



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: A  
ARTS & HUMANITIES - PSYCHOLOGY  
Volume 23 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2023  
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal  
Publisher: Global Journals  
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

# Investigation of the Relationship between Early Maladaptive Schemas, Obsessive Beliefs and Personality Traits

By Kahraman Güler & Kadriye Yöndem

*Istanbul Dogus University*

**Abstract-** In this study, the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, obsessive beliefs and personality traits was investigated. In addition, it was examined how obsessive beliefs and personality traits were affected by early maladaptive schemas according to different socio-demographic variables. The sample group of the study consists of 235 female and 91 male 326 people in Turkey. Some of the data tools used in the research were printed on paper and some of them were determined by simple random method by creating a Google form. The forms were distributed to 326 people between the ages of 18-45. The validity and reliability of all scales used in the study in Turkish have been proven. Socio-demographic Information Form, Young Schema Scale Short Form-3 (YSS-SF3), Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire (OBQ) and International Personality Inventory Short Form (IPISV) were used in the study.

**Keywords:** *early maladaptive schemas, obsessive beliefs, personality traits.*

**GJHSS-A Classification:** DDC Code: 155.23 LCC Code: BF698



*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



# Investigation of the Relationship between Early Maladaptive Schemas, Obsessive Beliefs and Personality Traits

Kahraman Güler <sup>α</sup> & Kadriye Yöndem <sup>σ</sup>

**Abstract** In this study, the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, obsessive beliefs and personality traits was investigated. In addition, it was examined how obsessive beliefs and personality traits were affected by early maladaptive schemas according to different socio-demographic variables. The sample group of the study consists of 235 female and 91 male 326 people in Turkey. Some of the data tools used in the research were printed on paper and some of them were determined by simple random method by creating a Google form. The forms were distributed to 326 people between the ages of 18-45. The validity and reliability of all scales used in the study in Turkish have been proven. Socio-demographic Information Form, Young Schema Scale Short Form-3 (YSS-SF3), Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire (OBQ) and International Personality Inventory Short Form (IPIST) were used in the study. As a result of the research, all sub-dimensions of the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire and emotional deprivation, social isolation, defectiveness, emotional inhibition, enmeshment, abandonment, instability, failure, pessimism, insufficient self-control, self-sacrifice, punitiveness, unrelenting and approval-seeking schemes a positive relationship was found between. A positive relationship was found between while most sub-dimensions of the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire have a positive relationship between introversion, antagonism, responsibility, neuroticism, openness to development and closedness to development; A negative correlation was found between giving importance and extraversion sub-dimension. While there was a positive relationship between some sub-dimensions of early maladaptive schemas and some sub-dimensions of the International Personality Inventory Short Form, a negative was found between some sub-dimensions.

**Keywords:** early maladaptive schemas, obsessive beliefs, personality traits.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Piaget, schema is the arrangement of people by dividing things, objects, ideas and actions in their own mental structures (Bedir, 2020, p.29). Schema therapy is a developmental and integrative approach by Young and their friends that greatly enhances cognitive behavioral and traditional approaches and terms (Young, Kloska, & Weishaar, 2019, p.19). They have distinctive features of their own. Behaviors of parents are effective in the formation of

early maladaptive schemas of relationships with peers, siblings and other people around (Canıdemir, 2019, p.4). Early maladaptive schemas are classified under five domains. The domain of Disconnection and Rejection includes schemes related to putting oneself in empathy, sharing feelings, not meeting global needs such as security, stability, approval, safety, and respect. These; abandonment, mistrust/abuse, emotional deprivation, defectiveness and social isolation (Rafaeli, Bernstein, & Young, 2011, pp.25-27). In the field of Impaired Autonomy and Performance, there are schemas related to competition and one's own needs. These schemas appear as dependence, vulnerability to harm or illness, enmeshment and failure (Ekşi, 2021, pp.25-26). In the Impaired Limits domain, it is said that the boundaries of self-control and equality with other individuals are not as developed as they should be. The schemes of this domain are said to be justification, insufficient self-control/self-discipline scheme (Duran, 2016, p.8-9). Other-Directedness schemas relate to deficiencies in satisfying the need to be self-directed. The schemes in this domain are; subjugation scheme, self-sacrifice scheme, approval-seeking/acceptance-seeking (Rafaeli et al., 2011, pp.30-31). In the emergence of schemas in the field of excessive Overvigilance and Inhibition, the fact that the person does not express his natural feelings and impulses and suppresses them is effective. Schemes in this domain; negativity/pessimism, emotional inhibition, unrelenting standards, punitiveness (Kaya, 2010, p.16-17).

According to the research of the Obsessive Compulsive Cognitions Working Group (OCCWG), it is said that there are 6 main beliefs that cause seriousness in the formation of obsessions. These beliefs are responsibility expectation, danger expectation, perfectionism, intolerance of uncertainty, giving importance to thoughts and caring about control of thoughts (Acarer, 2019, p.86). In the expectation of enlarged responsibility; it is the belief that the individual has the control to reveal or inhibit negative consequences (Dönmezler, 2017, p.22). Danger expectation; perfectionism; it is seen as the state of being powerless in situations or events that lack clarity (Gözü Kırmızı, 2019, p.28). Inability to tolerate uncertainty; it is stated as individuals' needing to be clear about situations and events, feeling negative about

**Author α:** Assistant Professor, Istanbul Dogus University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0049-0658>

e-mail: [pskkdrkahramanguler@gmail.com](mailto:pskkdrkahramanguler@gmail.com)

**Author σ:** M.A in Clinical Psychology, Turkey.

e-mail: [kadriyeyondem@gmail.com](mailto:kadriyeyondem@gmail.com)

uncertain situations and having difficulty in fighting this situation (Kir, 2020, p.27). Giving consideration to thoughts; they are beliefs that have an idea and explain the seriousness of that idea (Yeşilnacar, 2020, p.9). Consideration of control of thought is defined as intrusive ideas are followed very seriously, they are destroyed and individuals feel responsible for them, and placing a high value on controlling these ideas. (Alsancak, 2016, p.9).

Personality is defined as all of the movement functions that keep the person separate from other people and include continuity (Kolcu, 2018, p.119). In this study, the Five Factor Personality Theory was used. The Five Factor Theory of Personality includes the hypothesis that the existing personal changes of individuals will be categorized in all languages in the world, spoken language will be transferred, and there may be a division that will form the individual structure based on these (Tatliloğlu, 2014, p.943). Factors created by Costa and McCrae, which are also included in the Five Factor Theory of Personality, appear as extraversion/introversion, agreeableness/antagonism, responsibility, emotional instability (neuroticism), openness to experience/closeness to experience (Yurdakul, 2019), p.10).

## II. METHOD

### a) Model of the Research

Relational screening model was used in this study. The relational screening model is explained as a model that aims to learn the variation of more than one variable within itself and its amount (Karasar, 2012, p.81). In correlation studies, it is stated that the direction and level between the situations that are the subject of the research are important (Doğanay et al., 2012, p.92). In the study, the relationship of early maladaptive schemas with obsessive beliefs and personality style variables was examined. In addition, the age and gender of the participants in the study were also taken into consideration.

### b) Sample

The sample of the study consists of 326 people between the ages of 18 and 45 living in Turkey, selected by simple random method. 72,1% of the participants were female and 27,9% were male.

### c) Data Collection Tools

In the study, together with the informed consent form to the participants representing the sample; Socio-demographic Information Form, Young Schema Scale Short Form-3 (YSS-SF3), Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire and International Personality Inventory Short Form were applied.

#### i. Socio-demographic Information Form

The socio-demographic information form used in the research contains information that is important to

learn from the participants after the relevant studies are examined. In the form, participants are asked to indicate information such as gender and age.

#### ii. Young Schema Scale Short Form-3 (YSS-SF3)

In the study, version 3 of the short form of the Young Schema Scale was used to identify early maladaptive schemas in adults. There are 90 questions in this scale. The original version of this scale, which was developed by Jeffrey Young (1990, 2003), was adapted to Turkish, and its reliability and validity studies were carried out by Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, and Çakır (2009). In the researches carried out to compare the short and long versions; It is stated that both of them have close internal consistency, discriminant validity, parallel form reliability, and provide findings that they can be applied both for research and clinical practice (Stopa, Thorne, Waters, & Preston, 2004 cited by Güler-Gümüş, 2018, p.384).

The scale is grouped with 5 schema areas and consists of a total of 18 sub-dimensions belonging to these areas. The scores obtained from this scale, which uses a 6-point Likert-type scoring (1 = completely wrong for me and 6 = describes me perfectly), vary between 5 and 30 for each scheme.

#### iii. Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire

In the study, the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire Short Form was used to determine obsessive beliefs in adults. The original version was first created by the Obsessive-Compulsive Cognitive Study Group (1997) as 87 items, then it was reduced to 44 items. The scale's adaptation to Turkish, reliability and validity studies were carried out by Yorulmaz, Güngör and Gökdağ. In the scale, participants are expected to answer the questions according to a 7-point Likert-type rating (10 = I strongly disagree and 7 = I completely agree). It is stated that the reliability and validity of this scale, which has 3 sub-dimensions as responsibility-threat perception, importance-control of thoughts, and perfectionism-certainty, have been supported in many studies (Yorulmaz et al., 2019, p.192). In a study, it was reported that the internal consistency of the Obsessive Beliefs Scale was 0.95 and the 30-day test-retest correlation was  $r=0.79$  (Boysan et al., 2010).

#### iv. International Personality Inventory Short Form

Based on the "Five factor personality theory" developed by Costa and McCrae, the Turkish adaptation of the short version of the International personality inventory developed by Goldberg in 1999 was carried out by Yöyen in 2016 and brought to our country. As a result of the validity and reliability studies, the cronbach's alpha for the internal consistency coefficients of the subscales of the scale ranged from 0.64 to 0.75, while this ratio was 0.82 for the whole scale; the scale's content validity ratio (CVR) The factor loadings of the confirmatory factor analyzes of the scale were between 0.448 and 0.656 for the extraversion sub-

dimension; 0.408 to 0.606 for emotional balance sub-dimension; 0.387 to 0.629 for the sub-dimension of responsibility; 0.339 to 0.698 for the aperture sub-dimension; 0.290 to 0.589 for the compatibility sub-dimension; for the hostility sub-dimension, it ranges from 0.466 to 0.690.

While there were 50 items in the original scale, 10 items were removed from the scale in the validity, reliability and adaptation study because of their low factor loads. Thus, the scale was reduced to a total of 40 questions; It has five bipolar dimensions: extraversion-introversion, agreeableness-antagonism, responsibility, emotional instability (neuroticism), openness to experience and closedness to experience (Yöyen-Güneri, 2016).

#### d) Data Collection

The data collection study to be used for the research was carried out in December 2020. Socio-demographic information form, Young Schema Scale Short Form-3, Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire and International Personality Inventory Short Form were printed on paper and Google form versions were created, selected by simple random method, and distributed to adults between the ages of 18-45 in order

to apply the data collection tools to the participants. In about 2 months, 326 data were obtained. In order for the participants to give sincere and correct answers in the collection of data, it was not obligatory to give their identity information to the participants. All of the participants were informed about this study and the purpose of the research, and they were informed that the sincere and correct answers given in this research they participated in increased the validity and reliability of the research.

#### e) Data Analysis

After the data were transferred to the SPSS 25 program, the analyzes were started. The normality test, which is the first step of the analysis, was applied and when the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables were examined, it was seen that the relevant values were between -2 and +2. According to George and Mallery (2010), skewness and kurtosis values are between -2 and +2; According to Groeneveld and Meeden (1984), Moors (1986), Hopkins and Weeks (1990), and De Carlo (1997), it was determined that these values were in the range of -3 to +3 to be sufficient for a normal distribution.

### III. RESULTS

#### a) Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire, International Personality Inventory Short Form, Correlation Analysis Findings of the Young Schema Scale

**Table 1:** Findings of the Analysis of the Relationship Between the Young Schema Scale and the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire

	Responsibility Hazard Expectation	Perfectionism/ Certainty	Caring Considering Control of Thoughts
Emotional Deprivation	.269**	.182**	.230**
Social Isolation/ Mistrust	.241**	.273**	.183**
Defectiveness/ Shame	.184**	0.087	.234**
Emotional Inhibition	.111*	.115*	.197**
Enmeshment/Dependence	.222**	0.076	.264**
Abandonment	.248**	.206**	.274**
Vulnerability to Harm or Illness	.312**	.207**	.295**
Failure to achieve	.157**	0.012	.149**
Negativity/ Pessimism	.334**	.216**	.234**
Entitlement/Self-Discipline	.187**	.258**	.138*
Self- Sacrifice	.381**	.281**	.323**
Punitiveness	.449**	.378**	.341**
Unrelenting Standards	.223**	.382**	.227**
Approval-Seeking	.237**	.295**	.120*

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$  Test used: Pearson Correlation Test

When we analyzed the findings, we found a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Deprivation and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r = .269$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Deprivation and

Perfectionism/Certification ( $r = .182$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores. There is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Emotional Deprivation and Caring/Attention to control of thoughts ( $r = .230$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).



There is weak and positive relationship between Social Isolation/Mistrust and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r=.241, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Social Isolation/Mistrust and Perfectionism/Certification ( $r=.273, p<0.01$ ) scores relationship, there is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Social Isolation/Mistrust and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.183, p<0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.184, p<0.01$ ) scores, and a weak and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Caring/Importance of Control of Thoughts ( $r=.234, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Expectation of Responsibility Danger ( $r=.111, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Perfectionism/Certitude ( $r=.115, p<0.01$ ) scores, Emotional Inhibition there is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Caring for Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.197, p<0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Enmeshment/Dependence and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r=.222, p<0.01$ ) scores, Enmeshment/Dependence and Caring/Caring for Thought Control ( $r=.264, p<0.01$ ) scores there is a weak and positive relationship.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Abandonment and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.248, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Abandonment and Perfectionism/Certainty ( $r=.206, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between Abandonment and Caring for Caring/Caring scores ( $r=.274, p<0.01$ ).

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Responsibility Expectation of Danger ( $r=.312, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Perfectionism/Certainty ( $r=.207, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.295, p<0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Failure and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.157, p<0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Failure and Caring/Importance of Control of Thoughts ( $r=.149, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Pessimism and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r=.334, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Pessimism and Perfectionism/Certainty ( $r=.216, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between the

Pessimism and Caring / Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.234, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r=.187, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r=.258, p<0.01$ ) scores there is a weak and positive correlation between Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.138, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Self-Sacrifice and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r=.381, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Self-Sacrifice and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r=.281, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive correlation between the scores of Self-Sacrifice and Caring /Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.323, p<0.01$ ).

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Punitiveness and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.449, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Punitiveness and Perfectionism/Precision ( $r=.378, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive correlation between the scores of Punitiveness and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.341, p<0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Unrelenting Standards and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.223, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Unrelenting Standards and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r=.382, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Unrelenting Standards and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.227, p<0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Approval Seeking and Responsibility Hazard Expectation ( $r=.237, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Approval Seeking and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r=.295, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between the scores of Approval Seeking and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r=.120, p<0.01$ ).

**Table 2:** Findings of the Analysis of the Relationship between the International Personality Inventory and the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire

	Responsibility/Expectation of Danger	Perfectionism/Certainty	Caring/ Caring for Control of Thoughts
Extraversion	-0.069	0.023	-.137*
Introversion	.138*	0.049	.241**
Agreeableness	0.054	0.046	-0.061
Antagonism	.179**	.169**	.215**
Responsibility	.252**	.407**	.173**
Lack of direction	0.025	-0.073	0.023
Neuroticism	.399**	.291**	.304**
Openness to experience	.115*	.256**	-0.051
Closedness to experience	0.008	-0.024	.170**

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$  Test used: Pearson Correlation Test

When we analyze the findings, there is a weak and negative correlation between Extraversion and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r = -.137$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Introversion and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r = .138$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Introversion and Caring/Caring for Thought Control ( $r = .241$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Antagonism and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r = .179$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Antagonism and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r = .169$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between the scores of Hostility and Caring/Caring for Thought Control ( $r = .215$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Responsibility and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r = .252$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between

Responsibility and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r = .407$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive correlation between the Responsibility and Caring/Caring for Thought Control ( $r = .173$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Neuroticism and Responsibility Danger Expectation ( $r = .399$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Neuroticism and Perfectionism/Certainty ( $r = .291$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive correlation between the Neuroticism and Caring/Caring for Thought Control ( $r = .304$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

There is a weak and positive relationship between Openness to Experience and Responsibility to Danger Expectation ( $r = .115$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Openness to Experience and Perfectionism/ Certainty ( $r = .256$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive correlation between Closedness to Experience and Caring/Caring for Control of Thoughts ( $r = .170$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

**Table 3:** Findings of the Analysis of the Relationship between the Young Schema Scale and the International Personality Inventory

	Extraversion	Introversion	Agreeableness	Antagonism	Responsibility	Lack of direction	Neuroticism	Openness to experience	Closedness to experience
Emotional Deprivation	-.164**	.214**	-0.069	.178**	0.049	0.076	.186**	-0.047	.153**
Social Isolation/ Mistrust	-.150**	.195**	-.154**	.194**	0.043	.158**	.347**	0.040	0.001
Defectiveness	-.251**	.402**	-.396**	.342**	-.156**	.275**	.227**	-.327**	.321**
Emotional Inhibition	-.382**	.375**	-.334**	.296**	-.157**	.137*	.129*	-.193**	.231**
Enmeshment/Dependence	-.279**	.306**	-.262**	.218**	-.251**	.210**	.263**	-.252**	.201**
Abandonment	-0.103	.222**	-0.072	0.106	0.005	0.056	.299**	-0.012	0.072
Vulnerability to Harm or Illness	-0.106	.177**	-.133*	.189**	-0.005	.151**	.341**	-0.066	0.039
Failure	-.287**	.326**	-.159**	.154**	-.199**	.233**	.294**	-.256**	.169**
Negativity/Pessimism	-.222**	.294**	-0.062	.184**	-0.083	.219**	.494**	-0.090	0.089

Entitlement / Insufficient Self-Control	.121*	-0.064	-0.041	0.097	0.016	0.066	0.104	.190**	-0.052
Self- Sacrifice	0.010	0.016	.144**	-0.097	0.091	0.016	.186**	0.058	-0.011
Punitiveness	0.011	0.032	.116*	0.046	.124*	0.022	.304**	0.092	-0.002
Unrelenting Standards	0.017	-0.020	-.118*	0.085	.171**	-0.012	.117*	.110*	0.023
Approval-Seeking	0.035	-0.058	.187**	-.138*	0.081	-0.006	.221**	.143**	-.125*

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$  Test used: Pearson Correlation Test

When we analyzed the findings, we found a weak and negative relationship between Emotional Deprivation and Extraversion ( $r = -.164$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Deprivation and Introversion ( $r = .214$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Deprivation and Antagonism ( $r = .178$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Deprivation and Neuroticism ( $r = .186$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores and there is a weak and positive correlation between the Emotional Deprivation and Closedness to experience ( $r = .153$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and negative relationship between Social Isolation/ Mistrust and Extraversion ( $r = -.150$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Social Isolation/ Mistrust and Introversion ( $r = .195$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Social Isolation/ Mistrust and Agreeableness ( $r = -.154$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Social Isolation/ Mistrust and Antagonism ( $r = .194$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Social Isolation/Mistrust and Lack of direction ( $r = .158$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Social Isolation/ Mistrust and Neuroticism ( $r = .347$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and negative relationship between Defectiveness and Extraversion ( $r = -.251$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Introversion ( $r = .402$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and negative correlation between Defectiveness and Agreeableness ( $r = -.396$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Antagonism ( $r = .342$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative correlation between Defectiveness and Responsibility ( $r = -.156$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is weak and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Lack of direction ( $r = .275$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Neuroticism ( $r = .227$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and negative relationship between Defectiveness and Openness to experience ( $r = -.327$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a moderate and positive relationship between Defectiveness and Closedness to experience ( $r = .321$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a moderate and negative relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Extraversion ( $r = -.382$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a moderate and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Introversion ( $r = .375$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and negative relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Agreeableness ( $r = -.334$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Antagonism ( $r = .296$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Responsibility ( $r = -.157$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Lack of direction ( $r = .137$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Neuroticism ( $r = .129$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Openness to experience ( $r = -.193$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Emotional Inhibition and Closedness to experience ( $r = .231$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

There is a weak and negative relationship between Enmeshment/ Dependence and Extraversion ( $r = -.279$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a moderate and positive relationship between Enmeshment/Dependence and Introversion ( $r = .306$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is weak and negative relationship between Enmeshment/ Dependence and Agreeableness ( $r = -.262$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a weak and positive relationship between Enmeshment/ Dependence and Antagonism ( $r = .218$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a weak and negative relationship between Enmeshment/ Dependence and Responsibility ( $r = -.251$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between the scores of Enmeshment/ Dependence and Lack of direction ( $r = .210$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a weak and positive relationship between Enmeshment/Dependence and Neuroticism ( $r = .263$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), there is a weak and negative relationship between Enmeshment/Dependence and Openness to experience ( $r = -.252$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Enmeshment/ Dependence and Closedness to experience ( $r = .201$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Abandonment and Introversion ( $r = .222$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Abandonment and Neuroticism ( $r = .299$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Introversion ( $r=.177, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Agreeableness ( $r=-.133, p<0.01$ ), there is a weak and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Antagonism ( $r=.189, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Lack of direction ( $r=.151, p<0.01$ ), and there is a moderate and positive relationship between Vulnerability to Harm or Illness and Neuroticism ( $r=.341, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and negative relationship between Failure and Extraversion ( $r=-.287, p<0.01$ ) scores, moderate and positive relationship between Failure and Introversion ( $r=.326, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and negative relationship between Failure and Agreeableness ( $r=-.159, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Failure and Antagonism ( $r=.154, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and negative relationship between Failure and Responsibility ( $r=-.199, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Failure and Lack of direction ( $r=.233, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and positive relationship between Failure and Neuroticism ( $r=.294, p<0.01$ ) scores, weak and negative relationship between Failure and Openness to experience ( $r=-.256, p<0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between Failure and Closedness to experience ( $r=.169, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and negative relationship between Pessimism and Extraversion ( $r=-.222, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Pessimism and Introversion ( $r=.294, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Pessimism and Antagonism ( $r=.184, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Pessimism and Lack of Direction ( $r=.219, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a moderate and positive relationship between Pessimism and Neuroticism ( $r=.494, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control and Extraversion ( $r=.121, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control and Openness to Experience ( $r=-.190, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Self-Sacrifice and Agreeableness ( $r=.144, p<0.01$ ) scores, and a weak and positive relationship between Self-Sacrifice and Neuroticism ( $r=.186, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive relationship between Punitiveness and Agreeableness ( $r=.116, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Punitiveness and Responsibility ( $r=.124, p<0.01$ ) scores and there is a moderate and

positive relationship between Punitiveness and Neuroticism ( $r=.304, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and negative relationship between Unrelenting Standards and Agreeableness ( $r=-.118, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Unrelenting Standards and Responsibility ( $r=.171, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Unrelenting Standards and Neuroticism ( $r=.117, p<0.01$ ) scores, and there is a weak and positive relationship between the Unrelenting Standards and Openness to Experience ( $r=.110, p<0.01$ ) scores.

There is a weak and positive correlation between Approval Seeking and Agreeableness ( $r=.187, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and negative relationship between Approval Seeking and Antagonism ( $r=-.138, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Approval Seeking and Neuroticism ( $r=.221, p<0.01$ ) scores, there is a weak and positive relationship between Approval Seeking and Openness to Experience ( $r=.143, p<0.01$ ), there is a weak and negative correlation between Approval Seeking and Closedness to experience ( $r=-.125, p<0.01$ ).

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When the results of the study were examined, a moderate and positive relationship was found between the Vulnerability to Harm or Illness schema and the scores of Responsibility/Danger Expectation, and a weak and positive relationship was found between the scores of Perfectionism/Certainty and giving importance to the control of thoughts. When a literature review is made, the most common schemas appear as Vulnerability to Harm or Illness, subjugation and defectiveness (Angin & Kızılgöç, 2020, p.97). In another study, it is said that the tendency of an individual with an Vulnerability to Harm or Illness schema to exhibit anxiety disorder behaviors is higher than the tendency to reveal signs of depression (Akbaş, 2021, pp.100-101). In one study, the mediating effect of cognitive insecurity was observed in the connection of impaired autonomy schema domain and obsessions. (Velibaşoğlu, 2014, p.57). Another finding obtained in the research is; The pessimism schema and all sub-dimensions of obsessive beliefs affect each other positively. In a similar study, compared to individuals with low OCD symptom levels, the pessimism averages of individuals with high symptom levels were found to be at a high level of impact and significantly high. (Yazıcı, 2018, p.58). In this study, a moderate and positive relationship was found between self-sacrifice and the expectation of responsibility/danger, giving importance/considering the control of thoughts, and a weak and positive relationship between self-sacrifice and perfectionism scores. In a study conducted by Yazıcı (2018, p.59), it was found that the self-sacrifice averages of individuals with high Obsessive Compulsive Disorder symptom levels were



moderately significantly higher than those with low symptoms. In another study that supports this study with the results found; individuals diagnosed with Obsessive Compulsive Disorder scores on the Beck Depression Scale, impaired autonomy and performance, disconnection/rejection, defectiveness, impaired limits, enmeshment/dependence, abandonment, failure, pessimism, vulnerability to harm or illness, emotional deprivation in the Young Schema Scale-Short Form 3, emotional inhibition, social isolation/mistrust, and unrelenting standards schemas were found to be positively and significantly correlated. (Kızılağaç, 2018, pp.53-54).

People who are overly balanced emotionally show characteristics such as being non-anxious, reliable, tolerant, empathetic and balanced. People who are emotionally unstable also; they have features such as looking at the bad side of events, anxious, not reassuring, withdrawn and angry (Çavuşoğlu & Yalçın, 2018, p.55). In the study, a moderate and positive relationship was found between emotional instability and the scores of responsibility/danger expectation and giving importance to control of thoughts, and a weak and positive relationship was found between emotional instability and perfectionism/certainty scores. In a study, it was found that there was a negative, significant and low level relationship between emotional stability sub-dimension and compulsions (Anlı, Türkoğlu, Sağır, 2019, p.30). In the study, there was a weak and positive relationship between openness to experience and responsibility/danger expectation and perfectionism/certainty scores, while a weak and positive relationship was found between closedness to experience and giving importance to control of thoughts scores. From this point of view, it can be interpreted that individuals who are closed to development attach importance to controlling their thoughts.

Another finding in the study is; a moderate and positive relationship was found between the scores of defectiveness schema introversion, antagonism, and closedness to experience, and a moderate and negative relationship between defectiveness and agreeableness, and openness to experience scores. In a similar study, it was found that early maladaptive schemas were negatively related to compatibility (Ehsan & Bahramizadeh, 2011, p.547). Considering the relationship between defectiveness schema and agreeableness, contrary to the findings of this study, it is more likely that these sub-dimensions are positively related rather than negatively related. People with the defectiveness schema are expected to be more adaptable to the external environment. In another study, when the relationship between loneliness and Young Schema Scale schema areas is examined, it is said that there is a very high relationship with the disconnection schema domain (Demirli Yıldız, 2018, p.88).

In the study, a moderate and negative relationship was found between Emotional Inhibition and Extraversion, and Agreeableness scores, and a moderate and positive relationship between Suppression of Emotions and Introversion scores. The emotional inhibition schema refers to the intense suppression of spontaneous action, feeling, or communication in order to avoid to be accused of shameful acts by others, the loss of control of their motives, or embarrassment (Rafaeli vd. 2019, s.33). Based on this and the findings, it can be said that as feelings are suppressed, introversion will increase and extraversion will decrease. Another result of the research is; there is a weak and positive relationship between unrelenting standards and the scores of responsibility, neuroticism, and openness to development. From this point of view, it can be deduced that people with perfectionism will take more responsibility, experience an imbalance in the sense of feeling to reach perfection and be openness to experience.

As a result, it was found that there is a relationship between early maladaptive schemas and obsessive beliefs, a relationship between early maladaptive schemas and personality traits, and a relationship between obsessive beliefs and personality traits.

## REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Acarer, E. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinde obsesif inanışlar ve beden imgesi ile baş etme stratejileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi].
2. Alsancak, C. (2016). Çocukluk çağı travmaları ve bağlanma özellikleri ile obsesif inanışlar ve obsesif-kompulsif belirtilerin ilişkisinde dünyaya ilişkin varsayımların aracılık rolü: üniversite öğrencilerinde bir değerlendirme, [Yüksek lisans tezi Hacettepe Üniversitesi].
3. Akbaş, B. Ç. (2020). Obsesif-kompulsif bozuklukta erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar, Bilişsel Davranışçı Psikoterapi ve Araştırmalar Dergisi, 10(1), 98-108.
4. Angın, Y., & Kızılgeçit, M. (2020). Obsesif kompulsif bozukluk tanılı hastalarda erken dönem uyumsuz şemalar ve kader algısı, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, (17), 73-105.
5. Anlı, İ., Türkoğlu, L., & Sağır, R. (2019). Bağlanma biçimleri, kişilik özellikleri ve obsesif kompulsif kişilik oluşumu arasındaki ilişki, İstanbul Bilim Üniversitesi Florence Nightingale Tıp Dergisi, 5(1), 26-31.
6. Bedir, Y. B. (2020). Disosiyatif bozuklukta (konversiyon bozukluğu) erken dönem uyum bozucu şemaların incelenmesi, [Tıpta uzmanlık tezi Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi].
7. Boysan, M., Beşiroğlu, L., Çetinkaya, N., Atlı, A. ve Aydın, A. (2010). Obsesif inanışlar ölçeği-44'ün

- (OIÖ-44) Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenirliği/the validity and reliability of the turkish version of the obsessive beliefs questionnaire-44 (OBQ-44), [Elektronik versiyon]. Nöro-Psikyatry Arşivi, 47(3), 216-222.
8. Canidemir, S. (2019). 18-30 Yaş arası bireylerde erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar ve empatik eğilim düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi Üsküdar Üniversitesi].
  9. Çavuşoğlu, S., & Yalçın, M. (2018). banka çalışanlarının kişilik özelliklerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerine etkisi, Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (16)2, 49-76.
  10. Dönmezler, F. G. (2017). Bipolar bozuklukta obsesif inanışlar, [Tıpta uzmanlık tezi İstanbul Bakırköy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman Ruh Sağlığı ve Sinir Hastalıkları Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi Psikiyatri Kliniği, İstanbul Bakırköy Bölgesi Kamu Hastaneleri Birliği Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi].
  11. Ehsan, H. B., ve Bahramizadeh, H. (2011). Early maladaptive schemas and agreeableness in personality five factor model, Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, (30), 547-551.
  12. Ekşi, H. (2021). Çocukluk çağında yaşanan travma yaşantılarının evlilik doyumu üzerindeki etkisi: erken dönem uyum bozucu şemaların aracı rolü, [Yüksek lisans tezi İstanbul Kent Üniversitesi].
  13. Doğanay, A., Ataizi, M., Şimşek, A., Balaban Salı, J., Akbulut, Y. (2012). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri, Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.
  14. Duran, S. (2016). Depresyon ve erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar arasındaki ilişkide otomatik düşünce özelliklerinin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi Beykent Üniversitesi].
  15. Gözükmızı, E. (2019). Okul öncesi çocukların sosyal yetkinlik becerileri ve davranış sorunları ile annelerinin obsesif inanışları arasındaki ilişki, [Yüksek lisans tezi İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi].
  16. Güler, K., ve Gümüş, Z. (2018). Erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların yordayıcısı olarak çocukluk çağı travmalarının incelenmesi, Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 81, 379-398.
  17. Karasar, N. (2012). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi kavramlar-ilkeler-teknikler, Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.
  18. Kaya, F. (2010). Çocukluk döneminde yaşanan istismarın kişilerarası ilişki tarzları üzerindeki etkisi: Erken dönem uyum bozucu şemaların aracı rolü, [Yüksek lisans tezi Ankara Üniversitesi].
  19. Kır, G. (2020). Panik bozukluğu hastalarında obsesif inanışlar ve üst bilişlerin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi Çağ Üniversitesi].
  20. Kızılağaç, F. (2018). Obsesif kompulsif bozukluğu olan hastalarda erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların ve içselleştirilmiş damgalanmanın incelenmesi, [Tıpta uzmanlık tezi Kocaeli Üniversitesi].
  21. Kolcu, R. (2018). Girişimcilik ve kişilik özellikleri: geleneksel ve sosyal girişimcilerin kişilik özellikleri arasındaki farklara ilişkin bir araştırma, [Yüksek lisans tezi Marmara Üniversitesi].
  22. Rafaeli, E., Bernstein, D.P. ve Young, J.E. (2019). Şema terapi ayırıcı özellikler (A. Karaosmanoğlu & N. Azizlerli, Çev.), Psikonet Yayıncılık. (Orijinal çalışma 2011 yılında yayımlanmıştır).
  23. Tatlıoğlu, K. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin beş faktör kişilik kuramına göre kişilik özellikleri alt boyutlarının bazı değişkenlere göre değerlendirilmesi, Tarih Okulu Dergisi (TOD), (7)17, 939-971.
  24. Velibaşoğlu, B. (2014). Obsesif kompulsif bozukluk hastalarında obsesyon, kompulsiyon ve endişe ile erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar, üst-biliş ve düşünce eylem kaynaşması arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi Hacettepe Üniversitesi].
  25. Yazıcı, P. (2018). Algılanan ebeveynlik biçimleri ve obsesif kompulsif belirtiler arasındaki ilişki: Erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların aracı rolü, [Yüksek lisans tezi Okan Üniversitesi].
  26. Yeşilnacar, A. (2020). Yetişkinlerde obsesif inanışların yaşam doyumu, mutluluk ve öz yeterlilik üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi, [Yüksek lisans tezi Beykent Üniversitesi].
  27. Yıldız, A. D. (2018). Erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar ve yalnızlığın üniversite uyum düzeyi ile ilişkisi. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 33(81), 82-96.
  28. Young, J.E., Klosko, J.S., ve Weishaar, M.E. (2019). Şema terapi, (T. V. Soylu, Çev.), Litera Yayıncılık. (Orijinal çalışma yılında yayımlanmıştır).
  29. Yöyen Güneri, E. (2016). Uluslararası kişilik envanteri (IPI) kısa versiyonu'nun Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: güvenirlik ve geçerlilik analizi, International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, (2)4, 1308-1315.
  30. Yurdakul, Y. (2019). Beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ve karanlık üçlü kişilik özelliklerinin eş uyumu ile olan ilişkileri: evli çiftlerde kesitsel bir çalışma, [Yüksek lisans tezi Işık Üniversitesi].