I. INTRODUCTION

Marriage which is a very important step forward in a person's life, is a universally recognized public institution .

By its creation a human is in need for the opposite sex. This is not only a sexual need. Man and woman both are actually like parts of a whole. In the absence of one the other actually has no meaning. In this context, for the continuation of the generation and the sustainability of the human kind there should be a relation between the sexes. For the sustainability of humankind and the continuation of generations the sexual intercourse or the integration of male and female sexual intercourse is inevitable. In order to officialize and institutionalize this inevitable situation public wide there is need for various issues.

Marriage is the official form of sexual intercourse. During the course of history it differentiated significantly in connection with time, space, community and even within the groups. Even today in different regions and layers of a community different forms of marriage could be seen. We have targeted to evaluate the attitude and behaviour of the university generation that we deem as the most literate amongst the groups of marriage candidates towards such a variable institution.

The features such as the level of education, the level of income, origins, the family structure, gender etc. İnfluences the expectations for the spouse choice. Partner selection is not only marriage. It is a process of sharing a life. It is being together in both good and bad days. While selecting a partner and defending our views on marriage naturally we will have a certain criteria.

To establish the criterion of the university youth in such an important issue is the main aim of our survey.

1.1 Youth

Youth, is the period, in which sweet dreams are made ambitions and ideals bud, close friendships are established and we fall in love for the first time. It is the period in which steps are taken forward and for innovation, where efforts are made for self-realization and revealation of identity. 2300 years ago, Aristotales had made a striking explanation of the charecteristics of the youth. For Aristo the youth ; "Young people are passionate, mean and furious. Loose themselves to impulses; become slaves of their passions. They cannot even stand a small obstacle before their demands. They value honour and success more than money. Because they had no need for money. They are generous and benevolent. Because they haven't met the evilness. They have immideate trust and connect. Because they haven't been let down. They have big aims and dreams; because they haven't yet recieved a blow from life. They haven't learnt the limiting impact of the conditions (Yörükoğlu, 1988).

In other words, the concept 'youth' that could be qualified as a biological concept is being evaluated by various disciplines in a greater extent through economic, social, psychological and cultural angles. Although a common definition has not been reached, in definitions and explanations besides the biological features and grouping by age the psychological and sociological aspects should be considered. Therefore in the definition of youth psychological, sociological, biological and cultural criterion are used (Yörükoğlu, 1988).

Youth, is a spritiual maturation, developmental and preporatary period for live that stands between childhood and adolesence .The youth age that includes the ages of 12 and 21 and starts with the early adolesence continues till the growth stops. The rapid growth that begins with adolesence at the end of the youth ends with the physical, sexual and spiritual maturation. Generally the period between the ages of 12 -15 is defined as the real teenage period and the period between the ages of 21 – 25 is defined as the extended youth (Yörükoğlu,1988).

According to the definition of the UN 'a youngster, is a person who ; is between the ages of 15 – 25, is in education, does not work to earn his living and does not have his/her own housing' (Yörükoğlu,1988). UNESCO accepts the period of youth as the period between the ages of 12 – 24 (Köknel,1986). In The five-year development plan the youth is defined as the population between the ages of 12 – 24, 25 (Köknel,1986).

Youth, does not indicate a situation defined with biological, economic and sociological elements. Youth is more a process than a situation (Ataberk,1990). Adolesence begins with physical change and development. This is followed by the mental change and development. The period of adolesence with the physical and mental features, knowledge, exprience of the past childhood effects person's future life of adulthood and maturity (Köknel,1986).

According to Gökçe, 'a youngster , is a person who has a wide imagination, also whose courage outmarches his shyness and his will of adventure is superior to his sense of comfort' (1971).

When we consider the definitions of the youth we can see that there is no universal definition for the youth. Because the youth concept is subject to a different age average, cultural factors and legal practices in every country and every continent. In this case we have to address the persons who are deemed young as 'youth' (Kocacık,1985).

In order to evaluate the personality of a young person, to understand his/her feelings, thoughts, attitudes and behaviours is only possible by being aware of the society or neighborhood in which he/she lives or came from and how the concepts of responsibility, autonomy and identity development in that society. When it comes to the identification of youth, it is defined within different societies and time or even within the various sections of the same society with different approaches (Kocacık, 1987).

However, all of these identifications define the youth using one or more of the biological, psychological, social, economic and chronological concepts (Kocacık, 1987).

According to Kocacık, in Turkey the group considered as the youth is the group between the ages of 15 – 24. For example while a section of the group is studying the other is not. While one section is working the other is not. For this reason the youth can be categorized differently depending on their structural differences (1987).

At the same time, the sections of the youth within a society can be seperated. For example we can seperate and classify them as the youth in education and the youth out of education. We can name the ones in school as the student youth and the ones who are not in education the youth out of education. We can further seperate the student youth as the secondary education youth and the university youth; and the youth out of education as the

pastoral youth, urban youth, unemployed youth, slum youth, youth in military service, inmate youth, youth abroad etc (Kocacık, 1985).

Both in Turkey and TRNC when we say youth, the first thing that comes into mind is the student youth. The university student youth is the top layer of the youth in education. The other youth is a section apart from this section. They are the ones with a high education standard, who are sensitive to the issues related with the living standards, the social and national issues.

1.2 Marriage

According to Yavuzer, society is an organized system formed with males, females and children. Like every other institution within the society family is also a part of the socioatal system. The 'family' institution which is based upon the 'marriage' which has established principles and rules has a history of nearly 4000 years. The family institution which was first established in BC 2000 in Egypt, continued up to date as an institution which has been securing the sustainability of the social order, culture and heritage as well as providing the education and care of the new generations, had the support of the religious institutions and the state (Yavuzer, 2010).

Although marriage as a produce of culture has weaknesses and deficits as in all every produces of culture, it is also accepted as indispensable (Yavuzer, 2010).

1.2.1 Marriage In Civil Law

According to the Turkish Civil Law which defines marriage as "the unision of a male a and female in a valid legal way in order to establish a permanent and lifelong marriage" the qualified conditions for marriage are (Arpacı,1993).

a. Age: According to the clause 88 of the Civil Law a male should be 17 and a female be 15 in order to get married. But, under extraordinary conditions the marriage of a 16 year male and a fourteen year female could be permitted. Before reaching a decision, mother's-father's or the guardians' say should be heard.

b. Compos Mentis: According to the clause 89 of the Civil Law; only the compos mentis are eligible to marry. A person with mental disorder is not eligible to marry.

c. The Conset of the Legal Representatives:

(1) Regarding the minor: According to the clause 90 of the Civil Law, minor, without the conset of his/her mother or father or the guardian cannot marry. At the time of banns if only the mother or the father has the custody the conset of the one having the custody is suffice.

(2) Regarding the Incapaciated: According to the clause 91 of the Civil Law, the incapaciated cannot marry without the conset of his/her guardian. The incapaciated, on the refusal of appreciation of the guardian, can apply to the court.

According to the Turkish Civil Law, the impedements to marriage are (1993,Arpacı):

a. Kinship: According to the clause 92 of the Civil law, the marriage between the following persons is prohibited.

(1) Between the ascendant and the heir whether the genealogy is authentic or not; between the siblings from the same parents or between the siblings descending only from the father or mother, between a person and his/her paternaluncle, maternal uncle, paternal aunt or maternal aunt.

(2) Even though the kinship has been removed by the means of divorce, between the ascendant and the heir of the wife and husband and the ascendant and heir of the husband and wife.

(3) Between the foster child and the foster parents.

b. First marriage;

i)As of Generality: According to the clause 93 of the Civil Law, person who wishes to marry again, has to prove the elimination of the marriage by way of death or divorce or nulity of marriage.

ii) In case of Disappearence: According to the clause 94 of the Civil Law, the wife or husband of the person who had been sentenced of absentia cannot marry unless the marriage has been revoked.

(iii) For woman; According to the clause 95 of the Civil Law; The woman who has become a widow as a result of husband's death or divorce or her marriage declared null; can not marry again unless 300 days after the divorce or death or the rule of nullity of marriage has passed.

The judge can shorten this period under the conditions that the pregnancy of the woman is not possible or in case the divorced husband and wife wishes to re-marry.

(iv) For the divorced woman; Clause 96 (revoked by the clause 9 of the Law dating 4 May 1988 and numbered 3444)

1.2.2 The Reasons Prompting Marriage

According to Yavuzer, human beings are social entities. One of their fundamental needs is to live together with the other human beings. Individuals recognize their feelings during social relations. They develop different behaviours as reactions in comformity with their experiences. Individuals are entities who has been constructed as entities in relation with other individuals in a society not to live on their own (Yavuzer, 2010).

They need to be in relation with the opposite sex as they have with other human beings. He/she is going to have a different relation with the opposite sex than the other relations. In order to have the approval of the society that they live in for their relation the individuals have to confirm their relations through the rules of marriage. Some people, deem marriage as a necessity of the society that they live in and accept that this kind of relation is natural and necessary so they decide to marry. Some people marry in order to escape loneliness, some marry not to be alone in their further lives (Yavuzer, 2010).

One of the most important issues of marriage is whether the person is ready or not for marriage. For example, if you force a child to walk who has not physically developed for walking, he/she cannot walk properly, he/she would fall every now and then, and his/her legs would be wrapped. In marriage the readiness of the persons in various aspects who intend to get married is an important factor. The marriage or decision for marriage of a person who has not reached a certain level of maturity could be inconvenient (Yavuzer, 2010).

According to Anonim, it is important for marriage to be ready in aspects such as, being dependent or undependent, awarness of life, the loyalty of the person who is getting married to his/her own family, level of selfishness, valuing other's opinions, work, recreation,

entertainment ,being petulant or not, ability to control the feelings and excitement and to be economical (Anonim, 1988).

Even though some never gets married, some experiences a very short marriage, some initially being against marriage and many did not find what they have expected from the marriage, the institution of marriage is still vey popular. Although wishing the ideal that the marriage is the free choices of individuals because of love to be true but in reality as in the past even today there are more realistic reasons, opinions or expectations and hopes in marriage that evoke many people in thinking marriage as a necessity (Anonim, 1988).

In this sense, expectations and aims in marriage varies from person to person. The things that makes one's life meaningful are the relations that are shared, sustained and developed with others (Anonim, 1988).

According to Özuğurlu, as a social entity, the expectation to be happy with the opposite sex, emerged with husband and wife relation which is the institution of marriage. The motive of marriage which initiates, sustains and makes such a relation significant should be based on an indispensable, powerful and deep-rooted social conscious (Özuğurlu, 1990).

It is not easy to be a partner in marriage. Because as soon as a person steps into this system his/her responsibilities increases considerably. But people never considers the negative examples and always believes in up coming happy days (Gençtan, 1984).

According to Adasal, marriage is not an absolute must and need for the people. In modern society having sexual intercourse or even babies without marrying is possible .Even so every year many of the young people who have reached the age of marriage marry. In general every where, even in many societies having hard times or in times of famine many marriages take place (Adasal, 1963).

Although people can explain the reason of choosing their spouse they cannot easily explain why they have to marry. Many don't marry with the person they are in love and many marry without having a real and serious love affair. In many marriages the main factor is not love then there are various other factors than love. These are in social, family and emotional nature. For example the role of family connections, sense and need for economical security, the effect of the wedding ceremony. Briefly the some of the reasons for marriage are sexual and biological, some are social, affective and economic in nature (Gençtan, 1984).

As mentioned above the reasons that evoke people to marriage van be various. They change from people to people. We can summarize these reasons as follows:

a.Getting Rid of Loneliness

Loneliness is an emotion accompanied with unhapiness. Even in situations where we are in full relation with our environment there is always a lonely part within us. This is a universal and healthy loneliness that motivates a person to be productive and creative. The remaining part of ourselves always seeks a relation and needs to establish a tie. Because a human attains his/her humanity within the close and warm relation between her/his mother and father that looked after and loved him/her. Relation for the person who detached him/herself from the family this time is the close physical and emotional relation with the opposite sex. The hope of living and develop this closeness is one of the basic reasons that makes the marriage attractive (Gençtan, 1984).

b.Ensuring Sexual Satisfaction

In traditional communities despite of sexuality maintaining its importance as a reason for marriage in a section of modern urban societies the individuals do not deem marriage as a necessity in order to have sex (Gençtan, 1984).

c.Attaining Status, Authority, Independence

For both man and woman marriage is an important status change. Gives a maturity status to a person. For the male while this means independence and attaining the responsibilities of the others for the female it means a new a new form of dependency and attainment of the responsibility of the household. While marriage means the way of attainment of independence and authority for the man it means a social status and the rise of her authority within the house as she passes from the status of daughter to the status of wife. When she has children her authority increases (Gittins, 1991).

d.The Sense of Possesion

Marriage limits individual freedom, develops a person's some social feature. Feeling the responsibility of sharing the happiness and griefin life, being able to make sacrifices for their relatives and devoting to her/himself are the feelings that a normal person should feel (Erkal,1991).

According to Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis and today's measures for mental health, marriage , is beneficial for health, necessary for the stage of development, is the last point in growth and maturation. In his opinion the main success of the woman is marriage (Scienderberg De Grow,1988).

One of the reasons that evoke people for marriage is that it satisfies the need of jelousy and having right over the spouse for the man and woman. Marriage is a very good life insurance. According to surveys the married people live longer than the single. Because the life of the married couples are more comfortable and orderly. Marriage is a holy institution that provides a home in where man and woman with their spouse can live a of sexual and pritual satisfaction without the shame, guilt ,concern and remorse of illegal relation (Nejad,1991).

e.Deeming Marriage As a Partnership

Marriage is a kind of buisiness relation in which the woman gives her capacity of labor, sexuality and productivity in order to gain security, care and some rights over the children (Gittins,1991).

f.Economic Factors

Marriage is the legal result of the emergence of the family, private property and the need for the heirs-at-law. In order to live in peace and welfare people consider to marry with rich people (Engels, 1972).

According to Gittin's, powerful factor that evokes marriage is the economic factor which is the most the most contradictory to our ideology of romance. His economic definition

is not only limited with property. It also contains, time, space, service, sexuality and labour. Various groups and various individuals have different economic needs (Gittin, 1991).

g.Having Children

The children who are one of the factors that evoke marriage are also increases the devotion between husband and wife during the span of marriage. According to surveys the children are the joy of the house (Çaplı, 1992).

h.The Married People Being The Majority

According to Çaplı, the people marry because they emaluate the married people and they marry because they think the marriage is something normal. For the people who think like that, not to marry and not to consider marriage is not normal (Çaplı, 1992).

i.For a Happy Life

Some want to marry in order to escape their present unpleasant, unhappy and bad life conditions. For these people marriage is a kind of refuge (Çaplı, 1992).

1.2.3 Marriage

The more common way in selection of the spouse in marriage is the way in which the spouse is selected by the family elders. The elders' name this as "arranged". The meaning of this is that the opinions and appraisals of elders should be in marriage, and the marriage should be in accordance with their selection. Generally the male line, by knowing their son's features and qualities they search for a spouse who would make him happy and that would be equlivate and appropriate to him in every way. Generally this is done by the father. According to them the one that they approve would also be approved by their children (Özuğurlu, 1990).

Another different way of marriage other than the 'arranged' is 'cradle notch'. This is the promise made by two families concerning the new born that when they reach the legal they will marry. Generally this is done because of reasons and this decision is definite (Özuğurlu, 1990).

The spose selections for marriage In recent years are generally done through by personal incidential selections .These kind of marriages are realized through flood of emotions. To marry through incidential selections can cause certain difficulties. In order to avoid these there are two ways. First, the couples date and like each other, take the opinions of their relatives and friends and then take the decision of marriage. Second, to get to know a person recomended by the elders, relatives and close friends that they trust their judgements and then to date and see if they can get on or not and at the end to decide to marry or not. These two are very close ways (Özuğurlu, 1990).

According to Özuğurlu, who defines marriage as " an interdependence, an act realized by social approval and a fusion where the sexual needs ,which are excluded from the other social prohibitions, are mutually satisfied" marriage is also " a special communication system"(1990). Marriage is a togetherness which is both legally approved and holds common interests (Özuğurlu, 1990).

Marriage is the coalesce of two opposite genders who have reached physical, social, psychological, economic and age maturity in order to establish a full and permanent life partnership. This coalesce is realized in accordance with the social principles and laws. Individuals are aware that they are going to share a certain period of their life with others. What else could be expected from the relation of the opposite genders who dispose each other. Shortly marriage is a social institution where the relation is in accordance with the norms, values and rules established by the society (Özuğurlu, 1990).

One of the most important features of a human is being a social entity. If the very special conditions are not considered a human being continues his/her life as a member of a small or a large group. One of these is the 'family' institution. Family is the smallest group. The institution that establishes the family is the marriage (Kışlak, 2006).

According to Kışlak, marriage is an institution established through interdependence, social validation. Also for many it is the most meaningful interpersonal relation. It is

established that the distress and unhappiness in marriage has harmful effects on the physical and emotional health of both the couples and the children (Kışlak, 2006).

The marriage of the couples that interact, that can reach a consensus on issues related with the marriage and the family and can resolve their problems in a positive what is considered to be in harmony. The realization of the expectations of the couples and getting satisfaction from their relation can be only possible through mutual harmony. Harmony in marriage has a great role in happy and harmonized marriage. When we look at the base of the marriage we see that the harmony in marriage is one of the most important in keeping the couples together (Kışlak, 2006).

According to Gençtan, marriage is "with the happiness and distress, a normal aim that most of the people wishes to reach." Although in some western countries in recent years there is a rise in the trend of living together out of wed-lock marriage still maintains to be important in almost every society (Gençtan, 1984).

According to Atabek, "the institution of marriage" is a way of living into which the society we live in transfers its own rules and culture. There is 'economic security', 'social security' and 'psychological security' at the base of the marriage (Atabek, 1990).

According to Güvenç, marriage, in a social structure in accordance with the present norms, by establishing a legal connection in comformity with the customs or civil law, is accepted as a fact that enables the marriage institution to be approved by that society. Marriage is transition that enables having a child. Here marriage is deemed as a way that legalizes the sexual intercourse that will result in birth, socially and legally (1984). In other words the understanding of marriage of Uraz and Güvenç are similar. For both of them marriage is the legalization of the sexual intercourse (Güvenç, 1984).

As we have mentioned, according to Uraz, as well marriage, other than a few negligible number of cases, in every present and past societies, the togetherness of the couples in which they will have a sexual intercourse is expected to be approved in a certain way by society. This approval is generally named as 'marriage'. The relation established through wedding is called 'marriage'. Here the intention is to explain that the marriage is the approval of marriage in terms of sexual intercourse by the society (Uraz, 1979).

In other words, marriage is an institution that two people from opposite sexes share their emotions and opinions, secure material and spiritual solidarity under the same roof.

Marriage is an order, devotion established to ensure the continuation of the generation in absolute free will, love and desire of a man and a woman .We can name it as a loan that should be paid to nature and by the human beings (Bilen, 2004).

However, in order to have a healthy marriage to have reached economic and ethical maturity is an important point. The main problems that the diffused and separated families encounter are economical. Today, economic maturity does not only mean to have reached a level where you can afford the basic needs of a family. This means ensuring future developments of the persons, who are economically dependant on the family, and getting them ready to use their professional skills (Bilen, 2004).

According to Bilen, reaching a level of sharing responsibilities that improve and strenghten the social relations is only possible when a person reaches a certain level of social maturity. Having a social maturity means reaching a level of establishing positive and balanced relations with the members of the society and the family. Besides reaching a level of social maturity, an individual needs to have reached an emotional maturity and to complete education. There is a close relation between the readiness of marriage and the emotional maturity. A person who has reached to emotional maturity is the person who can see his/her faults and fix them. A person who insists on his faults is a person who doesn't have sufficient maturity (Bilen, 2004).

If married during the course of education while still a student it would bring along many problems. The student couples that marry while they are still studying don't have sufficient economic means thus they need the financial support of their families. The financial support by the family also brings along the wish to control and direct the married couple. This situation can be named among the factors that prevent the newly married to have relations that they wish to establish (Bilen, 2004).

1.2.4 The Types of Marriage

Marriage is an act of choice. The choice mentoined here is not the same choice that is mentioned in the traditional life. Here it is referred to the choice made by the families for the individual. There are certain rules in marriage. In life styles where these rules are clearly set, marriage has a binding character between the families, groups and society.

The attainment of the marriage harmony by the parents can be affected by the structure of the family, the type of marriage of the couple and the period of marriage. In large families, especially the father- and mother- in –laws can be a source of the problems in marriage. The negative effect of mother and father on their children's marriage decreases as the years in marriage increases. In large families, the fulfilment of the parenthood as required by the mother and mother can be obstructed by the family elders. The situation therein sets up the base for the development of problematic behaviour in children (Savi,2008).

According to Balaman, the family heads are each a competent and effective decision organs. In marriage instead of emotional bond and romance, beneficiary relations, continuation of the line, sustaining the harmony and present harmony is valid (Balaman, 1982). The types of marriage are as follows.

a.The Marriage of The Children of Siblings

This is as we get from the title it is the marriage of the cousins. This is a marriage of relatives made between the children of the paternal aunt, paternal uncle, maternal aunt and maternal uncle. The main factors for this kind of marriage are the reasons such as the intensive control on the children by the families, where there is very low mobility and the economical interdependence and dependence on the families. The marriage of the children of the same gender siblings forms 'The Marriage of the Children of Parallel Sibling ' and the marriage of the children of the opposite gender siblings forms 'The Marriage of the Children of Contrary Sibling'.

b.Berder Marriage

In these types of marriages there is a substantial amount of conflict of interest. The conflict of interests depends on the economy. Generally this is more common in traditional farming communities. The both sides pay a certain amount of money to each other. Expenses are made commonly.

Here the two families which have daughters and sons at the same age agree to swap their daughters as brides. This marriaged is realized when two male friends agree among

themselves and mention this to their families and then when the decision of marriages are made this establishes the two families 'berder family' relation.

c.*Sister-in-law Marriage (Sororate)*

This kind of marriage is not common in our society. This marriage is the marriage with the sister-in-law when the wife dies. The factors and dependencies such as; the consideration that the aunt will look after the children better than a stranger, family secrets, living habits, field and property partnership, makes this kind of marriage a must.

d.*Potential Marriage*

In this kind of marriage which degrades marriage to a very special situation, the marriage of male is only possible to marry the daughter of his grandmother's brother's daughter or the daughter of mother's-father's sister's daughter. In such a situation the children are deemed as potential spouses and they are engaged by their mothers.

e.*Brother-in-law Marriage (Levirate)*

According to Tezcan, levirate is seen under two conditions. The first one is where the brother-in-law is single and the second is when the brother-in-law is married. The brother-in-law being married brings about the polygamous marriage. The marriage with the brother-in-law mainly takes place with the family pressure and the traditions. Thus many problems arise within the family. Derangement occurs because of the age difference. Shortly it is the marriage of a widow with his husband's brother.

f.*Getting a Promise – Giving a promise*

The relations of the children of the families who have beneficiary interest. The continuation of this relation is the task of the children. The reason for this is that the families have made the promise that their children will marry.

g.Sexual Communism

The adolescent sons of brothers or the ones with no kinship they form a group in order to establish a very powerful friendship. They live together with the similar female groups. If in these group there is a sister her brother, if there is a brother then his sister cannot be member. All the male have the common right of use over all the female. These people are the people against marriage.

h.Kidnap

Kidnap, referred as kidnap in law, is commonly seen in rural societies. In villages, the kidnap, is the kidnapping of the girl by the male who has selected her as his spouse either by force or voluntarily with the help of his friends. Kidnap is similar to this one. The girl takes her bundle and goes to the house of the boy who she was in relation with and stays there, that's why it is called kidnap (1962).

i.Taygeldi Marriage

According to Gökçe, these kinds of marriages that especially seen in the village communities, in the event of divorce or usually at the death of the spouse in order to reform the broken family, bring solutions to family problems by providing both the continuation of the children's lack of the mother-father model and the widow's marriage relations and practices .It is the marriage of a widow male with children and a female widow with children.

j.Marriage of a Couple of Males with a Group of Female

The marriage of a couple of males adolescent brothers with a couple of daughters of a relative family or a non-relative family. Each individual has its own house and they are the mother and father of their children. This is not a group marriage.

k.Beşik Kertme

The word 'kertme' means marking, marking for engagement. Even when the babies are in cradle they are engaged for marriage in the future by their families. If the promise is

not kept in some areas there are very hard impositions. This is the fact of security of the future marriage by the families of the two children from opposite sex that born on the same day. In this case there is no problem of age difference. In case the girl is older or younger than the boy is insignificant.

Briefly the types of marriage, are the result of the natural periphery and economic conditions. More over the female population in a society is one of the factors that effects the type of marriage. The male and female ratio should be balanced. Generally the type of marriage depends of the basis of interest. The wish to have authority, preventing the division of the land, preventing the disintegration of the home, preventing the spread of the family secrets , wish to take control of the individuals generates and naturalizes marriage.

In other words, every society in order to appraise family as an institution, had framed marriage with various specific norms .These norms gets a functional features through tradition and customs and ceromonials. So the age of marriage, the kind of marriage, the way of the establishment of the order of the house, type, amount and presentation of the present, the place of resident of the married couple, the attitude and manner against each other and their relatives ,the quality of marriage and the conditions of divorce in relation with time are clearly set (Tolon, 1975).

Özkalp, had used different measures for distinguishing the types of marriage. As a sociologist Özkalp, had generally categorized the family and the marriage in five basic categories and studied them (Özkalp, 1990).

a.Group Relations

Group relations can be qualified as the 'neighbourhood'. There are two different practices. First is the in group and the other is ex group. In group is known as the endogamy and the ex group is known as the exogamy. In modern societies both of them are found, but in ancient societies the fact easy not so.

Ex- group Marriage: According to Tolon, the meaning of the ex-group marriage, are the family relations that are specified accordingly. More ever in order to define the ex-group marriage there are various views. These are; loathing the sexual intercourse by the people who live together, getting married within the klan to be seen as cowardice, the possibility of

harming the future generation via the marriage of the kind in societies in which the daughters were killed kidnapping girls from other klans in time turned into ex-group marriage (1975).

Ex-group marriage, by anticipating the marriage with the people outside their families or groups increases the ability of cooperation and communication between the various groups of a society.

In-group Marriage: According to Armağan, the in-group marriage is mainly found in close villages and scattered rural settlements. Because the marriage takes place within his/her own group. It's the kind of marriage in which the spouse to be married is chosen within the same group. It is a more natural situation that the people who live in a certain group understand each other better ,feel more close to each other inttelectually, religiously and emotionally. People's preference to marry each other who have more things in common is an expected situation. Here living in the same place and atmosphere has a great effect. 'The drums beat morganatic' is a good example explaining this.

b.Family and Genealogical Relations

When the head of the family dies the way of sharing the heritage is discussed. Three types of family and marriage kinds are observed (Özkalp, 1990).

1. Marriage by the way of kidnap

2. Marriage by the way of purchase

3. Civil Marriage

c.Authority Relations

The factor generally determining the form of authority between husband and wife is the personality of the spouses. But generally the spouses act in accordance with the norms of the society they live in. In relation with the authority relations three types of family and marriage is observed (Özkalp,1990). Generally the dominance of the husband's authority is approved in many societies. The dominance of wife's authority is rarely observed.

1.Patriarchy (Husband's Authority)

2.Matriarchy (Wife's Authority)

3Egalitarian (Balanced Authority)

d.Number of Spouse

1.Monogamy

This is the marriage between a man and a woman. The circumstances such as the necessity for division of labour, specialization, long-term learning as a result of the level of modern life have influenced the emergence of the nuclear family and the monagamous marriage that would create the nuclear family.

2.Polygamy

This is a marriage of a man or woman in which he/she has more than one spouse. It is observed as two types.

a.Polygny (Marriage with more than one female)

This the marriage of a man with more than one woman. This kind of marriage is seen as an indication of wealth, prestige, as a show of sovernigty within the group in society where the female population is large and the margin between the rich and poor is huge. Also it is observed in places where the woman is deemed as a labour force.

b.Polyandry (Marriage with more than one man)

This the marriage of a woman with more than one man. This is a kind of marriage which is even rarely observed in matriatal families. The lack or limited amount of fertile land can cause the marriage of several brothers with the same woman. In this way the division of property is prevented and by having fewer children a kind of natural population planning is achieved.

e.The Residence Place of the Couples

The place and the type of house of residence is generally determined by the social norms. Here we come across with five types of place of residences.

1.Patria-locality (Periphery of the father)

This is the newly wed wife's joining in the region where the husband lives and his traditions are valid. In present this is a kind of traditional marriage mainly observed in large families of the rural regions which is realized as bringing a bride to the family.

2.Matria-locality (Periphery of the mother)

This is the newly wed husband's joining in the region where the wife lives and her traditions are valid. In present the concept of 'içgüveyisi' corresponds with this type of marriage.

3. Neo-locality (Opening a New House)

In modern society this the denial of the both sides by the newly married couple and choose to live on their own apart from them.

4.Matria-Patria –locality

Moving in first to the mother's house and then to the father's house.

5.Bi-local (Two sided residence)

In some societies it is observed that the married couples reside both near the bride's and the bride groom's families (Özkalp,1990).

1.2.5 Spouse Selection

According to Yavuzer, the selection of spouse is one of the most important decision of a person's life. Person's remaining life, can be effected positively or negatively in many ways. This is a very important decision as the marriage relation could cover half or even the two thirds of a person's life time. Selection of the spouse is a very important and hard and

complex process as well. With this decision, the person has given the decision of with whom he/she is going to live his/her remaining life, what kind of life he/she is going to live, and even from whom he/she is going to have a child and raise with (Yavuzer, 2010).

The most important factor determining the kind of marriage is the freedom of spouse selection given to the person who intends to marry. We can classify the marriage types according to who is holding the decision making power (Timur, 1972).

a.The decision of marriage taken by families without taking the young people's opions who are going to marry.

b.The decision of marriage taken by the families but with the consent of the young people entering into marriage.

c.The spouse selected by the young people but with the consent of the family.

d.Marriage without the consent of the family.

We can discuss that there are many factors that effects the one's choice of selection of the spouse. A person determines her/his choice of spouse according to his self-opinion above all. If a person has a low self-esteem, endows feelings of fear and uncertainty about himself then his/her expectation in spouse selection would be different, or if his/her self-esteem is high and endows positive feelings and opinions about him/herself then the expectations in spouse selection would be different. However the the personal characteristics of the individual is an important factor in determining the marriage type.

Having options or not having any options of spouse selection is a determinant for the individual's selection of the spouse. Generally where the differentiation of the people is very low the marriage becomes very easy. In situations where the men are more different than the other men, women are more different than the other women there is annoyonce of why I have married with this than that. In situations where there is no optional choice of spouse then they will be accepting the current relation. Furthermore if the couples don't have high expectations from marriage then they will have a happy marriage. Even though the individuals have different expectations in spouse selection at the end the real choices are made in accordance with the principle of equivalence. The people choose their spouses among the ones that they deem almost at the same carat (Yavuzer, 2010).

In general, the harmony of the couples, is one of the factors that can influence almost every scope of the relation. In time a balance is established in which the positive and negative factors of the spouse relations work together, this system of balance can play a role in the continuation of the marriage or the divorce. These balances that have a fixed function within the spouse relations ,can be shattered by the socially, economically, culturally and personal ly originated disruptive factors, and especially can be in such a power to end the marriages established on a fragile ground. Sometimes these balances are built upon the personal pathology of one of the spouses, when the spouse under treatment recovers the system could collapse (Yavuzer, 2010).

According to Yavuzer, the decision of marriage and spouse selection can be taken with different reasons and can be explained in various ways. So because of these it is very important for the persons to find each other attractive. There are various opinions on why a person finds the people that he/she wishes to be with. First of these opinions is that the attraction is related with the benefits in interpersonal relations. Secondly closeness is important in interpersonal relations. Actually people by choosing the place of residence they also choose the persons that would be an important part of their life. Third opinion supports the idea of physical attraction in interpersonal relations. Generally finds people attractive that they deem beautiful or handsome. Fourthly people like people who look like themselves. While this resemblance can be in various features such as physical, family structure, religous and education, resemblance in personality can be attractive and play a positive role in marriage (Yavuzer, 2010).

According to Tarhan, the family's effect on the decision for marriage can be dealed both directly or indirectly .The indirect effect, is realized through the frames of thought and behaviour shaped by the childhood experiences. The frame of thought and behaviour in relation with male model for the woman and female model for the man are mainly shaped by mother and father. For example the relation between a girl and his big brother and father shapes a male model in her mind. This model effects her attitude against the opposite sex. In the decision of marriage, the features of and the expectations from the opposite sex of a person is determined by the mother and father oriented thoughts and behaviours. But this indirect effect is not realistic. Because the personality of the   person to be married is impossible to be similar as the mother's and father's personality (Tarhan, 2012).

The direct effect of the family in marriage decision, arises from the wish of the parents that this decision of the child to be a correct one and the feeling of responsibility in his/her important decision. In our traditional family structure because 'achievement of setting the child's home' is percieved as the material and moral task of mother and father, the family undertakes a significant role. Thus the mother and father wishes to have a say on the child's choice for marriage. If the person chosen for marriage is approved by the father and mother, in general no problems are encountered other than the problems that will arise during the process of preparation for marriage between the couples to be married and their families (Tarhan, 2012).

According to Bilen, the happiness in marriage depends on the choice of spouse. In order to make a successful choice a person should have to determine his expectations and aims in marriage, and to assess whether his/her level of expectation is realistic. The chances to have a successful marriage of the people who have many in common are high. But to find two similar persons from the opposite sex and to expect them to live in positive and balanced relations would be unrealistic. Thus the marriage should be in such a quality that will satisfy the similar or converse or colleteral needs arising from the relation. There are two different views on spouse selection (Bilen, 1983).

a.Homogamy

According to this view if the couples to marry have a lot in common then they have a big chance to be successful in marriage. Because in such marriages there are a great many proximities and similarities related with social values, economy, religion, race, education, age the amount of disagreements and conflicts are very low. Furthermore it is more easy to find solutions to the problems that may arise within this kind of marriage (Alkan, 1981).

b.Heterogamy

This view claims that converse features are valid in spouse selection. Especially in societies with primitive structures, the spouse selection is far from being a personal choice. The issue is dealt by the family, relatives, distant relatives even the state. In many situations the needs of the couples to marry are not even considered. In modern societies, although the peripherial factors are still important in spouse selection personal choice overrides.

According to Alkan, the level of income and education and urbanization has an underestimated effect on the spouse selection attitude (Alkan, 1981).

There are certain features that should be considered while making choice of spouse. These are;

1.Physical Features

When we say physical features, we are reffering to features such as the height, weight,beauty, uglyness, the deformation in the body etc. People who have similarities related with these features have no problems .People who have significant differences related with these can have problems in their marriage.

2.Intelligence

The level of intelligence has a great part in human life. If two people understand each other then they are expected to have similar intellegences.

3.Socio-Economic Features

The social environment has a great influence on individuals. Every individual is a product of the social and economic conditions that he/she born and developed within. The behaviours that are accepted as correct by each group are naturally differ from each other. The people that come from different socio-economic levels have different expectations in marriage. Hence the chance of being successful in marriage will be low. In other words the family structures influences the individuals. When a person gets married he/she also gets married with his/her spouse family too. The differences among the families will complicate the acceptance of each other and will also create pressure on the people to marry.

4.Inter-marriage

The issue of the people who has by ties of blood kinship cannot get into marriage is construed differently among various cultures but also has been deal with definite legal rulings. Despite a number of differences in every culture the marriage between siblings, parents and children, grandparents and grandchildren, cousins and aunts and uncles is prohibited by law. Inter-marriage has certain advantages such as the protection of the family property and land integrity, organization of the probate process more easily, establishment of love and respect among the family members. The relatives have common expectations and standarts because of the similarity of the socio-economic conditions that they live within.

5.The Level of Education and Career

One of the basics of success in marriage is the balance in the level of education of the spouses. If the gap between the level of educations of the two people who wishes to marry is bid it means that they differ in many areas such as interest, needs, friends etc.

6.The Situation of the Couples from the point of Sexual Life

Like in every issue there are privilege differences among the individuals. Two individuals should mutually come to agreement on this issue and have similar features. It takes a long time to have harmony in sex in their marriage.

7. Personal Features

Personal features, have effect on the success in marriage. First of all it should be accepted that being a person fit for marriage is more important than finding a person fit for marriage .A person after bringing him/herself up to a fit state for marriage can make the choice of a fit person for marriage.

According to Özuğurlu, in the contemporary sense a happy and strong marriage can only be possible through mutual integration. This situation which is described as 'integral harmony' is the harmony of the wife and husband in mutual communication and interaction

on various dimensions. The dimensions of this harmony are ; harmony in interpersonal relation ,harmony in spiritual life, harmony together in a society, harmony in the couples' subsistence, harmony in mutual attitude and behavıoır, harmony in mutual integration, harmony in sexual behaviour (Özuğurlu, 1990).

According to Schen, bilateral relationship, is not only a medium in which he/she; finds compassion, sees the approval of his/her personality, welcomed with love but is also a medium in which he/she can be more him/herself than the other mediums and feels in general that he/she is still being understood, is one of the most superior values that a person has. A person should approve the marriage as it is in the same way he/she approves him/herself (Schen, 1992).

1.3 Family

Family, is considered as a system in which the members have respect both to each other and family rules. In this system the quality of three relations which forms the sub-systems is significant. These the relations in between the parents, parent children relation and the relation between the siblings. The quality of emotions and behaviours within one of these three sub-system effects the others as well. The positiveness or the negativeness of the relations within the parent sub-system, the quality of the marriage harmony can be influential on the parent children communication in the same direction. (Hakvoort, 2010).

The harmony in marriage has great effects on the couples' both physical and emotional health. The way the interpersonal relations are percieved, the ability of problem solving of the couples are discussed as important factors (Erdoğan,2007).

According to Özkalp, with the most common definition family is an economic and social institution which is made up of the mother, father and children and the relatives of the couples. The reason why the family is taken as an institution is that it gets more than being self sufficient and gradually gets larger and becomes a unit that has special tasks within the society (Özkalp, 1985).

It is not possible to make a universal definition of the family when we consider the social, geographical and economic developments and differences (Tolon, 1990). The family

concept has shown a variety of qualities during the formation and development of the humanity and the society, there is a family concept and a family understanding of every era and every society (Velidedeoğlu, 1976).

Family, is a social institution, in which; the human generation is produced in a certain way, to a certain extent the first and effectual emergence of the process of the preparation for the society, the sexual intercourse has been arranged in a certain way, to an extent sincere, warm and trusting relations established between the spouses and between the parents and the children, more or less according to the society within which the family is the economic functions occur (Ozankaya, 1984).

Every definition made for family is putting it in a different category. Although every definition for family describes it as one of the main forms of the social life, they have considered it in different frames as a social group, a social unity, a social organization and a social structure. This definition which defines family as an institution, family is a part of a social system (Gökçe, 1976).

Family is 'a social group having vital features for their members and a solidarity frame that is not transferred to others and a limited size depending on the basis of emotional commitment' (Armağan, 1988).

According to Christensen, is a group, which has blood ties and living together and being in relation because of either marriage or having children' (1964).

As it can be seen family is the oldest and the most fundamental institution amongst other institutions. During the course of historical development it has been through various changes ,therefore differences occurred both in its functions ,structure and the number of its members. As in the formation of the other social institutions has been formed by the systemization of the norms related with marriage and family after the normative, traditional and moral initial organization of interpersonal relations of the members of society .

According to Gökçe, a series of changes occur in family, family has its unique features. Gökçe has assessed the features of the family in eight main groups.

1.*Family is universal.* It is seen in every society and in every stage of the social development.

2.*Family depends on an emotional basis.* Family rests on the complex feelings that have their roots in our texture such as the wish of the continuation of generation, motherhood, friendship ,parenthood.

3.*Family has the ability of shaping.* The development of the child's character and the socialization of an individual begins in the family,

4.*The scope of the family is limited.* Family which is the smallest of the formed social structures has a limited size within the framework of biological conditions.

5.*Family is the nucleus in the social structure.* Although it has partly lost this property, from the beginning of the primitive society up to the patriachal societies the social, structure was made up of the family units.

6.*The family members have responsibilities*. Family, imposes responsibilities to the family members that will last a lifetime.

7.*Family is surrounded with social rules.* Family, is a social system shaped by the social taboos and rules.

8.*Family is in both permanent and temporary nature.* Family is permanent and universal. Family which is formed as a unity by two is the most temporary and versatile one among all the organisations.

According to law the family types in Turkey are as follows:

1.Nomadic Tribal Family

In nomadic tribes family is the large family type. The mother, father, sons, grandchildren and daughter-in-laws live together in the same tent. In nomadic societies because the family is patriarchal the kinship is transferred from the father. I n this family type the marriages -out of tribe is very rare and the girl kidnapping is rare as well. In the nomadic family although the task of the woman is various and hard her position in the family is important. In family relations are realistic. There is an increasing enstrangment against varios traditions. But the main problem that threatens the family is the lack of land ownership.

2.Village Family

The village family which is in general a economic business and production unit involves in farming and husbandry and does this for its consumption. Village family, it is formed by the living of the father, mother, unmarried children, grandchildren, close relatives under the same roof. The age of marriage is law and mainly marriage takes place among the village residents. The newly married reside in the outher's house. In village family the labour division is made accordingly with gender.

3.Town Family

The town families consists of the families of artisans, craftsman, small tradesman, the farmers who don't work on their land, minor officers and to an extent workers. They engage in agriculture for only their consumption. In marriage they pat attention to the economic level of the couples to be married to be on the same level. The influence of the mother and father on spouse selection is great.

4.City Families

They are the families of worker, bureaucrat or small or large business owners that are completely detached from agriculture. The city family is not a homogenous one. It lives in a social environment composed of effective technology surrounded by specialized, differentiated and organized institutions.

While the education, teaching and leisure time functions of the city family decrease, the function providing the emotional satisfaction gradually increase. The marriage age in the city family is older than the village and slum family, the rights and interests of kin play lesser role in spouse selection. The couples decide to marry on their own.

The city family has a more democratic structure than the village family. The divorce and separation rate is more than tillage family. The city family is deeply influenced by the form of the government, economic, socio-cultural events of the society (Armağan,1988).

5.Slum Family

Mainly the slum families consist from the people which has migrated to the city from the villages. The nuclear family is dominant. In some ways it resembles the village family. Especially in the first generation slum families the traditions of the village family are dominant. In later generations it began to look alike the city family as the woman and children gain more independence. The age of marriage is higher than that of the village family. The civil marriage has taken over the religious marriage, but also the religious traditions are kept .

Family, is the result of the varying structure and features that differs from society to society, and at different times of the same society . Family can be defined as the features such as; being a formation by two opposite sexes, social approval via marriage, a group movement maintained by more than one person, fulfilling the physiological, social and economic functions ,limited in size and the changeability of these features.

The family type and structure can demonstrate regional and class differences from society to society or even in different periods of the same society or in a certain period of time .From the primitive ancient societies to the present day industrialized civil societies family in general has been considered as the basic group.

According to Bilgin, the social group referred as the family is a social structure that is shaped sometimes depending on the authority, periphery, kinship and ownership relations and sometimes to the composition of the household. The most general and common classifications in relation with the family types are the large family and the nuclear family (Bilgin, 1991).

1.3.1 Large Family

The large family term, in various classifications, are named as the big family,old family, village family, traditional family. The reasons that lay behind the exsistence of the large family are; dependence on land, a system that aims a production which will satisfy the needs of the family, the traditional and religious factors and the efforts made for the protection of the family integrity. As a result of the traditional society system there is an absolute solidarity among the family members (Yavuzer, 2010).

The large family is the ideal family type of the traditional societies. In this kind of family the mother, father, the married children, the relatives of the mother or the father and their spouse and children live under the same roof (Ozankay, 1995). In the large family the father is the head of the family or he has a great influence on the authority. In this kind of family the power of control on the family members by the institutions and the devotion of the members are high.

According to Timur, in the large family, the kinship comes from the father, the dominance of the old over young and the dominance of the man over woman is clearly observed. The married sons will stay in the father's house and the spouse selection will be done by the family. The social status will be determined by the family and the system of kinship (Timur, 1972).

1.3.2 Nuclear Family

The nuclear family which is the ideal type of family in the modern societies, consists of the mother, father and unmarried children. The nuclear family is also called the small family, modern family, marriage family, independent family.

According to Eserperk, 'generally the nuclear family, is the result of all the other kinship groups and the family types, in other words all of the family types are derived from the nuclear family' (Esperk, 1979).

According to Morgan, who explains the formation of the family in four stages 'Family is a mobile unit, it is never in a standstill status; as much the society develops from a lower level to a higher level, the family passes from a lower to a higher level as well. 'These stages are;

a.Cognate Family

It is the first stage of the family. In this stage the wife-husband groups are separated according to generations. Within the boundaries of the family all the grandfathers and grandmothers are wife and husband amongst themselves; this is also true for their children ,grandchildren and the grand grand children. That is to say that the sexual intercourse is free

amongst the members of the same generation in this type of family. This is prohibited between two different generations.

b.Collective Family

After the prohibition of the sexual intercourse between the children and the mother and father in the second stage the intercourse between the siblings and even the marriage of the children, grandchildren and grand grandchildren of the brothers and sisters were prohibitted.

c.Two Headed Family

In time as, the number of the siblings and relatives whose marriage were banned increased, because of the limitation of the group relations the two headed family type emerged. In this stage a man lives with a single woman but has also the right two have relation with more women. The marriage bond can easily be dissolved by the both sides.

d.Monogamous Family.

The monogamous family which is the determinant family type for civilisation emerged from the two headed family during the period in between the middle and upper stages of barbarism. This family is established on the basis of the male dominance in order to breed children whose father is certainly known. The monogamous family differs from the two headed family in which the marriage could easily be dissolved whenever one of the couples wished by strengthening the marriage bondage.

According to Engels, monogamy is the first family type which is not established on natural conditions but rather on the economic conditions that is to say on the loss of the private property for primitive and spontaneous common property (Engels, 1992).

Briefly, in all modern societies the nuclear family which is the most common family type, is the result of the economic evolution and especially industrialisation. The function of the industrialisation and urbanization have only been the crystallization of the weight of the

nuclear family. With the industrial revolution the family which lost its productive functions and no longer is a production unit, assumed the functions of giving spritiual support and the reinforcing solidarity within life for their members. The family institution kept portecting its biological and social features.

Family has certain tasks. Family is an instutiation that have assumed various tasks beginning with the primitive societies up to present industrialized society .In ancient societies while the family had performed all of these functions in present industrial society some functions of the family are performed by the other social institutions and beraucratic organisations (Şahinkaya, 1983).

In ancient societies the family, 'was a social institution that supplied the needs of its members to a large extent, making a self-sufficient production .'All the members of the family cooperated for making furniture, building a shelter, hunting and farming. İn complex societies family has become more specialized, changed and its functions decreased (Şahinkaya, 1983).

According to Şahinkaya, although the family which the most common institution found in societies it has gone through structural and functional changes in present societies it stell keeps its importance as the smallest unit of the society (Şahinkaya, 1983).

The basic functions of the family are; the organisation of the sexual behaviours and securing the contuniation of the generation, the care and socialization of the children, securing the economic cooperation of man and woman and supplying the satisfaction of the primal group.

If we look into the basic views of Ogborn on family, Ogborn has classified the family according to its functions:

1.*Biological Task.* The continuation of the generation has been assured.

2.*Economic Task.* The needs of the family members attempted to be met within the family. There is economic coorperation. The income is in the control of the head of the family.

3.*Protection.* The protection of the family from the material and moral damages that would come outside the family.

4.*Physicological Task.* To provide the emotional ties among the family members. It is a must for the growth and maturation of the family members. When fails to provide maturing protection against the emotional stimuli and the processes of learning essential for the following social harmony for its members, significant breakdown in the personal structure even disasters can emerge. In healthy families the interactions, determines the stable equilibrium that would be necessary for the following social harmony of its members.

5.*Education.* Every kind of education is given within the family. The necessary education and preparation for a certain career branch is done within the family and the child is raised in that field.

6.*Religious Task.* Giving religious knowledge, organizing the worship and religious practices of its members are the tasks of the family elders.

7.*Leisure Task.* The family is responsible for its members leisure and entertainment.

8.*Providing Prestige*. The large family determines the status of its members within the society.

1.4 Studies Conducted Related To The Research

The purpose of this study is to examine the university students' views on marriage and spouse selection, you can find previous studies, variety of sources and studies that are relevant in this section.

In 1974 Strauss done a research on 173 men and 200 women who were engaged or married for 1 year. In the research, the person to be elected as a partner instead of the ideal type was dominated by the call of some special properties. For example, 65.5% of women and 49.7% of men anyone from a different race again, 42.5% of women and 41.6% men with a person of another religion, 40.5% women, 33.5% men between the levels of their education in a particular which is the difference with someone, 34.0% of women , 28.2% men with a person with very different social class, 13.5% of women again with a person who is disabled and 21.9% men, who is not good looking said that they won't get married with these people. (Şahinkaya, 1979).

On a survey that was held by Osmond in 1977' happily married couples who act together in decision making, the decisions reached by a compromise, the balance of power between one of the spouses and spouse dominance of decisions in cases of very large differences indicate a high rate of divorce and that the marital satisfaction was found to be decreased (Osmond, 1977).

In 1978, Tütengil has done a study over 1614 participants from the University of Istanbul by in order to determine their views about the "family and marriage". 49.4% of the participants said that the family is the foundation of society and 75.3% said that marriage is very important to mutual agreement while 45.6% stated that marriage is the main motive to obtain a close friend. In addition, 68.9% of the participants said that the mans power is very important that they are going to marry, while 27.2% stated that it is very important that he has finished his military service. (52.4%) Participants have said that women to be older than the men and (56.5%) said that women that is more educated than men is inappropriate (Tütengil, 1978).

Şahinkaya (1979) conducted a study to determine the family structure in villages in the province of Diyarbakir in 1977. The research carried out on 739 people, composed of 29 individuals a total of 90 families in the village of Diyarbakir. Findings of the survey, 56.0% of families were receiving core, 32.0% percent smaller, 12.0% percent were large patriarchal

family, the average individual number of families 8, the smallest of the family with 2, and the largest family with a population of 26 indivicuals. 38% of these families our married by religious marriage, 58% are married by both religious and formal marriage, 4% is married with religious marriage and they live in an area which is commonly seen that men marry more than one wife.

Uraz (1979) in his study with 111 university students, has examined that the expectations of men are more moral values of physical properties, while the girls have given importance to marital relationships.

In the research that has been done by Kitson and Sussman (1982) in Detroit and Cleveland for over 322 people in order to examine the problems of marriage, which is effective divorce it has been found out that the major problem for the couples who want to divorce is because of financial matters.

In order to determine the power sharing and equality between the spouses on the marital adjustment Davidson (1984) done a prospective study on 162 married couples in the study increased the sense of equality and power sharing between the spouses, also increases the couple's happiness.

Kongar (1986) has done a study on integration with the city in Altındağ. On his study he has found out that the famillies in Altındağ among the girls and boys a wider freedom of choice of spouse has been given to the boy and that they wish for there child to marry someone outside of the slum.

On a research that has been done on 489 couples by Vannoy-Hiller and Philliber (1989) flexibility in gender roles of men and sufficient communication between spouses has shown that it has significant positive effect on the quality of marriage.

In the 1980s Surra (1990) has done a research on choosing a partner and premarital relationships. Structural mechanisms that influence the decision of marriage, is the cultural and personal decisions. The reasons that affect personal decision-making is sex, regional effects, social status, marital status and psychological status. Studies about marriage age of marriage in the United States between 1970 and 1988 differ, In the 1970s, although the average age at marriage for men was 20-24 it has increased by 23% in 1988, for women while it was 36% it increases up to 62%.

Among the study that Durmazkul (1991) had done on university students, girls want a men similar to there own religious beliefs. Men want the person that they are going to marry to have similar religious beliefs as there own and they want their spouses who meet the requirements of religion. Girl students want to marry someone with good economic status and guy that is older then them.

With the management of Esmer (1991) students at Bogazici University, has done various researches on gender equality issues, women, marriage and dating. Some of these are as follows: Researchers to examined the subjects that approve dating and the subjects educational status as follows; 18% without a diploma, 50% graduated from primary school, %4 graduated from university and the rest is from high school. In the study covered three-fourths of the have approved to flirt with the men before they get married and 10% has approved to have sexual relationship before they get married. In the research it has been seen that having a happy sexual relationship is important for the marriage. The researchers took Implications of a woman to a marriage as a subject of investigation. Accordingly, almost all women, to the question "an antiquated institution of marriage" they gave the answer as no. For a good marriage, loyalty, happy sexual life, is the most important values. Slightly behind those values, mutual affection, love, sharing, the religious values and economic factors was found important. Within this research, two thirds of women said that it is good for the marriage if you are married to the same religion and as opposed to their children marrying someone indicated foreign. Women think that the major causes for divorces is the wife and husband not loving each other. They think that this is a justified reason for a divorce. Women surveyed were male head of the household families have also been identified. the women that was surveyed have been identified to be from male head of the household families.

Department of Istanbul University Faculty of Medicine (1991), has made a study of senior students at Istanbul University about arranged marriages what the young people's attitudes are.in the research it has been seen that, young people are actively opposed to an arranged marriage, they don't approve to live with their family after marriage, they don't want a big age gap with the person they are going to marry, men want's a working wife and that both genders want to date before the marriage.

Ceylan (1994) has done a research on 154 students who studies in Cumhuriyet University on the subject of "the students preferences and expectations with the partner that they are going to choose". The results are as follows; students want to choose their partner.

They want to share life, love and have with their partner. The students that don't approve relationships without marriage prefer a legal marriage and they want to do a wedding. In the researches it has been found out that the best age for marriage is 20-25 for woman and 23-28 for men. According to the students a family who doesn't have economical problem should have 2-3 kids.

Kocadere (1995) has done a research with 100 couples to determine the properties of good and bad marriages. In the research you can see that: one of the couple not to get along with their partners relative is four times more in bad marriages, in good marriages couples spend more time together, a child has no effect on the evaluation of marriage for better or for worse, in good marriages couples decide together' in bad marriages a choice is made one sided. There is also differences for specified demographic characteristics in these subjects that were found.

In the study conducted by Gülcere (1996) the individuals that were participated in the survey listed family functions as follows: (72,3%) to ensure that the person has a proper life,(71.7%) to provide an environment of love and compassion the individual needs, (68.8%)ensure the continuity of the generation and (68.2%) to observe the children's mental health. In his study Gülerce has found out that there is changes in our infrastructure to maintain the sanctity of the family.

At the study of the elements of an effective rate of marriage were thought by determining psycho-social factors of the candidates for marriage. Through the research ıt has been seen that women decide to marry someone that is equal or higher educated then them while men prefer someone equal or lower educated then them. At the research ıt has been seen that (71%) people want someone they love to share there life with and all of the participants want to choose the person that they are going to marry.

Demir and Fısıloğlu (1999) has done a research on being lonely and marital adjustment on 58 couples. On the results of the research it has been seen that people who have met before has a positive effects on the marriage. On both participant groups there has been found significant negative correlation, marital adjustment and loneliness. On marriages who were decided by the person himself are more compatible.

Özgüven (2000) has done a research on univesity students about " who should choose your partner" the answers are as follows: 80% of the students said that they want to

choose themselves while 20% said family or another answer. 29% of the participants look for love in there relationship and 24% look for honesty. 78,2% of the participants refuse to get married before winning their economic independence. 86% said that religious beliefs were important while 14% said that it wasn't.

Fışıloğlu (2001) has done a research on 150 couples to investigate the relationship of marriage between relatives. At the research it has been seen that the group that has done marriage with a relative has less harmony in their marriages then the group who hasn't. also those who have a consanguineous marriages are found that they experience more conflict with relatives.

On the research that Bacanlı (2001) has done with 220 university students it has been found out that men's choice of spouse is "to cook, virginity, the desire to have a family, appearance, beauty and similarity of religious beliefs" and this is higher then the girls desires. Also men want physical attractiveness, as the women want their men to be more intelligent.

Ekşi (2005) in his study has examined the ages of the participants which is about to marry on the subject "Preparatory phase of marriage, husband and wife candidates' thoughts on marriage and becoming parents,". When we look at the results you can see the age differences as follows. 42% age 20-24 , 40% age 25-29, 10.5% age 30-41 and 7.5% 15-19 age. 81% of the participants described marriage as "to gaining a partner and a friend."

Acemoğlu and Ark (2005) has done a research on "Early Age Marriages in Diyarbakir ". It has been seen that 45.3% of the women participants that have got married at an early marriage is married to a relative, while 38% women who haven't married at an early age is married to a relative. Also 65% of participants in the study of women over the age of 60 make early age marriage, while women in the age between 15-19 to make an early marriage is a rated 20%.

In the study made by Yildirim (2007) on the subject "Criteria for choosing a spouse of university students" 20 questions were asked. Boys and girls gave the similar answers. The highest answers that were given were that they want their partner to be trustworthy, honest, loyal, faithful and cultural. However, these features were more selective and careful by girls than boys.

II. METHOD

2.1 Topics and Aim of the Study

The aim of this research is to evaluate the effects of some different demographic variables, such as, age, gender, place of birth, location and feelings of loneliness on relationships and views on marriage.

At the last years of adolescence and first years adulthood, some people that start a relationship with the opposite sex tends to end with marriage. During this dating time, the persons expectations about their future partner develops. Partner choice effects the persons whole life. It has been observed that it is during university that most people decide their partner choice. In this study determination of preferences and expectations about spouses will be researched.

2.2 Reason and Importance of the Study

To establish the family that has an important place in the life of mankind, two individuals of the opposite sex has to choose each other as a spouse. In some societies and sub-cultures some people don't have right to choose who they are going to marry. In societies where there is nuclear family the individuals often choose their partners themselves.

Preferences and expectations of selecting a partner is open to researches with it's interesting and different aspects. If new research's bring contributions to the results of previous research's, then the university counseling center's, will know how to approach this issue. In addition, it is thought that the research can attest, update, develope, the previous findings and shed light to the other studies conducted earlier about marriages.

2.3 Participants

Population of the study consists of students studying Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department Near East University in the academic year 2011-2012.

At this study accidental sampling technique was employed and 70 female students and 70 male students were chosen. 35 students from each class were taken.

This research is an applied research using the scientific method using scanning model that aims to describe co-selection preferences and expectations. Preferences and expectations of this class, gender, family form, according to change of environment variables such as income level and family as a relation were investigacted. In this research we will find out these preferences and expectations change by the effect of class, gender, family form, according to change of environment variables such as income level and family.

2.4 Instruments

Subjects completed a questionnaire composed of a demographic information form and two scales. Demographic Information Form (Appendix 1), which was developed by researcher, was used to get socio-demographic characteristics of participants. Relationships between other people was measured by using Multidimensional Relationship Questionnaire (MRQ) (Appendix 2) and loneliness measured by using UCLA (Appendix 3).

2.4.1 Demographic Information Form

Development of the survey has been prepared according to the preliminary discussions and expert opinions, on relevant literature, previous research conducted surveys on similar topics, married and single people and students. The survey consists of 21 questions in total. Questions, are a feature that qualifier the students thoughts of co-selection and their preferences and expectations, marriage and family issues. In addition, survey questions are also aiming to describe such properties of a form of family, mother and father's educational level, income level, ... and so on.

There are no questions in the survey to define the identity of the subject. In addition, to this it has been pointed out for the participants not to indicate anything about their identity.

2.4.2 Multidimensional Relationship Scale

Multi-Dimensional Relationship Scale , were made by Snell and colleagues (2002). Multi-Dimensional Relationship Scale 60-item Likert-type scale with five digits. At one end of the 'not suitable for me at all to the phrase' is 1 point, at the other end of the "very

convenient for me," statement is given 5 points. As a result of factor analysis in this study, no factor has incurred factor 7. In addition to these factors tested, it has been seen that the correlation values are low too. For this reason, these factors are removed from the scale.

This way the scale has eight sub-scales. There is 53 factors; Focus on a high level of relationship (12 factors), intercourse satisfaction (9 factors), fear of relationship / relational anxiety (10 factors), adjusting the impression of the relationship (5 factors), relational esteem (5 factors), external relational control (4 factors), relationship assertiveness (4 factors), internal relational control (4 factors). Correlation coefficients between the MRQ with RAS varies between -0.41 and-o.69. RAS's Alpha coefficient of internal consistency reliability of Cronc̀bach is 0.81 . Test-retest reliability is valued at 0.80.

There are eight subscales of MRS. The first subscale is the 'high level of relationship preoccupation' subscale aims to describe the tendency to dote upon another person or other people. The individual's intense concentration on another person comes into prominence within this scale. The second one is the 'relationship satisfaction' subscale aims to describe the individuals feeling that they are adequate and well equipped to deal with an interpersonal relationship. The next subscale is the 'relationship fear and anxiety' aims to describe the fear and anxiety the individual feels when deciding whether or not to enter into a relationship. The fear and anxiety felt hinders the inception of a relationship. The fourth one is 'relationship consciousness and adjustment' subscale aims to describe the individual's point of view during the process of entering a relationship. It means that the individual is aware that they are starting a relationship. The subscale of 'self-confidence in relationship' aims to describe the self-confidence the individual feels when entering a relationship. The 'external relationship control' subscale aims to describe the individual's tendency to leave matters relating to relationships in the hands of fate or luck instead of taking control themselves. Relationships which are left to chance are relationships which are controlled externally. The 'relationship assertiveness' subscale aims to describe the individual's ability to enter into a relationship with ease and without fear. The last subscale of 'internal relationship control' aims to describe the importance placed on the individual's own requirements and decisions within relationships and the individual's prominent ability to internalize their relationship.

2.4.3 UCLA Loneliness Scale

UCLA Loneliness Scale was developed by Russell, Peplau, and Ferguson (1978). UCLA Loneliness Scales reliability studies are done in both English and Turkish versions: UCLA scale is a scale that has sufficient level of reliability coefficients, a measurement tool that reveals a competent experience in determining the loneliness. The UCLA Loneliness Scale was developed to determine the sense of loneliness experienced, the UCLA Loneliness Scale consists of 20 items. Each contained a statement of the scale of the situation lived by the person and is determined by a grading of Likert type. Four grading is as follows: 1 = I'll never get in a situation like this, 2 = I seldom live in this situation, 3 = I sometimes live in this situation, 4 = I often live in this situation. The person marks the best answer that expresses them off the scale. Scoring is like this: (1=4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1). The positive factors on the scale is represented by the numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19 and 20. You can get 1 to 4 points from every factor and because of this the lowest point you can get is 20 while the highest point you can get is 80. The lower point you get indicates that you are feeling less lonely while the higher points you get indicates that you feel more lonely. The reliability study of the internal consistency coefficient for the scale as the original forum was 0.96. The internal consistency coefficient obtained from the original form of the scale with internal consistency coefficients obtained from these two studies were found in high correlation and the level was found between 0.91, (Russell, Peplau and Cutrona, 1980).

2.4.4 Procedure

Accidental sampling technique was employed and 70 female volunteers and 70 male volunteers were chosen. 35 volunteers from each class were taken. The questionnaires was completed in the first two weeks of May 2012, after obtaining the necessary permission from the university rector. Four teaching assistants helped with the surveys and for the application classrooms, day and time were predetermined and was applied as a group. The guideline were given both written and verbally. During the application of questionnaire volunteer were given approximately 30 minutes time.

2.4.5 Statistical Analyses

All statistical analyses were performed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 17. First, desciptive statistics of the sample were defined. Too see the relation between variables of the study, between age of marrige, gender, who decide to marry, correlation coefficients were computed for UCLA and MRQ. Independent samples t-test was conducted in which defining the variables of the study.

III. RESULTS

In this chapter, results of statistical analyses will be given.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants

	N	%
Age		
18-20	40	28.6
21-23	73	52.1
24-26	27	19.3
Place of Birth		
Turkey	114	79.3
TRNC	26	16.4
Location		
City Centre	61	43.6
Small Town	11	7.9
Town Centre	52	37.1
Village	16	11.4
Ideal Age to get Marry		
18- down	3	2.1
18-23	9	6.4
24-29	82	58.6
30-35	43	30.7
36-up	3	2.1
Importance given to Virginity		
Yes	107	76.4
No	33	23.6
Participants' Decision of who to Marry.		
Myself	94	67.1
With my Partner	37	26.4
With my Family and Relatives	9	6.5

As we can see 52.1% (n=73) of the participants were aged between 21-23 and 28.6 % (n=40) of the participants represented the 18-20 age group. Those aged between 24-26 years made up 19.3% (n=27) of the participants. It was observed that, the majority of the total 140 students, made up of 70 females and 70 males, 79.3% (n=114) were born in Turkey and 16.4% (n=26) were born in the TRNC. In other words, while only 16.4% of the students were born in the TRNC, 79.3% were born in Turkey. 43.6% (n=61) of the students lived in a city centre and 37.1% (n=52) in a town centre. 11.4% (n=16) were from a village and 7.9% (n=11) lived in a small town.

Over half of the participants 58.6%' (n=82) said that the ideal age for marriage was 24-29, almost half %30.7 (n=43) of the participants chose the next age range of 30-35

In answer to the question of; "Should there be sexual relations before marriage?" 76.4% (n=107) of the participants gave the reply 'no' and 23.6% (n=33) gave the reply 'yes'.

In answer to the question "who should choose your spouse?" 67.1% (n=94) of the students said "myself" and 26.4'% (n=37) answered 'my partner and I". The 67.1% (n=94) who replied "myself" represent a large majority of the participants. Those who would choose their spouse with their family only represented 7% (n=9).

Table 2. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to age of participants

	18-23 (n=93)	24-29 (n=47)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,15±8,55	37,55±10,26	-1.671	0,098
Relationship Satisfaction	24,93±5,02	25,37±5,69	-0,353	0,726
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	23,21±7,39	25,70±7,34	-1.500	0,140
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	12,49±4,36	13,62±4,93	-1.053	0,298
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,58±4,02	17,33±5,83	0.210	0,835
External Relationship Control	10,13±3,65	11,25±3,44	-1.422	0,161
Relationship Assertiveness	12,41±2,89	11,03±3,44	1.844	0,048*
Internal Relationship Control	12,32±3,05	12,40±3,66	-0.10	0,921

*Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compare MRQ subscale scores of the students according to age groups with Student's t-test analysis, we found that university students under the age of 23 were more assertive in their relationships compared with those over 24 years (p=0.048).

Table 3. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to gender of participants

	Female (n=70)	Male (n=70)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	33.11±9.16	36.01±8.51	-1.940	0.054
Relationship Satisfaction	24.27±4.84	25.68±5.74	-1.575	0.118
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	23.91±7.62	26.08±7.23	-1.728	0.086
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	12.21±4.41	14.14±4.63	-2.519	0.013*
Self- confidence in Relationship	17.68±4.37	17.15±4.53	0.171	0.865
External Relationship Control	9.42±3.62	11.27±3.16	-3.207	0.002*
Relationship Assertiveness	12.08±3.10	11.92±3.02	0.303	0.762
Internal Relationship Control	12.27±3.07	12.60±3.17	-0.622	0.535

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compare MRQ subscale scores of the students according to their gender with Student's t-test analysis, we found that males when compared with females were better able to adjust themselves to relationships (p=0.013) and had a tendency to create more external control (p=0.002). The 'external relationship control' subscale aims to describe the individual's tendency to leave matters relating to relationships in the hands of fate or luck instead of taking control themselves. Relationships which are left to chance are relationships which are controlled externally.

Table 4. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to place of birth of participants

	Turkey (N=114)	TRNC (n=26)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34.69±8.67	34.60±10.70	0.041	0.967
Relationship Satisfaction	25.18±5.21	24.30±6.09	0.642	0.526
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	25.33±7.59	22.78±6.72	1.618	0.115
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13.82±4.54	10.17±3.98	3.904	0.000*
Self- confidence in Relationship	17.03±4.43	17.73±4.69	-0.660	0.514
External Relationship Control	10.52±3.44	9.47±4.15	1.128	0.269
Relationship Assertiveness	12.15±2.95	11.60±3.61	0.677	0.504
Internal Relationship Control	12.42±3.11	12.43±3.44	-0.150	0.988

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compare MRQ subscale scores of the students according to their birth place with Student's t-test analysis, we found that students born in Turkey had higher 'relationship consciousness and adjustment' than the students from TRNC (p=0.000). The 'relationship consciousness and adjustment' subscale aims to describe the individual's point of view during the process of entering a relationship. It means that the individual is aware that they are starting a relationship.

Table 5. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to year of study of participants

	1st and 2nd year (n=70)	3rd and 4th year (n=70)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	33.71±8.07	35.34±9.74	-0.761	0.449
Relationship Satisfaction	25.11±5.94	24.71±5.21	0.299	0.766
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	26.71±7.67	22.97±7.22	2.101	0.039*
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	14.00±4.55	11.85±4.46	1.988	0.051
Self- confidence in Relationship	16.54±4.39	17.34±4.88	-0.721	0.474
External Relationship Control	10.54±3.38	9.54±3.86	1.152	0.254
Relationship Assertiveness	11.94±2.95	11.45±3.27	0.651	0.517
Internal Relationship Control	12.28±2.81	12.17±3.47	0.151	0.880

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compared the MRQ subscale scores of the students according to year of study with Student's t-test, we found that 1st - 2nd year students had significantly higher fear/anxiety about relationship than 3rd – 4th year students (p=0.039).

Table 6. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to accomodation of participants

	City/ City Centre (n=113)	Town/Village (n=27)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	32,72±8,66	34,62±8,53	0.784	0.438
Relationship Satisfaction	24,01±5,28	27,12±4,17	-2.498	0.292
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	23,63±7,69	25,75±6,78	-1.076	0.018*
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,01±4,52	11,75±4,50	0.999	0.328
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,03±4,65	17,68±4,64	-0.502	0.621
External Relationship Control	10,32±3,25	10,37±4,27	-0.041	0.968
Relationship Assertiveness	11,52±3,27	12,56±3,14	-1.136	0.255
Internal Relationship Control	12,19±2,87	13,00±3,46	-0.853	0.403

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compared the MRQ subscale scores of the students according to their accomodation using Student t-test method. It was determined that those living in a town or village experienced more relationship fear and anxiety (p=0,018).

Table 7. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the marital status of the participants' parents

	Together (n=119)	Seperate (n=21)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,36±9,25	34,75±1,25	0.547	0.603
Relationship Satisfaction	24,55±5,31	25,00±5,47	0.987	0.364
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	24,81±7,27	23,25±7,27	0.084	0.936
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,16±4,76	12,75±2,06	0.980	0.366
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,15±4,53	14,25±2,21	1.044	0.341
External Relationship Control	10,26±3,54	12,25±2,06	0.346	0.743
Relationship Assertiveness	11,85±3,08	12,25±3,86	0.629	0.555
Internal Relationship Control	12,26±3,13	12,25±2,06	0.626	0.558

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

No significant difference was found in analysis by using Student's t-test to compare the views of the participants on marriage according to the marital status of their parents, ie. whether their parents are together or seperated.

Table 8. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to who the participants prefer to spend their free-time with.

	Alone (n=23)	Friends/ Family/ Lover (n=117)	T	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,34±6,09	35,04±8,33	-0.356	0.691
Relationship Satisfaction	23,56±4,84	25,66±5,31	-1.665	0.103
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	28,13±5,94	25,78±7,18	1.467	0.149
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,04±4,12	14,88±4,67	-1.692	0.097
Self- confidence in Relationship	15,04±3,92	17,66±3,36	-2.765	0.009*
External Relationship Control	11,04±3,28	10,82±3,56	0.263	0.794
Relationship Assertiveness	11,78±2,57	12,24±2,46	-0.715	0.479
Internal Relationship Control	11,82±2,49	12,40±2,56	-0.904	0.371

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compared the MRQ subscale scores of the students according to who the participants prefer to spend their free-time with, a significant difference (p=0,009) was found in the area of self-confidence in relationship between those who answered that they preferred to spend their free-time alone and those who stated that they preferred to spend time with their friends, family or lover.

Table 9. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the importance given to virginity by the participants

	Virginity is important (n=107)	Virginity is not important (n=33)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,69±9,16	34,15±8,25	0.320	0.750
Relationship Satisfaction	25,16±5,48	24,36±4,87	0.755	0.451
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	25,12±7,73	24,60±6,71	0.345	0.731
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,32±4,70	12,69±4,35	0.684	0.495
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,50±4,29	16,30±4,82	1.363	0.175
External Relationship Control	10,30±3,49	10,48±3,61	-0.862	0.802
Relationship Assertiveness	12,13±3,03	11,60±3,12	0.862	0.390
Internal Relationship Control	12,71±3,12	11,54±295	1.894	0.060

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compared the MRQ subscale scores of the students according to the importance given to virginity by Student's t-test, no significant difference is found. Most of the participants said that virginity is important compared with those who said that it is not.

Table 10. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to who affects the participants' decision of who to marry.

	Myself (n=94)	Others (n=46)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,71±8,78	32,71±9,06	0.564	0.591
Relationship Satisfaction	24,74±5,02	26,14±4,63	-0.765	0.469
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	25,05±7,23	27,85±9,52	-0.762	0.473
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,31±4,39	13,14±4,94	0.092	0.930
Self- confidence in Relationship	16,80±4,69	19,57±3,10	-2.179	0.060
External Relationship Control	10,34±3,34	10,57±3,64	-0.163	0.876
Relationship Assertiveness	11,94±3,09	12,71±2,92	0.665	0.526
Internal Relationship Control	12,28±3,07	15,71±2,81	-3.091	0.017*

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compare the MRQ subscale scores of participants who make decision about who to marry themselves or by others, by Student's t-test, it was found that participants who are affected from others had significantly higher internal relationship control (p=0.017).

Table 11. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to financial support from the participants' family

	Yes (n=131)	No (n=9)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34,70±8,86	32,50±10,90	0,562	0,590
Relationship Satisfaction	24,99±5,15	24,50±8,50	0,162	0,876
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	24,87±7,39	26,87±9,58	-0,579	0,580
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13,11±4,61	13,50±4,75	-0,223	0,829
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,42±4,33	14,62±5,26	1,476	0,180
External Relationship Control	10,25±3,46	11,62±4,43	-0,854	0,419
Relationship Assertiveness	12,05±2,97	11,25±4,49	0,499	0,632
Internal Relationship Control	12,48±3,00	12,00±4,89	0,275	0,791

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

No significant difference in views on marriage was found using Student's t-test method, when comparing those who were receiving financial support from their families and those who were not.

Table 12. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the participants' current emotional relationship.

	Yes (n=72)	No (n=68)	T	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	36,04±9,56	33,00±7,98	2,047	0,043*
Relationship Satisfaction	25,84±5,13	24,05±5,43	1,998	0,048*
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	24,25±7,47	25,79±7,47	-1,222	0,224
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	12,97±4,56	13,39±4,69	-0,543	0,588
Self- confidence in Relationship	18,36±4,10	16,01±4,49	3,221	0,002*
External Relationship Control	10,26±3,65	10,44±3,38	-0,298	0,766
Relationship Assertiveness	12,50±3,17	11,48±2,85	1,991	0,048
Internal Relationship Control	13,12±3,07	11,70±3,01	2,757	0,007*

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compared the MRQ subscale scores of the students according to the participants' current emotional relationship with Student's t-test we found the students who had relation had significantly higher scores on relationship occupation, relationship satisfaction, self-confidence in relationship and internal relationship control (p≤0.05).

Table 13. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the participants' having experienced an engagement or marriage in the past or not.

	Yes (n=15)	No (n=125)	T	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	36,92±11,38	34,32±8,66	0,831	0,419
Relationship Satisfaction	26,35±6,42	24,80±5,23	0,870	0,398
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	28,07±8,91	24,64±7,30	1,386	0,186
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	12,28±5,68	13,23±4,48	-0,602	0,556
Self- confidence in Relationship	17,50±5,11	17,24±4,36	0,183	0,857
External Relationship Control	9,50±3,70	10,43±3,49	-0,886	0,389
Relationship Assertiveness	11,85±4,09	12,02±2,94	-0,148	0,884
Internal Relationship Control	12,50±3,69	12,44±3,06	0,051	0,960

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

The participants who stated that they had experienced an engagement or marriage in the past (n=15) and those who stated that they had not (n=125) were defined. When comparing the views on marriage of these two groups, no significant difference was found.

Table 14. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the social environment of the participants

	Active social life (n=132)	No social life (n=8)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	36.41±5.38	32.50±4.07	-1.849	0.081
Relationship Satisfaction	25.66±4.31	25.50±4.98	-0.077	0.940
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	28.75±7.80	29.37±5.31	0.895	0.383
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13.33±4.47	15.00±3.25	0.963	0.348
Self- confidence in Relationship	16.00±4.43	13.87±4.79	-1.001	0.334
External Relationship Control	9.66±2.99	12.87±2.35	2.672	0.016*
Relationship Assertiveness	12.41±2.39	11.37±2.77	-0.868	0.400
Internal Relationship Control	11.91±1.72	12.00±3.58	0.061	0.953

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When we compare the MRQ subscale scores of students who have active social life with the ones having no social life with Student's t-test, students who had no social life had significantly higher external relationship control (p=0.016).

Table 15. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the number of siblings of the participants

	None-3 Siblings (n=84)	4 or more Siblings (n=56)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	30.00±4.24	33.97±10.08	-0.548	0.383
Relationship Satisfaction	31.00±2.82	24.19±6.02	1.570	0.125
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	31.00±1.41	24.47±7.56	1.204	0.006*
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	16.50±0.70	13.77±4.72	2.920	0.015*
Self- confidence in Relationship	10.00±4.24	17.61±5.14	-2.439	0.218
External Relationship Control	12.50±4.94	10.30±2.88	0.621	0.643
Relationship Assertiveness	13.00±1.41	11.69±3.38	1.137	0.388
Internal Relationship Control	12.50±2.12	12.16±3.41	0.208	0.863

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

The numbers of siblings of the university students affected their views on marriage in the areas of relationship fear/ anxiety and relationship consciousness and adjustment. Individuals with fewer siblings experience more relationship fear and higher relationship consciousness when compared with individuals with more siblings (p≤0.05).

Table 16. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the type of marriage the participants' parents have.

	Officially registered (n=118)	Religious ceremony (n=22)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34.57±8.08	33.50±3.53	0.404	0.743
Relationship Satisfaction	24.64±5.39	25.00±2.82	-0.172	0.888
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	25.01±7.63	25.50±8.36	-0.106	0.932
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	12.83±4.08	13.00±2.82	-0.081	0.947
Self- confidence in Relationship	17.23±4.17	13.50±2.12	2.372	0.218
External Relationship Control	10.14±3.34	11.50±0.70	-2.167	0.138
Relationship Assertiveness	12.07±3.10	10.50±2.12	1.024	0.478
Internal Relationship Control	12.08±2.76	10.50±3.53	1.037	0.477

* Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

There was no difference in the views on marriage of the university students between those with officially married parents and those with parents who married through a religious ceremony.

Table 17. Comparison of MRQ subscale scores according to the participants perceived ideal age to get married.

	18-30 (n=94)	Over 30 (n=46)	t	P*
High Level of Relationship Preoccupation	34.81±9.20	34.67±7.68	0.092	0.927
Relationship Satisfaction	24.71±5.29	25.30±4.87	-0.616	0.539
Relationship Fear / Anxiety	24.96±7.17	23.86±7.66	0.781	0.437
Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	13.08±4.39	13.20±4.81	-0.141	0.888
Self- confidence in Relationship	17.47±4.21	17.58±3.97	-0.138	0.890
External Relationship Control	10.04±3.52	10.44±3.19	-0.630	0.530
Relationship Assertiveness	12.01±3.19	12.25±2.44	-0.475	0.636
Internal Relationship Control	12.47±3.07	12.55±2.22	-0.172	0.864

*Statistically significant (p≤0.05)

When the results were analysed using Student's t-test method no significant difference was found in the results of those who stated that the ideal age for marriage is 30 and under and those who stated that the ideal age for marriage is 31 and over.

Table 18. Correlation between MRQ subscale and UCLA loneliness Scale Scores

	r	P*
Loneliness and High Levels of Relationship Preoccupation	0.161	0.058
Loneliness and Relationship Satisfaction	0.279	0.001*
Loneliness and Relationship Fear / Anxiety	0.246	0.003*
Loneliness and Relationship Consciousness and Adjustment	0.215	0.011*
Loneliness and Self-confidence in Relationship	0.251	0.003*
Loneliness and External Relationship Control	-0.297	0.000*
Loneliness and Relationship Assertiveness	0.226	0.007*
Loneliness and Internal Relationship Control	0.336	0.000*

When we investigate the relation of MRQ subscale scores with UCLA scores with Pearson correlation, we find significant positive relation between UCLA scores and 'relationship satisfaction' (p=0.001), 'relationship fear/anxiety' (p=0.011), 'self confidence in relationship' (p=0.003), 'external relationship control' (p=0.000), 'relationship assertiveness' (p=0.007) and 'internal relationship control' (p=0.000).

IV. DISCUSSION

This study has shown that some socio-demographic variables, such as, age, gender, place of birth, location and loneliness have a direct effect on relationships and views on marriage. It was determined that loneliness in particular affects relationship dimension.

This study aims to investigate the views of Psychological Counseling and Guidance students studying at Near East University on marriage and preferences when choosing a partner. Differences were found between male and female participants views on marriage from a "relationship consciousness and adjustment" and "external relationship control" point of view. It was established that males pay more attention to what people around them say in their relationships than females.

This may be due to the fact that more women are studying at university and becoming more knowledgeable. The growth and development of women's rights, in recent years, is an important factor which may have led to this interesting finding.

The fact that the younger group was more assertive may be the result of their youth and lack of experience. They may not be considering a serious relationship due to their young age. If we are to relate this to their year of study, as stated before, students in the 1st or 2nd year experience more relationship fear / anxiety due to their being younger.

A large majority of the students were born in Turkey. When considering differences according to place of birth a significant difference was determined in the area of "relationship consciousness and adjustment" between the results of those born in the TRNC and those born in Turkey. The Turkey group was more successful in terms of "relationship consciousness and adjustment" than the TRNC group. The 'relationship consciousness and adjustment' subscale aims to describe the individual's point of view during the process of entering a relationship. It means that the individual is aware that they are starting a relationship.

Most of the participants stated that the ideal age for marriage is 24-29. The fact that they wanted to get married as soon as they graduated from university could be due to their desire to start a career, adjust to their career and stand on their own two feet as soon as possible. Differences in the participants ideal age for marriage did not affect the participants' views on marriage.

A large majority of the participants stated that they would make their own decision when choosing a partner. Those who stated that they preferred to consult their family, friends and partner showed high levels of internal control. This could be due to the fact that they are under less pressure than those choosing their own partner. It is safe to say that those choosing their own partner will be under more pressure. In other words, the fact that individual are able to marry the person of their own choice is an indicator that our community is moving towards a more modern era. Everyone has their rights and freedom of choice. These views are becoming more and more popular as time goes by. The results of our research is parallel to some other research in Turkey. Research by Tezcan (1981) and Ozguven (2000) determined that young people wanted to choose their own partners. The finding that more than half the students in this study stated that they wanted to choose their own partner confirms this evidence.

The decision to get married is a very important one. Individuals wishing to get married should first evaluate the suitability of the individuals planning to be married in every area before making this decision. It is necessary for individuals to be able to accommodate each other emotionally, cognitively, socio-culturally and economically in order to have a healthy and happy relationship which leads to a healthy and happy community. This can only be achieved by making more logical and reasonable decisions.

A group of students believe that virginity is important. The importance of virginity plays a role in making the decision to start a relationship. However, once the decision to start a relationship has been made other socio-demographic and cultural factors affect views on relationships and marriage.

At the Istanbul University Science Faculty is completed research (1991) on its final year students to examine their views and attitudes towards arranged marriages. It found that the young individuals were against arranged marriages and they did not approve of one of the spouses continuing to live with their parents after marriage.

Our research found no difference in the views of marriage of those who placed importance on virginity before marriage and those who did not. We can summarize that the lack of difference in views on marriage is due to the fact that our community has adjusted to more modern lifestyles and that everything is now acceptable. Nowadays, the topic of sexuality is separate and very broad. People perceived sexuality very differently in the past

however today sexuality has lost its taboo status. The results of our study also show this. We can observe that the results we gathered run parallel to those from studies in Turkey.

We can observe that views on the importance of virginity have not changed a great deal since this research conducted 21 years ago.

Esmer conducted various pieces of research (1991) at Boğaziçi University on women, flirting, male / female equality, etc. It was established that only a small minority (%12) of participants approved of sex before marriage.

According to Yazuver, humans are social beings. Their most fundamental requirement is to live among other humans. Individuals realize their emotions during social interaction. Their behavior patterns are formed according to their reactions to various events. Humans are beings who were constructed to live with and form relationships with other people, not to live alone (2010).

Yazuver's thoughts support our study about how the students spend their free-time with. Different views emerged between those who spent their free-time alone and the other group, those who spent it with friends, family and lovers. This could be due to their not having experienced a relationship in the past. Individuals who have never experienced being in a relationship may feel less experienced than individuals who have been involved in relationships. This may lead to their lack of self-confidence.

Marriage is one of the most important turning points of a human being's life. Along with taking the decision to get married the individual must go through a process of moving from a familiar environment to different environment. This situation brings with it many financial and moral responsibilities.

It was found that the large majority of students said that they had an active social environment Although, the number of participants who stated that they had no friends was low, it is proof that there are individuals we can classify as "alone" even today. Those with an active social environment can individualize and shape their relationships and marriages using their experiences within this environment using this framework.

Just as in our study, lonely individuals have higher levels of external relationship control. It is possible to state that individuals who think this way will find it harder to get married.

Parallel to our study, Gittins states that marriage is a great change in status for both men and women and that marriage is difficult for both those with an active social environment and those without (1991).

This research has some limitations comprised of the following; The study was limited to chosen students (the sample group) studying Psychological Counseling and Guidance at Near East University in the city of Nicosia. The information on the topic was gathered using a questionnaire and the prepared research questionnaire was limited to 94 items.

V. CONCLUSION

Family structure and family values have a great effect on young people. We observed a sample group who have their own beliefs about marriage and make their own decisions before taking the advice of their friends and family when choosing a partner. Factors, such as, the participants' birth place, location, social environment, how they choose to spend their free-time, previous engagement or marriage and number of siblings have both positive and negative effects on their views on marriage and choosing a partner.

Taking this research in to consideration, further research can be completed on the effects of birth place, location, social environment, how they choose to spend their free-time, previous engagement or marriage and number of siblings on the views of marriage and choosing a partner of university students. Consecutive research can use the results of this study and research the views on marriage of university students studying in other departments. This research completed on Near East University Psychological Counselling and Guidance students can be universalized by repeating it at other universities, at different times, in different locations and with different sample groups and these results collected can be compared.

REFERENCES

Acemoğlu, H., Ceylan, A., Saka.G., Ertem, M., (2005). Diyarbakır'da Erken Yaş Evlilikleri. Aile Ve Toplum Egitim Kültür Ve Arastırma Dergisi. 2.

Alkan, T., (1981). **Kadın ve Erkek Eşitsizliği Sorunu.** Ankara. A.Ü. Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Altuntek, S., Türkiye Üzerine Yapılmış Evlilik ve Akrabalık Araştırmalarının Bir Değerlendirmesi. **Hacettepe Üniversitesi Taehiyat Fakültesi Dergisi.** Cilt: 18 i Sayı: 2

Anonim, M., (1998). **Bosanma Sebepleri Arastırması Nihai Rapor.** Aile Arastırma Kurumu. Ankara

Armağan, S., (1988). **Toplumbilim.** İzmir. Barış Yayınları.

Arpacı, A., (1993). **Türk Medeni Kanunu ve Borçlar Kanunu.** İstanbul. Temel Yayınları.

Atabek, A., (1990). **Kuşatılmış Gençlik.** İstabul. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.

Bacanlı, H., (2001). **Eş Seçimi Tercihleri.** Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Dergisi. 2.

Balaman, A.R., (1982). **Evlilik Akrabalık Türleri.** İzmir. Karınca Matbaacılık.

Bilen, M., (2004). **Sağlıklı İnsan İlişkileri.** Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.

Bilgin, V., (1991). **Yapısal Özellikleri İtibariyleAilenin Görünümü.** Türkiye Aile Yıllığı. Ankara.

Ceylan, F.G., (1994). **Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimindeki Tercih Ve Beklentileri.** Cumhuriyet University Institute of Social Sciences Department of Sociology (Unpublished master thesis).

Christensen, H.T., (1967). **Handbook of Marriage and Family,** New York Royald Press.

Çaplı, O., (1992). **Evlenmeye Hazır Mısınız?.** Bilgi Yayınevi. (1. Basım). Ankara.

Davidson, B., (1984). A Test Of Equity Theory For Marital Edjustment. **Social Psychology Quarterly.** Vol: 24 Number 2.

Demir, A., Fısıloğlu, H., (1999). Loneliness and Marital Adjustment Of Turkish Couples. **The Journal Of Psychology.** Vol: 33 Number 4.

Durmazkul, A., (1991). **Cinsiyete Göre Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçme Tercihleri.** Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences Department of Sociology (Unpublished master thesis).

Duyar, T., (2002). **Evlilik Ve Kadının Yabancılaşması.** İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences Department of Sociology. Woman Studies (Unpublished master thesis).

Ekşi, B., (2005). Evliliğe Hazırlık Aşamasındaki Karı-Koca Adaylarının Evlilik Ve Anne-Baba Olma Üzerine Düşünceleri. **Aile Ve Toplum Egitim Kültür Ve Araştırma Dergisi** Cilt 2. Sayfa 76-86.

Engels, F., (1992). **Ailenin Özel Mülkiyetinin ve Devletin Kökeni.** Ankara. Sol Yayınları.

Erdoğan, S., (2007). **Evlilik Uyumu ile Psikiyatrik Rahatsızlıklar, Bağlanma Stilleri ve Mizaç ve Karakter Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi.** Unpublished thesis. Gazi Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Psikiyatri Anabilim Dalı. Ankara.

Erkal, M., (1990). **Türk Ailesi ve Batı Avrupa'daki Değişmeler.** Aile Yazıları 2. Ankara.

Eserperk, A., (1979). **Sosyal Kontrol Sapma ve Sosyal Değişme.** Ankara. A.Ü.Eğitim Fak.Yayınları.

Esmer, Y., (1991). **Her Yönüyle Kadın**. Türkiye Aile Yıllıgı.T.C. Aile Araştırma Kurumu.

Fısıloğlu, H., (2001). Consanguineous Marriage And Marital Adjustment In Turkey. **The Family.** Vol 9. Number 2. 215-222.

Gençtan, E., (1984). **Çağdaş Yaşam ve Normal Dışı Davranışlar.** Ankara. Maya Yayıncılık.

Gittins, D., (1991). **Aile Sorgulanıyor.** İstanbul. Pencere Yayınları.

Gökçe, B., (1976). Aile ve Aile Tipleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme. **Hacettepe Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi..** Cilt 8, Sayı -2. Ankara. H.Ü. Yayınları.

Gökçe, B., (1995). **Toplumsal Değişim Sürecinde Gecekondu Ailesi**. Aile Kurultayı. (Cilt:1). Ankara.

Gkmwn, A., (2001). **Evli Eşlerin Birbirlerine Yönelik Kontrolcülük ve Bağımlılık Algılarının Evlilik Doyumu Üzerindeki Etkisi.** Hacettepe University, Unpublished master thesis.

Gülerce, A., (1996). **Türkiye'de Ailelerin Psikolojik Örüntüleri.** Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Matbaası. İstanbul.

Güvenç, B., (1977). **Sosyal Degişme Sürecinde Aile, Akrabalık ve Soy İlişkileri.** Türkiye'de Toplumsal Bilim Araştırmalarında Yaklaşımlar ve Yöntemler. Ankara: ODTÜ Türk Halk Bilimleri Topluluğu

Güvenç, B.,(1984) **İnsan ve Kültür.** İstanbul. Remzi Kitabevi Yayınları.

Hakvoort, E. M., (2010). Family Relationship and The Psychological djaustment of School-Aged Childrenn intact Families. **The Journal of Genetic Psychology**. Vol 61. Page No:1112-1125 171.

Kalyoncu, H., (2012). **Genç Psikolojisinde Sevgi ve Evlilik Öncesi Cinsellik.** Boğaziçi Yayınları.

Karacehennem, S.Ö., (2009). **Evlilik Sanatı.** İstanbul. Epsilon Yayıncılık Hizmetleri.

Kitson, G.C., Sussman, M.B., (1982). Marital Complaints, Demographic Characteristics And Symptoms Of Mental Distress In Divorce. **Journal Marriage And the Family**. Vol 73. Number 44.

Kocacık, F., (1985). Toplumsal Bir Olgu Olarak Gençlik. **Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi.** Cilt 6. Sayı 2. Sayfa 25-29.

Kocacık, F., (1987). Üniversite Gençliği C.Ü. Sorunları Üzerine Uygulamalı Bir Araştırma. **Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi.** Sayı 9. Sayfa 10.

Kocadere, M., (1995). **İyi Ve Kötü Evliliklerin Özelliklerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Betimsel Bir Çalışma.** Ege University, Institute of Health Sciences Department of Sociology (Unpublished master thesis).

Kongar, E., (1986). **Türkiye Üzerine Araştırmalar.** Evrim Yayınları. İstanbul.

Köknel, Ö., (1981). **Cumhuriyet Gençliği ve Sorunları.** İstanbul. Cem Yayınevi.

Köknel, Ö., (1986). **İnsanı Anlamak**. İstanbul. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.

Köknel, Ö., (2000). **Kimliğini Arayan Gençliğimiz.** İstanbul. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.

Nejad, M., (1991). **Psikolog Gözüyle Aile ve Sorunlarınız.** İstanbul. Yapa Yayın Pazarlama.

Osmond, M.W., (1977). Marital Organization In Low-Income Families: a Cross-Race Comparision. **Intenational Sociology Of The Family**. Vol 7. Page 23-33.

Ozankaya, Ö., (1996). **Toplumbilim.** Cem Yayınevi. İstanbul

Özkalp, E., (1985). **Sosyolojiye Giriş Dersleri.** Eskişehir. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Özkalp, E., (1990). **Sosyolojiye Giriş.** Eskişehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Özgüven, İ.E., (2000). **Evlilik Ve Aile Terapisi.** Pdrem Yayınları. Ankara.

Öztan, B., (2000). **Aile Hukuku.** Turan Kitabevi, Ankara.

Özuğurlu, K., (1990). **Evlilik Raporu.** İstanbul. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.

Pitol, S., (2010). **Evlilik.** Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Seidenberg, R.,(1983). **Eviyle Evli Kadınlar.** İstanbul. Ata Yayınları.

Schen, H., (1992). **Günümüzde Aşk. Sevgi ve Toplumsal İlişkiler.** İstanbul. Belge Yayınları.

Solmuş, T., (2010). **Bağlanma Evlilik ve Aile Psikolojisi.** Sistem Yayıncılık.

Steel, D., (2000). **Marriage.** İnkilap Kitabevi.

Surra, C.A., Research And The Ory On Mate Soloction And Premarital Relationships In The 1980's. **Journal Of Marriage And The Family.** 52.

Şahinkaya, R., (1979). **Psiko-Sosyal Yönleriyle Aile.** Kardes Basımevi. Ankara.

Tarhan, N., (2012). **Evlilik Psikolojisi.** Öncesi ve Sonrasıyla Evlilik. Timaş Yayınevi.

T.C. Basbakanlık Mevzuat Bilgi Sistemi. Türk Medeni Kanunu.

http://mevzuat.basbakanlik.gov.tr/mevzuat/metinx.asp?mevzuatkod=1.5.4721 (erisim: 24.04.2007)

Tezcan, M., (1991). **Kırsal Topluluklarımızda Tercihli Evlilik Tiplerinin İşlevsel Çözümlenmesi**. Ankara. Aile Yazıları.

Timur, S., (1972). **Türkiye'de Aile Yapısı.** Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tolon, B., (1990). **Geleneksel Aileden Çağdaş Aile Yapısına Doğru.** Aile Yazıları. Ankara.

Tomas, Sherry.,(2011) **Evlilik.** Artemis Yayınları.

Tütengil, C. O., (1978). **Aile ve Evlilik Araştırması Sonuçları.** İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Enstitüsü Yayını.

Uraz, G., (1979). **Müstakbel Eşten Beklentiler Üzerine Bir İnceleme.** Hacettepe University (Unpublished master thesis).

Ünal, E., (1996). **Evlilik Adaylarının Eş Seçim Ölçütleri ve İzmir'de Verilen Evlilik Danışmanlığı Hizmetleri**. 9 Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü (Unpublished master thesis).

Vannoy-Hiller, D., Philliber, W.W., (1989). **Equal Partners Successful Women In Marriage.** California. Penguin Books.

Velidedeoğle, H., (1976). **Ailenin Çilesi-Boşanma.** İstanbul. Çağdaş Yayınları.

Yavuzer, H., (2010). **Evlilik Okulu. Evlilikte Kişilerarası İlişkiler ve İletişim Becerileri.** İstanbul. Remzi Kitabevi.

Yıldırım, İ., (2007). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçme Kriterleri. **Türk Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Dergisi**. Cilt 111. Sayı 27.

Yörükoğlu, A., (1987). **Gençliğin Eğitimi.** Ankara. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Yörükoğlu, A., (1988). **Gençlik Çağı Ruh Sağlığı ve Ruhsal Sorunları.** Ankara. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.

Appendix 1. Demographic Information Form

1.Yaşınız ? …………......

2.Cinsiyetiniz ?   (1) Kız   (2) Erkek

3.Doğum yeriniz ?   (1)TC   (2)KKTC   (3)Diğer

4.Kaçıncı sınıfta okuyorsunuz ?   ……………

5.Ailenizin yaşadığı yerleşim yeri:

(1) İl merkezi   (2) Kasaba   (3) İlçe merkezi   (4) Köy

6.Anne ve babanızın yaptığı evlilik şekli nedir?

(1) Resmi nikah   (2) Dini nikah   (3) İkisi birlikte   (4) Nikahsız

7.Anne ve babanız;

(1) Birlikteler   (2) Ayrı yaşıyorlar   (3) Boşandılar   (4) Diğer.............................

8.Anne ve babanızın aylık toplam geliri yaklaşık ne kadardır?

(1) 500-1000TL (2) 1001-2000TL   (3)2001-3000TL   (4)3001 TL ve fazlası

9.Anne ve babanızın eğitim durumları nedir?

Anne: (1) Okumamış   (2)İlkokul   (3) Ortaokul   (4)Lise   (5) Yüksekokul/Diğer

Baba: (1) Okumamış   (2)İlkokul   (3) Ortaokul   (4)Lise   (5) Yüksekokul/Diğer

10.Anne ve babanız çalışıyor mu?

Anne: (1) Evet   (2) Hayır

Baba: (1) Evet   (2) Hayır

11.Anne ve babanız ekonomik açıdan size destek oluyor mu?

(1) Evet   (2) Hayır

12. Ailedeki Kardeş Sayısı:

(0)   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   (6 ve fazlası)

13.Eğer varsa kardeşinizin/kardeşlerinizin medeni hali evli olan kaç kişi bulunuyor?

(0)   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   (6 ve fazlası)

14.Sosyal çevrenizde yakın arkadaş olarak tanımlayabileceğiniz kaç kişi var?

(1) Hiç yok   (2) 1 (3) 2-3   (4) 4-5   (5) 6-7   (6) 8 ve fazlası

15.Boş vakitlerinizi kiminle geçirirsiniz?

(1) Tek başıma   (2) Kız/Erkek arkadaşımla   (3) Ailemden birisiyle (4) Arkadaşlarımla

16.Eş seçiminizde sizin için bakirelik/bakirlik önemli midir?

(1) Evet   (2) Hayır

17.Şu anda duygusal bir beraberliğiniz var mı?

(1)Evet   (2)Hayır

18.Daha önce nişanlılık veya evlilik dönemi geçirdiniz mi?

(1)Evet   (2)Hayır

19.Size en uygun evlenme yaşı kaçtır?

(1)18'den küçük   (2)18-23   (3)24-29   (4)30-35   (5) 36-fazlası

20.Kiminle evleneceğinize kim karar vermeli?

(1)Kendim   (2)Eşimle anlaşarak birlikte   (3)Ailem   (4)Akrabalar

21.Son dönemlerde herhangi bir psikolojik rahatsızlık geçirdiniz mi?

(1)Evet   (2) Hayır

Appendix 2. Multidimensional Relationship Scale

Aşağıda yakın ilişkiler ile ilgili verilen maddeleri dikkatlice okuyup cevaplandırınız.

(1)Hiç Uygun Değil   (2)Kısmen Uygun Değil   (3)Uygun   (4)Kısmen Uygun   (5)Çok Uygun

1.Yakın ilişkilerde bir partner olarak kendime güvenirim.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

2.Sürekli yakın ilişkiler üzerine düşünürüm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

3.Yakın ilişkilerimle ilgili çok fazla düşünürüm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

4.Yakın bir ilişki içinde olma isteğim çok fazla.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

5.Yakın ilişkiler kendimi sinirli ve kaygılı hissetmeme neden olur.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

6.Yakın ilişkilerle ilgili kendimi depresif hissederim.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

7.Yakın ilişkilerim çoğunlukla şansa bağlı olaylarla gelişmiştir.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

8.Başkalarının yakın ilişkilerim konusunda ne düşündüğüne

   aşırı önem veririm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

9.Birisiyle yakın ilişkiye girmek beni biraz ürkütür.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

10.Yakın ilişkiyle ilgili gereksinimlerimin şu anki karşılanma

   biçiminden memnunum.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

11.Yakın bir ilişkide iyi bir partner olduğumu düşünüyorum.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

12.Yakın ilişkileri, başka her şeyden daha çok düşünürüm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

13.Yakın ilişkilerimde, kendi davranışların çoğunlukla belirleyici

   bir rol oynar.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

14.Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda düşünmeye genellikle zaman

   ayırırım.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

15.Yakın bir ilişkiye zaman ve emek vermek konusunda çok

   istekliyim.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

16.Yakın ilişkilerde biraz acemi ve gerginimdir.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

17.Yakın ilişkilerde tercihleri doğrudan dile getiririm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

18.Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda kendimi mutsuz hissediyorum.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

19.Yakın ilişkilerimin başkalarına nasıl göründüğüne aşırı

   önem veririm.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

20.Bazen yakın ilişkilerden korkarım.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

21.Yakın ilişkilerimden çok memnunum.   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)

22.Yakın ilişkilerde pek çok insana göre daha iyiyimdir.　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

23.Yakın ilişkiler zihnimi meşgul eder.　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

24.Yakın ilişkilerde kontrol daha çok benim elimdedir.　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

25.Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmayı çok arzu ediyorum.　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

26.Karşı cinsten biriyle duygusal bir yakınlık kurmak bende

　gerginlik yaratır.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

27.Yakın ilişkilerde isteklerimi dile getirmede biraz pasifimdir.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

28.Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda cesaretimin kırıldığını hissediyorum.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4) (5)

29.Yakın ilişkilerim üzerinde şansın büyük etkisi vardır.　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

30.Yakın ilişkilerimin başkaları üzerinde bıraktığı izlenim konusunda

　sıklıkla endişe duyarım.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

31.Zaman zaman, birisiyle yakın bir ilişkiye girmekten korkarım.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

32.Yakın ilişkilerim temel beklentilerimi karşılıyor.　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

33.Kendimi yakın bir ilişki için oldukça tercih edilen bir partner

　olarak değerlendiririm.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

34.Sürekli olarak yakın bir ilişki içinde olmayı düşünürüm.　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

35.Yakın ilişkilerimi etkileyen temel şey benim kendi yaptıklarımdır.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

36.Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmak benim için önemlidir.　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

37.Yakın ilişkilerde birçok insana göre daha kaygılıyımdır.　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

38.Yakın bir ilişkide isteklerimi dile getirmekten çekinmem.　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

39.Yakın ilişkilerim konusunda kendimi hayal kırıklığına

　uğramış hissediyorum.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

40.Yakın ilişkilerimin büyük oranda şans meselesi olduğuna inanırım.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

41.Genellikle başkalarının yakın ilişkilerine yönelik verdikleri

　tepkilere duyarlıyımdır.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

42.Yakın bir ilişki içinde olmak beni fazla korkutmaz.　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

43.Yakın ilişkilerim, diğer pek çok ilişki ile karşılaştırıldığında,

　çok daha iyidir.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

44.Yakın bir ilişki içinde kendime oldukça güvenirim.　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

45.Zamanının büyük bir bölümünü yakın ilişkileri düşünerek

　geçiririm.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

46.Yakın ilişkilerim benim sorumluluğum ve kontrolüm altındadır.　(1)　(2)　(3)　(4)　(5)

47. Yakın bir ilişki içinde olup, bunu sürdürmeyi çok isterim. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

48. Yakın bir ilişki içinde kendimi tutuk ve utangaç hissederim. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

49. Yakın ilişkiler söz konusu olduğunda, isteklerimi genellikle
   İfade ederim. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

50. Yakın ilişkilerimi düşündüğümde üzülüyorum. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

51. Yakın ilişkilerimin gerçekten de bir kısmet işi olduğunu
   düşünüyorum. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

52. Başkalarının yakın ilişkime nasıl tepki verdiklerine dikkat ederim. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

53. Yaşamımın yakın ilişkiler yönü, benim için çok doyurucudur. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Appendix 3. UCLA Loneliness Scale

Aşağıdaki ölçekte kendinize ilişkin bir dizi ifade bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatli bir şekilde okuyunuz.

	Hiçbir zaman	*Nadiren*	*Bazen*	*Her zaman*
1.Kendimi çevremdeki insanlarla uyum içinde hissediyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.Arkadaşım yok.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3.Başvuracağım kimse yok.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.Kendimi tek başınaymışım gibi hissetmiyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5.Kendimi bir arkadaş gurubunun bir parçası olarak hissediyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6.Çevremdeki insanlarla bir çok ortak yönüm var.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7.Artık hiç kimseyle samimi değilim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8.İlgilerim ve fikirlerim çevremdekilerce paylaşılmıyor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9.Dışa dönük bir insanım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10.Kendimi yakın hissettiğim insanlar var.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11.Kendimi grup dışına itilmiş hissediyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12.Sosyal ilişkilerim yüzeyseldir.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13.Hiç kimse beni gerçekten iyi tanımıyor.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14.Kendimi diğer insanlardan soyutlanmış hissediyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15.İstediğim zaman arkadaş bulabilirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16.Beni gerçekten anlayan insanlar var.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17.Bu derece içime kapanmış olmaktan dolayı mutsuzum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18.Çevremde insanlar var ama benimle değiller.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19.Konuşabileceğim insanlar var.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20.Derdimi anlatabileceğim insanlar var.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Appendix 4. Informed Consent

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü ''Üniversite öğrencilerinin evlilik ve eş seçimiyle ilgili görüşlerinin incelenmesi'' konulu tez çalışması ile ilgilidir. Anket formundaki soruları içtenlikle cevaplayacağınıza inanıyor, ilgi ve yardımlarınız için hepinize teşekkür ediyorum.

Gizem ÖNERİ UZUN

Gizem ÖNERİ UZUN

She was born on 13rd January 1985 in Nicosia. She completed high school at Near East College in Nicosia. She graduated from Psychological Counseling and Guidance of Eastern Mediterrenean University in Famagusta. In 2006, she worked as guidance assistant at Namik Kemal High School for five months. In 2007, she graduated from Psychology post-graduate at University of Wolverhampton. She graduated psychology at Near East University in 2008. In 2009, she worked an assistant of "Bakırköy Sinir ve Ruh Hastalıkları Hastahanesi" for two months in Istanbul.

She has been studing psyhology post graduate programme at Near East University since 2009. In 2011, she worked as psycholog assistant in Nicosia "Barış Ruh ve Sinir Hastalıkları Hastahanesi" for eight months.

She has been working at NEU Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department since 2009. She has given different courses on educational psychology, development and learning psychology, child psychology, develoment psychology, pathological psychology, parent education, stress and introduction to psychology in this period. She is a psychological counselor and psycholog.