

ATTACHMENT STYLE, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT
DEPRESSION AND ANXIETY

by

C. BAYBARS BEKİROĞLU

B.A. in Psychology, Boğaziçi University, 1993

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of M.A. in
Clinical Psychology

Bogazici University Library



39001100081663

14

Department of Psychology, Institute of Social Sciences

Boğaziçi University, 1996

CONTENTS

	page
Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
Introduction	1
Review of the literature	13
Rationale of the study and the hypotheses	25
Method	27
Participants	27
Instruments	27
Procedure	30
Results	31
Discussion	37
References	43
Appendices	52

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank many people without whom this thesis would not be accomplished:

Doç. Dr. İ. Ercan Alp, for his indispensable help and supervision ... and his patience.

Prof. Dr. Güler O. Fişek, for her guidance, suggestions and considerate review of this thesis.

Doç. Dr. Falih Köksal, for his help and careful review of this thesis.

Prof. Giovanni Chimienti, for his help in the analyses.

Doç. Dr. Banu Ö. Küsefoğlu, for facilitating access to the participants.

Participants in this study, for their presence.

I am also grateful to my wife, Nur, and my family and friends, for their support, understanding and compassion.

ABSTRACT

Attachment styles and their relationship to family environment, anxiety and depression were investigated. A sample consisting of 81 university students provided scores of attachment style (as measured by Adult Attachment Scale), perceived cohesion and control within the family (as measured by Family Environment Questionnaire), anxiety (as measured by Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory) and depression (Beck Depression Inventory). As avoidance and ambivalence scores were very close in a considerable number of cases, these were collapsed into a single category of insecurity. Thus, in the analyses, the attachment quality variable had two levels, secure and insecure. The results indicated significant differences in terms of mean anxiety and depression scores between secure and insecure groups; insecure group scored higher in both variables, as it was hypothesized. In terms of perceived cohesion, a tendency for the secure group to score higher than the insecure group and in terms of control, a tendency to score lower than the insecure group were detected in the hypothesized direction. Male and female participants were not found to differ with respect to any of these variables.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada bağlanma tarzları ile aile ortamı, kaygı ve depresyon arasındaki ilişki araştırılmıştır. Örneklemi oluşturan 81 üniversite öğrencisinin bağlanma tarzları, Yetişkin Bağlanma Ölçeği; aile ortamını algılama şekilleri, Aile Ortamı Envanteri; kaygı seviyeleri, Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Ölçeği ve depresyon seviyeleri, Beck Depresyon Envanteri kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Kaçınma ve ambivalans puanlarının kişilerin önemli bir bölümünde birbirlerine çok yakın olmaları nedeniyle, bu iki kategori birleştirilerek tek bir güvensiz bağlanma kategorisi oluşturulmuştur. Bu şekilde araştırmaya katılan kişiler bağlanma tarzı açısından ikiye ayrılmışlardır: güvenli ve güvensiz. İki grup arasında, kurulmuş olan hipotezlere uygun olarak, kaygı ve depresyon puanlarında istatistiksel açıdan anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur; güvensiz olarak sınıflandırılmış grubun her iki puanı da daha yüksek çıkmıştır. Kurulan hipotezlerle aynı yönde olmak üzere, aile içinde algılanan birliktelik/paylaşım açısından, güvenli olarak tanımlanan grup diğer gruba göre daha yüksek bir ortalama puan, aile içinde algılanan kontrol açısından ise, daha düşük bir ortalama puan almışlardır. Ancak bu farklar, istatistiksel açıdan anlamlı bir düzeyin altında kalmışlardır. Cinsiyete bağlı herhangi bir farklılık gözlenmemiştir.

" Why is it, then, that they live ... with so much greater difficulty and, in the process, suffer more feelings of unpleasure, anxiety and pain ?... The determining cause of all the forms taken by human mental life, is, indeed, to be sought in the reciprocal action between innate dispositions and accidental experiences." Sigmund Freud (1940).

Introduction

The primary aim of this study was to examine the relationship between attachment styles and the anxiety and depression levels as well as the perception of family environment.

The family (or any environment having the same or similar function within which the child develops) and especially the primary caregiver are considered as a principal origin in modelling the child's personality which, in turn, constitutes the adult's personality (Freud, 1964); the conclusion that psychological problems encountered during adult life are rooted in the childhood, logically follows. This may, in a way, be similar to the "primacy effect" (i.e., in impression formation, the tendency for initial information to carry more weight than information received later; Reber, 1995). Freud suggested that individuals repeated their infantile attachments and conflicts in their adult relationships to others (Sandler, Dare & Holder, 1993).

Principal elements of attachment theory were developed, as a general theory of personality formation, mainly by Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) and Ainsworth (e.g., 1985 a, b) with a specific focus on the development of affectional bonds in infancy. Bowlby (1969) initially emphasized the importance of proximity to a caregiver in terms of the child's survival and security. Later, the emphasis in

attachment theory shifted from the physical proximity to the security the child feels (Ainsworth, 1985, a).

According to Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980), attachment system remains active throughout the life span, i.e., the aim of obtaining felt security via nearness to a special and chosen other and the affective results of the failure to attain the aim persist throughout life: " Attachment behavior is held to characterize human beings from the cradle to the grave " (Bowlby, 1977; p. 203). Bowlby has suggested that working models of attachment figures are constructed during early childhood and are likely to configure the individual's construction of following relationships. A fundamental aspect of attachment theory is the concept that the sense of security in any relationship relies on the characteristics of responsiveness sensed with the attachment figure (West, Rose & Sheldon-Keller, 1994). According to Bowlby (1973), "when an individual is confident that an attachment figure will be available to him whenever he desires it, that person will be much less prone to either intense or chronic fear than an individual who for any reason has no such confidence" (p. 202). Hence, a relation of affect and attachment can be noticed here.

In fact, Bowlby (1980) argues a link exists between many intense emotions and attachment relationships. For instance, threat of loss, in such relationships, provokes anxiety and the maintenance of a bond constitutes a source of security.

Bowlby assumes that such emotions are "a reflection of the state of a person's affectional bonds" (p. 40) and hence, he argues that the problems in the affectional bonds are mostly related to emotional problems. The development and patterns of attachment behavior that are principally determined by experiences with attachment figures during the individual's childhood affect his or her relationships across life span.

Bowlby's theorizing, in fact, has its roots in psychoanalytic thinking, agreeing with Freud (1964) that an early childhood "drama" constitutes the model for and a root of adult psychopathology. Bowlby (1973) argued that the infant internalizes the relationship patterns between the caregivers and him or herself as "internal working models". Internal working models are central components of the personality, organizing thoughts, affects, and behaviors relevant to attachment experiences (Bowlby, 1973). These working models determine how the infant interprets and responds to the caregiver's behavior, and later, by generalization, how the individual, as an adult, perceives relationships. Working models may be sensitive to some degree to later experience but they tend to persist once organized.

In the case that caregiver is not sensitive to the child's signals, defensive processes may interfere with appropriate development and functioning of working models in the child. This affects the relationship and influences how a child (or

later an adult) construes attachment relationships.

If parents' working models of attachment relations are distorted by defensive processes, the resulting insensitive behaviors toward their children may interfere with these children's construction of working models (Bowlby, 1973, 1980). This is a plausible explication for intergenerational transmission of insecure attachment relations: the characteristics of initial attachment relationships between the child and the principal caregiver (i.e., usually the mother) seem to play an important role in terms of continuity in infant attachment systems and the attachment style of the infant is projected into the adulthood in the form of intimate relationship styles (Benoit & Parker, 1994; Fogany, Steele & Steele, 1991).

Negative expectations or interpretations of attachment are reinforced because of continuing flaws in accomplishing felt security; this process can be seen as a vicious circle, especially in adults, possibly because of increased inflexibility in time, an observation many clinicians seem to be aware of. The working model's representations are charged affectively and can be viewed as latent but ready to be manifest in present relationships as they by definition have coordinating power. An explicit indication of the effect of working models, according to Bowlby (1977), is the pattern of relationships which are organized by the defensive operations: An anxious attachment style manifests itself as perceiving the attachment relationship

as seeking care (compulsive care seeking) or as giving care (compulsive caregiving). In avoidant style, a lack of confidence in the attachment figure's reliable availability leads to an emphasis on self-sufficiency (compulsive self-reliance) or generalized anger directed toward the attachment figure (generalized anger). Insecure attachment patterns in adults range from close, preoccupied patterns to distant, detached patterns (West et al., 1994). Secure attachment pattern, on the other hand, is characterized by perception of parents as supportive, self-reliance, a sense of trust in others, an ability to co-operate, helpfulness towards others and ability to handle constructively negative emotions (Bowlby, 1977; Cassidy, 1988; Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

Attachment styles have been studied both in children and in adults. Unfortunately, adult studies are virtually retrospective in nature, i.e., adults have been interviewed about their childhood and there are no longitudinal studies, at least up to date, examining attachment styles from childhood to adulthood (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

By using " the strange situation" (a structured laboratory condition which involves an unknown milieu for the infant, the coming of a stranger, two short separations from the mother and two ensuing reunions with her), three infant-caregiver attachment styles has been identified by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and

Wall (1978) as avoidant, secure, and ambivalent. Securely attached children greet their mothers upon the mother's return following a separation and want closeness when they are tense, and get calm easily. Ambivalent infants exhibit ambivalent behavior toward their mothers and cannot be comforted when reunited; they are also hypervigilant on their mother's accessibility. Avoidant infants avoid closeness with their mothers when the reunion takes place.

Not unexpectedly, equivalents of 3 infant-caregiver attachment styles identified by Ainsworth et al. - avoidant, secure, and ambivalent - can be found among adolescents and adults and seem to be roughly the same as in infancy (Ainsworth, 1985, b; Collins & Read, 1990), although the nomenclature for adult classification may differ slightly; for instance, The Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan & Main, 1985, as cited in Main, 1991), which is a structured interview consisting of 15 items with an emphasis on early attachment experiences and their effects and influences, classifies adults in the parallel lines to infant attachment styles, as autonomous (i.e., secure), dismissing (anxious/avoidant), preoccupied (anxious/ambivalent); "detached" can also be used for "avoidant" (Ainsworth, 1985 a). In order to avoid any confusion about the nomenclature, attachment styles are classified as secure, avoidant and ambivalent throughout this present work. These styles are associated with patterns of feelings in love

relationships, assumptions about romantic love, remembered relationships with parents, and present susceptibility to loneliness (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990). Similar proportions of distribution across three attachment styles (roughly 55% secure, 25% avoidant and 20% ambivalent) for adults and children have also been reported on several instances but no gender differences across these styles have been reliably reported (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Adult styles of love seem to be related to their attachment histories and working models (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Bowlby (1980) suggested discontinuities in parenting or partial and intermittent rejection were likely to constitute the childhood experiences of individuals with ambivalent attachment styles involving hypervigilance around themes of love and rejection. The avoidant attachment style, "assertion of independence of affectional ties" in adulthood, as Bowlby puts it, seems to stem from "the unsympathetic and critical attitude toward the child's natural desires for love, attention and support" (p.224). The avoidant individuals may seem to be self-reliant but feel isolated and unloved (Bowlby, 1980). The relevance of the mother-child relationship for the later development of the child is, therefore, evident: it is important for children to experience the presence of an attachment figure sensitive to their needs in order to develop felt security.

When interviewed about their childhood experiences, securely attached adults were usually found to be considerate, to appreciate attachment experiences and relationships, and to freely examine the effects past experiences have had on their growth. They tend to give balanced, noncontradictory descriptions of one or both parents as loving during childhood. Individuals classified as avoidant, however, were found to reject attachment experiences as inconsequential in inspiring their personal growth and their approach to their own children; they also tend to assert that they cannot recall early events. What they do recall usually opposes or fails to support their usually idealized report of early experiences. In contrast, individuals classified as ambivalent are often confused about their early experiences and relationships with their family; they rarely have difficulty remembering early events but have difficulty presenting a coherent and concise account of childhood experiences. They may still be dependent upon their parents and want to please them immoderately. Some ambivalent individuals may still be highly angry with their parents (Benoit & Parker, 1994).

As one considers the early relationship between the child and the caregiver as a critical factor in terms of attachment styles, the family then becomes a crucial study sphere. For instance, avoidant attachment seems to be the result of a family environment within which expression of affection and attachment behavior are

devalued as they are likely to be perceived as signs of weakness. Inhibition of attachment behavior and "bottling up of feelings", to use Bowlby's (1980) expression, follows; "Instead of being permitted to share occasional fear, unhappiness and grief, an individual treated thus is driven in on himself to bear his sorrows alone" (p.228). At that point, anxious and depressive affects can be related to attachment styles. " Anxiety ... itself needs no description, everyone has personally experienced this sensation, or to speak more correctly this affective condition, at some time or other....one thing is certain, that the problem of anxiety is a nodal point, linking up all kinds of most important questions: a riddle of which the solution must cast a flood of light upon our whole mental life " Freud wrote in 1917 (1963, p.392). This must also hold for depression. The roots of these frequent mental states may be found in the attachment styles which should originate from family environment, if Bowlby's claims on a link between emotions and attachment, as already cited, are taken into account.

Studying attachment styles and their relationship to family dynamics with related symptomatology as depression and anxiety levels in Turkey where, as Usluer (1989) pointed out in her work on the Turkish Family Environment Questionnaire (FEQ), there are few studies "...on the psychological composition of the family, its psychodynamics, and interpersonal atmosphere, known as the

family environment", would be meaningful.

It has been cited on many instances that Turkish culture is basically traditional, although a pattern of change towards modernization seems to exist (e.g., Fişek, 1982, Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992, Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996). Related to these factors, Turkish family, as Fişek (1982) puts it, is subject to a rapid process of social change, but again, the relationships are largely determined by familial and relational merits and depend on mutual support and loyalty. This is a "culture of relatedness", as Kağıtçıbaşı sees it, (1985, 1987, 1990, as cited in Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992) within which "the children would grow up with a clear idea of their place in their family and the world" (Fişek, 1982, p.317): Belongingness is more important than individuality. Fişek argues that unless compatibility between social context and family system is disrupted (via social change), it would remain "functional and healthy".

In Turkish culture, child-rearing practices seem to be authoritarian in nature, stressing control and discipline. External control, rather than internal control, is favored; autonomy is generally frowned upon, whereas obedience, conformity and dependence tend to be highly prized; in fact, obedience was found to be the most desirable quality in children whereas self-reliance and independence to be the least (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982, 1984, 1996, Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). However, control and

emotional closeness seem to coexist within the Turkish family; hence, as Kağıtçıbaşı and Sunar argue, the child may not perceive control as rejection.

However, it must be kept in mind that generalizations about Turkish family have to be done with caution because of the range of differentiations within the society and rapid social changes (Fişek, 1982, Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1994); on the other hand, these generalizations may serve as starting points for research projects, as Fişek asserts.

Given these patterns of the Turkish culture and family, one may be inclined to question the applicability of attachment theory. This constitutes a major point in this study. If attachment theory is again alluded to, what Bowlby terms as "deviation" refers to the failure in achieving secure attachment. These deviations are, it must be recalled, the result of negative experiences in the family. Negative experiences, according to Bowlby, consist of parent-figures' response patterns to the child's longing for affection and care. Accordingly, the individual's attachment behavior becomes organized. Hence, the environment within which the individual initially faces life and constructs his or her own interpretations of attachment in a strict sense, and of life, in a general sense, accordingly seems to be crucial. In short, an attempt to study how individuals with different attachment styles perceive their family environments and whether depression and anxiety levels of these

individuals differ would be meaningful, first as a possible confirmation of attachment theory in general and second, as an inquiry into the applicability of this theory in Turkey, with a culture of "relatedness", as Kağıtçıbaşı sees it.

Thus, this present study is an attempt to unveil, at least, some of the underlying processes.

The present study and the related hypotheses are presented following a literature review on attachment styles, family environment and their relation to depression and anxiety.

Review of the Literature

Theoretically, the failure of an attachment figure in providing a secure base or comfort for the child is presumed to cause anxiety and anger (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1980). Different strategies are used to handle these affects: avoidant pattern seems to use a strategy of cutting off anger and anxiety related affective expressions in order to reduce conflict with attachment figures who are insensitive and rejecting (Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Lutkenhaus et al., 1985). As Fogany et al. (1991) put it, " their current state of mind ... is variously characterized by ... cognitive formulations divorced from affect" (p.892). The ambivalent style of attachment, in contrast, appears to involve intensified expressions of distress (Simpson, 1990; Kobak & Sceery, 1988), not due to rejection and insensitivity as it is the case for avoidant style of attachment but due to inconsistency in the caregiver's availability and supportiveness during early childhood. This inconsistency seems to cause a low threshold for arousal of anxiety, which, in turn, may interfere with the ability to maintain self-confidence (Ainsworth, 1985 a; Kobak & Sceery, 1988). These individuals can be viewed as more overtly anxious and less self-confident than individuals conceptualized as having avoidant style of attachment (Sroufe, 1988).

The strategies used to manage tension related to attachment issues and to

control affect, by generalization, in any disturbing or challenging situation, have been found to be affected by attachment working models (Kobak & Sceery, 1988, Mikulincer, Florian & Tolmacz, 1990). Kobak and Sceery (1988) found that securely attached college students were less anxious and less hostile and managed negative feelings in a more constructive manner than did those exhibiting either the ambivalent or avoidant styles. Kobak and Sceery (1988) also outlined the characteristic ways of affect regulation ambivalent and avoidant individuals exhibit: Individuals with ambivalent pattern of attachment tend to potentiate negative feelings by directing attention toward distress in a hypervigilant style. As Main et al. (1985) put it, they have free access to confused and negative affects and memories related to their attachment experiences in childhood, which constantly produce high conscious levels of anxiety and distress; these negative affects are transformed into separation anxiety and worry about being rejected and deserted, leading to dependent relationships that fail to reduce anxiety (Bowlby, 1973). Avoidant individuals, in contrast, tend to regulate negative feelings by obstructing the acknowledgment of distress and employing what Bowlby (1973) identifies as compulsive self reliance. The characteristics of such a strategy are emphasis in autonomy and self-reliance, rejection of the importance of attachment relations, maintenance of distance from attachment figures, and an inhibiting display of

negative emotions (Bowlby, 1973; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Main et al., 1985). In this way, the avoidant individual diverts the worry of social rejection from consciousness, restricting it to lower levels of awareness (Mikulincer et al., 1990). An interesting finding to note here is from a Spangler and Grossmann (1993) study of biobehavioral organizations of secure and insecure infants. Using cardiac measures as indication of emotional arousal, Spangler and Grossman found that although avoidant infants exhibited low levels of distress following separation from their mothers in a Strange Situation, they had similar arousal patterns to secure infants.

When we move from infancy research to adult research, a prevalent trend has been considering adult "romantic" relationships as attachment operations. For instance, Hazan and Shaver (1987) conceptualized romantic love as an attachment process, " ... just as affectional bonds are formed earlier in life between human infants and their parents" (p.511) while they have developed a questionnaire of Adult Attachment Types based on the three attachment styles in infancy, namely avoidant, secure and ambivalent styles. Hazan and Shaver found that adults' distribution across the three attachment styles was similar to children's distribution in Strange Situation, adults' attachment styles are related to the way romantic love is experienced. Trust, friendship and happiness were reported as relationship

characteristics of secure adults.

Simpson (1990) found ambivalent and avoidant styles to be associated with more negative emotions in a romantic relationship as compared to secure style of attachment. The secure attachment style was also associated with commitment, satisfaction, trust and relationship interdependence.

As a general trend, then, secure pattern in adults seems to be related to more satisfactory relation patterns as compared to insecure patterns.

Lutkenhaus, Grossmann and Grossmann (1985), following the attachment style assessment at 12 months, found that at age 3 years, securely attached children interacted faster and more smoothly with a stranger who visited them in their homes. These children also increased their efforts following a failure-feedback after a competitive game whereas the insecurely attached children decreased their efforts. Following the failing, the securely attached children inclined to display their sadness more openly than insecurely attached children.

In sum, social competence and expression and management of affect is likely to be related to attachment patterns.

Mikulincer et al. (1990), starting from the premise that the idea of personal death is a general source of anxiety for most individuals, found that insecure individuals scored higher in the anxiety and centrality of death scales than did

secure subjects. They also found that ambivalent subjects had higher levels of overt fear of death when compared to secure and avoidant subjects. However, both ambivalent and avoidant subjects had higher levels of fear of death at a low level of awareness (i.e., unconsciously) when compared to secure subjects, a finding that hints at the differences of defensive processes across attachment patterns.

In a similar vein, Mikulincer and Orbach (1995) studied repressive defensiveness across three attachment styles among Israeli university students. Secure subjects were found to report moderate levels of defensiveness and low levels of anxiety. They also had access to memories of early personal experiences of anxiety, sadness and anger without difficulty and without being overwhelmed by these. On the other hand, ambivalent subjects reported high levels of anxiety, although they also accessed negative memories easily, they were unable to repress negative affects and were overwhelmed by these. Avoidant subjects also reported high levels of anxiety, but they had high levels of defensiveness and exhibited low levels of access to negative memories.

Mikulincer, Florian and Weller (1993) studied coping strategies following distress (a missile attack during the Gulf War) across attachment styles among Israeli university students. Ambivalent subjects were found to be more distressed when compared to secure subjects and to use more emotion-focused strategies.

Avoidant subjects, on the other hand, were found to have higher levels of somatization, hostility and avoidance related to distress when compared to secure subjects and to use more distancing strategies. Additionally, secure subjects were found to use more support-seeking strategies in coping with the distress.

Crowell, O'Connor, Wollmers, and Sprafkin (1991) found that the child's self-reported anxiety and depression levels were negatively associated with secure style of attachment and positively with insecure styles of attachment. The secure children (aged 5-11 years) were also reported to be more competent and low in psychological symptomatology compared to children with insecure styles of attachment. It is, however, necessary to note an exception to these findings; Fagot and Kavanagh (1990), in their study on the predictability of antisocial behaviors based on attachment styles, compared secure and avoidant infants and found no significant difference between these two groups in terms of maladjustment.

Another study in the similar line (but using college students as subjects) resulted with comparable findings: Secure college students were rated as less anxious, less hostile and more ego resilient by their peers as compared to insecure college students. The secure group also reported less distress and higher social support (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

In short, anxiety and related affects seem to be associated with insecure

styles of attachment rather than secure style, in accord with the predictions of attachment theory. The ways affects are dealt with also differs across attachment styles.

The correlation between insecure styles of attachment and depression has been suggested on numerous instances (e.g. Brewin, Firth-Cozens, Furnham & McManus, 1992; Carnelley, Pietromonaco & Jaffe, 1994; Cassidy, 1988; Sroufe, 1988): Individuals with insecure style of attachment report having more negative self-concepts, experiencing lower levels of satisfaction and higher levels of conflict in their intimate relationships. This is, in fact, an unsurprising finding when inner working models of individuals who have experienced unavailability or rejection are taken into account. Hortaçsu, Oral and Cesur (1993), with a Turkish sample of parent and institution-reared children, found depression to be negatively correlated with secure attachment and positively correlated with avoidant and ambivalent attachment. They also found that avoidant attachment was predicting depression better than secure and ambivalent attachment styles.

Collins and Read (1990) having developed an 18-item Adult Attachment Scale consisting of three 6-item subscales measuring secure, avoidant and ambivalent styles, based on Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Adult Attachment Style measure found secure individuals having a more positive view of themselves than

did insecure individuals.

Parents (and especially the mother) have been a focal point in attachment research. As it was stated earlier, responsiveness and sensitivity of the parents to the infant's attachment signals and their availability in stressful occasions are argued to supply the infant with a secure base on which emotional experience is organized and stress is handled. Infants of parents who are responsive to their attachment signals, compared with infants of nonresponsive parents, react with less fear, hostility, and avoidance behaviors to separation situations and show more exploratory behavior (Ainsworth, 1985 a). This behavior pattern signifies infants' attachment security in their caregivers, which has been found to be associated with more positive affect, less fear in new situations, better problem solving during toddler age and more ego resiliency in preschool settings (Sroufe, 1983).

Secure style of attachment was found to be correlated with less intrusiveness of the caregivers during childhood (Belsky & Isabella, 1988); those caregivers also had higher levels of general self-esteem when compared to caregivers of insecure children (Lyons-Ruth, Connell, Grunebaum, Botein & Zoll, 1984; cited in Belsky & Isabella, 1988). Secure style of attachment was also found to be associated with more nurturance, more understanding, more autonomy, less aggression, more interest, appreciation of physical sensation, responsiveness to

stimuli, display of little tendency to dominate others or self-centeredness of the caregivers (Maslin & Bates, 1983, as cited in Belsky & Isabella, 1988) as compared to the caregivers of children with insecure style of attachment.

Insecure attachment was found to be more pervasive in institution-reared children (separated from parents at early age) as compared to children from two-parent families (Hortaçsu et al., 1993).

Hazan and Shaver (1987) studied the relationship between adult love relationships and early parent-child interactions. Secure individuals reported their parents as more respectful and accepting than did ambivalent or avoidant adults.

As Benoit and Parker (1994) found out, given mother's attachment style classification during pregnancy, the child's attachment style can be predicted in 81% of the cases one year later. Furthermore, mother's attachment style as measured during pregnancy also predicts 75% of grandmother's attachment style classification. Moreover, mother's attachment style has been found to be stable over a year in 90% of the cases. Similarly, Fogany, Steele and Steele (1991) found that mother's representations of attachment during pregnancy predicted in 75% of the cases the child's attachment style as secure or insecure at a 1-year follow-up. Usually, secure adults have securely attached children; avoidant adults have avoidant infants; ambivalent adults have ambivalent infants (Main, 1991). In a

similar line, Zimmermann, Fremmer-Bombik, Spangler and Grossmann (1995) found that mothers' attachment representations as measured 10 years earlier predicted their adolescent children's attachment representations. A point must be made here on the continuity of attachment styles as Zimmermann et al. put it. According to their evaluation, this continuity can be shown from infancy to childhood at a behavioral level (i.e., observed) and from childhood to adolescence, at a representational level (i.e., reported).

As a transitional conclusion, it is clear that the family, and hence the general family environment, must have a critical function in the development of attachment styles of the children who will, in time, become adults with internal working models that effects the way relationships are perceived and processed.

The family environment can be defined as the interpersonal atmosphere in the family structure with respect to its relationships and organizational features (Moos, 1974; cited in Usluer, 1989; Fowler, 1980). Two important dimensions of the family environment, as measured by FEQ (Turkish standardization by Usluer, 1989), are cohesion (sense of belongingness and expression of feelings within the family, the degree of concern and support among family members for each other) and organization-control (family rules, rigidity of family order and organization within the family). Lower levels of cohesion are correlated with anxiety and

depression whereas higher levels of cohesion are found to be correlated with positive self-concept. Higher levels of control are associated with strict discipline, rigidity, conflict and lack of communication within the family (Usluer, 1988).

Usluer (1989), following her review of literature, concluded that a better psychological development was a likely outcome of a cohesive, expressive family milieu featuring independence and only moderate amounts of control. Higher levels of self-esteem, extraversion, lower levels of psychological problems tend to characterize the children and adolescents within these families whereas higher levels of anxiety, depression and introversion with lower levels of self-esteem tend to be the result of a more controlling and less cohesive family environment.

Lower levels of cohesion and higher levels of control were found to be associated with anxiety, anger and hostility (Farber, Felner & Primera, 1985). Families stressing cohesion are more likely to have assertive and self-sufficient children (Forman & Forman, 1981; cited in Usluer, 1989).

To sum up, family environment seems to be related to the psychological health. It can also be related in theoretically meaningful ways to inner working models as their core lies in the family environment.

Some additional studies may contribute to this point. For instance, Crowell and Feldman (1988) studied secure, avoidant and ambivalent mothers' interactions

with their preschoolers by assigning a task which involves tool-using. Secure mothers were found to be supportive and their contributions were helpful and clear while avoidant mothers appeared cold and distant, centering their attention on the finishing of the task. Ambivalent mothers were found to be warm and kind sometimes but they were also forcible, angry, and confused, hence, their responsiveness was unpredictable.

Consistent with these results, Crowell et al. (1991) found secure mothers supportive and well organized with their children, whereas insecure mothers were found to be unsupportive and distant. In a similar line, avoidant college students reported lower levels of social support from their families compared to ambivalent college students (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

As a final and overall conclusion, the studies mentioned above suggest a positive association between secure attachment style and family cohesion. A positive association between insecure styles and anxiety, depression and high levels of perceived control with low levels of perceived cohesion within the family can also be suggested following these studies.

Rationale of the Study and the Hypotheses

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between attachment styles, anxiety, depression and perceived family environment.

The hypotheses that will be tested are:

- 1) The mean depression score of the individuals classified as having insecure style of attachment (avoidant and ambivalent styles) will be significantly higher than the mean depression score of the individuals classified as having secure style of attachment.
- 2) The mean trait anxiety score of subjects classified as having insecure style of attachment will be significantly higher than the mean trait anxiety scores of subjects classified as having secure style of attachment. The mean trait anxiety score of subjects classified as having ambivalent style of attachment will be significantly lower than the mean anxiety scores of subjects classified as having avoidant style of attachment.
- 3) The mean control subscore on FEQ for the subjects classified as insecure will be significantly higher than the subjects classified as secure.

4) The mean cohesion subscore on FEQ for the subjects classified as secure will be significantly higher than the subjects classified as insecure. More specifically, the mean cohesion subscore for the subjects classified as having ambivalent style of attachment is expected to be significantly higher than the mean cohesion subscore of the subjects classified as having avoidant style of attachment.

Method

Participants

Eighty-four Bogazici University students from first year introductory psychology courses (41 females, mean age = 19.41 years and 43 males, mean age = 19.39 years) volunteered to participate. Three subjects were discarded from analysis because of missing data. All participants had an extra credit added to their grades in the introductory psychology course.

Instruments

Adult Attachment Scale (AAS). AAS is a Likert-type 18-item self-report scale developed by Collins and Read (1990) from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Attachment Style Measure. It assesses adult attachment styles, namely avoidant, secure and ambivalent styles by means of three factors (Depend, Anxiety and Close). In terms of internal consistency of AAS, Cronbach's alpha were found to be .69 (Close), .72 (Anxiety) and .75 (Depend). Test-retest correlations were .52 (Anxiety), .71 (Depend) and .68 (Close) for a 2-month period (Collins and Read, 1990). AAS has been translated into Turkish by I.Ercan Alp. Turkish standardization of AAS is currently being carried out by I. Ercan Alp in the Department of Psychology, Bogazici University. The Turkish version utilized in

this present research uses items from the above cited factors to form the three attachment subscales (secure, avoidant and anxious/ambivalent), i.e. all avoidance items in Depend, Anxiety and Close factors are collected as an avoidance subscale consisting of six items. The same procedure is used for security and anxiety/ambivalence subscales, each consisting of six items as well, totalling to a 18-item questionnaire. On each subscale, the possible range of scores is between 6 as the minimum and 24 as the maximum, each item with a response potential between 1 (total disagreement with the item) and 4 (total agreement with the item) (see appendix B). Higher scores indicate concordance with the patterns of attachment style each subscale is supposed to measure.

The Family Environment Questionnaire (FEQ). The FEQ, developed by Fowler (1980), is a Likert-type 30-item self-report instrument (Usluer, 1989). It assesses the structure within the family on two magnitudes: Cohesion (the degree of concern and support among family members for each other) and organization-control (family rules, rigidity of family order and organization within the family) Turkish standardization (Usluer, 1989) consists of 26 items with alpha values of .82 (cohesion subscale, 16 items) and .74 (organization-control subscale, 10 items) Test-retest correlations ranged between .61 and .73 for a period of one to three weeks. Construct validity of the FEQ was assessed with factor analysis, with factor

1 (cohesion) and factor 2 (organization-control) accounting together for 33.4 % of the total FEQ score variance (Usluer, 1989).

The Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). STAI, developed by Spielberger (1970) is a Likert-type 40-item self-report instrument, consisting of 20 items for assessing level of anxiety in situational contexts and another 20 items for assessing general level of anxiety. Turkish standardization of STAI was carried out by Öner and LeCompte (1981). Internal consistency of STAI, as measured with K-R 20, gave alpha coefficients ranging between .83 and .87 (Trait anxiety) and .94 and .96 (State anxiety). Test-retest reliability coefficients ranged between .71 and .86 (Trait anxiety) and .26 and .68 (State Anxiety) over 10 to 365 day intervals (Öner & LeCompte, 1985).

The Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). BDI is a Likert-type 21-item self-report inventory developed by Beck (1978) in order to measure the level of depression (Turkish adaptation by Hisli, 1988, as cited in Hortaçsu et al., 1993). Test-retest reliability coefficients of the Turkish version range between .74 and .86 and Hisli (as cited in Usluer, 1989) reports correlations of .63 between BDI and MMPI Depression Subscale (MMPI-D), .55 between BDI and the Trait Anxiety Scale of the STAI as indication of construct validity.

Procedure

Students were invited to participate in a questionnaire study via participation lists posted on the bulletin board of the Department of Psychology. Participation lists included different dates and rooms in order to render the study more accessible for participants and announced that each participant would get an extra credit added to his or her final grade in the introductory psychology course. The study was also announced by introductory psychology instructors during class hours. A total of eight scale-administration sessions, each consisting of a 30-minute period, were held in four consecutive days. Before the administration of the scales instructions were given in Turkish (see Appendix A for instructions). The questionnaires (see Appendix B) were administered in the following order: AAS, BDI, FEQ, State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety Inventories (State Anxiety Inventory was administered for underlining the difference between anxiety level at that time and general anxiety level and hence it is excluded from further analysis).

A participation list titled as "Extra Credit List for PSY 101", consisting of a single blank sheet of paper was also given during each session and each participant has written down his or her name, course section and student number.

Results

In this section, first the classification into attachment groups will be presented. Next, results of the multivariate analysis of variance on anxiety, depression, cohesion and control scores as a function of attachment style and sex will be given.

Descriptive analyses of avoidance, security, ambivalence, trait anxiety, Beck Depression Inventory, cohesion and control scores were conducted are presented in Table 1. Note that three subjects were dropped out because of missing data.

Classification of the subjects into attachment groups

Classification of the subjects into attachment groups caused some problems from the beginning, especially for two groups of insecure attachment (namely into avoidant and ambivalent groups). As it can be inferred from Table 1, the mean scores for attachment styles are close, especially for the ambivalence and avoidance scores. A first attempt for classification consisted of using scores above 15 on any one of the subscales (which corresponds to a general tendency to agree with the items; as cited before, scores in any attachment subscale range from 6 to 24) and classifying the individual as belonging to that group if the other two scores were below 10 (which corresponds to a general tendency to disagree with the items). This approach suffered from redundant effects caused by missing cells: only

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on all the Variables for the Entire Sample.

Variables	Entire Sample n=81	Females n=39	Males n=42
Avoidance	12.95 (2.66)	13.15 (2.61)	12.76 (2.73)
Security	14.43 (3.00)	13.97 (2.71)	14.85 (3.21)
Ambivalence	12.43 (3.51)	12.48 (3.61)	12.38 (3.47)
Trait Anxiety	47.18 (8.52)	49.51 (8.42)	45.02 (8.13)
BDI	16.37 (8.56)	18.00 (8.69)	14.85 (8.25)
Cohesion	44.13 (7.80)	44.66 (8.14)	43.64 (7.53)
Control	24.01 (5.36)	24.15 (5.65)	23.88 (5.14)

Note. The first values represent mean scores and the second values in parenthesis represent standard deviations.

7 subjects (1 female and 6 males) could be classified as securely attached, none as

avoidant and one female subject as ambivalent. When the criteria was rendered less conservative by using 12 instead of 10 as a cutting point, the sample size turned out to be 26, but again suffered from similar problems: one female subject could be classified as avoidant, two as ambivalent. 9 females and 14 males could be classified as secure. When median scores on the three attachment subscales were attempted to be used as cut-off points, the sample size was reduced to twenty-four, 4 subjects could be classified as avoidant (2 females, 2 males), another 16 as secure (6 females, 10 males) and 4 as ambivalent (3 females, 1 male), making any further analysis virtually impossible.

The following method has therefore been used in the transformation of the data: For each subject, the mean of the avoidance and ambivalence scores was calculated and used as a single insecurity score for further analyses. Medians of security and insecurity scores were calculated. Subjects with security scores above the median and insecurity scores below the median were classified as secure and those with insecurity scores above the median and security scores below the median were classified as insecure. Following this procedure, the secure group consisted of 30 subjects and the insecure group consisted of 30 subjects. Hence, it was not possible to test second parts of the hypotheses involving comparisons between the two insecure subclasses. From the original sample of 84, 3 cases were left out

because of missing data and 21 cases (the excluded group) consisting of 13 females and 8 males were left out because of out of range scores which did not satisfy the above cited criteria for inclusion into the secure or insecure categories.

The hypothesis testing was carried out on 60 subjects (30 females and 30 females). Means and standard deviations of trait anxiety, BDI, cohesion and control scores for secure, insecure and excluded groups were calculated and are presented in Table 2. Means and standard deviations of avoidance, security and ambivalence scores for each group were also calculated and are given in Table 3.

Analysis of the data for the reduced sample

A multivariate analysis of variance of trait anxiety, BDI, cohesion and control scores as a function of attachment style and sex was carried out. Both Sex X Attachment interaction and the main effect for sex failed to reach statistical significance ($F(4,53) = 2.50, p > .05$ and $F = .50, p > .05$ respectively). There was, however, a significant main effect of attachment (i.e., group), $F(4,53) = 4.25, p < .01$. When the univariate analyses were examined, two of four were reached statistical significance: Trait anxiety ($F(1,56) = 10.07, p < .005$) and depression ($F(1,56) = 13.60, p < .005$). The insecure group scored higher in terms of anxiety and depression when compared to the secure group. The two groups did no differ significantly in terms of cohesion and control, although the

secure group tended to score higher in terms of cohesion, $F = 3.27$, $p = .076$ but lower in terms of control, $F = 3.34$, $p = .073$.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Trait Anxiety, BDI, Cohesion and Control Scores Obtained by Attachment Groups and Excluded Group.

Variables	Attachment Groups		Excluded Group
	Secure	Insecure	
Trait Anxiety	43.13 (8.72)	50.46 (8.11)	48.28 (6.52)
BDI	12.23 (7.87)	20.36 (8.15)	16.57 (7.57)
Cohesion	45.90 (6.67)	42.90 (7.66)	43.38 (9.27)
Control	23.06 (5.85)	25.30 (5.03)	23.52 (4.94)

Note. The first values represent mean scores and the second values in parenthesis represent standard deviations.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Scores for Attachment Groups and Excluded Groups.

Variables	Attachment Groups		Excluded Group
	Secure	Insecure	
Avoidance	10.90 (1.52)	14.83 (2.04)	13.20 (2.71)
Security	17.03 (1.65)	11.60 (2.11)	14.76 (1.81)
Ambivalence	9.87 (2.22)	14.67 (2.95)	12.90 (3.47).

Note. The first values present mean scores and the second values in parenthesis represent standard deviations. Secure group consists of 30 subjects (12 females and 18 males), insecure group consists of 30 subjects (14 females and 16 males) and excluded group consists of 21 subjects (13 females and 8 males).

Discussion

The aim of this study was to explore the relationship between attachment style on one hand and perceived family environment, depression and anxiety on the other.

1 The first hypothesis anticipated that subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment would have a significantly higher mean score in terms of depression than those classified as having secure type of attachment. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance of anxiety, depression, control and cohesion scores as a function of attachment style and sex indicated that there was a significant difference between secure and insecure groups in terms of mean depression scores. The group of subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment reported being more depressed than the group of subjects classified as having secure type of attachment.

2 The second hypothesis predicted that the mean trait anxiety score of the group of subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment would be significantly higher than that of the group of subjects classified as having secure type of attachment. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of anxiety scores. The group of subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment had a higher mean anxiety score than the

group of subjects classified as having secure type of attachment.

The third hypothesis stated that the group of subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment would score significantly higher than the group of subjects classified as having secure type of attachment in terms of mean control scores. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between two groups in terms of perceived control within the family, but a tendency for such a difference was detected in the expected direction.

The fourth hypothesis stated that the group of subjects classified as having insecure type of attachment would score significantly lower than the group of subjects classified as having secure type of attachment in terms of mean cohesion scores. The result indicated that there were no significant differences between two groups in terms of perceived cohesion within the family but a tendency for such a difference was detected in the expected direction.

In sum, the results indicated that individuals categorized as securely attached scored significantly lower than individuals categorized as insecurely attached in terms of mean depression and trait anxiety scores. Although no significant differences were found between the two groups in terms of mean cohesion and control scores, trends for such a difference were detected. Secure subjects tended to score higher than insecure subjects in terms of mean cohesion scores and

insecure subjects tended to score higher than secure subjects in terms of mean control scores. As stated earlier, the second parts of the second and fourth hypotheses involving comparisons between the insecure subgroups could not be tested as the scores for ambivalence and avoidance were similar in a considerable number of cases.

As a global conclusion, it can be assumed that general tenets of the attachment theory are also valid in Turkey; securely and insecurely attached individuals differ in their self-reports of anxiety and depression. They also tend to perceive cohesion and control within family differently, although these differences failed to reach an acceptable level of statistical significance. Hence, an individual's attachment style may be argued to affect the way he or she feels and possibly tend to affect the way he or she perceives his or her family.

An important caveat is that the scales employed in this study to assess attachment styles have not yet been validated in Turkish samples. This study was, in fact, carried out as part of a larger project launched for this purpose by I. Ercan Alp. Therefore, the above conclusions must be at best treated as tentative.

Moreover, all of the measures employed in the present study were self-report inventories. As Bartholomew (1994) points out, it may be possible that the attachment-style self-report measures may be affected by the current state of the

close (or romantic) relationships. In future studies, it may be wise to also use ratings by peers or others who are familiar with the participants in the study in order to classify them across different attachment styles. It has been found, in one study, that out of 80% of the individuals classified as secure on the basis of self-report inventories, only 50% were rated as so by observers using semi-structured interviews (Bartholomew, 1994). A similar predisposition may also be at work in this study. Furthermore, differences between self-report ratings and observer ratings have been reported in terms of depression as well (Gotlib & Robinson, 1982). This seems to be related, in general, to the nature of self-report inventories.

Another point to be made is on the composition of the sample of this study. The sample consists of nonclinical university students. Depression and anxiety measures seem to be highly correlated in such nonclinical samples, and it has been argued these two could not be differentiated reliably as they must be overlapped (Gotlib, 1984). In this present study, a Pearson's correlation coefficient of .60 ($p < .001$) was calculated for whole sample ($n=81$) and this seems to support Gotlib's argument. Gotlib suggested that BDI and STAI may simply measure "general psychological stress" in college students rather than measuring anxiety and depression separately. If this is also the case for this present study, then the results must be read as follows : The insecure group had significantly higher levels of

general psychological stress. But again, this result is in line with the attachment theory.

It may be mentioned that Endler, Cox, Parker and Bagby (1992) found that depression and anxiety could be differentiated by using BDI with EMAS (Endler Multidimensional Anxiety Scales). Therefore, it would be appropriate to use EMAS in future studies in order to measure anxiety.

Problems encountered in the attempt to classify participants into three attachment categories and failure to obtain significant differences in terms of cohesion and control need to be addressed. One inherent problem may be related to the sample size of this study. Using a larger sample in future studies may help here. A second source of these findings may be related to the dynamics of Turkish family and culture. Fisek (1982), for example, in her analysis of the "typical" Turkish family within a systems theory perspective pointed out that belonging and interdependence were in general emphasized within the family and the likely outcome of the child-rearing practices "is an individual who is dependent, somewhat constricted, externally controlled and lacking autonomy" (p.312). If this is related to the finding that cohesion and control differences between groups failed to reach statistical significance (although a tendency exists), one could argue that cohesion and control may go hand-in-hand in this culture, as it has already been

suggested.

More problematic point, however, is an explanation of the failure of classification into three attachment categories. Whether this is a result of the Turkish cultural context or a measurement question remains a problem to be dealt with in future studies.

As a conclusion, the results of the present study indicate that attachment style of individuals is related to psychological adjustment variables such as anxiety and depression and possibly to perceptions of family environment. As the validity of the scales employed to assess attachment style have not yet been established, these results can only be viewed as tentative at the present time.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985 a). Patterns of infant-mother attachments: Antecedents and effects on development. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 61, 772-791.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985 b). Attachments across the life span. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 61, 792-812.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment; a psychological study of the Strange Situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bartholomew, K. (1994). Assessment of individual differences in adult attachment. Psychological Inquiry, 5, 23-27.
- Belsky, J., & Isabella, R. (1988). Maternal, infant, and social determinants of attachment security. In J. Belsky & T. Nezworski (Eds.), Clinical implications of attachment (pp. 41-94). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Benoit, D., & Parker, K. C. H. (1994). Stability and transmission of attachment across three generations. Child Development, 65, 1444-1456.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. Volume I: Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss. Volume II: Separation, anxiety and anger. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: 1: Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. British Journal of Psychiatry, 130, 201-210.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss. Volume III: Loss, sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books.
- Brewin, C. R., Firth-Cozens, J., Furnham, A., & McManus, C. (1992). Self-criticism in adulthood and recalled childhood experience. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101, 561-566.
- Carnelley, K. B., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others, relationship functioning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 127-140.
- Cassidy, J. (1988). Child-mother attachment and the self in six-year olds. Child Development, 59, 121-134.

- Cassidy, J., & Kobak, R. R. (1988). Avoidance and its relation to other defensive processes. In J. Belsky and T. Nezworski (Eds.), Clinical implications of attachment (pp 300-323). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 644-663.
- Crowell, J., & Feldman, S. (1988). The effects of mothers' internal models of relations and children's developmental and behavioral status on mother-child interactions. Child Development, 59, 1273-1285.
- Crowell, J. A., O'Connor, E., Wollmers, G., & Sprafkin, J. (1991). Mothers' conceptualizations of parent-child relationships: Relation to mother-child interaction and child behavior problems. Special Issue: Attachment and developmental psychopathology [CD-ROM]. Development and Psychopathology, 3, 431-444. Abstract from: SilverPlatter File: PsycLIT Item: 79-31283.
- Endler, N. S., Cox, B. J., Parker, J. D. A., & Bagby, R. M. (1992). Self-reports of depression and state-trait anxiety: Evidence for differential assessment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 832-838.

- Fagot, B. I., & Kavanagh, K. (1990). The prediction of antisocial behavior from avoidant attachment classifications. Child Development, 61, 864-873.
- Farber, S. S., Felner, R. D., & Primera, J. (1985). Parental separation, divorce and adolescents: An examination of factors mediating adaptation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 2.
- Fişek, G. O. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family systems theory analysis. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Sex roles, family and community in Turkey (pp. 295-321). Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Fogany, P., Steele, H., & Steele, M. (1991). Maternal representations of attachment during pregnancy predict the organization of infant-mother attachment at one year of age. Child Development, 62, 891-905.
- Fowler, P. (1980). Family environment and early behavioral development. Psychological Reports, 47, 611-617.
- Freud, S. (1963). Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 16. London: The Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1917).

- Freud, S. (1964). An outline of psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud Vol. 23. London: The Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1940).
- Gotlib, I. H. (1984). Depression and general psychopathology in university students. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 19-30.
- Gotlib, I. H., & Robinson, L. A. (1982). Responses to depressed individuals: Discrepancies between self-report and observer-rated behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91, 231-240.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. Psychological Inquiry, 5, 1-22.
- Hortaçsu, N., Cesur, S., & Oral, A. (1993). Relationships between depression and attachment styles in Turkish parent- and institution-reared children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 154, 329-337.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). Sex roles, value of children and fertility. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Sex roles, family and community in Turkey (pp. 151-180). Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1984). Socialization in traditional society: A challenge to psychology. International Journal of Psychology, 19, 145-157.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). İnsan, aile, kültür (Individual, family, culture) (3rd ed). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Sunar, D. (1994). Family and socialization in Turkey. In I. E. Sigel (Series Ed.) & J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Vol. Eds.), Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures: Annual advances in applied developmental psychology (Vol. 5) (pp. 75-88). NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. Child Development, 59, 135-146.
- Lutkenhaus, P., Grossmann, K. E., & Grossmann, K. (1985). Infant-mother attachment at twelve months and style of interaction with a stranger at the age of three years. Child Development, 56, 1538-1542.
- Main, M. (1991). Metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive monitoring, and singular (coherent) vs. multiple (incoherent) model of attachment: Findings and directions for further research. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde & P. Marris (Eds.), Attachment across the life cycle (pp. 127-159). London:

Routledge.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50 (pp. 66-106), Serial No. 209.

Mikulincer, M., & Orbach, I. (1995). Attachment styles and repressive defensiveness: The accessibility and architecture of affective memories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 917-925.

Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Weller, A. (1993). Attachment styles, coping strategies, and posttraumatic psychological distress: The impact of the Gulf War in Israel. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 817-826.

Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment styles and fear of personal death: A case study of affect regulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 273-280.

Öner, N. , & LeCompte, A. (1985). Süreksiz durumluk / sürekli kaygı envanteri el kitabı (Handbook of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory). Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications.

Reber, A. S. (1995). Dictionary of psychology. London: Penguin.

- Sandler, J., Dare, C., & Holder, A. (1993). The patient and the analyst. London: Karnac Books.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *59*, 971-980.
- Spangler, G., & Grossmann, K. E. (1993). Biobehavioral organization in securely and insecurely attached infants. Child Development, *64*, 1439-1450.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Infant-caregiver attachment and patterns of adaptation in preschool: the roots of maladaptation and competence. In M. Perlmutter (ed.) Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology, Vol. 16 (pp. 41-81). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1988). The role of infant-caregiver attachment in development. In J. Belsky and T. Nezworski (Eds.), Clinical implications of attachment (pp. 18-38). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Usluer, S. (1989). The reliability and the validity of the Turkish Family Environment Questionnaire. Unpublished master's thesis, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- West, M. W., Rose, M. S., & Sheldon-Keller, A. (1994). Assessment of patterns of insecure attachment in adults and application to dependent and schizoid personality disorders. Journal of Personality Disorders, *8*, 249-256.

Zimmermann, P., Fremmer-Bombik, E., Spangler, G., & Grossmann, K. (1995).

Attachment in adolescence: A longitudinal perspective. Poster presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, March 30-April 2, 1995.

Appendix A

“Bu araştırma, ülkemizde gençlerin kendilerini ve ailelerini nasıl değerlendirdikleriyle ilgilidir. Bu amaçla sizlere beşer adet ölçek dağıtıldı. Lütfen herbirinin yönergesini dikkatle okuyarak cevaplandırın. Hiç birinin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur, bu yüzden sizin için en doğrusu hangisiyse onu işaretleyin. Cevaplar kişisel olarak değil, grup bazında değerlendirilecek, bu yüzden lütfen adınızı yazmayın. İlgı ve yardımınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim. Herhangi bir sorunuz varsa lütfen sorun.”

Appendix B

Bu arařtırma, lkemizde genlerin kendilerini ve ailelerini nasıl deęerlendirdikleriyle ilgilidir. Bu amala iliřikte 5 adet lek sunulmaktadır. Her birinin ynergesini dikkatle okuyarak cevaplandırmanızı rica ediyoruz. Cevaplar kiřisel olarak deęil grup bazında deęerlendirileceęi iin leklere adınızı yazmayın. İlgi ve yardımınız iin teřekkr ederiz

ÖLÇEK 1

Adult Att-Scale

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin herbirini dikkatlice okuduktan sonra, herbirinin kendinizi ne kadar iyi tanıttığını dört seçenekten birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz; eğer sizi çok iyi tanıttığını düşünüyorsanız, “Çok doğru (4)” seçeneğini işaretleyiniz. Fakat hiç iyi tanıtmıyorsa “Hiç doğru değil (1)” seçeneğini işaretleyiniz. Diyelim ki şu ifadeyi okudunuz: “İnsan ihtiyacı olduğunda kimseyi bulamaz”. Eğer ihtiyacınız olduğunda kimseyi bulamayacağınızı düşünüyorsanız, o zaman “Çok doğru (4)” seçeneğini işaretlemeniz gerekir. Tam tersine, bu ifadenin sizi hiç tanıtmadığını düşünüyorsanız, o zaman “Hiç doğru değil (1)” seçeneğini işaretlemelisiniz.

1) İnsan, ihtiyacı olduğunda kimseyi bulamaz.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

2) Başkalarına bağımlı olmayı kabullenmek benim için zordur.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

3) Başkalarına bağımlı olmak beni rahatsız etmez.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

4) İnsanlara ihtiyacım olduğunda onları bulabileceğimi biliyorum.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

5) İnsanlara tamamen güvenmek bana zor geliyor.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

6) İhtiyacım olduğu anda birini bulabileceğimden emin değilim.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

7) Terkedileceğim diye pek endişelenmem.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

8) Beraber olduğum kişi (veya kendimi yakın hissettiğim kişi) beni gerçekten sevmiyor diye çoğu zaman kaygılanırım.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

9) İnsanlar bana, benim onların bana yakınlaşmalarını istediğim kadar yakınlaşmaktan çekiniyorlar.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

10) Beraber olduğum kişi (veya kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim kişi) benimle kalmak istemeyecek diye çoğu zaman kaygılanırım.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

11) Birisiyle tamamen kaynaşmak isterim.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

12) Bazen benim onlarla kaynaşmak arzumu insanları ürkütüp kaçırıyor.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

13) İnsanlara yakınlaşmak benim için oldukça kolaydır.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

14) Birisi bana gereğinden fazla yakınlaşacak diye pek kaygılanmam.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

15) İnsanlara yakın olmaktan biraz huzursuzluk duyarım.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

16) Birisi bana aşırı derecede yakınlaştığında tedirgin olurum.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

17) Başkalarının bana bağımlı olması beni rahatsız etmez.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

18) İlişkiye girdiğim (veya kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim) kişiler çoğu zaman beni rahatsız edecek kadar samimi olmak istiyorlar.

1. Hiç doğru değil 2. Biraz doğru 3. Oldukça doğru 4. Çok doğru

ÖLÇEK 2

Aşağıda gruplar halinde bazı cümleler yazılıdır. Her gruptaki cümleleri dikkatle okuyunuz. Bugün dahil, SON 6 AYDIR kendinizi nasıl hissettiğinizi en iyi anlatan cümleyi seçiniz. Seçmiş olduğunuz cümlenin yanındaki numarayı daire içine alınız. Eğer bir grupta durumunuzu tarif eden birden fazla cümle varsa herbirini daire içine alarak işaretleyiniz.

Seçiminizi yapmadan önce her gruptaki cümlelerin hepsini dikkatle okuyunuz.

- 1) 0 Kendimi üzüntülü ve sıkıntılı hissetmiyorum.
 - 1 Kendimi üzüntülü ve sıkıntılı hissediyorum.
 - 2 Hep üzüntülü ve sıkıntılıyım. Bundan kurtulamıyorum.
 - 3 O kadar üzüntülü ve sıkıntılıyım ki artık dayanamıyorum.

- 2) 0 Gelecek hakkında umutsuz ve karamsar değilim.
 - 1 Gelecek hakkında karamsarıyım.
 - 2 Gelecekte beklediğim hiç bir şey yok.
 - 3 Geleceğim hakkında umutsuzum ve sanki hiç bir şey düzelmeyecekmiş gibi geliyor.

- 3) 0 Kendimi başarısız bir insan olarak görmüyorum.
- 1 Çevremdeki birçok kişiden daha çok başarısızlıklarım olmuş gibi hissediyorum.
- 2 Geçmişime baktığımda başarısızlıklarla dolu olduğunu görüyorum.
- 3 Kendimi tümüyle başarısız bir kişi olarak görüyorum.
- 4) 0 Birçok şeyden eskisi kadar zevk alıyorum.
- 1 Eskiden olduğu gibi herşeyden hoşlanmıyorum.
- 2 Artık hiçbirşey bana tam anlamı ile zevk vermiyor.
- 3 Herşeyden sıkılıyorum.
- 5) 0 Kendimi herhangi bir şekilde suçlu hissetmiyorum.
- 1 Kendimi zaman zaman suçlu hissediyorum.
- 2 Çoğu zaman kendimi suçlu hissediyorum.
- 3 Kendimi her zaman suçlu hissediyorum.
- 6) 0 Kendimden memnunum.
- 1 Kendimden pek memnun değilim.
- 2 Kendime çok kızıyorum.
- 3 Kendimden nefret ediyorum.

- 7) 0 Başkalarından daha kötü olduğumu sanmıyorum.
1 Zayıf yanlarım veya hatalarım için kendimi eleştiririm.
2 Hatalarımdan dolayı her zaman kendimi kabahatli bulurum.
3 Her aksilik karşısında kendimi kabahatli bulurum.
- 8) 0 Kendimi öldürmek gibi düşüncelerim yoktur.
1 Zaman zaman kendimi öldürmeyi düşündüğüm oluyor fakat yapmıyorum.
2 Kendimi öldürmek isterdim.
3 Fırsatını bulsam kendimi öldürürüm.
- 9) 0 Her zamankinden fazla içimden ağlamak gelmiyor.
1 Zaman zaman içimden ağlamak geliyor.
2 Çoğu zaman ağlıyorum.
3 Eskiden ağlayabilirdim, şimdi istesem de ağlayamıyorum.
- 10) 0 Şimdi her zaman olduğumdan daha sinirli değilim.
1 Eskisine kıyasla daha kolay kızıyor ya da sinirleniyorum.
2 Şimdi hep sinirliyim.
3 Bir zamanlar beni sinirlendiren şeyler şimdi hiç sinirlendirmiyor.

- 11) 0 Başkaları ile görüşmek, konuşmak isteğimi kaybetmedim.
1 Başkaları ile eskiden daha az konuşmak, görüşmek istiyorum.
2 Başkaları ile konuşmak ve görüşmek isteğimi kaybettim.
3 Hiç kimse ile görüşüp, konuşmak istemiyorum.
- 12) 0 Eskiden olduğu kadar kolay karar verebiliyorum.
1 Eskiden olduğu kadar kolay karar veremiyorum.
2 Karar verirken eskisine kıyasla çok güçlük çekiyorum.
3 Artık hiç karar veremiyorum.
- 13) 0 Aynada kendime baktığımda bir değişiklik görmüyorum.
1 Daha yaşlanmışım ve çirkinleşmişim gibi geliyor.
2 Görünüşümün çok değiştiğini ve daha çirkinleştiğimi hissediyorum.
3 Kendimi çok çirkin buluyorum.
- 14) 0 Eskisi kadar iyi çalışabiliyorum.
1 Bir şeyler yapabilmem için gayret göstermem gerekiyor.
2 Herhangi bir şeyi yapabilmek için kendimi çok zorlamam gerekiyor.
3 Hiçbirşey yapamıyorum.

- 15) 0 Her zamanki gibi iyi uyuyabiliyorum.
1 Eskiden olduđu gibi iyi uyuyamıyorum.
2 Her zamankinden 1-2 saat daha erken uyanıyorum ve tekrar uyuyamıyorum.
3 Her zamankinden çok daha erken uyanıyorum ve tekrar uyuyamıyorum.
- 16) 0 Her zamankinden daha çabuk yorulmuyorum.
1 Her zamankinden daha çabuk yoruluyorum.
2 Yaptığım hemen herşey beni yoruyor.
3 Kendimi hiçbirşey yapamayacak kadar yorgun hissediyorum.
- 17) 0 İştahım her zamanki gibi.
1 İştahım eskisi kadar iyi değil.
2 İştahım çok azaldı.
3 Artık hiç iştahım yok.
- 18) 0 Son zamanlarda kilo vermedim.
1 İki kilodan fazla kilo verdim.
2 Dört kilodan fazla kilo verdim.
3 Altı kilodan fazla kilo verdim.
- Daha az yiyerek kilo vermeye çalışıyorum. Evet Hayır

- 19) 0 Sağlığım beni fazla endişelendirmiyor.
- 1 Ağrı, sancı, mide bozukluğu veya kabızlık gibi rahatsızlıklar beni endişelendiriyor.
- 2 Sağlığım beni endişelendirdiği için başka şeyleri düşünmek zorlaşıyor.
- 3 Sağlığım hakkında o kadar endişeliyim ki başka hiçbir şey düşünemiyorum.
- 20) 0 Son zamanlarda cinsel konulara olan ilgimde bir değişme farketmedim.
- 1 Cinsel konularla eskisinden daha az ilgiliyim.
- 2 Cinsel konularla şimdi çok daha az ilgiliyim.
- 3 Cinsel konulara olan ilgimi tamamen kaybettim.
- 21) 0 Bana cezalandırılmışım gibi gelmiyor.
- 1 Cezalandırılabileceğimi seziyorum.
- 2 Cezalandırılmayı bekliyorum.
- 3 Cezalandırıldığımı hissediyorum.

ÖLÇEK 3

YÖNERGE

Bu anket formunda aileler hakkında 26 ifade yer almaktadır. Sizden istediğimiz, bunların herbirini okuyarak, ailenizi en iyi tanımlayan ifadenin sağındaki şıklardan uygun olanını işaretlemenizdir. Bazı ifadeleri cevaplamak sizin için zor olabilir. Bu tür ifadelerle karşılaştığınız zaman karar verebilmek için, size yakın gelen şıkkı işaretleyiniz. Burada öğrenmek istediğimiz ailenizi nasıl gördüğünüzdür (algıladığınızdır). Ailenizden diğer kişilerin bu soruları nasıl cevaplayacaklarını tahmin etmeye çalışmayınız. Lütfen, yalnız kendi duygu düşüncelerinize göre cevaplayınız.

Hiç	Biraz	Katılı-	Kuvvet-
katılmı-	katılı-	yorum	le katılı-
yorum.	yorum		yorum

1) Ailemizde faaliyetler oldukça dikkatli

planlanır.

(1) (2) (3) (4)

2) Aile üyeleri duygularını açıkça ifade

ederler.

(1) (2) (3) (4)

3) Ailemizde kurallara uymaya çok önem

verilir.

(1) (2) (3) (4)

	Hiç katılmıyorum.	Biraz katılmıyorum.	Katılıyorum.	Kuvvetle katılıyorum.
4) Ailemizle ilgili kararlar, daha çok büyükler tarafından verilir.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5) Bizim ailede bireyler, kendi meselelerini kendileri hallederler.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6) Bizim evde işler belirli bir düzene göre yapılır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7) Evde birbirimize kişisel sorunlarımızı anlatırız.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8) Aile üyelerinin “doğru ve yanlışlar” hakkında kesin düşünceleri vardır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9) Aile üyeleri gerçekten birbirine destek olur.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10) Birbirimizle konuşurken ne dediğimize dikkat ederiz.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11) Bizim ailede herkese verilecek bol zaman ve ilgi vardır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

	Hiç katılmı- yorum.	Biraz katılı- yorum	Katılı- yorum	Kuvvet- le katılı- yorum
12) Bizim ailede canımız ne isterse yapabiliriz.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13) Ailemizde birlik, beraberlik duygusu vardır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14) Ailemizde uyulması gereken kurallar vardır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15) Ailemizde kararlaştırılmış birşeyin tam zamanında yapılması (dakiklik) çok önemlidir.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16) Bizim evde kurallar oldukça katıdır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17) Ailemizde üyelerin, sormadan karar değiştirmesi olumsuz karşılanır.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18) Aile üyeleri, kızgınlıklarını açıkça gösterirler.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19) Ailece temiz ve düzenli insanlarız.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Hiç	Biraz	Katılı-	Kuvvet-
katılmı-	katılı-	yorum	le katılı-
yorum.	yorum		yorum

20) Ailemiz bizi kendi kendimize yeterli

olmaya teşvik eder.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

21) Ailemizde, sesimizi yükselterek birşey

elde edemeyeceğimize inanırız.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

22) Ailemizde her bireyin görevi açıkça

belirlenmiştir.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

23) Ailemizde bir anlaşmazlık olduğunda,

bunu çözümlenmek ve huzuru sağlamak

için çaba sarfederiz.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

24) Birbirimizle gerçekten iyi

geçiniriz.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

25) Bizim evde aradığımız birşeyi, yerinde

bulmak zordur.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

26) Aile üyeleri, karşılaştıkları sorunları

kendi kendilerine hallederler.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

ÖLÇEK 4

Sprellberg State - Trait
Anx. Inv.
duruşumluluk - surekli kaygı →

YÖNERGE: Aşağıda kişilerin kendilerine ait duygularını anlatmada kullandıkları bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi okuyun, sonra da o anda nasıl hissettiğinizi, ifadelerin sağ tarafındaki parantezlerden uygun olanını karalamak suretiyle belirtin. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Herhangi bir ifadenin üzerinde fazla zaman sarfetmeksizin anında nasıl hissettiğinizi gösteren cevabı işaretleyin.

	Hiç	Biraz	Çok	Tama- mıyla
1. Şu anda sakinim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2. Kendimi emniyette hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. Şu anda sinirlerim gergin	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4. Pişmanlık duygusu içindeyim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5. Şu anda huzur içindeyim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6. Şu anda hiç keyfim yok	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7. Başıma geleceklerden endişe ediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8. Kendimi dinlenmiş hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9. Şu anda kaygılıyım	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10. Kendimi rahat hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

	Hiç	Biraz	Çok	Tama- mıyle
11. Kendime güvenim var	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12. Şu anda asabım bozuk	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13. Çok sinirliyim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14. Sinirlerimin çok gergin olduğunu hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15. Kendimi rahatlamış hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16. Şu anda halimden memnunum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17. Şu anda endişeliyim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18. Heyecandan kendimi şaşkına dönmüş hissediyorum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19. Şu anda sevinçliyim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20. Şu anda keyfim yerinde	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

ÖLÇEK 5

YÖNERGE: Aşağıda kişilerin kendilerine ait duygularını anlatmada kullandıkları bir takım **ifadeler** verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi okuyun, sonra da **genel** olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi, ifadelerin sağ tarafındaki parantezlerden uygun olanını karalamak suretiyle belirtin. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Herhangi bir ifadenin üzerinde fazla zaman sarfetmeksizin **genel** olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi gösteren cevabı işaretleyin.

	Hemen		Hemen
	hiç bir		Çok
	zaman	Bazen	zaman
			her zaman
21. Genellikle keyfim yerindedir	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
22. Genellikle çabuk yorulurum	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
23. Genellikle kolay ağlarım	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
24. Başkaları kadar mutlu olmak isterim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
25. Çabuk karar veremediğim için fırsatları kaçırırım	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
26. Kendimi dinlenmiş hissedirim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
27. Genellikle sakin, kendime hakim ve soğukkanlıyım	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)

	Hemen		Hemen
	hiç bir	Bazen	her
	zaman		zaman
28. Güçlüklerin yenemeyeceğim kadar biriktiğini hissederim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
29. Önemsiz şeyler hakkında endişelenirim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
30. Genellikle mutluyum	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
31. Herşeyi ciddiye alır ve etkilenirim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
32. Genellikle kendime güvenim yoktur	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
33. Genellikle kendimi emniyette hissederim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
34. Sıkıntılı ve güç durumlarla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
35. Genellikle kendimi hüznü hissederim	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
36. Genellikle hayatımdan memnunum	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
37. Olur olmaz düşünceler beni rahatsız eder	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
38. Hayal kırıklıklarını öylesine ciddiye alırım ki hiç unutmam	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
39. Akli başında ve kararlı bir insanım	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)
40. Son zamanlarda kafama takılan konular beni tedirgin eder	(1)	(2)	(3) (4)