	3,22		
As the game	3 month under	158	10,90	3,07	-2,16	0,03*
	4 and over	142	12,17	2,66		

Possessive	3 month under	158	13,47	2,77	0,92	0,36
	4 and over	142	12,95	2,72		

p<0,05

According to Table 13; students participating in the research the number of relationship in which they live related selfless subscale score 3 and under average students taking point 13,47±2,77; 4 and over average students taking average students taking 12,95±2,72 point there is no significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained. Students related friendly subscale 3 and under average students taking point 13,29±3,62; 4 and over average students taking average students taking point 12,71±3,09 there is no significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained. Students related passionate subscale subscale 3 and under average students taking point 14,34±3,28 4 and over average students taking average students taking point 14,00±2,27 there is no significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained. Students related to logical subscale 3 and under average students taking point 12,72±3,52 4 and over average students taking average students taking point 12,14±3,22 there is no significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained. Students related the subscales game 3 and under average students taking point 10,90±3,07 4 and over average students taking average students taking point 12,17±2,66 there is no significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained. This situation reveals that PR = 0.03; p <0.05 criterion that is the extent of the significant differences. Students related the possessive subscale 3 and under average students taking point 13,47±2,77 4 and over average students taking average students taking point 12,95±2,72 there is no

significant difference between these subscales number of relationships they have with expressions contained.

4.13. According to the type of relationship they live Students Attitudes toward the scale Coverage of altruistic love, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

It participated in this study based on the type of students they lived relationship; "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, logical, such as game and their scores were compared possessive of views on the subscale. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 14 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 14. According to the participants by the type of relationship they live"Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the subscale comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale on Love	Type of relationship	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Altruist	Flirt	181	12,99	3,40	-0,01	0,99
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	13,00	3,27		
Friendly	Flirt	181	12,86	3,56	-1,13	0,26
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	13,84	2,54		
Passionate	Flirt	181	14,32	2,84	0,86	0,39
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	13,68	3,13		
Sensible	Flirt	181	12,41	3,51	-0,44	0,66
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	12,79	2,94		
As the game	Flirt	181	11,49	2,89	0,44	0,66
	Married / Engaged / Verbal	119	11,16	3,29		
Possessive	Flirt	181	12,99	2,68	-2,00	0,05

Married / Engaged / Verbal 119 14,37 2,85

According to Table 14; students participated in the survey according to the type of relationship in which they live; altruistic subscale related living flirt relationship students   taking an average 12.99 ± 3.40 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship with students taking an average 13.00 ± 3.27 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related friendly subscale living flirt relationship student taking an average 12,86±3,56 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship with students taking an average 12,86±3,56 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students are related passionate subscale living flirt relationship student student taking an average 14,32±2,84 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship with students taking an average 13,68±3,13 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related to sensible subscale living flirt relationship student taking an average 12,41±3,51 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship with students taking an average 12,79±2,94 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related the subscales game living flirt relationship student taking an average 11,49±2,89 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship with students taking an average 12,16±3,29 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale. Students related the possessive subscale living flirt relationship student taking an average 12,99±2,68 points; Married / Engaged / Verbal relationship

with students taking an average 12,99±2,68 points there is no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with the statements contained in this subscale.

4.14 Student Living According to Time Reletionship Attitudes toward the scale Coverage of altruistic love, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

Research within the scope of students' according to time relationsip "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, such as game and their scores were compared possessive of views on the subscales . Those discussed in the research were determined averages   according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 15 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 15. According to the participants by the time in which they live relationship "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the lower size comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale on Love	Relationship time	n	$\bar{x}$	s	Min	Max	F	p
Altruist	3 month under	130	13,10	3,53	4	19	1,00	0,40
	3-6 months Between	14	13,71	3,29	8	20		
	7-12 months Between	22	11,95	3,76	5	19		
	12 month and up	134	13,26	2,94	7	20		
Friendly	3 month under	130	12,87	3,38	4	19	1,70	0,17
	3-6 months Between	14	14,86	2,38	11	19		
	7-12 months Between	22	12,36	3,54	5	20		
	12 month and up	134	12,91	3,57	4	19		
Passionate	3 month under	130	14,63	2,92	8	20	0,86	0,46
	3-6 months Between	14	14,36	2,71	8	20		

	7-12 months Between	22	13,36	2,13	9	18		
	12 month and up	134	14,29	3,34	8	20		
Sensible	3 month under	130	13,27	3,49	7	19	0,80	0,49
	3-6 months Between	14	11,86	3,03	8	16		
	7-12 months Between	22	12,23	3,56	7	19		
	12 month and up	134	12,21	3,36	6	19		
As the game	3 month under	130	11,80	3,07	7	18	0,26	0,86
	3-6 months Between	14	11,36	3,77	4	18		
	7-12 months Between	22	11,41	2,65	4	16		
	12 month and up	134	11,15	2,78	7	17		
Possessive	3 month under	130	13,37	2,74	8	18		
	3-6 months Between	14	12,50	2,59	8	17	0,44	0,72
	7-12 months Between	22	13,55	2,56	9	18		
	12 month and up	134	13,26	3,00	6	20		

According to Table 15; The students participated in the survey according to the time of in which they live the relationship; related the selfless subscale 3 months and under the average of 13.10 ± 3.53; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 13,71±3,29; between 7 and 12 months, time of the relationship avarage 11,95±3,76; 12 months and over the average of 13,26±2,95; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale. In the research related friendly subscale 3 months and under the average of 12,87±3,38; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 14,86±3,38; between 7 and 12 months, time of the relationship avarage 12,36±3,54; months and over the average of 12,91±3,57; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale. In the research related passionate subscale 3 months and under the average of 14,63±2,92; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 14,36±2,71; between 7 and 12 months, time of

the relationship avarage 13,36±2,13; months and over the average of 14,29±3,34; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale. In the research related the logical subscale 3 months and under the average of 13,27±3,49; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 11,86±3,03; between 7 and 12 months, time of the relationship avarage 12,23±3,56; months and over the average of 12,21±3,36; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale. In the research related as the game subscales 3 months and under the average of 11,80±3,07; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 11,36±3,77; between 7 and 12 months, time of the relationship avarage 11,41±2,65; months and over the average of 11,15±2,78; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale. In the research related possessive subscales 3 months and under the average of 13,37±2,74; between 3 and 6 months, time of the relationship avarage 12,50±2,59; between 7 and 12 months, time of the relationship avarage 13,55±2,56; months and over the average of 13,26±3,00; there are no significant differences according to the time of taking the points on which they live with the statements contained in this subscale.

4.15. The students they live on in which relationship according to Resume StatusAttitudes toward the scale Coverage of altruistic love, friendly, passionate, sensible, as the game Opinions about the possessive Subscale

Scope of the research located of the students they live in relationship according to continuing status; the comparison score was made

"Attitude Scale Regarding Love" is located altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, get the views on the game and possessive as they subscales. Those discussed in the research were determined averages according to the minimum and maximum levels. Table 16 are also shown the opinions expressed in the research descriptive statistics determined by the size of these views.

Table 16. According to participants lived relationship continue status "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" located in the lower size comparison of their scores

Attitudes Scale on Love	Continuation of the relationship	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Altruist	Continuing	139	13,33	3,46	0,82	0,42
	Not Continuing	161	12,77	3,30		
Friendly	Continuing	139	13,72	3,63	1,58	0,12
	Not Continuing	161	12,62	3,21		
Passionate	Continuing	139	14,97	3,18	2,18	0,03*
	Not Continuing	161	13,70	2,60		
Sensible	Continuing	139	12,23	3,66	-0,59	0,56
	Not Continuing	161	12,64	3,24		
As the game	Continuing	139	11,54	2,95	0,29	0,77
	Not Continuing	161	11,36	2,99		
Possessive	Continuing	139	13,59	2,82	0,99	0,33
	Not Continuing	161	13,03	2,71		

*$p<0,05$

According to Table 16; The students participated in the survey according to continuation in which they live the relationship; related the selfless subscale students continuing relationship taking an average 13.33 ± 3.46 points; students not continuing relationship taking an average 12,77±3,30; located on the lower scale there are no significant differences according to the type of relationship they had with continuing expression. Students from friendly subscale students continuing relationship taking an average 13,72±3,63 points; students

not continuing relationship taking an average 12,62±3,21 there is no significant difference in this subscale according to the state to continue the relationship they had with the statements contained. Students are related passionate subscale students continuing relationship taking an average 14,97±3,18 points; students not continuing relationship taking an average 13,70±2.60 there are significant differences in this subscale according to the state to continue the relationship they had with the statements contained. Students to related sensible subscale students continuing relationship taking an average 12,23±3,66 points; students not continuing relationship taking an average 12,64±3,24 there are no significant differences according to the state to continue their relationship with the statements contained in this subscale. Students to related as the game subscale students continuing relationship taking an average 11,54±2,95 points; students not continuing relationship taking an average 12,16±3,29 there is no significant difference in this subscale according to the state to continue their relationship with the statements contained. The students related the possessive subscale living in flirt relationship students taken score average 11.36 ± 2.99 points; students not continuing relationship taking an average 13,03±2,71; bu alt ölçekte yer alan ifadelerle yaşadıkları ilişki türlerine göre anlamlı farklılık bulunmamaktadır. there is no significant difference between these subscales kind of relationship they had with the statements contained.

4.16. Students' Attitude Scale Regarding Love "in the Location field with the points they got from the bottom Size Correlations Between "Rational- individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" Location field points taken from the bottom Size

Students based on data obtained in the studies "Attitude Scale Regarding Love" in the grades they received from the dimensions involved are given "Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" located correlations between the scores they receive from subscale.

Table 17. Participants' Attitudes Scale on Love "located on the scores they receive from subscales correlations between "Rational-individualist-collectivist in Self Scale" scores they receive from Located subscales

		Individualism	Relatedness	Collectivism	Altruist	Friendly	Passionate	Sensible	As the game	Possessive
Individualism	r	1,00								
	p									
Relatedness	r	0,68	1,00							
	p	0,00*								
Collectivism	r	0,70	0,78	1,00						
	p	0,00*	0,00*							
Altruist	r	-0,08	-0,02	0,03	1,00					
	p	0,44	0,86	0,74						
Friendly	r	-0,14	-0,06	0,00*	0,30	1,00				
	p	0,17	0,56	0,97	0,00*					
Passionate	r	0,01	0,06	0,13	0,36	0,30	1,00			
	p	0,96	0,52	0,21	0,00*	0,00*				
Sensible	r	-0,17	-0,08	-0,11	0,14	0,05	0,12	1,00		
	p	0,08	0,43	0,29	0,16	0,62	0,24			
As the game	r	-0,12	-0,01	-0,05	0,07	0,02	0,00	0,18	1,00	
	p	0,25	0,92	0,61	0,49	0,81	0,99	0,08		
Possessive	r	-0,18	-0,09	-0,11	0,32	0,17	0,01	0,14	0,19	1,00
	p	0,08	0,40	0,27	0,00*	0,10	0,96	0,16	0,05	

*p<0,05

Considering table 17. Students "individualism, relational, collectivism, altruistic, friendly, passionate, sensible, games, possessive" were identified statistically significant correlations subscale and the overall scale they have received in total points [n (300) = p<0,05)]. At the same time research within the scope of teachers a positive and strong correlation has been found to be both subscales the general scale between related of opinions. Also are positive comparisons with each other correlations between all the dimensions.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

According to findings from both scales "Relational Collectivist Individualist Self Scale" and "Attitudes about Love Scale" in love scale students obtained relatedness and collectivism in relational collectivist scale students obtained friendly and passionate data. And also we had significant differences related with subscales. This research examined young adults' relation time and relation status with comparing against love styles and ego, sex, educational level and socio economic level, love styles and addition to this variables relation number and also handled love styles and ego types. Findings showed that passionate love style is more common than other love styles for young adults who are studied at KKTC as university student. Expect that love styles are different according to number of relations, length of relation, statue of relation, sex, age. Again findings showed that relational-individualism ego comes forward against collectivist ego. Addition to that individualist, relational and collectivist ego types are showing differences according to sex, socio-economic status and educational status. Findings related to classification of ego types showed that university students can't be classify with one ego type, they can classify with three combine type of ego (individualist-

related-collectivist) or two combine (individualist-related and related collectivist).

Based on the research results, Girne American University students in emotional relationship with the opposite sex of the source of problems are held clues and capture these clues it is important for the self-types can be accepted as a reflection on the individual level culture. Furthermore, we have obtained findings types and styles of self-identity types in the context of love relationships love the styles of young adults, It said to offer support Lee's love styles to the theory, lately triple to support self-classification and the self Kağıtçıbaşı model. Experienced in a social context, it seems important love the styles of both individuals in shaping the personality type. A substantial body of research has demonstrated that gender is a significant predictor of love styles. Reported that men tend to endorse passionate (Eros) and game-playing (Ludus) love styles more frequently, whereas women are more likely to adopt friendship-based (Storge) and altruistic (Agape) love styles. The present findings, which reveal significant gender-based differences in love styles, are in line with these previous results (Hendrick, 2004). With regard to age and relationship experience, the literature suggests that passionate love tends to be more prominent during young adulthood, while increasing age and longer relationship duration are associated with a shift toward more stable, realistic, and commitment-oriented love styles. Sprecher and noted that intense romantic passion gradually gives way to deeper emotional attachment and commitment over time. In this study, the differentiation of love styles according to relationship duration and relationship status supports this developmental perspective (Regan 2016). Educational level and socio-economic status are also important factors influencing individuals' expectations from romantic relationships and the meanings they

attribute to love. Emphasized that individuals with higher levels of education and socio-economic status tend to approach love more consciously, selectively, and within a long-term relational framework. The findings of the present study, which demonstrate significant differences in love styles according to educational level and socio-economic status, are consistent with these observations (Levine et al., 1995). Furthermore, the results indicate that love styles are related to the number of previous romantic relationships and relationship history. Previous studies suggest that individuals with multiple relationship experiences are more inclined toward game-playing or pragmatic love styles, whereas those with fewer romantic experiences may adopt more passionate and idealistic love styles. The finding that love styles differ significantly according to the number of relationships provides empirical support for this claim (Dicke, 1998). In conclusion, the present study demonstrates that love styles are shaped not only by individual emotional preferences but also by a complex interplay of demographic, developmental, and socio-cultural factors. The findings support the cross-cultural applicability of Lee's Love Styles Theory and underscore the importance of considering demographic variables in understanding young adults' romantic relationships. From this perspective, examining love styles in conjunction with demographic characteristics offers valuable contributions to both academic research and psychological counseling and guidance practices.

This study it considered two related cases love style and personality types to open the contextual effect. This research may offer some suggestions for work to be done hereafter. These suggestions:

- This research the context feature of university students making qualitative study existing related the love understanding

- The realization of the research will be discussed along with the development of self and identity,

- Love the style investigation on the basis of different developmental stages,

- Love styles and personality types examining the rural-urban context,

- Love styles and personality types working with social gender roles,

- Regarding the self-relational and communitarian nature it can be arranged as conducting research.

REFERENCES

Açıkel, M. (2013).University Students Examining the Personality Characteristics Relationship Between and Love Styles.Hacetepe University Institute of Social Sciences High Language Thesis.

Arkonaç, S. (2008). Understanding People in Social Psychology: Experimental and Critical Perspectives. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Arnett J. J. (2000). Emerging Adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. American Psychologist, 55, 469-480.

Attack, H. and Stone, N. (2012). Attack, H. and Stone, N. (2012). Journal of Current Approaches in Psychiatry (4), 4, 520-546. (4) 4, 520-546.

Atalay, D. (2004). Love's source. Turkish Journal of Psychology, (32), 108-110.

Atkinson, R. (1999). Project Management: Cost, Time and Quality, Two Best Guesses and a Phenomenon, Its Time to Accept Other Success Criteria, International Journal of Project Management.

Bacanlı, H., T., Ilhan and S. Leo (2009). Development of Personality Scale Based on the Five Factor Theory: Personality Test Based on adjective (SDKT). Journal of Turkish Science Education, 70 (2), 261-279.

Banaji, M. R., and Prentice, D. A. (1994). The self in social contexts. In M. R. Rosenzweig L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology Vol. 45, pp. 297-352. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Berscheid, E. and Meyers, S., A. (1996). A social categorical approach to a question about love. Personal Relationships, (3), 19-43.

Boyacıoğlu, G. (1994). Relationships between inter-personal schemas and depressive symptom in university students. Clinic Psychology Program. Ankara: Hacettepe University.

Brizendine, L. (2010). The Male Brain. New York: Broadway Books.

Brown, H. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall Regents. 299 pp.

Bugay, A. and Tezer, E. (2008). Attachment styles and loving attitudes among Turkish university students. Paper presented at 2nd Global Conference on Persons, Intimacy Love: Probing the Boundaries. Salzburg, Austria, March, 10-13.

Burger, J., M. (2006). Personality. (Translation: Believe Sea, E. Sarioglu). (Edition 1). Istanbul: Cactus Publications.

Büyükşahin, A. (2007). Connection in close relationships: connection styles of investment model and examining with some variables. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Büyükşahin, A. and Hovardaoğlu, s. (2004). Examining of couples' attitudes for love according to Lee's Multidimensional Love Forms. Turkish Psychology Magazine, 19, 59-72.

Carter, C., S. (1998). Neuroendocrine perspectives on social attachment and love. Psychoneuroendocrinology. (23) 779-818.

Crews, D. (1998). On the organization of individual differences in sexual behavior. American Zoologist (38) 118-132.

Cross, S., ve Madson, L., (2011). Models of The Self: Self-Construals and Gender. Psychological Bulletin (122).

Curun, F. (2006). Relation between downloads, communication conflicts, orientation to sex and sex role and marital satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Ankara University.

The etymological dictionary of contemporary Turkish. (2007). The words Nişanyan pedigree. Istanbul: Adam Publications.

Çalışır, M. (2009). Relation between depression and adult connection theory and emotion regulation strategy. Current Approaches in Psychiatry. (1), 240-255.

Çavuşoğlu, Ş. (2004). Examining relation between self-esteem of married couples and harmony of marriage. Unpublished License Thesis. Ankara: Ankara University.

Dashdamirov, D. (2013). Examining relation between attitudes types to love of university students and depression levels. Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences Master Thesis.

Demirtas, H. A. (2004). Jealousy in close relationships (personal, relational and situational variables). Unpublished PhD Thesis. Ankara: Ankara.

Dicke, A. (1998). The Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15(2), 147–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407598152001

Ercan, H. (2008). Love Styles and Self Type of Young Adults. Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences Doctoral Dissertation.

Ercan, H. (2013). Young Adult Types of Self-Love Style and Examining the demographic variable angle. Journal of Turkish Studies. (8) 12, 479-493.

Esch, T. and Stefano, G. B. (2004). The neurobiology of pleasure, reward processes, addiction and their health implications. Neuroendocrinology Letters (25) 235-51.

Furman, W., and Shaffer, L. (2003). The role of romantic relationships in adolescent development. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hatfield, E. (1988). The passionate love scale. Sexuality-related measures. A compendium: Bloomington, IN.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52 (3), 511-524.

Hendrıck, C. & Hendrıck, S. (1989). Research on Love: Does It Measure Up? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56 (5), 784-794.

Hendrick, C. (2004). A relationship-specific version of the Love Attitude Scale. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, (5), 239-254.

Hortaçsu, N. (1997). Human relationship. Ankara: Imge publications.

Işınsu, M. (2003). Connections of bilateral relation's type, long and connection styles. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara: Ankara University.

İmamoğlu, E. O. (2003). Individuation and Relatedness: Not: Opposing but Distinct and Complementary. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 129 (4), 367-402.

İmamoğlu, E., O. (1998). Individualism and Collectivism in A Model and Scale of Balanced Differentiation and Integration. Journal of Psychology, 132 (1), 1-8.

James, W. (2007). The Principles of Psychology, New York: Dover.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2004). Autonomy and Relatedness in Cultural Context. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36 (4), 403-422.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). Family Self-Cultural Psychology and Human Development. Istanbul Koç University Press.

Kurt, A. (2000). A Comparison of Three Self-Construal Conceptualizations and Scales with Reference to Issues of Culture and Gender. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara.

Levine, R. V., Sato, S., Hashimoto, T., & Verma, J. (1995). Love and Marriage in Eleven Cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26(5), 554–571. DOI:10.1177/0022022195265007

Levesque, R. J. R. (1993). The romantic experience of adolescents in satisfying love relationships, Journal of Youth Adolescence, 22 (3), 219-251.

Maker, C. J. (2001). DISCOVER: Assessing and developing problem solving. Gifted Education International, 15, 232-251.

Marar, Z. (2004). Paradox of Happiness - Freedom and approval. (Tr. S. Cascade). Istanbul: Book Publisher

Markus, H., R. and Kitayama, S. (2003). Culture, Self, and Reality of the Social. Psychological Inquiry, (14), 277-283.

Muammar, O. M., Maker, C. J., and Kwang, C. C. (2004). Internal structure of the DISCOVER spatial analyticala Assessment. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Arizona.

Myers, J. E. ve Shurts, W. M. (2002). Measuring positive emotionality: A review of instruments assessing love. Measurement and Evaluation in counseling and development, 34, 238-254.

Neto, F. (1993). Love styles and self representations. Personality and Individual Differences, 14, 795-803.

Neto, F. (2005). The satisfaction with love scale. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling Development, 38, 2-13.

Onur, B. (2005). Love in the memories: Childhood and Youth psychosexual history. Istanbul: Book Publishing.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. ve Kemmelmier, M., (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and MetaAnalyses. Psychological Bulletin, (128) 3-72.

Önen, L. and Tüzün, M. (2005). Motivation. Istanbul: Epsilon Publishing.

Özdemir, Y. (2009). Adolescence Fiction Self Development Investigation of Parents for Child Rearing Styles. PhD Thesis.

Özer, B. U. Tezer, E. (2008). Prediction of attitude forms for love of positive and negative emotions. Turkish Psychological Consultation and Guidance Magazine 3(30).

Pines, A. M. (2003). Love and jealousy. (Tr. Canan Yonsel). Istanbul: Read Usa publication.

Regan P.C. (2016). Koşulsuz sevmek: Agapik sevgi tarzının demografik korelasyonları. Interpersona , 10(1), 29–35. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v10i1.199

Rubin, Z. (1970). Mesurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. (16) 265-273.

Russell, J. A. and Carrol, J. M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. Psychological Bulletin, 125(1), 3-30.

Sakallı, N., & Curun, F. (2001). Attitudes against stereotypes of romantic relations. Empirical Psychology Studies, 22, 31-45.

Selcuk, E., Gunaydin, G., Sumer, N., & Uysal A. (2005). A new scale for adult connecting forms: Psychometric assessment of Living Inventory in Close Relations II according to Turkish sample. Turkish Psychology Writings 8, 1-11.

Selçuk, E., G. Günaydın, N. and Uysal, A. (2005). New Scale for Adult Connection Forms: Psychometric assessment of Living Inventory in Close Relations II according to Turkish sample. Turkish Psychology Writings Ankara, 8 (16), 1-11.

Singelis, T. (1994). The measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, (20), 580-591.

Solmuş, T. (2008). Attachment and Two Sides of love. Istanbul: Publishing System. 58.

Solmuş, T. (2003). Romantic connect (II) relational variables and relationship process: Turkish Psychological Bulletin, 9 (28-29), 99-108.

Sternberg, R. J. (1999). The theory of successful intelligence. Review of General Psychology, 3, 292-316.

Sternberg, R.J., and Grajek, S. (1984). The nature of love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (47) 312-329.

Sümer, M. (2006). Examining of connection styles, emotional intelligence, commitment to relation, satisfaction of relation of adults' connection styles according to some variables. Unpublished Master Thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul.

Şahin, S. (2001). Romantic Relations of Turkish Young Adults: Love attitudes, relation satisfactions, psychological health and expanding egos. Boğaziçi University Clinic Psychology Main Science. Master Thesis.

Tufan, A., E. and Yaluğ, İ. (2010). Lack of attention and hyperactivity of adults: Revision according to Turkish data. Anatolia Psychiatry Magazine, (11), 351-359.

Turkish Language Institution. (2015). Love Concept. Ankara: Turkish Language Publications.

Uğurlu, N. (2004). How do romantic relationship satisfaction, gender stereotypes, and gender relate to future time orientation in romantic relationships? The Journal of Psychology, 137(3), 294-303.

Waller N., G. and Shaver P., R. (1994). The Importance of Nongenetic Influences on Romantic Love Styles. A Twin- Family Study. Psychological Science, 5 (5), 268-274.

Waller N.G. and Shaver P. R. (1994). The Importance of Nongenetic Influences on Romantic Love Styles: A Twin- Family Study. Psychological Science, 5 (5), 268-274.

Watts, S. and Stenner, P. (2005). The Subjective Experience of Partnership Love: A Q Methodological Study. British Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 85-107.

Yilmaz, O. (2005). Evolution of love. Third Edition. Istanbul: Ceylan Publications.

Walster, E., Walster, G. W., and Traupmann, J. (1978). Equity and premarital sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (36) 82-92.