

ATTACHMENT AND REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Işıl Feyza Aracı

Boğaziçi University

2007

ABSTRACT

Attachment and Reflective Functioning

by

Işıl Feyza Aracı

The present study examined the relationship between attachment security and level of reflective functioning on a sample of late adolescents. A positive relationship between attachment security and reflective functioning was expected based on research suggesting that a secure attachment organization facilitates reflective functioning.

61 female and 58 male Boğaziçi University undergraduate students filled out the Short Form of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) and the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ). The reflective functioning levels of the participants were assessed based on their parental relationship narratives in response to some selected questions from the Adult Attachment Interview, using the Reflective Functioning Scale developed by Fonagy, Target, Steele and Steele (1998).

Results revealed that there was no relationship between either maternal or paternal attachment security, and level of reflective functioning. In addition, reflective functioning scores were a bit lower than expected. Maternal attachment security was found to be higher than paternal attachment security. Moreover, females were found to be more securely attached to their mothers and they showed a tendency to be more securely attached to their fathers. Results are discussed on the basis of the validity of the attachment measures used in the present study and the applicability of the Reflective Functioning Scale to the Turkish culture.

ÖZET

Bağlanma Güvenliği ve İçsel Değerlendirme İşlevselliği

Işıl Feyza Aracı

Bu araştırmada bağlanma güvenliği ile kendinin ve başkalarının içsel, zihinsel süreçleri hakkında yorum yapabilme (içsel değerlendirme işlevi) arasındaki ilişki, bir geç ergen örnekleminde incelenmiştir. Güvenli bağlanma örgütlenmesinin içsel değerlendirme işlevselliğine katkıda bulunduğu yönündeki araştırmalara dayanarak, bağlanma güvenliği ve içsel değerlendirme işlevselliği arasında pozitif bir ilişki beklenmiştir.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi'nden altmış bir kadın ve elli sekiz erkek lisans öğrencisi Ebeveyn ve Arkadaşlara Bağlanma Envanteri kısa formu ve Ebeveynlere Bağlanma Ölçeği'ni doldurmuşlardır. Katılımcıların içsel değerlendirme işlevselliği, Yetişkin Bağlanma Görüşmesi'nden (Adult Attachment Interview) seçilen bazı sorulara verilen yanıtlardaki ebeveynle ilişki anlatıları üzerinden, Fonagy, Target, Steele ve Steele (1998) tarafından geliştirilen Reflective Functioning Scale (İçsel Değerlendirme İşlevselliği Skalası) kullanılarak ölçülmüştür.

Sonuçlar anneye ya da babaya olan bağlanma güvenliğinin içsel değerlendirme işlevselliği ile ilişkili olmadığını göstermiştir. Ek olarak, içsel değerlendirme işlevselliği puanları beklenenden biraz daha düşük bulunmuştur. Anneye bağlanma güvenliğinin, babaya bağlanma güvenliğinden daha yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca kadınların erkeklere oranla anneye daha güvenli bağlandığı ve

babaya da daha güvenli bağlanma eğiliminde olduğu bulunmuştur. Bulgular bu araştırmada kullanılan bağlanma ölçeklerinin geçerliği ve İçsel Değerlendirme İşlevselliği Skalası'nın Türk kültürüne uygunluğu ışığında tartışılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I feel very privileged to have Prof. Dr. Güler Fişek as my supervisor for this study. Her support, wisdom, enthusiasm and her constant encouragement have been invaluable at a time when I really needed an outside source to relieve my anxiety. She has been an inspiration throughout my graduate years and I will always be deeply grateful to her.

I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Hamit Fişek and Assist. Prof. Serra Müderrisoğlu. Prof. Dr. Hamit Fişek's serene stance whenever I needed his help contributed a lot to this study. Assist. Prof. Serra Müderrisoğlu helped clarifying the design of the study and encouraged me in carrying out this study.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all those Boğaziçi University students who participated in and made this study possible by sharing their intimate feelings and experiences with their parents. Without their sincerity, this thesis could not have been written.

Throughout this study and my graduate years, two special people, Sibel Halfon and Nihan Sefer have always been there for me and I cannot thank them enough. The relationship I shared with you through the good times and the bad times, your priceless help and comments in the rating process, your support and encouragement, and your sensitive and calm stance whenever I was anxious have been among the greatest contributions. I am also grateful to Serap Serbest, Evrem Tilki and Yeşim Yaşa whose presence turned my graduate years into a wonderful experience with being just the amazing people that they are. Thank you all for your endless support. I feel extremely lucky to have shared this experience with you.

I would also like to thank Elvin Aydın for her support in coding my transcripts and for being so kind and encouraging. You have been a major source of motivation for me with your belief in me and your valuable comments have contributed a lot to this study.

I also thank Assoc. Prof. Levent Arslan, Assist. Prof. Murat Saraçlar and Ebru Arısoy from the Electrical and Electronics Engineering Department, and Ali Haznedaroğlu from Sestek Company who helped me save a lot of time by developing the transcription program that I used.

I am also grateful to all those friends who helped me in the transcribing process including Ufuk Güngör and Elif Tunç. Thank you for being there for me when I needed that so much.

I dedicate this study to my parents Sevim and Mürsel Aracı for their belief in me and for their sustaining love all through my life. You have always made sure that I felt I could turn to you for support and comfort, and I am indebted to you for this. I also dedicate this study to my brother Şerif Türker Aracı and my sister Pınar Aracı. Your presence and your encouragement made me stronger and I am thankful for your patience in tolerating my monopolizing the computer and my not very infrequent bad moods. And lastly I dedicate this study to my wonderful grandmothers Rabia Erol and Fatma Aracı, and to the memory of my beloved grandfather Mustafa Aracı. Your love that I felt all along the way has helped me a lot more than you think.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
APPROVAL.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Attachment Theory: An Overview.....	1
Adult Attachment.....	4
Attachment towards the Father.....	14
Continuity and Transgenerational Transmission of Attachment.....	15
Metacognition.....	18
Reflective Function.....	19
The Development of Reflective Functioning.....	24
Reflective Function and Attachment.....	29
The Present Study.....	37
METHOD.....	40
Sample.....	40
Materials.....	40
Procedure.....	47
RESULTS.....	48
DISCUSSION.....	53
APPENDICES.....	80
Appendix A.....	81
Demographic Information Form	
Appendix B.....	83
Short Form of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)	
Appendix C.....	86
The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ)	
Appendix D.....	91
Interview for the Assessment of Reflective Functioning	
Appendix E.....	93
Informed Consent Form	
Appendix F.....	95
Sample Interviews	
REFERENCES.....	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Inter-rater Correlation Coefficients for Scoring of RF.....	46
Table 2. Inter-rater Correlation Coefficients of the three Main Judges with Judge D.....	46
Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Security Scores as Measured by IPPA and PAQ, and Reflective Functioning Scores.....	48
Table 4. The Distribution of Reflective Functioning Scores of Males.....	49
Table 5. The Distribution of Reflective Functioning Scores of Females.....	49
Table 6. Significance Values of the Correlation Coefficients between Reflective Functioning (RF) scores and Maternal and Paternal Attachment Security Scores Derived from the IPPA and the PAQ.....	50

INTRODUCTION

Attachment theory became a major field of study in the last two decades and considerable research has been conducted by investigators from a variety of disciplines related to the emotional, cognitive, developmental and physiological aspects and correlates of attachment.

The present study aims to investigate the relationship between mentalization ability and security of attachment in a sample of adolescents and young adults. In the following sections, first an overview of attachment theory will be presented and major assessment measures of infant and adult attachment will be reviewed. Afterwards, several studies regarding the continuity and transgenerational transmission of attachment security from the parent to the infant will be reviewed and the supposed mediating variable in this transmission; namely parental sensitivity will be introduced. Following this, a more recent literature that introduces mentalization rather than parental sensitivity as the link in the transmission of attachment and as a correlate of attachment security will be reviewed. Literature regarding the development of mentalization in children, the relationship between parental mentalization capability and infant attachment, and between attachment security and mentalization ability in children and adults will be discussed.

Attachment Theory: An Overview

Attachment theory, developed by John Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1982), postulates that there is a universal human need to form affectional bonds. Bowlby hypothesized that an attachment system evolved to maintain proximity between infants and their

caregivers and to provide safety and survival under conditions of danger or threat. Bowlby (1982) defined attachment in terms of four classes of behavior which are proximity maintenance, safe haven, separation distress and secure base. These behaviors are observable between normal one year old infants and their mothers. The infant tries to maintain the desired proximity with the mother, retreats to her as a safe haven in cases of threat, becomes distressed when separated from the mother and uses her as a secure base to explore the environment.

Bowlby proposed that children, over time, internalize experiences with caregivers in such a way that early relationships with the caregivers become the prototypes for later relationships. These prototypes or “internal working models” are based on expectations formed on the basis of the availability and sensitivity of the caregiver to the infant at times of distress (Bowlby, 1982). The infant's behavior by the end of the first year is based on these expectations or internal working models (Fonagy, 1999). Working models include two complementary components, one referring to the attachment figure and the other referring to the self. The attachment figure component characterizes whether the caregiver will be available and responsive when needed. The self component is related to whether the self is worthy of love and care (Bowlby, 1973).

The Strange Situation

The second pioneer of attachment theory, Mary Ainsworth, with her colleagues, developed a laboratory based procedure called the “Strange Situation” for observing infants' internal models and assessing the infants' type of attachment (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall, 1978; cited in Fraley and Shaver, 2000). In this procedure,

the infant enters a room with her mother where there is a stranger, and the mother talks to that stranger for a while. Then a brief separation follows when the mother goes out leaving the infant with the stranger. She returns a few minutes later. Infants classified as Secure explore their environment readily when the mother is present, are anxious in the presence of the stranger and avoid her. They tend to be distressed when the mother leaves but are easily soothed by the mother's return and they return to exploration. Some infants seem to be distant from the start and are made less anxious by separation. They do not seek proximity with the mother when she returns and they do not seem to prefer the mother over the stranger. These infants are called Anxious/Avoidant. Resistant (Anxious/Ambivalent) children do not explore the room even in the mother's presence, become intensely upset when she leaves and have great difficulty in settling down upon the reunion, acting ambivalently seemingly both wishing to be picked up by the mother and struggling to get down. In recent years a new category has been established. Main and Solomon (1990; cited in Bleiberg, 2001) observed that a group of infants appear difficult to classify because they exhibit seemingly undirected behavior giving the impression of disorganization and disorientation in the presence of the caregiver. These infants, referred to as Disorganized/Disoriented exhibit a mix of approach, avoidance, and trance-like activity. Ainsworth and her colleagues believed that behavior in Strange Situation reflects fairly stable characteristics at least in the first years of life (Ainsworth and Bell, 1974; cited in Bleiberg, 2001)

According to Sroufe (1996; cited in Fonagy, 1999), secure infants' behavior is based on the experience of sensitive caregiving. The caregiver is rarely over-arousing and is able to restabilize the child's disorganizing emotional responses. When these children grow up, stressful situations do not lead to disorganization and negative

emotions feel less threatening. Anxious/Avoidantly attached children have had experiences where their emotional arousal was not restabilized by the caregiver, or where they were overaroused through intrusive parenting. Therefore they overcontrol their affect. They tend to avoid situations in which they are likely to be aroused or distressed. In contrast Anxious/Resistantly attached children undercontrol their affect. They heighten the expression of distress to make it more likely that the caregiver will respond. Considering the Disorganized/Disoriented group, it is generally held that their caregivers have served as a source of both fear and reassurance producing conflicting motivations when the attachment system is aroused (Main and Hesse, 1990; cited in Fonagy, 1999). A history of severe neglect or physical or sexual abuse is often associated with this pattern.

Adult Attachment

Bowlby believed that attachment relationships play an important role also in adult emotional life (Bowlby, 1979). He viewed the working models of self and others as the main source of continuity between early experiences of attachment and feelings, behaviors and cognitions in later relationships. In much of adult attachment literature, it has been assumed that there are direct parallels between infant and adult patterns of attachment and representations (e.g. Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan and Cassidy, 1985; cited in Simpson and Rholes, 1998)

Romantic Adult Attachment

In the 1980s, several investigators began to use Bowlby's ideas to understand adult relationships and love. This line of research is typically carried out by using self-report inventories.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) proposed that romantic love is an attachment process that is influenced and governed by the same rules and patterns as in infant-parent attachment. Adult attachment behavior reflects the internal working models formed in the infant-parent relationship early in life. Hazan and Shaver (1987) developed a measure called the Adult Attachment Scale (AAS) to assess adult attachment styles based on the three attachment classifications of Ainsworth and her colleagues. The AAS consists of three vignettes each of which corresponds to one of the three attachment styles (secure, anxious/avoidant, ambivalent) and the individual is asked to choose the one that best characterizes how he/she feels. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that the proportion of people in each category obtained in this measure was similar to the proportions obtained in infant attachment studies. Moreover attachment style predicted the kind of love experience the individual had. Specifically, Hazan and Shaver (1987) describe secure people as having warmer, more stable and satisfactory relationships compared to insecure people. Avoidant people show low levels of self-disclosure, trust, and emotional sharing in relationships, whereas anxious-ambivalent people describe their romantic relationships in more passionate and emotional terms. These findings have been replicated in several studies (Collins and Read, 1990; Feeney and Kirkpatrick, 1996; Hazan and Shaver, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994).

Based on Bowlby's (1973) conceptualization that internal working models differ in terms of images of self and others, Bartholomew (1990; cited in Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) proposed that the attachment types can be grouped in terms of the “model of the self” and “model of the other”. The “model of self” is based on whether the individual has a positive self-worth or negative self-worth internally. The “model of other” relates to the individual's concepts of significant others in terms of whether the individual believes in their availability and responsiveness or whether others are viewed as rejecting, uncaring and distant.

Based on Bartholomew's (1990; cited in Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) conceptualization, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) proposed that there are four types of attachment patterns rather than the three suggested in Hazan and Shaver's (1987) tripartite typology. According to that model, secure individuals hold positive beliefs about the self, and availability and responsiveness of close others. Preoccupied (ambivalent) adults have a negative, unworthy sense of self combined with a positive evaluation of others leading them to feel anxious concerning their close relationships as they feel that others are not as committed to them as they are. Fearful-avoidant adults have negative views of self-worth and view others as unsupportive and unavailable. Dismissing-avoidant individuals have positive self-views with a negative disposition toward other people. They deny the importance of close relationships and they have a strong commitment to independence and self-reliance. Empirical research on adult romantic attachment has validated these distinctions (Shaver and Brenson, 1992; Mikulincer, Florian and Weller, 1993; cited in Fraley and Shaver, 1997; Collins and Read, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994).

Based on this model, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) developed a self-report questionnaire called the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) which they adapted

from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) self-report measure. This questionnaire consists of four short paragraphs reflecting a specific attachment style, and the respondents are required to choose the one that describes them best and then to provide a rating for each paragraph based on the degree of correspondence with their self concepts.

Brennan, Clark and Shaver (1998) conceptualized attachment in two main dimensions; namely attachment-related anxiety and attachment-related avoidance. People who score high on anxiety tend to worry about their partner's availability, responsiveness etc. People who score low on this dimension tend to be more secure in the perceived responsiveness of their partners. Related to avoidance, people who score high in this variable prefer not to rely on others for support or open up to them. People who are low in avoidance tend to depend on others more easily and are comfortable being depended upon by or being intimate with others. Secure people are defined by low scores on both of these dimensions. Brennan, Clark and Shaver (1998) created a multi-item scale called Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) based on these dimensions.

There are some psychometric problems related to the use of self-report measures of attachment in Turkey. For instance, Sümer and Güngör (1999) conducted a psychometric evaluation of the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ, Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) on a Turkish sample and a cross-cultural comparison with a U.S. sample was made. They found that although the secure group matched the American sample in terms of psychometric properties and could consistently be distinguished from the insecure group, there were problems in properly distinguishing the insecure groups. Results revealed that, in the Turkish sample, there was a negative but weak correlation between the preoccupied and dismissing groups contrary to the significant negative correlation reported in the

American sample. Moreover, respondents with a preoccupied attachment style seemed to be overrepresented and those with avoidant or fearful attachment styles seemed to be underrepresented in the Turkish sample compared to the American sample.

Kuşçu Orhan (1998) in a study using both the RQ and the AAS, found that avoidant and ambivalent scores in the AAS correlated positively with each other contrary to what is expected. In addition, similar to Sümer and Güngör's (1999) findings, the preoccupied group seemed to be overrepresented in the RQ. Moreover, the expected negative correlation between the preoccupied and avoidant groups in the RQ could not be found. Bekiroğlu (1996), using the AAS, was unable to differentiate between the insecure groups and conducted the study distinguishing the groups only as secure or insecure.

Ankoğlu (2003) used the anxiety and avoidance dimensions of the RQ in order to study individual differences and could not find any significant difference between the attachment types in the avoidance dimension. She suggests that these results cast some doubt in the effectiveness of the RQ in assessing attachment differences in the Turkish sample.

These results suggest that the self-report measures are insufficient in properly distinguishing attachment styles in the Turkish sample. Sümer and Güngör (1999) call for new attachment measures that are more reliable and more applicable to the Turkish culture and to similar cultures.

Parental Adult Attachment

Beginning in the early 1980s, several other researchers began to investigate the quality of emotional bonds with parents in adolescence and adulthood, and some self-report scales were developed. Some frequently used instruments that are designed to tap the attachment history and feelings of security in relationship with parents are The Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI; Parker, Tupling and Brown, 1979; cited in Garbarino, 1998), the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ; Kenny, 1990), and the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden and Greenberg, 1987).

The Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI; Parker, Tupling and Brown, 1979; cited in Garbarino, 1998) was designed to examine the parental contribution to the parent-child bond. The PBI assesses the participants' memories of their parents on two major dimensions of parenting: care (level of warmth and affection) and overprotection (level of parental control and intrusion versus encouragement of autonomy). The respondent rates each parent separately on 25-item scales in terms of how accurately the item corresponds to the parent's behavior during the first 16 years of the respondent's life. The researchers found negative intercorrelations between the scales of Overprotection and Care. Parker and colleagues (1979; cited in Garbarino, 1998) reported low to moderate reliabilities for scores on the subscales. However, subsequent research by Mallinckrodt (1991; cited in Garbarino, 1998), reported high internal reliability estimates. Considerable evidence of the validity of the retrospective ratings of the PBI has been established (e.g. Mackinnon, Henderson, Scott, & Duncan-Jones, 1989; Mallinckrodt, 1991; cited in Garbarino, 1998).

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden and Greenberg, 1987) is one of the most commonly used scales and it is designed to assess adolescents' and young adults' perceptions of their relationships with their parents and close friends. Armsden and Greenberg (1987) argue that the quality of parental attachment is based on the internal working models of adolescents related to the feeling of trust in the availability and responsiveness of the parents and feelings of hopelessness and anger resulting from unresponsiveness or inconsistent responsiveness of the parents. Accordingly, the IPPA is comprised of three subscales, Trust, Communication and Alienation. The Trust subscale reflects the degree of mutual trust and understanding in the relationship, the Communication subscale taps the level of constructive involvement in the relationship and the Alienation subscale taps feelings of anger, hopelessness and interpersonal isolation. The sum of these items are used to make an assessment of the security of relationships with respect to parents and peers.

Moderate to high reliabilities of scores were reported by Armsden and Greenberg (1987). Convergent validity of the IPPA has been established as significant correlations have been found between the IPPA parent attachment scores and levels of family support, conflict and cohesiveness, and with the tendency to seek out parents in times of need. Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke, and Mitchell (1990) found that less secure parental attachment has been related to depression, suicidal ideation, separation anxiety, and hopelessness in young adolescents.

Günaydın, Selçuk, Sümer and Uysal (2005) assessed the psychometric qualities of the short form of the IPPA (Raja, McGee and Stanton, 1992) on a Turkish sample of young adults. The maternal and paternal attachment scales were

both found to have high internal consistency and reliability. As expected, significant correlations were found between security of attachment to the father and the mother, and self-esteem. Security of attachment to the father was found to be negatively correlated to fear of disapproval. However, contrary to expectations no significant relationship was found between security of parental attachment and fear of separation, pleasing others and enjoying solitude. Moreover, the subscales of Trust, Communication and Alienation did not emerge for the Turkish sample. The authors suggest that in order to increase construct validity, the same research should be carried out with different age groups of adolescents. Furthermore the relationship between the IPPA and constructs that are known to be related to attachment such as coping with stress and depression should be assessed.

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ; Kenny, 1987) is a self-report measure for use with adolescents and young adults. It was designed to adapt Ainsworth, Blehar, Walters and Wall's (1978; cited in Kenny 1990) conceptualization of attachment as an enduring affective bond which serves as a secure base in providing emotional support and in fostering autonomy. The questionnaire taps perceived parental availability, understanding, acceptance, respect for autonomy, interest in interaction with parents and affect toward parents during visits, student help-seeking behavior in situations of stress, and satisfaction with help obtained from parents. The PAQ contains three subscales: Affective Quality of Relationships, Parental Fostering of Autonomy, and Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support. The questionnaire allows for separate ratings for each parent.

High test-retest reliability and internal consistency were reported for the PAQ (Kenny, 1987). Predictive validity was established by Kenny (1987), who reported that quality of relationship predicted first-year college men's and college women's

scores on independent measures of self-assertion and dating competence. Kenny and Donaldson (1991) also reported that all subscales correlated with each other and each subscale was correlated with social competence and psychological functioning in the expected directions.

Another line of research on adult attachment was carried out by Mary Main who developed a structured assessment called the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) (George, Kaplan and Main, 1985; cited in Siegel, 1999) which was able to move the field of attachment research also beyond the study of infant attachment and moreover, into the representational realm (Siegel, 1999).

The representational structures underlying interpersonal behavior is a focus of convergence between psychoanalysts and developmentalists (Fonagy, Leigh, Kennedy, Mattoon, Steele, Target, Steele and Higgitt, 1995a). Psychoanalytic theory and practice suggest that parents' responses to their children are based upon the expectations formed in the experiences with their own primary caregiving figures (e.g., Fraiberg, 1980; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a). In line with this idea, Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985; cited in Main, 1994) found that the attachment patterns of infants in the Strange Situation can be predicted on the basis of their parents' responses in the AAI. This idea might be useful in explaining the observed relative stability of internal working models (Collins and Read, 1994; cited in Fonagy, 1999) and the stability of attachment demonstrated by longitudinal studies of infants assessed with the Strange Situation and followed up in adolescence or young adulthood with the AAI (George, Kaplan and Main, 1996; cited in Fonagy, 1999).

George, Kaplan and Main's (1985; cited in Meins, 1997) intention in using the AAI was not to assess adults' original attachment types in childhood, but to investigate their present stance towards their own childhood experiences. The AAI is

a semi-structured interview which elicits narrative histories of childhood attachment relationships such as experiences of separation, loss, maltreatment, what the individual used to do when upset, and so on (Meins, 1997). It is not the details of the events per se that are used to find out the individual's AAI classification. Rather his/her current emotional and psychological orientation to these events based on the structural qualities of the narratives such as coherence are evaluated.

The AAI scoring system (Main and Goldwyn 1994; cited in Main, 1994) classifies individuals into four categories: Secure/Autonomous, Insecure/Dismissing, Insecure/Preoccupied and Unresolved with respect to loss or trauma. Secure/Autonomous individuals value attachment relationships and are able to talk coherently about both positive and negative experiences without minimizing or maximizing the emotional qualities of those experiences. They demonstrate an ability to reflect on those experiences with an understanding of both of their own and their parents' behavior. Their responses are clear, relevant and to the point. Dismissing individuals show avoidance in denying memories, idealize and/or devalue early relationships, and present a dismissing, devaluing stance toward attachment relationships. They typically give short, uninformative answers to the interview questions. Preoccupied individuals exhibit a confused, angry, or passive preoccupation with attachment figures, often still complaining of childhood slights. As a result, they provide excessively long but wandering narratives, and they often fail to answer the question they were asked. Unresolved individuals usually have lapses in memory especially related to loss or trauma and give indications of significant disorganization in their attachment relationship representations. They may speak as if they are reexperiencing the loss or trauma, talk of a dead person as if he/she were still alive, or show dramatic changes in discourse style.

Psychometric studies in several countries have established that the dismissing, secure-autonomous, and preoccupied categories in the AAI are stable over a 1 to 15 month period. (e.g., Bakermans-Kranenburg and Van Ijzendoorn, 1993: cited in Main, 1994). Moreover they are unrelated to intelligence, social desirability, memory and more general discourse style.

Attachment towards the Father

Although the literature on attachment has mostly focused on the infant's attachment to the mother, studies assessing paternal qualities and infant attachment have also been conducted. In a meta-analysis by van Ijzendoorn and De Wolff (1997), it was found that fathers also shaped infants' attachment though to a lesser extent than mothers. The overall percentage of secure infant-father dyads (67%) was found to be exactly the same as the percentage of security in a large set of infant-mother dyads (van Ijzendoorn and Bakermans-Kranenburg, 1996; cited in Van Ijzendoorn and De Wolff, 1997). The similarity of attachment to mother and to father was found to be modest yielding a correlation of only .17. Sroufe (1985; cited in Van Ijzendoorn and De Wolff, 1997) had already argued that infant attachment security is more relation-specific than infant-specific. Steele, Steele and Fonagy (1996; cited in Fonagy, Gergely, Jurist and Target, 2004) also found that each parent transmits their internal working model independently of the actions of the other parent. For example the security of the mother's internal working model will not affect the child's security of attachment to father at 18 years old. Only the father's internal working model is associated with this.

Continuity and Transgenerational Transmission of Attachment

There is much evidence for the continuity of attachment patterns from infancy through adulthood. For instance Erickson, Sroufe and Egeland (1985; cited in Stein, Jacobs, Ferguson, Allen and Fonagy, 1998) found that classifications established in childhood persist through the end of childhood unless there is substantial environmental change. Hamilton (1994; cited in Stein et al., 1998) compared the Strange Situation classifications obtained at 12 months with the AAI classifications when the subjects were 17 years old. 77% of the secure versus insecure infant classifications overlapped with secure versus insecure AAI classifications 16 years later. In another study, Waters, Treboux, Crowell, Merrick, and Albersheim (1995; cited in Stein et al., 1998) compared the Strange Situation classifications with the mother at 12 months with AAI classifications of the same subjects 20 years later. When those subjects that had suffered severe negative life events were removed from the sample, the correspondence between the secure versus insecure classification in Strange Situation and secure versus insecure classification in the AAI was 78%.

Besides the observed continuity of attachment classification in many studies, significant connections between early attachment history and later expected behavior correlates have been found (e.g., Grossman and Grossman, 1991; cited in Fonagy, 2001). Thus, children classified as Secure in the Strange Situation have been observed to talk about their negative feelings more easily at times of distress and seek help and comfort as they grow older. In contrast, insecure attachment was found to predict later behavioral problems and psychopathology (Lewis, Feiring, McGuffog and Jaskir, 1984; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a), inadequate affect regulation (Erickson, Sroufe and Egeland, 1985; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a) and a relative

lack of cognitive resourcefulness (Grossman and Grossman, 1991: cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a). Avoidant children are more likely to try to solve their problems alone as they grow older and they tend to have a poor understanding of interpersonal relationships (Carlson and Sroufe; 1995, Elicker, Englund and Sroufe, 1992; cited in Stein et al., 1998). Children classified as Resistant/Ambivalent at 12 months of age, tend to be dependent on adults as they grow older and are likely to see their peers in a more negative light.

Moreover, not only is the predictive validity of the attachment classification through adult years high, but also the attachment type (or internal working model) of the caregivers seem to be predictive of the infant's attachment classification. Thus for instance, Van Ijzendoorn (1995) in a meta-analysis, found that 14 studies thus far had demonstrated that the AAI administered to mother or father will predict the child's security of attachment. The overall correspondence of security versus insecurity between a parent's interview and the response of the child to that parent in the Strange Situation was found to be very strong. In addition, the precise attachment category that the child displayed in the Strange Situation could also be predicted. Thus dismissing AAI interviews predict avoidant behavior in the Strange Situation while parents with a preoccupied style on the AAI tend to have children that exhibit anxious/resistant behavior in the Strange Situation. Secure parents tend to have secure children. Lack of resolution of mourning indicating an Unresolved style on the AAI predict disorganized behavior in the infant. This correspondence is equally strong when the AAI is conducted before the birth of the child.

Attachment and Parental Sensitivity

What accounts for the continuity and the transgenerational transmission of attachment? Developmental psychology provides a model with four steps to explain this process (Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Leigh, Kennedy, Mattoon & Target, 1995b, p. 241). According to this model, (1) the parent's attachment related experiences in childhood are embodied within a working model (Bowlby, 1973, 1980; Bretherton, 1985) that (2) is thought to affect the development of the mental representation of the child in the caregiver's mind, which (3) determines parenting functions underlying sensitive caregiving behavior (Bowlby 1969), which then (4) constitutes the primary determinant of the child's quality of attachment to the parent (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

Related to parental sensitivity, research has shown that mother's positive affect, reciprocal interaction, moderate levels of contingent interaction, affectionate and gentle handling and sensitivity to behavioral cues predicted security of attachment (e.g., Cox, Owen, Henderson and Margand, 1992; Isabella, 1993; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a). In contrast, an insecure-avoidant attachment classification was found to be related to an unresponsive pattern of parenting and an insecure-resistant attachment pattern to inconsistent responsiveness (Hazan and Shaver, 1994).

Egeland and Farber (1985; cited in Meins, 1997) found that mothers of securely attached babies were responsive to their infant's cries, had positive views of themselves and their babies, and were more skilled in playing with and feeding the baby. Mothers of avoidant children tended to be tense, reacting to motherhood negatively and they handled their baby less. Mothers of resistant children were found to have lower I.Q.s and their babies were less alert and sought less responsive interaction with the mother. In a different study, mothers who were found to have

secure attachment representations in the AAI exhibited more sensitive behaviors in laboratory paradigms (Crowell and Feldman, 1988; Haft and Slade, 1989; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995b).

However the mechanism for the transmission of attachment seemed to be more complicated than it first appeared. Van Ijzendoorn (1995) conducted a meta-analysis which assessed the combined influence of individual studies' measures of maternal sensitivity. Results showed that observed measures of maternal sensitivity did not sufficiently explain the gap between caregiver state of mind and infant attachment. Van Ijzendoorn called this the “transmission gap”. De Wolff and van Ijzendoorn (1997), in another meta-analysis of 66 investigations involving more than 4000 mother-infant dyads, found that the effect size of maternal sensitivity was very small (.17). Thus parental sensitivity accounted for only a small variability in attachment security. Moreover, the observations conducted to assess parental sensitivity usually include the infant and therefore cannot be considered to be independent of the infant's temperament (Kagan, 1982; Lamb, Thompson, Gardner, Charnov and Estes, 1984; cited in Fonagy et al., 1995a). The link between parental sensitivity and attachment security seems to be inadequate from the psychoanalytic standpoint (Fonagy et al., 1995a).

Metacognition

Main (1991; cited in Fonagy et al, 1995a) proposed a new model for the transmission of attachment security. She argued that attachment patterns in childhood are directly related to the parent's metacognitive quality. The term metacognition refers to one's knowledge and control of one's own cognition processes. Metacognition also

includes the self-regulation of knowledge so that a person notices when there are contradictions between the ideas he presently holds, which leads to a reorganization of the mind to eliminate the inconsistencies. Main proposed that incoherent parental narratives on the AAI suggesting poor metacognitive monitoring might be a key indicator of the child's insecure attachment pattern because poor metacognitive monitoring results in their inability to form coherent, integrated models of attachment relationships. Absence of metacognitive capacity on the part of the parent makes the infant vulnerable to inconsistent or nonresponsive parental behavior. This vulnerability is due to the infant's inability to step beyond his/her real experience and discriminate the immediate reality and the mental state which might underlie it. Thus maternal sensitivity will not predict attachment security. It is the mother's capacity to understand mental states and consider them in a coherent manner that should predict attachment security.

Reflective Function

Fonagy and his colleagues (Fonagy, Steele, Moran, Steele and Higgitt, 1991; cited in Fonagy, 2001) expanded Main's concept of metacognition to include the understanding of mental states in others as well as the self. They call this ability reflective function and propose that reflective functioning involves one's awareness of the mental states of other individuals (in this case attachment objects) as well as a coherence in representing one's own mental states in the past and present.

Reflective function (RF) or mentalization, referred to in developmental psychology as the “theory of mind”, is the developmental acquisition of the ability to mentalize, that is “the biologically prepared and nearly universal capacity of humans,

including very young humans, to interpret behavior of all agents, themselves as well as others, in terms of internal mental states” (p. 34) such as beliefs, desires and intentions (Bleiberg, 2001). The term “theory of mind” describes “the child’s evolving capacity to make use of mental state concepts in interpreting the behavior of the other” (p. 386, Fonagy et al., 1995a). Multiple sets of self-other representations are formed in the early experiences of children with other people. As the ability to understand other people’s behavior develops, children become able to more flexibly use these representations (Fonagy et al., 2004). Reflective function enables children to “read” other people’s minds (Morton and Frith, 1995; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004). RF is the moment-to-moment “reading” of other people’s minds. It enables us to understand self and others’ internal states without particular conscious effort. Therefore, this capacity should not be confused with insight, introspection, or the ability to explain our own and other people’s motives which define mental states in terms of consciousness rather than in terms of their capacity to understand and regulate behavior (Bleiberg, 2001). By attributing mental states and intentions to themselves and others, individuals make human behavior meaningful and predictable. RF involves both a self-reflective and an interpersonal component that allows the individual to distinguish inner from outer reality, pretend from “real” modes of functioning, intra-personal mental and emotional processes from interpersonal communications (Fonagy, Target, Steele and Steele, 1998). RF enables people to maintain reciprocity and mutual adjustment in daily interactions (Bleiberg, 2001).

The notion of RF is rooted in Dennett’s (1987, 1988; cited in Fonagy et al., 1998) proposal that three stances are available in the prediction of behavior: the physical stance, the design stance, and the intentional stance. He uses a chess-playing

computer as an example to explicate his idea. The prediction of the computer's move can be based on the computer's physical properties at its simplest. It can also be based on the design stance by taking into account the design of the computer and its programming. At the highest level, the move can be predicted on the basis of what the most rational move for the computer is. Here certain beliefs and desires, in other words regulation by intentional states, are attributed to the computer. Dennett proposes that using such states of mind provides good grounds for predicting human behavior which is the only way accessible to all of us. This knowledge is implicit in the theory of mind of folk psychology (Churchland, 1986; Fodor, 1987, Mele, 1992; cited in Fonagy et al., 1998).

Recent philosophers of mind (Hopkins, 1992; Wollheim, 1995; cited in Fonagy and Target, 1997) have extended Dennett's approach to unconscious processes. They illustrated that one of Freud's most important contributions was to extend folk psychology to a theory of unconscious mind. This makes those aspects of behavior that do not seem meaningful using the ordinary constructs of intentionality (e.g., dreams, neurotic symptoms, humor) make sense. They might be understood if the everyday model of the mind is extended to include unconscious thoughts, feelings and beliefs.

In the psychoanalytic literature, various notions have formerly been introduced to denote mental processes that overlap with the construct of reflective functioning. These all have their roots in Freud's initial concept of "Bindung" or linking (Fonagy et al., 1998). In Freud's distinction of primary and secondary processes, "Bindung" indicates a qualitative change from a physical to a psychic associative quality of linking (Freud, 1911b; cited in Fonagy et al., 1998).

Melanie Klein's notion of depressive position (Klein, 1945 ; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) is somewhat analogous to RF as it involves the transition to a stage in which the other person's hurt and suffering is recognized as well as one's own role in the process (Fonagy et al., 2004). Wilfred Bion described the “alpha function” as the transformation of internal events experienced as concrete (“beta-elements”) into tolerable thinkable experiences (Bion, 1962a, 1962b; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004). Similar to the current conception, Bion proposed that the mother-child relationship lay at the root of this symbolic capacity. Winnicott (1962; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) also recognized the prominence of the caregiver's psychological understanding of the child in order for the true self to emerge. He proposed that the psychological self develops through the perception of oneself in another person's mind as a thinking and feeling individual.

Fonagy and his colleagues (1998) demonstrated that RF correlates only negligibly with I.Q. and educational background indicating that reflective functioning is an independent construct that refers to the capacity to think about one's own and others' behavior in terms of mental states.

Fonagy and his colleagues (1995b, pp. 251-253) operationalize reflective functioning according to the following characteristics:

1) Special mention of mental states:

a) Representing self or other as thinking and feeling.

The statement “I was angry” is nonreflective, while the statement “At the time I often felt very angry” is considered reflective.

b) Explicit statements concerning the source of interpersonal knowledge as inference, observation, or information transmission.

“I assume that she must have felt angry because she would try to hide her feelings, but I never saw her actually expressing it to anyone.”

c) Anticipation of the reaction of another that takes into account the other's perception of the mental state of the self.

“He probably thought that we didn't really love him, so he tried to avoid disappointment by being sometimes a bit short with us.”

2) Sensitivity to the characteristics of mental states:

a) Recognizing the fallible nature of knowledge.

Describing her reactions to her manic-depressive father, one mother commented: "You can easily mistake depression and withdrawal for rejection. I still find it hard to tell the difference."

b) Explicit recognition of the limited power of wishes, thoughts, and desires with respect to the real world.

"Most people must want things they can't have. I always wanted a mother who would come and pick me up from school and it took me a long time to accept that she was not going to be that mother for me."

c) Acknowledgement of the opaqueness of the mental world of others while retaining the principle of psychic causation.

"I couldn't tell what she had in mind. She might react to things and it would leave me feeling confused and frustrated. Afterwards, sometimes I understood that it was because she had an argument with dad or something, but not at all always."

3) Sensitivity to the complexity and diversity of mental states:

a) Explicit recognition of the possibility of diverse perspectives and points of view of the same event.

"People might say that she was caring and attentive to us, but to my sister and I it just felt as if she was constantly wanting to be in control, and that's why she was such a disciplinarian."

b) Recognition of the complexity of causation in the social world and that the world of physical causality is a poor model for the mental world.

"I don't know why he behaved as he did. In part it had to do with his sense of inadequacy, because of the job he had, but also he was disappointed by us and he was angry because he felt we had let him down. There is no simple reason and it would be facile to pretend that there is just one simple explanation."

c) Recognition that social roles interact and the same person can maintain sometimes contradictory attitudes in the context of different relationships.

"She is a lovely, generous, almost selfless woman in the confines of her family, but she is quite constrictive and resents people outside and can be quite mean to them."

4) Special efforts at linking mental states to observed behaviors:

a) Recognition that observed behavior may be determined by an underlying mental state and that the latter can serve as a satisfactory account of the former.

"I would say he behaved very badly, but he was worried about his job and being unemployed again."

b) Understanding that people may express different emotions from those they feel.

"She was always kind and generous but we knew that underneath it she was suffering. It must have been terribly difficult for her to cope on her own."

c) Recognition that people may intentionally wish to deceive by presenting themselves in self-serving ways.

"He needed to be liked, so he was careful to make a good impression on all the people who came to visit us."

5) Appreciation of possibility of change in mental states, with implications for corresponding changes in behavior:

a) Acknowledging the possibility of change between the ideas of a child and those of an adult.

“As a child you see your parents as being able to do everything. It's sad when you realize that they are just human.”

b) Acknowledging the possibility of changing attitudes in the future.

“I want him to be happy with what he has. I would be content just if he was content. But I know, once he is born, I will probably want him to be prime minister”

Fonagy and his colleagues (1998) operationalized individual differences in mentalizing capacities based on the clear descriptions of mental states in the way the individual talks about past and present relationships with attachment figures in a coding system called the Reflective Functioning Scale. According to this scale, people who are poor in reflective functioning do not represent self or others as intentional beings, and tend to give banal, generalized, sociological (rather than psychological) accounts of behavior (e.g. “My parents were older than those of my friends”). Individuals that score in the middle of the scale tend to offer some psychological attributions which however lack specificity, and their perceptions might be inaccurate or self-serving. Individuals that score high in reflective functioning are consistent in understanding mental states. They can reason about the causes of behavior in terms of mental states and they understand conflict and the limitations in monitoring all aspects of mental activity.

The Development of Reflective Functioning

The development of reflective functioning is tied to the evolution of social understanding in children (Fonagy et al., 2004). Between birth and the age of 5 months, face to face exchanges of affective signals between infant and caregiver

(Beebe, Lachmann and Jaffe, 1997; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) play a key role in the development of the child's representation of affect (Fonagy et al., 2004). At 7 months, infants are already sensitive to the direction of the gaze of another person suggesting that they are motivated to share the experiences of those around them. Soon after that, they begin to guide their behavior in terms of the expression on the mother's face when they are faced with uncertainty (Klinnert, Campos, Sorce, Emde and Svejda, 1983; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004).

By 18 months infants show a mentalistic understanding of desire (Meltzoff, 1995; Repacholi and Gopnik, 1997) as they are able to understand that another person's actions may be driven by desires other than the infant's own.

In the second year, infants start to become interested in the feelings of others such as pain, anger or pleasure. Their understanding of these states remains intuitive however, and can be demonstrated as empathic sensing of the mood of another (Fonagy et al., 2004).

In the third year, children seem to be capable of understanding that other people have feelings different from their own. They begin to talk about feelings and beliefs of their own and of others (Dunn, Bretherton and Munn, 1987). The full capacity to mentalize emerges towards the end of the third year as indicated by the attribution of false-beliefs in theory of mind tasks (Perner, 1991; cited in Fonagy, 1999)

Much developmental research about mentalization in children falls under the heading of “theory of mind” (Allen, 2003). Research on theory of mind has mostly focused on understanding belief, especially false belief (Wellman, Cross and Watson, 2001) because the understanding of mental states requires realizing that such states might be real and might be manifest in overt behavior. Nevertheless they are internal

and mental. A child's understanding that somebody has a false belief - one whose content is contradictory to reality- provides evidence that the child began to understand the distinction between outer and inner reality, between mind and world.

A classic false-belief scenario involves a character called Maxi who hides a piece of chocolate in a box, saying that he has to leave now but he will come back and eat the chocolate later (Perner, 1991; cited in Fonagy, 1999). While he is away, the child sees the experimenter move the chocolate to a basket. The child is asked: "Where will Maxi look for the chocolate, when he comes back?" The four and five-year-olds usually pass this task by judging that Maxi will look in the box on the basis of where he believes it to be, while three year olds tend to fail saying that Maxi will look in the basket where the chocolate really is. The four year old is said to have a theory of mind as indicated by his ability to assess false beliefs (Wimmer and Perner, 1983; cited in Fonagy, 1999, Morton and Frith, 1995; cited in Fonagy et al., 1998). He adopts an intentional state and predicts Maxi's behavior on the basis of Maxi's own belief while the three-year-old predicts behavior on the basis of his own representation of reality (Fonagy, 1999). A meta-analysis by Wellman, Cross and Watson (2001) revealed that false-belief performance shows a consistent developmental pattern even across various countries and various task manipulations.

Fonagy (1999) argues that one way to interpret the finding of the three-years olds' inability to pass the false-belief tasks is that their expectations are based on a nonmentalistic, "teleological" model of behavior rather than a mentalistic intentional one. A teleological stance is the precursor to an intentional stance (Gergely and Csibra, 1997). Within the teleological model, human behavior is interpreted in terms of visible outcomes and the constraints of physical reality rather than inferred desires and beliefs about reality. The three-year-olds in the above mentioned false-belief task

predict Maxi's behavior on the assumption that he will do what is most rational to achieve his goal (to eat the chocolate), given the current state of external reality (chocolate is in the basket) (Fonagy, 1999).

In fact the capacity to distinguish between rational and irrational acts seems to be present as early as 9 months of age (Gergely, Nadasy, Csibra and Biro, 1995; cited in Fonagy, 1999). In a study by Gergely et al. (1995, cited in Fonagy, 1999) infants watched a computer-animated display showing a ball jump over a wall and make contact with another ball. After the infants watched this repeatedly and became habituated, they were shown two displays in which the wall had been removed. The infants were surprised to see the ball jump as if there were still a wall to reach the other ball. They did not show surprise when the ball made a straight line to make contact with the other ball suggesting that the infants expected the ball to act rationally given the physical circumstances and reach the target by the shortest route.

Gergely and his colleagues (Bahrick and Watson, 1985; Gergely and Watson, 1996, 1999; Watson, 1994; cited in Allen, 2003) provided an explanation of the process that binds infants' attention into the social world. Initially, the infant's attention is captured through perfect stimulus-response contingencies such as the moving of her/his limbs. This allows the infant to differentiate between the self and the world fostering a sense of bodily agency. However, at about 3 months of age, a switch occurs such that the infant's attention begins to be captured by high but less than perfect contingencies. They do something, and something related to what they do happens a bit later. This enables the infants to turn their attention to others' responses to the infants' own actions and thus they become involved in the social world.

An example of high but imperfect contingency is emotional mirroring or affective attunement (Allen, 2003). For instance Stern (1985; cited in Bleiberg, 2001) argued that the infant achieves a core sense of self as “a separate, cohesive, bonded, physical unit” (p. 10) during the first 2 months of life. The mother, by behaving in a way that somehow imperfectly matches the infant's state of mind, reflects the infant's internal states. This allows the infant to develop a sense of being an individual with different affects and a sense of continuity over time. Bleiberg (2001) argues that this development later leads to the evolving of the capacity to represent memories of self and others coherently and to understand other people as psychological beings with mental states of their own.

Gergely and Watson (1996; cited in Bleiberg, 2001) argue that the first step towards mentalizing is through mentalizing emotions. The infant comes to use the caregiver's attuned reflective response as a source of information about the infant's own internal states. This is made possible by the caregiver's attuned response to the infant, communicating to the infant that he/she understands what the infant is feeling. This external feedback is linked to the infant's internal state of mind such as her/his perception of physiological arousal (Allen, 2003). The emerging domain of relatedness is what Trevarthen and Hubley (1978; cited in Bleiberg, 2001) call the domain of “intersubjectivity” which points to a developmental path leading to the capacity of both partners to represent each other's mental states in their minds eventually. This secondary representation moves the infant from the affective experience of psychophysiological arousal to the reflective or mentalized experience of construing himself as a thinking agent (Bleiberg, 2001). The child is capable of producing an effect and is being comforted in return. These interactions form the precursors of the child's capacity to represent affect mentally, to realize that internal

states can be conveyed to others and be managed, and sets the stage for the infant to use the caregiver as a reference point to guide the infant's behavior.

Reflective Function and Attachment

Fonagy and his colleagues (Fonagy, Steele, Moran, Steele and Higgitt, 1991; cited in Fonagy, 2001) proposed that the parent's capacity to adopt an intentional stance toward the infant, to think about the infant in terms of mental states such as thoughts, feelings and desires in the infant's mind and in their own mind in relation to the infant and his/her mental state, is the mediating factor of the transmission of attachment and the classical accounts about the importance of maternal sensitivity on attachment quality.

Fonagy and Target (1997) suggest that common mechanisms underpin attachment organization in caregiver and infant, and the emergence of mentalizing in the child. They believe that the parent's capacity to observe the changes in the infant's mental states lies at the root of sensitive caregiving and of secure attachment. Secure attachment in turn provides the psychosocial basis for acquiring an understanding of mind. The secure infant feels safe in making attributions of mental states to account for the behavior of the parent (Fonagy et al., 2004). In contrast, the avoidant child shuns to some degree the mental state of the other. The resistant child focuses on its own state of distress to the exclusion of close intersubjective exchanges.

Fonagy and his colleagues (1991; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) found that reflective functioning was strongly related to the AAI attachment classification. High reflective functioning corresponded to the Secure/Autonomous classification.

Moreover, the highest correlation of RF was found with the AAI coherence scale. Thus those individuals who can speak coherently and freely about their childhood experiences during an AAI tend to be classified as Secure/Autonomous and they tend to get higher scores on reflective functioning. Conversely, individuals who lose coherence during the interview tend to score lower on reflective functioning which indicates their inability to integrate, monitor and manage their mental states during the interview.

A caregiver's coherence score on the AAI and infant attachment security (Main et al., 1985; cited in Slade, Grienberger, Bernbach, Levy and Locker, 2005) were found to correlate significantly. Fonagy, Steele, Moran, Steele and Higgitt (1991; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) found that parents who were more able to reflect on their caregivers' and their own mental states were far more likely to have infants with a secure attachment classification and the authors link this finding to the parent's capacity to foster the infant's self-development. When reflective functioning was controlled for, the relationship between coherence on the AAI and infant attachment security disappeared suggesting that coherence in fact had its predictive power due to its close association with reflective functioning.

Fonagy and his colleagues (2004) argue that mentalization is a lifelong developmental process beginning in infancy and continuing throughout life. The parent's capacity to observe the child's mind facilitates the child's reflective functioning capacity through the mediation of secure attachment (Fonagy et al., 2004). The reflective caregiver increases the likelihood that the child will be securely attached, which in turn facilitates mentalization. Fonagy and his colleagues (2004) argue that secure attachment not only makes it more likely for the child to explore the outer world but also helps him explore the inner world, the minds of self and

other. Thus “secure attachment is conducive to exploring your mind in the mind of the other who has your mind in mind” (Allen, 2003, p. 100). A secure attachment pattern to the parent provides a context in which the child feels safe enough to explore the content of the parent's mind, and in this way, learns about minds in general. The child gets to know the caregiver's mind as the caregiver attempts to understand the mental states of the child and to regulate the child's affect accordingly.

Parental Reflective Functioning and Infant Attachment

But how does this intersubjective process between the child and the parent occur? Fonagy suggests that this process has 3 components. These are: “(1) the role of mirroring, (2) the move to the interpretation of the caregiver's behavior in intentional rather than teleological terms, and (3) the integration of the primitive dual form of psychic reality into a singular mentalizing representation of the mind” (Fonagy, 1999, p. 5).

Fonagy and his colleagues (2004) argue that the emergence of a well-developed RF is possible only in the context of a secure attachment relationship. Moreover, high RF on the part of the parent fosters security of attachment of the infant. Related to this, Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Higgitt and Target (1994; cited in Fonagy et al., 2004) found that in a group of deprived mothers (overcrowding, parental mental illness, childhood separation), all of the mothers with high reflectiveness ratings had children with a secure attachment pattern, whereas only 1 out of 17 of the deprived mothers with low reflectiveness ratings had a secure child. This finding is taken as evidence that the transmission of an insecure attachment

pattern can be interrupted if the caregiver has acquired the capacity to reflect productively on mental states.

The theory of reflective functioning is connected considerably to Bion's (1962; cited in Fonagy and Target, 2005) concept of affect containment. Fonagy (1999) proposes that secure attachment is the direct outcome of successful containment, namely the parent's capacity to understand and reflect the infant's internal state, especially distress, as well as represent it for the infant in such a way that the infant sees it as a manageable experience. This position is also close to Winnicott's (1960; cited in Fonagy and Target, 2005) concept of good enough mothering and to Stern's (1985; cited in Slade et al., 2005) conceptualization. Mentalization comes to be a regulating factor when the baby is in distress. The mother makes experiences real to the infant through mirroring and thereby makes a dysregulated bodily state manageable. Slade and her colleagues (2005) argue that the coherence of the infant's internal working model is achieved through the integration of disruption as well as the emotional balance and flexibility that is intrinsic to child security.

Meins and her colleagues (Meins, Fernyhough, Russell and Clark-Carter, 1998; Meins, Fernyhough, Wainwright, Das Gupta, Fradley and Tuckey, 2002) were able to demonstrate that there is a link between a mother's recognition of her child's mental experience and some developmental outcomes. They call this parental quality mind-mindedness; that is the tendency to treat one's infant as an individual with a mind, capable of intentional behavior.

Meins et al. (1998) found that while describing their children, mothers of securely attached infants used more mentalistic attributes (rather than physical attributes or behavioral characteristics) than mothers of insecurely attached children. Moreover,

children whose mothers had used more mental attributes showed higher theory of mind performance. In a different study Meins et al. (2002) found that mothers' use of mental state language that commented appropriately on the infants' mental states independently predicted overall theory of mind performance accounting for 11% of the variance.

Several studies have used an interview measure, the Parent Development Interview (PDI; Aber, Slade, Berger, Bresgi and Kaplan, 1985; cited in Slade et al., 2005) as the basis for assessment of maternal reflective functioning. The scoring system for this interview was based upon the scoring system of RF used with the AAI (Slade et al., 2005). The PDI involves questions about the current parent-child relationship rather than the historical child-parent relationship. It measures RF in terms of the parent's ability to conceive the child as a mental agent, and to understand the possible links between mental states and behavior of the child as well as of oneself. Slade et al. (2005) found that the mother's capacity to reflect on her child's internal affective experience strongly predicted the quality of her infant's attachment organization. Higher levels of maternal RF were associated with secure attachment status in children, whereas lower levels of maternal RF were associated with insecure attachment, with the mothers of resistant and disorganized children having the lowest levels of RF. They suggest that reflective functioning may play a prominent role in explaining the "transmission gap" and in predicting maternal behavior.

In fact Grienberger, Kelly and Slade (2005) demonstrated that maternal RF did predict maternal behavior. They used a measure called the Atypical Maternal Behavior Instrument for Assessment and Classification (AMBIANCE; Bronfman, Parsons & Lyons-Ruth, 1999; cited in Grienberger et al., 2005) which intends to code atypical, disruptive or misattuned maternal behavior during the Strange

Situation. Grienberger et al. (2005) found that the level of disruption in the mother-infant affective communication was inversely related to the level of maternal RF. Moreover mothers with more disruptive behavior were more likely to have infants classified as disorganized or resistant, while mothers with more attuned behavior tended to have securely attached children. Further analysis indicated that maternal behavior mediated the impact of reflective functioning upon infant attachment.

Child Reflective Functioning and Attachment Security

Several studies also indicated a link between infant attachment security and reflective functioning. This is in line with Fonagy et al.'s (2004) suggestion that the development of RF is possible only in a secure attachment context.

Moss, Parent and Gosselin (1995; cited in Fonagy and Target, 1997) reported that attachment security with mother was a good predictor of metacognitive capacity in the child in the domains of memory, comprehension and communication.

Greig and Howe (2001) found that secure children had significantly better performances on emotion understanding than insecure children. However they found no such difference for mind understanding and suggested that understanding emotions and minds might be distinct processes. Nevertheless Repacholi and Trapolini (2004) found no discrepancy between emotion and mind understanding. They found that those children who scored higher on the avoidance dimension of the Separation Anxiety Test which is a projective, dimensional measure for attachment patterns, showed significantly lower performance in understanding both maternal emotions and maternal false-beliefs.

Meins, Fernyhough, Russell and Clark-Carter (1998) found that securely attached children were better able to incorporate an experimenter's play suggestions into their sequences of symbolic play at 31 months. Moreover they found evidence of superior mentalizing abilities in securely attached children at age five despite no evidence of group differences in general cognitive ability. They found that 83% of children who were securely attached in infancy passed a false-belief task at age 4 compared to 33% of insecurely attached children. At age 5, 85% of securely attached children and 50% of insecurely attached ones passed a task requiring an understanding of information access.

Fonagy, Steele, Moran, Steele and Higgitt (1991; cited in Fonagy and Target, 1997) had found that the parent's reflective functioning capacity was predictive of infant attachment. In a follow-up of the same group, the same capacity also predicted superior performance on a false-belief task at 5 years, controlling for verbal fluency in the child. A path analysis showed that not all the variance predicted was mediated by mother-infant attachment status at the age of 1. Mother's RF ability seemed to have a direct as well as an indirect relationship with the child's theory of mind. Thus both the child's attachment security and the mother's mentalization ability were predictive.

Humfress, O'Connor, Slaughter, Target and Fonagy (2002) conducted a study with 12 to 13-year-olds to assess both mentalizing capabilities and the attachment state of mind using the Child Attachment Interview (CAI; Target, Fonagy, Schmuelli-Goetz, Datta and Schneider, 1998; cited in Humfress et al., 2002). As expected, they found a significant overlap between mentalizing ability and the coherence of the attachment narratives. However there were also a group of adolescents who provided less coherent narratives than would be expected based on their mentalizing abilities.

The authors found that this group of adolescents were more likely to be categorized as dismissing/avoidant on the attachment interviews. Humfress et al. (2002) suggest that these findings support the connection between mentalizing and attachment representations in early adolescence.

The Present Study

Until recently, attachment security was thought to be a function of parental sensitivity and responsiveness to the infant. Moreover, the attachment style of the parents was found to correlate significantly with that of their children and parental sensitivity was considered to be the mediating factor. However studies revealed that parental sensitivity was not sufficient in explaining this relationship (van Ijzendoorn, 1995). Main (1991; cited in Fonagy et al, 1995a) proposed a new model for the transmission of attachment security. She argued that attachment patterns in childhood are directly related to the parent's metacognitive quality. Related to this, reflective functioning ability on the part of the parent emerged as a new variable to explain the transmission of security from the parent to the infant. In addition, a highly developed mentalizing capacity in the infant usually referred to as theory of mind was found to be a significant correlate of the presence of a secure attachment context. Studies with adults using the AAI (George, Kaplan and Main, 1996; cited in Fonagy, 1999) also indicated a relationship between a secure/autonomous state of mind and high reflective functioning.

In the present study the relationship between attachment security and reflective functioning in late adolescence/young adulthood was explored in a sample of university students. In order to assess the attachment status of the participants, the IPPA and the PAQ were used. Attachment research conducted in Turkey reveal that the three or four category adult attachment categorization systems do not totally apply to the Turkish culture. The IPPA and the PAQ are designed to measure general security experienced in attachment relationships. Moreover the maternal and paternal

attachment subscales of both measures were relevant as the relationship of parental attachment and reflective functioning is the domain of the present study.

In order to assess reflective functioning, interviews comprised of several questions of the AAI were conducted with the participants. The details about the selection method for the questions can be found in the Method section.

The Reflective Functioning Scale developed by Fonagy and his colleagues (1998) was used to assess participants' reflectiveness levels in the interviews.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in the present study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who are more securely attached to their mothers as measured by the IPPA and the PAQ will have significantly higher scores of reflective functioning as measured by the RF Scale than insecurely attached individuals.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who are more securely attached to their fathers as measured by the IPPA and the PAQ will have significantly higher scores of reflective functioning as measured by the RF Scale than insecurely attached individuals

Questions explored

- The effect of having a different attachment pattern toward the mother and father on reflective functioning will be explored.
- Gender differences in terms of reflective functioning will be explored.
- Gender differences in terms of attachment security will be explored.

- Further evidence for the construct validity of the IPPA and initial evidence for the PAQ will be explored.

METHOD

Sample

119 (61 female, 58 male) Boğaziçi University undergraduate students participated in this study for extra course credit. Their ages ranged between 18 and 24 ($M=20.08$, $SD=1.038$). Having both parents alive and coming from intact families were set as prerequisites for participation in the study to avoid the possible confounding effects of these two variables.

Materials

Demographic Information Form

Demographic information about the participants was collected using the Demographic Information Form which investigated the participant's gender, age and department, and family information such as the occupation and the educational level of both parents, and number and gender of siblings (See Appendix A).

Attachment Measures

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) was developed by Armsden and Greenberg (1987) based on Bowlby's theoretical formulations. It is designed to assess the affective and cognitive dimensions of relationships and the quality of

attachment to parents and peers (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). In this study the 12-item short form of IPPA developed by Raja, McGee and Stanton (1992) was used instead of the 28-item original scale. The short form of IPPA consists of three subscales, namely trust (e.g. “My mother/father accepts me as I am”), alienation (e.g. “I get easily upset at home”) and communication (e.g. “I tell my mother/father about my problems and troubles). Each subscale consists of four items. Participants rate each item on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always) separately for both their mothers and their fathers. Thus a separate score of attachment security can be calculated for both the mother and the father by adding up the scores participants receive on the subscales.

The short form of IPPA (see Appendix B) was translated into Turkish with the standard translation-back translation procedure (Günaydın et al., 2005). Günaydın et al. found that the internal consistency estimates are .88 for the mother scale and .90 for the father scale, and the test-retest reliabilities are .87 and .88 respectively. Validity has been partially established as significant correlations in the expected directions were found between self-esteem and attachment security for both the mother and the father scales, and between paternal attachment and fear of disapproval. However further work is needed to fully establish construct validity.

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) was developed by Kenny (1990) for use with adolescents and young adults based on Ainsworth's (1978; cited in Kenny, 1990) conceptualization of attachment as an enduring affective bond, which serves as a secure base in providing emotional support and in fostering autonomy. This

theoretical framework is adapted to the concept of individuation in late adolescence and to the use of the parental figures as a secure base (Garbarino, 1998). In this study the 55-item questionnaire was used separately for both the mother and the father.

PAQ contains three subscales: Affective Quality of Relationships (e.g. “My mother/father supports my goals and interests”), Parents as Fostering of Autonomy (e.g. “My mother/father respects my privacy”), and Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support (e.g. “My mother/father has given me as much attention as I have wanted”). Participants rate each item on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). A separate attachment score for the mother and the father can be calculated by adding up the scores received in the subscales of each.

The reliability of the attachment measure was assessed by Kenny (1987) through test-retest and internal consistency methods. Test-retest reliability over a 2-week interval was .92 for the measure as a whole and ranged from .82 to .91 for the three scales. Internal consistency was .96 for the Affective Quality of Relationships subscale and .88 for both the Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support and Parents as Fostering of Autonomy subscales.

Validity has been established as Kenny (1987) reported that quality of relationship predicted first-year college men's and college women's scores on independent measures of self-assertion and dating competence. Moreover, in a different study, findings revealed a negative association between attachment security and psychological symptoms at the time of college entry, and positive associations between attachment security and academic, social, and personal adjustment (Kenny and Rice; 1995; cited in Garbarino, 1998).

PAQ (See Appendix C) was translated into Turkish with the translation-back translation procedure conducted by two master's students in clinical psychology. A

pilot study was conducted with 31 Boğaziçi University undergraduate students. The Cronbach's Alpha score was .94 overall for the mother scale, .94 for the Affective Quality of Relationship Subscale, .73 for the Parents as Fostering of Autonomy subscale and .86 for the Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support Subscale. For the father scale, the Cronbach's Alpha score was .97 overall and was .96 for the Affective Quality of Relationship Subscale, .89 for the Parents as Fostering of Autonomy subscale and .83 for the Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support Subscale.

Interview about Parental Relationships

109 of the 119 interviews were conducted by the researcher who was a second year student in the clinical psychology master's degree program at Boğaziçi University. 10 of the interviews were conducted by another student enrolled in the same program.

Participants were first briefly oriented to the content of the interview with the statements “In the following interview I will ask you questions about your relationship with both your mother and your father. We can start when you are ready.” The interview consisted of several questions chosen from the AAI (George, Kaplan and Main, 1985; cited in Siegel, 1999) as will be explained below. They were translated into Turkish by two master's students in clinical psychology by the translation-back translation procedure.

While using the Reflective Functioning Scale (Fonagy et al., 1998) designed to evaluate the degree of mentalization, Fonagy and his colleagues (1998) divide the questions in the AAI into two such that six questions strictly demand that the participants use reflective functioning while others permit, but do not necessitate it.

The “demand” questions carry more weight in the assignment of an overall RF score to the interview. Out of a total of 16 questions in the AAI, five out of those six “demand” questions and one “permit” question were used in the present study (See Appendix D).

The “permit” question is: “I would like to ask you to choose four adjectives or words that reflect your relationship with your mother/father starting from as far back as you can remember from early childhood.” And then the participant is asked to describe each adjective and to provide specific memories related to the adjective. (Four adjectives were probed instead of five as in the AAI due to time limits).

The five “demand” questions are: “1- Did you ever feel rejected as a child? 2- Do you think your childhood experiences with your mother/father have an influence on who you are today? 3- Are there any setbacks related to your relationship with your mother/father? 4- Why did your mother/father behave as they did during your childhood? 5- Have there been changes in your relationship with your mother/father since childhood?” Different from the AAI, all of the questions were asked separately for each parent except the rejection question. The interviews were tape-recorded and were transcribed later.

Coding of Interviews

Interviews were coded on the basis of the rules in the Reflective Functioning Manual for Application to Adult Attachment Interviews (Fonagy et al., 1998). Fonagy and his colleagues (1998) operationalized reflective functioning by developing the Reflective Functioning Scale (RFS). This scale is based on the presence of clear descriptions of mental states such as thoughts, beliefs and desires in the attachment

narratives. High scores on the RFS suggesting high reflectiveness necessitate narratives indicating awareness of mental states, explicit efforts to tease out mental states behind behavior, awareness that mental states change and evolve in dyadic and family interactions, and sensitivity to the mental states of the interviewer.

In the rating process, first, a single rating is assigned for the whole response given to a question on the basis of the presence of the above mentioned qualities. If there are clearly different ideas contained within the response, they are rated separately. For instance the participant might answer the question with a clearly different way of thinking for the father and the mother. The assigned score reflects the highest reflective level demonstrated in the response on a scale of -1 through 9 using the odd numbers. -1 corresponds to a distinctly anti-reflective, bizarre or inappropriate response, 1 to a lack of RF in the response, 3 to a questionable or low RF, 5 to a definite or ordinary RF, 7 to a marked RF, and 9 to an unusually high degree of RF in the response. After rating all passages, a general judgment of the interview as a whole is made rather than averaging scores on individual passages, and a score through -1 to 9 is assigned. Subtypes are available for some of the scores and they can be assigned if needed. An even number can be assigned if the rater thinks that a transcript falls between two classes.

The transcripts of the present study were rated by three judges one of whom was the researcher. The judges were all advanced clinical psychology graduate students who are familiar with the concepts. First the Reflective Functioning Scale Manual (Fonagy et al., 1998) was studied thoroughly by the researcher and the other two judges were trained. Then a pilot sample of interviews conducted to measure RF were coded for training. The training procedure lasted one and a half months and consisted of 4 consecutive inter-rater reliability trials on the pilot sample of 20

interviews. The judges achieved acceptable levels of reliability in coding the pilot sample of interviews for RF (mean inter-rater reliability between judges A and B = .78, between judges A and C = .72, between judges B and C = .70). Then 40 of the 119 interviews conducted for the present study were rated by all three judges. The inter-rater reliability coefficients are listed in Table 1. All correlations were significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1. Inter-rater Correlation Coefficients for Scoring of RF (N=40)

	Judge A	Judge B
Judge B	.831	
Judge C	.687	.620

For reliability purposes, 12 of the overall 119 interviews were also coded by a certified judge (judge D) who attended the Reflective Functioning Training Course in London in 2002. Among these 12 interviews, 6 had been rated by all three judges, and there were 2 interviews per judge that had been coded alone. Thus each judge had 8 interviews that could be checked for reliability with judge D. All of the correlations were significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2. Inter-rater Correlation Coefficients of the three Main Judges with Judge D (N=8)

	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
Judge D	.938	.910	.728

Procedure

The study was conducted for each participant individually. Before starting, the participants were asked to fill out an informed consent form (See Appendix E) containing general information about the research and contact information of the researcher. One person declined to participate in the study after reading the informed consent form and left. However she signed up for another session of the study stating that she had changed her mind. She agreed to participate this time after reading and filling out the consent form. After the informed consent form, the participants were given a demographic information form. Then the interview intended to measure reflective functioning was conducted. The interviews were tape-recorded. Then the participants were given the two attachment measures used in this study. The participants were asked not to put their names on any of the materials except the informed consent form. They were each given a code for identification. The procedure lasted about 45 minutes for each participant.

RESULTS

The means and standard deviations of maternal and paternal attachment security scores as assessed by the IPPA, maternal and paternal attachment security scores as assessed by the PAQ, and reflective functioning scores are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Security Scores as Measured by IPPA and PAQ, and Reflective Functioning Scores

		Males N = 58	Females N = 61	Total N = 119	Range
Maternal Attachment Security (IPPA)	M	64.97	70.11	67.61	35-83
	SD	8.61	8.69	8.99	
Paternal Attachment Security (IPPA)	M	57.88	62.46	60.23	26-83
	SD	12.85	12.95	13.05	
Maternal Attachment Security (PAQ)	M	206.22	221.05	213.82	140-255
	SD	22.33	23.58	24.06	
Paternal Attachment Security (PAQ)	M	191.86	202.48	197.30	84-256
	SD	29.56	34.78	32.64	
Reflective Function Scores	M	3.64	3.74	3.69	1-8
	SD	1.41	1.43	1.41	

The distribution of RF scores for males and females are presented in Table 4 and Table 5 respectively.

Table 4. The Distribution of Reflective Functioning Scores of Males

RF score	Frequency (Number of males who got that score)
1	4
2	7
3	17
4	15
5	10
6	3
7	2

Table 5. The Distribution of Reflective Functioning Scores of Females

RF score	Frequency (Number of females who got that score)
1	2
2	10
3	19
4	7
5	20
6	1
7	1
8	1

In order to test whether there was a relationship between maternal attachment security and reflective functioning, Pearson correlations were conducted separately between reflective functioning scores and the IPPA maternal attachment scores, and with reflective functioning scores and the PAQ maternal attachment scores. Results are presented in Table 6.

Results revealed that there was no significant relationship between maternal attachment security as assessed by either the IPPA ($r(119) = -.048$, $p = .606$) or the PAQ ($r(119) = -.126$, $p = .172$) and reflective functioning. Therefore the first hypothesis was not supported.

In order to test whether there was a relationship between paternal attachment security and reflective functioning, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between reflective functioning scores and the IPPA paternal attachment scores, and with reflective functioning and the PAQ paternal attachment scores. Results are presented in Table 6.

Results show that there was no significant relationship between reflective functioning scores and paternal attachment security measured by the IPPA ($r(119) = -.089$, $p = .333$), and between reflective functioning scores and paternal attachment security measured by the PAQ ($r(119) = -.077$, $p = .407$). Therefore the second hypothesis was not supported.

Table 6. Significance Values of the Correlation Coefficients between Reflective Functioning (RF) scores and Maternal and Paternal Attachment Security Scores Derived from the IPPA and the PAQ.

	Maternal Attachment Security		Paternal Attachment Security	
	IPPA N = 119	PAQ N = 119	IPPA N = 119	PAQ N = 119
RF Score	$p = .606$	$p = .172$	$p = .333$	$p = .407$

Additional Analyses

In order to examine the effect of different levels of attachment security on reflective functioning, an independent samples t-test was conducted. Attachment security scores of the IPPA were transformed into categorical variables such that participants falling in the top third range of attachment security scores were assigned to the High

Security group separately for the maternal and paternal attachment scores.

Participants in the bottom one third range were categorized as the Low Security group.

Results revealed that there was no difference between the maternal High Security and maternal Low Security groups, $t(79) = .049$, $p = .961$, and between paternal High Security and paternal Low Security groups in terms of reflective functioning, $t(78) = .193$, $p = .847$.

In order to test whether attachment security scores measured by the IPPA and the PAQ were related, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between maternal attachment security scores derived from the IPPA and the PAQ, and between paternal attachment security scores derived from the IPPA and the PAQ.

Results showed that both maternal and paternal attachment security scores measured by the IPPA and the PAQ are significantly correlated, $r(119) = .825$, $p = .000$ and $r(119) = .905$, $p = .000$ for maternal and paternal scores respectively.

An independent samples t-test was conducted in order to examine gender differences in terms of reflective functioning. Results show that there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of reflective functioning, $t(117) = 116.81$, $p = .702$.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted in order to test the effect of having a different attachment style toward the mother and the father on reflective functioning. IPPA attachment scores were first divided from the median and those individuals falling below the median were assigned to the Low Security group and those above the median were assigned to the High Security group. This was conducted separately for the maternal and the paternal attachment scores. Individuals falling right on the median were not included in either group.

A 2x2 (Security toward mother x Security toward father) Analysis of Variance indicated that there was no significant effect of security toward the mother on reflective functioning, $F(1,107) = .649$, $p = .422$, $\eta^2 = .006$, no significant effect of security toward the father on reflective functioning, $F(1,107) = .030$, $p = .864$, $\eta^2 = .000$, and no significant effect of the interaction between attachment security toward the mother and toward the father on reflective functioning, $F(1,107) = 2.529$, $p = .115$, $\eta^2 = .023$.

In order to test whether the paternal and maternal attachment security scores differ, two paired samples t-tests were conducted for both the IPPA and the PAQ scales. The results indicated that the mean for maternal attachment security as measured by IPPA was significantly greater than the mean for paternal attachment security, $t(118) = 6.437$, $p = .000$, and the mean for maternal attachment security as assessed by PAQ was also significantly greater than the mean for paternal attachment security, $t(118) = 5.819$, $p = .000$.

In order to test the effect of gender on maternal and paternal attachment security, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance was conducted. A significant difference was found between the means of males and females in terms of maternal attachment security for both the IPPA scores, $F(1,117) = 10.53$, $p = .002$, and the PAQ scores, $F(1,117) = 12.37$, $p = .001$ indicating that females were more securely attached toward their mothers than males. The effect of gender on paternal attachment security was found to be marginally significant for both the IPPA scores, $F(1,117) = 3.75$, $p = .055$, and the PAQ scores, $F(1,117) = 3.20$, $p = .076$. Females had a tendency to be more securely attached toward their fathers than males.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship between the quality of parental attachment as measured by self-report inventories and level of reflective functioning on a group of late adolescents. Contrary to expectations, no significant relationship was found between attachment security and the level of reflective functioning using either the IPPA (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) or the PAQ (Kenny, 1987) as a measure of attachment. Next, results will be discussed in terms of the validity of the attachment measures used in the present study and in terms of the applicability of the Reflective Functioning Scale to the Turkish culture respectively.

Attachment as a Perceived Affective Quality vs. an Underlying Organization:

Validity of the Self-report Measures Used in the Present Study

The self-report measures of attachment used in the present study provided information about late adolescents' own appraisals of the current attachment-related quality of their relationships with their parents. Several researchers have demonstrated that the IPPA correlates highly with some family variables such as family cohesiveness and tendency to seek out parents in times of need (e.g., Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), and less secure parental attachment as measured by the IPPA has been found to correlate with some negative experiences in adolescence such as depression and hopelessness (Armsden et al., 1990). Correlations regarding the validity of the PAQ (Kenny, 1987) have also been established. However some researchers argue that it is difficult to fully represent the affective quality, or internal working model of attachment to parents by using questionnaires as they do not

actually tap the unconscious attachment organization (e.g., Paterson, Field & Pryer, 1994, Crowell, Treboux & Waters, 1999).

Different methodological and conceptual approaches have been taken in the study of adult attachment by researchers from a developmental or clinical psychology tradition and those from a social psychology tradition (Crowell et al., 1999). While social psychologists have mostly relied on self-report measures to assess the quality of attachment or “attachment style”, developmental and clinical psychologists have typically studied child and adult attachment via observation or narrative assessments. Although literature regarding the construct of mentalization has accumulated over a long time through contributions of many individuals from different disciplines, the operationalization of the construct has by and large been realized by developmental and clinical psychologists in theory of mind studies with children and in studies assessing the level of reflective functioning through interviews such as the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, George, Kaplan and Main, 1985; cited in Main, 1994) or the Parent Development Interview (PDI, Aber et al., 1985; cited in Slade et al, 2005) in adulthood. In effect, Fonagy et al. (1998) operationalized reflective functioning by developing the Reflective Functioning Scale on the basis of detailed coding instructions to be applied to the AAI narratives. Researchers interested in the relationship between mentalization and attachment have typically used observational methods to measure the attachment style of children or conducted interviews such as the AAI to assess the state of mind with respect to attachment in adulthood. Results mostly revealed a positive relationship between security of parental attachment and reflective functioning.

The lack of relationship found between attachment security and reflective functioning in the present study might be an artifact of the measures used to assess

parental attachment quality. Both the IPPA and the PAQ have been developed as self-report measures of parental attachment to be used with late adolescents and are among the most widely used scales in studies of attachment with that age group (Vivona, 2000). However some researchers argue that self-report measures of attachment do not assess the same underlying construct as the narrative assessments, and their construct validity is being questioned (e.g., Crowell et al., 1999; Bartholomew and Shaver, 1998). In effect Heiss, Berman and Sperling (1996; cited in Vivona, 2000) have concluded that these measures assess the general affective quality of the parental relationships of late adolescents, which is a construct related to but not the same as attachment.

Several arguments have been made as to why interview measures and self-report measures do not assess the same construct. The most important of these arguments is related to the level of consciousness of the constructs tapped in different assessment methods. The scoring system of the AAI goes beyond the content of the individual's narrative or what he or she feels about attachment experiences with the goal of tapping unconscious processes that are not directly available to inquiry (Crowell et al., 1999). This is accomplished via scoring the quality of childhood experiences according to the coder's view which does not always correspond to the presence of positive or negative experiences in the content, analyzing the language used in the narratives, and analyzing the ability to give a coherent and integrated account of experiences and their meanings (Main & Goldwyn, 1994; cited in Crowell et al., 1999). The way the respondent speaks about childhood experiences and attachment-related issues is critical in assigning a classification in the AAI rather than the manifest content. Thus for instance a respondent talking basically about negative, painful childhood experiences can be coded as having an

autonomous/secure state of mind with respect to attachment as well as insecure depending on the criteria mentioned above, or someone expressing a childhood with positive relationships can be coded as insecure based on the discourse analysis. On the contrary, self-report measures use the conscious evaluations of the individuals' perceptions with respect to attachment related cognition and behavior (Crowell et al., 1999).

Carlivati (2001) distinguishes between attachment organization and attachment perception such that attachment organization refers to the underlying internal working model which is tapped by the AAI while attachment perception refers to the adolescent's conscious appraisals regarding the positivity or negativity of the relationship with parents. In her study, she used the IPPA to measure those perceptions. She found that the relationship between school success of adolescents and their state of mind with respect to attachment as measured by the AAI was mediated by their peer relationships. No such relationship was found between school success and parental attachment perceptions of the adolescents as measured by the IPPA. She argues that this may be a result of attachment organization unconsciously affecting peer relationships, which in turn may predict school success. However she proposes that simply perceiving that one has secure relationships with parents does not guarantee having good peer relationships and their resulting positive effects in academic life. Similarly a perception of negative attachment-related experiences with parents does not lead to unsuccessful peer relationships if the person is able to reflect coherently on these negative experiences indicating a secure attachment organization. She questions the validity of IPPA if it is used as a measure of attachment organization rather than as a measure of perceived quality of parent-child relationship.

Maier, Bernier, Pekrun, Zimmermann and Grossmann (2004), by using an experimental paradigm, have also found that despite being moderately related to each other, the IPPA and the AAI present very different patterns of associations with automatic, unconscious processes. They primed the participants with subliminal stimulation, using sentences about maternal rejection intended to tap the participants' underlying unconscious representations of attachment and then rated their cognitive automatic evaluations of sentences related to self, self-efficacy, relationship to others and relationship to parents. Results revealed that two of the three attachment dimensions of the AAI (namely Secure and Dismissing) were associated with automatic evaluations of sentences related to self, self-efficacy, and relationship to others, whereas no evidence of the relationship between attachment security derived from the IPPA and automatic evaluations of the sentences after subliminal stimulation was found. They suggested that this result might be due to IPPA's lack of efficiency in tapping the participants' real representations of parental availability and support and that attachment security as measured by the IPPA might be under full conscious awareness decreasing its validity as a measure of the underlying attachment organization. The AAI seems to be more efficient in tapping those unconscious processes.

In fact Maier et al.'s (2004) study revealed that the perceived attachment quality as measured by the IPPA might sometimes be the opposite of the underlying unconscious organization. They found that self-reported attachment security to mother by the IPPA was related with automatic evaluations of the parents in the direction opposite to what is expected. Security as measured by the IPPA was associated with the subjects' increased response time with which they answered affirmatively to the evaluations of their relationships with parents (when primed with

maternal rejection). However the maternal rejection priming would be expected to accelerate the tendency to respond positively to those questions if the underlying attachment organization was secure. The authors argue that the delayed response time suggests that the internal working model tapped by priming was actually negative for those participants contrary to what they reported in the IPPA, thus interfering with the voluntary desire to respond positively. Therefore Maier et al. (2004) argue that the IPPA might be subject to idealization of the relationship with parents. The IPPA thus might be vulnerable to social desirability confounds.

Another reason proposed as to why there is a discrepancy between attachment state of mind and perceptions of the relationship with parents is that the correlates and consequences of attachment state of mind are more likely to appear under stressful conditions (Adam, Gunnar & Tanaka, 2004). One of attachment theory's main assumptions is that attachment representations and related behaviors are activated in times of personal distress when the sense of safety or security breaks down (Bowlby, 1982; cited in Stein et al., 1998). Thus attachment cannot be defined sociometrically in terms of the perceptions of individuals about their relationships. Rather the nature of attachment is revealed by what people make of these relationships at times of stress, fear or danger when the attachment system is activated (Stein et al., 1998). However studies that assess individuals' perceptions of their relationships with their parents are generally conducted in neutral situations such as the university labs (Bernier, Larose & Whipple, 2005).

To test this argument, Bernier et al. (2005) compared two groups of adolescents. One group was leaving home to attend college, a situation which was assumed to lead to stress. The other group was comprised of students who lived at home while going to college. The perceptions about parental relationship of both

groups were assessed by the IPPA while their attachment state of mind was assessed by the AAI. The authors found that there were significant differences between the perceptions of adolescents who were leaving home for college with regard to attachment as measured by the IPPA. Preoccupied students as assessed by the AAI reported more negative relationships with both their parents and more familial stress than their secure counterparts. No such difference was found among students who lived at home while attending college suggesting that the stress imposed on the adolescents leaving home might have activated their attachment system which might in turn have affected their perceptions. However no difference was found between dismissing and secure individuals in terms of perceptions of attachment. Although contrary to the authors' expectations, they suggest that this is consistent with dismissing individuals' discourse in the AAI. Dismissing individuals usually provide positive descriptions of relationships with their parents. Nevertheless they fail to support these evaluations with specific memories of warm exchanges with parents. The same pattern of idealization might still be at work when dismissing individuals are asked to report on their relationship with their parents on a questionnaire even under conditions of stress.

In fact, the ability to represent both negative and positive childhood experiences in a coherent manner allowing for the presence of disturbing autobiographical memories is a characteristic of the secure attachment organization as measured by the AAI. However such a person would probably score low on security according to the IPPA. Likewise, a pseudo-ideal representation of relationship with parents despite negative memories and denial of negative events would result in an insecure classification according to the AAI. However those people would probably score very high in security on the IPPA due to their defensive

idealization. Thus it can be argued that the attachment measures used in the present study, namely the IPPA and the PAQ (as it is very highly correlated to the IPPA) were not valid measures for assessing the underlying attachment organization which might explain why the hypothesized relationship between attachment security and reflective functioning was not found.

Cultural Considerations Related to the Reflective Functioning Scale

In addition to finding no significant relationship between attachment security and level of reflective functioning, the mean RF score of the participants in the present study was found to be 3.69 which is somewhat low considering that the ordinary RF expected to be commonly observed in the general population is 5. This finding may be an accurate reflection of their general level of reflective functioning. However this finding may also reflect some cultural biases in the operationalization of reflective functioning. Several arguments regarding these results will be discussed in terms of the effects of culture in the following sections.

Self as a Contextualized Construct

Understanding the self and others is part of our universal evolutionary heritage (Tomasello, 1999; Whiten, 2002; cited in Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni & Maynard, 2003). Infants all over the world develop an understanding of intentional actions of self and of others and the effects of actions on other people (Greenfield et al., 2003). However Greenfield and her colleagues propose that there are different cultural pathways, the pathways of independence and interdependence through development,

and that culture might be an important mediating variable in determining how understanding of minds develops and is expressed depending on the path relevant to the particular culture falls. These pathways are associated with individualism and collectivism. Most literature about the understanding of mental states relies on an individualistic perspective (Flavell, 1999; cited in Greenfield et al., 2003). However a culture might also emphasize social effects or context rather than the individual psyche in the development of social understanding which might lead to a different kind of developmental path for the theory of mind (Greenfield et al., 2003).

The traditional Turkish family is characterized by interdependence among the family members suggesting that the Turkish culture should be classified as “collectivistic” (Sunar & Fişek, 2005) although recent research suggests that it may be more properly regarded as lying in between these two extremes especially in the urban population (e.g., Anamur, 1998, Kılıç, 2000; cited in Sunar, 2002). Kağıtçıbaşı (1996) also described the Turkish culture as a “culture of relatedness”. Vinden and Astington (2000; cited in Greenfield et al., 2003) propose that personal, mental and emotional states might be relatively less important in collectivistic cultures. In collectivistic cultures, the self is conceptualized more in terms of relationships rather than individual characteristics (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) giving rise to an interdependently oriented self that is fluidly defined and is connected within a relational network (Wang & Brockmeier, 2002). According to this perspective, the self cannot be separated from others and from the social context (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

On the other hand, tied to an ideology of individualism, an independently oriented self has strict boundaries being distinct and separate from others and from the social context (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). According to Markus and Kitayama

(1991) such a model implies that the self is comprised of a unique configuration of internal attributes such as emotions, motives, values etc., and the self behaves as a consequence of these internal attributes.

Such a cultural difference in terms of the development of the self and perspectives on what constitutes the self is likely to have implications for mother-child interactions and for the formation and retrieval of narratives which in turn are likely to interact with reflective functioning. In fact, several researchers argue that how people process stimuli, reason about the causes of events, and describe themselves varies according to the culture they live in (Fiske, Kitayama, Markus & Nisbett, 1998; Triandis, 1989; cited in Leichtman, Wang & Pillemer, 2003)

The operationalization of reflective functioning is based on a clear self-other differentiation which closely resembles the individualistic Western notion of independent self. Thus the application of this scoring system to more collectivistic cultures with interdependent selves in which the effect of the social context on actions is relatively more important than the individual mental characteristics, might lead to some biased results that undermine the reflective abilities of individuals within such cultures.

Cultural Differences in terms of autobiographical memory

One of the ways culture affects the self is through autobiographical memory which creates a continuity between past and present contributing to the maintenance of a coherent self (Wang and Brockmeier, 2002). According to Wang and Brockmeier (2002) autobiographical memory is formed via the narrative constructions of

childhood experiences through interactions with parents which are affected by socially constructed meaning systems and culture.

In the present study, the questions presented to the participants in the interviews for the assessment of RF comprised of a couple of questions chosen from the AAI which asked the participants to describe and provide specific memories of their childhood relationship with their parents, to elaborate on why they thought their parents behaved like that etc. The interpretation of the AAI is highly dependent on analysis of cognitive processes in the construction of autobiographical memory narratives (Goldberg, 2000). Hesse (1996; cited in Goldberg, 2000) proposes that the respondent faces two tasks - first, to retrieve and reflect on memories of childhood experiences while second, and simultaneously, maintaining the coherent discourse with the interviewer. The secure individual is able to coordinate these two tasks, while the insecure individual is not. But what if there was a cultural difference to start with in the formation of those autobiographical memories?

In fact evidence points out to cultural differences in the formation and retrieval of autobiographical memories. For e.g. in individualistic European-American cultures, learning to “tell your story” and fostering personal narratives is very common and highly-valued (Mullen, 1994; cited in Nelson, 2003). Related to this, Wang (2001a), in a comparison of Caucasian-American and Chinese students, found that the average age of earliest memory for the Chinese students was 6 months later than for the Americans. Moreover, the early memories reported by Americans tended to be voluminous, specific, self-focused and concerned with autonomy and personal preferences. In contrast, memories of Chinese participants were more skeletal, routine-related, centered on relationships and sensitive to others involved. Evidence suggests that individuals raised in interdependent cultures recount specific,

detailed personal events less frequently than their North American counterparts (Leichtman, Wang & Pillemer, 2003).

Wang and Brockmeier (2002) argue that an independently oriented self is associated with the early establishment of autobiographical memory that is elaborate, specific, emotionally charged and self-focused whereas an interdependently oriented self is associated with the later establishment of autobiographical memory which is brief, general, emotionally unexpressive and relation-centered.

These differences are probably attributed to differences in parent-child interactions and narratives between the two groups. For instance Miller (1997; cited in Reese and Farrant, 2003) found that Chinese mothers were more likely to use discussions of past events as a vehicle for teaching the child social rules by resolving a previous misbehavior of the child. Reese and Farrant (2003) suggest that this pattern resembles the mother-child dialogue observed with insecurely attached children in the Western samples. However this kind of interacting in the Chinese culture takes place in the context of a warm, yet firm relationship between mother and child. They suggest that secure attachment might lead to different forms of narratives about autobiographical memories in different cultures. A secure attachment might lead to a less elaborative manner in recalling autobiographical memories and a sense of self that is interdependent with others if they are more psychologically adaptive for children in a particular culture.

The average reflective functioning scores of Turkish late adolescents based on their narratives about childhood is likely to be lower than that of their Western counterparts as currently assessed with the Reflective Functioning Scale, since a high reflective functioning score on that scale necessitates the presence of specific, elaborate examples. Although no research related to the autobiographical memory

comparisons of Turkish culture with other cultures is available, the interview narratives in the present study did indeed tend to be skeletal and generalized with little presence of specific memories as is characteristic of narratives observed in interdependent cultures.

Cultural differences in terms of focusing on mental states versus on the social context

Elaborate personal narratives are rich sources of information about mental processes and might be one important context in which children learn about the minds of the self and others (Haden, 2003). Parent-child discussions of past events might include a whole array of mental states such as references to intentions, thoughts, beliefs, desires and emotions. These in turn might enhance children's understanding of why others behaved the way they did, felt certain emotions etc. Talking about mental states might also be used to indicate commonalities and differences between the child's understanding and that of another. These are all qualities that point to high reflective functioning in narratives. However cultural differences might also lead to differences in the type and amount of mental language used and in the understanding of self and others in terms of mental states.

From an independent view of self, the most important features of the self are internal and the individual is highly vigilant to the corresponding subjective experience of inner attributes of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1994). One's reactions and actions are based on these attributes. Thus for example, in the United States, individuals mostly take the emotions experienced as referents of how to behave later. It is very important that one knows what one feels and acts on the basis of those feelings. Accordingly English has hundreds of words designating cognitively based

feelings including nouns, adjectives and verbs, and more than a hundred of them are in current use (Wierzbicka, 1994).

By contrast, from an interdependent view of the self, the most important features of the self are related to roles and relationships. Rather than individual, subjective experiences, a heightened sense of the other and the self in relation to the other is more privileged in the behavioral processes. The goal is not individual awareness and expression, but rather some attunement of one's reactions and actions with those of another (Markus & Kitayama, 1994).

Such differences in how the self is viewed in collectivistic versus individualistic cultures have implications on how behavior is explained and mental language is used in different cultures. In collectivistic cultures, behavior is generally explained in terms of group experiences such as attributes of the groups or norms as opposed to psychological processes such as attitudes and beliefs (e.g., Kashima, Siegel, Tanaka & Kashima, 1992; cited in Triandis 1994).

Accordingly, Wang (2001b) found that during conversations about shared emotional experiences with their children, American mothers tended to provide rich causal explanations for their children's emotions whereas Chinese mothers rarely provided explanations for the feelings states of their children, and when they did, they tended to “teach the child a lesson” rather than explaining why the child felt that way. Thus cultural differences about the view of the self and following that, about causes of behavior are reflected in mother-child dialogues.

Mesquita (1993; cited in Frijda & Mesquita, 1994) conducted a study in the Netherlands in which she compared Turkish, Surinamese and Dutch participants. She found that in open interviews with the participants, spontaneous reports of emotions appeared to contain more frequent reference to social aspects of meaning in the

Turkish and Surinamese groups than in the Dutch, suggesting that Turkish and Surinamese respondents more readily appraise emotional situations in terms of social dimensions. She also asked the participants to describe an emotional experience that fitted the description of a given type of situation and to answer questions about the emotional experience. Three of those questions referred to the “obviousness” of the meaning of the situation, asking whether another person would judge the pleasantness of the situation as the respondent did, whether another person would think and feel similarly when in the respondent's position and whether another person would react as the respondent had. The most obviousness was found in the Turkish group who on the average judged that the other person would think, feel and react as they did under similar circumstances. Frijda and Mesquita (1994) propose that these results suggest that an understanding of emotions within a social context leads to an increased sense that the meaning and implications of particular events are more or less fixed, objective facts.

In the present study, in order to be considered reflective, answers to the questions in the interview needed to contain internal, mental, specific attributions. Social, general, sociological accounts of behavior or explanations based on stable personality characteristics received low ratings. However these were very common in the narratives of individuals in the current study which might in part explain the relatively low mean of the level of reflective functioning found in the sample. As growing up in a culture in which it is very common to attribute causes of behavior to the effects of the social context in which the individual lives, participants frequently tended to respond to questions in terms of explanations that depend on the social context. Such answers were especially given to the question “why did your mother/father behave as s/he did?”. For a better demonstration, the answer of two

participants in response to the question “why did your father behave like that?” will be presented in the following lines. The first participant got an overall rating of 3 indicating a questionable or low level of reflective functioning. The second participant got an overall rating of 5 indicating an ordinary level of reflective functioning.

Excerpt from the narrative of the first participant:

According to me he behaved like that mostly because of what he observed in his family.

Interviewer: What did he observe for instance?

For instance the father is more dominant in his family too. The father, his kids... The father is authoritarian at home. The father is influential. Everything happens around the father. I mean because he observed these, he wanted to be in the center himself in his own family too.

Excerpt from the narrative of the second participant:

The reason for my father's behavior, I think... as I've told you before about the patriarchal society, in my hometown there is a custom; when one's father is with him, when one is with his family, which means my grandfather, one remains shy, does not express himself. My father couldn't even show affection to us when my grandfather was present. This was considered to be shameful. And I am telling you this as a custom that still goes on in the region where I live. I think the reason is he (participant's father) couldn't reflect his character, remained shy and couldn't express his own self when my grandfather was present. Maybe he had very good relationships with his friends or at work and he was treating other people very well. But he couldn't show much consideration or express himself in our family. He had been suppressed by my grandfather; I can put it like that. And this is of course something sociological; it is not just about our family, the society in general is like that in Anatolia.

The first participant explains her father's behavior entirely in reference to the family context, to the dominant role of her grandfather in his family. The father is told to have observed this pattern and acted accordingly. However specific internal mental states are not attributed to the father and the effect of the grandfather's role in the family on the father's psyche is skipped. The second participant explains his father's behavior in terms of the customs of the general social context the father and his

family are in. The father is explained as a self existing in relation with the culture. Possible effects of the social context and the grandfather's attitudes on the father's mental world are explicated by the participant. Yet again, the focus of explanation for the reasons of behavior is the social, cultural context rather than the inner mental states of the father.

Individuals' behaviors are generally viewed in a social context by the participants in the present study although the level of reflection might differ. Sometimes psychological effects of the context are pronounced. However most participants do not feel obligated to explicate the social effects any further as giving explanations in terms of the social context is a common practice in the Turkish culture.

Such differences in narratives in different cultures seem to be present from early on. Küntay and Nakamura (2003) investigated the narratives of Turkish and Japanese children and adults and compared the results with those of Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991; cited in Küntay and Nakamura, 2003) who conducted a similar study with English-speaking participants. Participants were asked to tell a story by looking at the pictures of the story. In order to tell the story successfully, participants needed to infer and convey aspects of the story that were not overtly available such as inferring relationships between the characters of the story, attributing mental states to them and providing causal explanations and motivations for the characters' actions. Küntay and Nakamura (2003) found that compared to the Japanese and Turkish narratives, narratives of English-speaking children and adults contained significantly more causal evaluations which showed that the respondent was actively reflecting on the story making connections between different aspects of the story. Moreover, English-speaking children used these causal connections mostly in

reference to a mental state or emotion of the character (e.g., “and then the boy was *mad* cause he knew that the frog went away”). Bamberg and Damrad-Frye (1991; cited in Küntay and Nakamura, 2003) suggest that this pattern of connecting behavior with intentions is part of the communicative convention in Western-European languages: whenever you refer to one's mental state, you justify your inference of that mental state or emotion with other knowledge about why you thought that way. In a similar vein, in a recent study of narrative retelling of a story, Aksu-Koç and Küntay (2001; cited in Küntay and Nakamura, 2003) found that Turkish narrators (both children and adults) tended to reformulate the causal relations in the story that was read to them by omitting the psychological causal explanations and focusing on the action-oriented parts.

Similarly, in the present study, the question about the effects of the parent on the participant's personality was frequently answered in terms of behavioral consequences such as ways of relating with other people, skipping the mental states evoked or the mental, emotional consequences. Changes in the relationship with parents have also been frequently described in terms of behavioral changes without clarifying as to what changes in mental states caused or accompanied these changes in relationship.

Küntay and Nakamura (2003) argue that there is no reason to suspect that the Turkish and Japanese narrators lack the cognitive ability of inferring mental states from particular situations. Rather, their inferences do not seem to be a part of their explicit interpretive stance as their American counterparts. It is not the case that they do not make such causal inferences. Looking at the data, the authors suggest that they do in fact make such inferences. However the mental/emotional attribute is

assumed/inferred on the part of the listener and becomes part of the shared knowledge between the speaker and the listener.

Related to shared experience, Wang (2001b) suggested that in interdependent cultures, instead of the explicit dialogue about the personal past common in individualistic Western cultures, empathy based on implicit understanding and shared perspectives that are communicated nonverbally might be more prominent. Fonagy et al. (1995b) also suggest that in Western cultures the visual and verbal modalities have primacy, but in other cultures, other channels such as physical contact might be more important in channeling the caregiver's containment. Such a difference in cultures might also have results that mediate the link between attachment security and reflective functioning. The Turkish culture is in fact more tactile-related in communication especially in the mother-child communication and verbal exchange is less prominent. This might be one reason affecting the general reflective functioning level in the present late adolescent sample as the procedure probably reflects the level of the verbal exchange used between the parent and the child which in turn reflects the level of reliance on verbal modality in that culture.

Considering the present study, a lack of mental state attributions in the explicit narrative might not be pointing to a cognitive deficit in inferring mental states, but rather to the assumption that such mental states are inferred by the interviewer and do not need explicit recognition by the speaker. This is in fact apparent in some of the answers the participants gave in response to the probe question “and how did that make you feel?”. In response to such a question, participants sometimes answered by adding “of course” to their answer such as “sad of course” suggesting that this must in fact be inferred by the interviewer and needs no explicit verbal exchange. As another example, adolescent crisis was frequently

brought up as the reason why relationships with parents got worse during a period and the behavioral consequences have been explicated. But the exact change in the mental states of the participant during that “crisis” was often not explicitly stated. Perhaps this is due to the inference on the part of the participant that the interviewer implicitly shares how the participant must have felt then. Moreover they could have skipped some mental state attributions in the interview assuming that since the interviewer is a psychologist, she “knows” how the people mentioned in their narratives including themselves must have felt, thought, wished etc. It is likely that in a culture in which shared knowledge is assumed, a psychologist is thought to grasp such knowledge better.

A recent study by Sefer (2006) also revealed some results that might be related to the relatively low level of reflective functioning observed in the present study. Sefer (2006) used Blatt, Chevron, Quinlan, Schaffer and Wein's (1988; cited in Sefer, 2006) measurement procedure on a sample of Turkish late adolescents to assess parental representations, wherein subjects are simply asked to describe their parents. She found that Turkish late adolescents got relatively low ratings on the Conceptual Level Scale which is a scale derived from psychoanalytic and Piagetian cognitive concepts. Descriptions of the self and significant other can be rated on a continuum from sensorimotor level to the symbolic/conceptual level at the highest on that scale. She found that Turkish late adolescents' descriptions fell between the external iconic level and the internal iconic level, not totally reaching the internal iconic level on average. The internal iconic level suggests the presence of psychological dimensions in the description such as the thoughts, feelings and values of the person described while in the external iconic level, the person is primarily described in terms of the manifest functions and actions. Thus, the Turkish late

adolescents in that study tended to describe their parents more in terms their actions and functions rather than their psychological characteristics.

This finding is interesting as Levy, Blatt and Shaver (1998) suggested that Fonagy's concept of reflective self-function might be similar to the concept of conceptual level. Sefer (2006) suggested that this finding might be a reflection of the individualistic bias regarding the definition of mental development which describes higher levels of development as independent, separate, bounded and unrelated to others. She suggests that it is possible that Turkish late adolescents internalized culture-specific interactions with their parents in terms of the relationship between the two rather than representing them as entities separate from the self.

In light of the studies and arguments mentioned above, it is probable that a secure attachment in the Turkish culture might not always be a correlate of high reflective functioning as currently defined considering the interdependent self encouraged in that culture. Conversations about past events and mental states depending on a clear separateness of the minds of the self and of others which in turn organize the underlying representations accordingly, might not be a part of the mother-child conversation in the Turkish culture even in dyads with securely attached children. However no conclusive remarks can be made related to this regarding the questionable validity of the attachment measures used to assess attachment security in the current study.

Comparisons between Maternal and Paternal Attachment Security Scores

Results revealed that there was a difference in the level of attachment security towards the mother vs. the father. Both males and females were found to be more

securely attached towards their mothers. This finding is in agreement with research that has found the mother to be the preferred attachment figure in Western cultures (Lamb, 1981; Lytton, 1980; cited in Haigler, Day & Marshall, 1995). Halfon (2006), using the IPPA scale, also found that individuals reported a more secure attachment towards their mothers. Thus the Turkish culture seems to be similar to the Western culture in terms of the preferred attachment figure.

The preference of mother over the father as the attachment figure makes sense considering the differences of traditional maternal and paternal roles in the family. In the Turkish culture mothers are highly involved in the care and supervision of their children while fathers take a more distant but authoritative role (Sunar, 2002). Sunar (2002), in a comparison of three generations of families, found that all three generations and both sexes portray a family atmosphere dominated by a close and highly positive maternal involvement with children compared with the father's relative distance and encouragement of some independence in the child. Hortaçsu (1989) found that mother-child communication was more pronounced than father-child communication and that adolescents were more intimate with their mothers than with their fathers. She argues that these results seem to paint a picture of the Turkish family wherein the mother is more focal and the father is more peripheral in terms of intimate relationships with children. Sefer (2006) found that late adolescents represented their mothers as more affectionate, warmer, stronger, more constructively involved and more nurturant than their fathers. Adolescents also feel emotionally closer to their mothers than their fathers (Hortaçsu, Gencöz and Oral, 1995). These differences in the mother-child versus father-child relationship show that the mother is preferred for expressive emotional sharing and care whereas

the father is preferred for sharing instrumental information about self and decisions (Fişek, 1991).

Gender Differences in terms of Attachment Security

Results revealed a gender difference in terms of attachment security. It was found that females were more securely attached toward their mothers than males. Moreover, females had a tendency to be more securely attached toward their fathers than males. Halfon (2006) using the IPPA scale, also found the same gender difference in terms of maternal attachment security. However, she did not find any difference between males and females in terms of paternal attachment security.

A gender difference in terms of the preferred attachment figure is not consistently found in the Western cultures. Some studies suggest that no difference in terms of attachment security exists between genders. (e.g., Lytton, 1980; Main & Weston, 1981; cited in Haigler et al., 1995). However some research suggests that women are closer and more securely attached to their parents than men are (e.g., Kenny, 1987, 1990; Lapsley, Rice & Shadid, 1989; cited in Kenny & Donaldson, 1991). Roland (1988) states that in Eastern cultures the relationship with mother is more important for girls as they internalize family customs, culture and tradition. They fear hurting the family, especially their mothers. In line with this idea, Hortaçsu (1989) found that although both males and females communicated more frequently with the mother and were more intimate with the mother than the father, this effect was more pronounced for females. Akhondzadeh (2002) found that females displayed more self-esteem enhancement needs from the mothers compared to males.

Sefer (2006) also found that females represented their mothers as being more affectionate, ambitious and intellectual than males.

Although females seem to be more close and emotionally-tied with their mothers, they might also be closer to their fathers compared to males as the finding in the present study suggests such a tendency. This might be due to fathers' feeling more comfortable getting intimate with their daughters because expression of emotions and intimacy are more compatible with feminine stereotypes (Cancian, 1989; cited in Fişek, 1994). In line with this, Sunar (2002) found that, although mothers were perceived to be more affectionate by both sons and daughters in three generations, daughters perceived their fathers as more affectionate than sons do again across the three generations. Moreover, sons were more likely than daughters to perceive their fathers as angry. Hortaçsu (1989) also found that the distance between fathers and sons seemed to be greater than that reported for Western samples. In a similar vein, Sefer (2006) found that females represented their fathers also as more affectionate and more intellectual in addition to representing them as more constructively involved, nurturant and benevolent than males did.

Limitations and Further Research

The attachment measures used in the present study, namely the IPPA and the PAQ can only tap current perceptions related to attachment rather than the unconscious cognitive processes underlying the attachment system. Therefore future research regarding the relationship between attachment security and level of reflective functioning could use narrative assessments that seem to tap the implicit attachment organization more reliably.

A further limitation of the present study is that selected questions from the AAI were used due to time-limits instead of applying the whole procedure. A longer interview might allow for more elaborate descriptions of experiences of childhood relationships with parents thereby making it more likely that the individual gets the chance to reflect on those experiences.

Cultural differences might have played a role in the relatively shorter and less elaborate narratives observed in the present study. Moreover, the concept of self in Turkey is not as separate and bounded as it is in the Western cultures. Having an interdependent self makes it less likely that spontaneous specific attributions to people's mental states are made when events are being described or making causal inferences as to why people felt or thought in certain ways every time an observed mental state is mentioned. They do not seem to be part of the common cultural practice as in the Western cultures. Therefore more prompting regarding the mental states of the characters being described could be used in further research. In fact Eaton, Collis and Lewis (1999; cited in Küntay and Nakamura, 2003) found that specific prompting about story characters led to an increase in the ability English-speaking children demonstrated about providing coherent causal explanations about story characters' feelings. Hence, Küntay and Nakamura (2003) suggest that the cognitive skill to formulate evaluative causal explanations in the narrative is separate from the tendency to spontaneously include them in the narrative without being prompted to do so.

Assuming that some mental states are shared and inferred nonverbally by both parties present in a conversation seems to be a part of cultures with interdependent selves. Therefore future research could also rely on some behavioral measures or use specific instructions in narrative measures that any mental state

should be mentioned no matter how obvious it seems. Also the scope of coding criteria for the assessment of reflective functioning in a narrative could be transformed to take into account the fact that the self is dependent on the social context in the Turkish culture and that social accounts of behavior are part of common practice.

The interviews in the present study were conducted in a university lab with individuals who participated for extra course credit. Frequently time limits were imposed on the participants because they needed to catch the next lesson or study for an exam after the interview. This could have interfered with their concentrating on the interview and reflecting on their experiences with parents which is a mentally demanding process. Future research could use settings that do not impose such limitations on the participants.

Further research on reflective functioning might also compare different age groups. About seventy percent of the participants in the present study were between the ages of 18 and 20. Habermas and Bluck (2000; cited in McAdams, 2003) suggest that causal and thematic coherence in autobiographical accounts increase substantially through the teen-aged years and into young adulthood. Such a difference might also lead to changes in the reflection ability. Also comparisons between students in their first and last years at university can be made as individuals face the challenge of creating a self-identity in college which might lead to differences in the content and coherence of narratives.

Lastly, future research could measure individuals' reflective functioning levels related to the relationship with mother and with father separately. The mother is highly involved in child care and is emotionally much closer to children than the father is in the Turkish culture. Therefore the father might be represented as a more

separate figure than the mother by individuals. Since reflective functioning as currently measured is based on the individualistic premise that the self and the other are separate, individuals might show differences in their reflective abilities about their relationships with their fathers as compared to their mothers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Demographic Information Form

Demografik Bilgi Formu

Cinsiyetiniz: Erkek___ Kız___

Doğum yılınız:_____

Bölümünüz:_____

Aileniz ile birlikte mi yaşıyorsunuz?: Evet___ Hayır___

Annenizin mesleği: _____

Babanızın mesleği: _____

Annenizin eğitim durumu: _____

Babanızın eğitim durumu: _____

Kaç kardeşiniz var?

_____ kız kardeşim var. Yaş(lar)ı _____

_____ erkek kardeşim var. Yaş(lar)ı _____

APPENDIX B

Short Form of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)

Annenizle řu anki iliřkinizi dűřűnerek, ařağıdaki cűmlelere ne kadar katıldığınızı 1'den 7'ye bir sayıyı daire iine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Asla 2 3 4 5 6 7= Daima

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-Annem duygularıma saygı gösterir..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2-Annem başka biri olsun isterdim..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3-Annem beni olduęum gibi kabul eder..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4-Sorunlarım hakkında annemle konuřtuęumda kendimden utanırım ya da kendimi kötü hissederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5-Evde kolayca keyfim kaar..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6-Annemin kendi problemleri olduęundan onu bir de benimkilerle sıkmak istemem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7-Kim olduęumu daha iyi anlamamda annem bana yol gösterir.. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8-Bir sorunum olduęunda ya da bařım sıkıřtıęında bunu anneme anlatırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9-Anneme kızgınlık duyuyorum..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10-Annemden pek ilgi görmüyorum..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11-Kızgın olduęumda annem anlayıřlı olmaya alıřır..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12-Annem bir řeyin beni rahatsız ettięini hissederse, bana nedenini sorar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Babanızla řu anki iliřkinizi dűřűnerek, ařaęıdaki cűmlelere ne kadar katıldığınızı
1'den 7'ye bir sayıyı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Asla 2 3 4 5 6 7=Daima

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-Babam duygularıma saygı gösterir..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2-Babam başka biri olsun isterdim..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3-Babam beni olduęum gibi kabul eder. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4-Sorunlarım hakkında babamla konuřtuęumda kendimden
utanırım ya da kendimi kötü hissederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5-Evde kolayca keyfim kaçar..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6-Babamın kendi problemleri olduęundan onu bir de
benimkilerle sıkmak istemem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7-Kim olduęumu daha iyi anlamamda babam bana yol gösterir.... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8-Bir sorunum olduęunda ya da bařım sıkıřtıęında bunu babama.
anlatırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9-Babama kızgınlık duyuyorum..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10-Babamdan pek ilgi görmüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11-Kızgın olduęumda babam anlayıřlı olmaya çalışır..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12-Babam bir řeyin beni rahatsız ettięini hissederse, bana
nedenini sorar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

APPENDIX C

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ)

Lütfen her cümleye bu cümlelerin sizin annenizi, annenizle olan ilişkinizi, deneyimlerinizi ve hissettiklerinizi ne kadar tarif ettiğine göre 1'le 5 arası bir değer veriniz.

1	2	3	4	5
Hiç doğru değil (0-10%)	Biraz doğru (11-35%)	Orta derecede doğru (36-65%)	Oldukça doğru (66-90%)	Çok doğru (91-100%)

Genel olarak annem,

- 1) Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde duygusal destek bulacağıma güvenilebileceğim bir insandır____
- 2) Amaçlarımı ve ilgilerimi destekler ____
- 3) Farklı bir dünyada yaşar____
- 4) Sorunlarımı ve kaygılarımı anlar____
- 5) Özel hayatıma saygı gösterir____
- 6) Bağımsızlığımı ve özgürlüğümü kısıtlar____
- 7) İsteddiğimde tavsiye vermek ve yol göstermek üzere yanımda olur____
- 8) Fikirlerimi ciddiye alır____
- 9) Kendi kararlarımı almam için beni teşvik eder____
- 10) Yapabileceklerimi eleştirir____
- 11) Kendi fikirlerini ve değerlerini bana kabul ettirmeye çalışır____
- 12) Bana istediğim kadar ilgi gösterdi____
- 13) Fikir ayrılıklarımı ifade edebileceğim biridir____
- 14) Ne düşündüğüm ya da hissettiğim konusunda bir fikri yoktur____
- 15) Denemem ve bazı şeyleri kendi başıma öğrenebilmem için bana yeterli özgürlüğü sağladı____
- 16) Bana yardım edemeyecek kadar meşguldü____
- 17) Bana güvenir ve itimat eder____
- 18) Hayatımı kontrol etmeye çalışır____
- 19) Beni tehlike ve zorluklardan korur____
- 20) Söyleyeceklerimi göz ardı eder____
- 21) Benim hislerim ve ihtiyaçlarıma duyarlıdır____
- 22) Benimle ilgili hayal kırıklığı hisseder____
- 23) İstesem de istemesem de bana tavsiye verir____
- 24) Kendilerinkinden farklı olsa bile yargılarıma ve kararlarıma saygı duyar____
- 25) Yapabileceğim şeyleri benim yerime yapar____
- 26) Beklentilerini karşılamak zorunda hissettiğim biridir____
- 27) Bana çocukmuşum gibi davranır____

Son zamanlardaki ziyaretlerimde ya da birlikte geçirdiğimiz zamanlarda, annem

- 28) Görmeye can attığım biridir. ____
- 29) Kavga ettiğim biridir____
- 30) Yanında rahatlamış hissettiğim biridir____
- 31) Beni kızdıran biridir____
- 32) Sürekli birlikte olmak istediğim biridir____
- 33) Mesafeli ve soğuk hissettiğim biridir____
- 34) Beni sinir eden biridir____

1	2	3	4	5
Hiç doğru değil (0-10%)	Biraz doğru (11-35%)	Orta derecede doğru (36-65%)	Oldukça doğru (66-90%)	Çok doğru (91-100%)

- 35) Suçluluk ve kaygı hissi uyandıran biridir____
- 36) Yaptığım ya da öğrendiğim şeyleri anlatmaktan zevk aldığım biridir____
- 37) Sevgi duyduğum biridir____
- 38) Görmezden gelmeye çalıştığım biridir____
- 39) En özel düşüncelerimi ve duygularımı paylaştığım biridir____
- 40) Birlikte olmaktan hoşlandığım biridir____
- 41) Deneyimlerimi paylaşmaktan kaçındığım biridir____

Birlikte vakit geçirdikten sonra, annemin yanından

- 42) sıcak ve olumlu duygularla ayrılırım. ____
- 43) Annem konusunda hayal kırıklığına uğramış hissederek ayrılırım____

Ciddi bir sorunum olduğunda ya da önemli bir karar almam gerektiğinde

- 44) destek ve cesaret almak ve/veya yol göstermesi için anneme dönerim____
- 45) Terapist, okul rehberi ya da din adamlarından yardım alırım____
- 46) Annemin nasıl tepki vereceğini ya da ne söyleyeceğini düşünürüm____
- 47) Başkalarından yardım almadan ya da onunla konuyu tartışmadan kendim hallederim____
- 48) Bir arkadaşımın konuyu tartışırım____
- 49) Annemin ne yapmam gerektiğini bildiğini düşünürüm____
- 50) Arkadaşlarımla konuştuktan sonra durumu çözemediysem anneme dönerim____

Yardım almak için anneme yöneldiğimde

- 51) Sorunları kendim halletme yeteneğime daha fazla güvenirim____
- 52) Güvensiz hissetmeye devam ederim____
- 53) Bir arkadaşımın daha fazla anlayış göreceğimi ve daha fazla rahatlayacağımı hissederim____
- 54) Annemin tavsiyelerini dinlediğim sürece işlerin yolunda gideceğine güvenirim____
- 55) Onun cevabı beni hayal kırıklığına uğratar. ____

Lütfen her cümleye bu cümlelerin sizin babanızı, babanızla olan ilişkinizi, deneyimlerinizi ve hissettiklerinizi ne kadar tarif ettiğine göre 1'le 5 arası bir değer veriniz.

1	2	3	4	5
Hiç doğru değil (0-10%)	Biraz doğru (11-35%)	Orta derecede doğru (36-65%)	Oldukça doğru (66-90%)	Çok doğru (91-100%)

Genel olarak babam,

- 56) Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde duygusal destek bulacağıma güvenilebileceğim bir insandır____
- 57) Amaçlarımı ve ilgilerimi destekler____
- 58) Farklı bir dünyada yaşar____
- 59) Sorunlarımı ve kaygılarımı anlar____
- 60) Özel hayatıma saygı gösterir____
- 61) Bağımsızlığımı ve özgürlüğümü kısıtlar____
- 62) İsteddiğimde tavsiye vermek ve yol göstermek üzere yanımda olur____
- 63) Fikirlerimi ciddiye alır____
- 64) Kendi kararlarımı almam için beni teşvik eder____
- 65) Yapabileceklerimi eleştirir____
- 66) Kendi fikirlerini ve değerlerini bana kabul ettirmeye çalışır____
- 67) Bana istediğim kadar ilgi gösterdi____
- 68) Fikir ayrılıklarımı ifade edebileceğim biridir____
- 69) Ne düşündüğüm ya da hissettiğim konusunda bir fikri yoktur____
- 70) Denemem ve bazı şeyleri kendi başıma öğrenebilmem için bana yeterli özgürlüğü sağladı____
- 71) Bana yardım edemeyecek kadar meşguldü____
- 72) Bana güvenir ve itimat eder____
- 73) Hayatımı kontrol etmeye çalışır____
- 74) Beni tehlike ve zorluklardan korur____
- 75) Söyleyeceklerimi göz ardı eder____
- 76) Benim hislerim ve ihtiyaçlarıma duyarlıdır____
- 77) Benimle ilgili hayal kırıklığı hisseder____
- 78) İstesem de istemesem de bana tavsiye verir____
- 79) Kendilerinkinden farklı olsa bile yargılarıma ve kararlarıma saygı duyar____
- 80) Yapabileceğim şeyleri benim yerime yapar____
- 81) Beklentilerini karşılamak zorunda hissettiğim biridir____
- 82) Bana çocukmuşum gibi davranır____

Son zamanlardaki ziyaretlerimde ya da birlikte geçirdiğimiz zamanlarda, babam

- 83) Görmeye can attığım biridir____
- 84) Kavga ettiğim biridir____
- 85) Yanında rahatlamış hissettiğim biridir____
- 86) Beni kızdıran biridir____
- 87) Sürekli birlikte olmak istediğim biridir____
- 88) Mesafeli ve soğuk hissettiğim biridir____
- 89) Beni sinir eden biridir____

1	2	3	4	5
Hiç doğru değil (0-10%)	Biraz doğru (11-35%)	Orta derecede doğru (36-65%)	Oldukça doğru (66-90%)	Çok doğru (91-100%)

- 90) Suçluluk ve kaygı hissi uyandıran biridir____
91) Yaptığım ya da öğrendiğim şeyleri anlatmaktan zevk aldığım biridir____
92) Sevgi duyduğum biridir____
93) Görmezden gelmeye çalıştığım biridir____
94) En özel düşüncelerimi ve duygularımı paylaştığım biridir____
95) Birlikte olmaktan hoşlandığım biridir____
96) Deneyimlerimi paylaşmaktan kaçındığım biridir____

Birlikte vakit geçirdikten sonra, babamın yanından

- 97) Sıcak ve olumlu duygularla ayrılırim. ____
98) Babam konusunda hayal kırıklığına uğramış hissederek ayrılırim____

Ciddi bir sorunum olduğunda ya da önemli bir karar almam gerektiğinde

- 99) Destek ve cesaret almak ve/veya yol göstermesi için babama dönerim____
100) Terapist, okul rehberi ya da din adamlarından yardım alırım____
101) Babamın nasıl tepki vereceğini ya da ne söyleyeceğini düşünürüm____
102) Başkalarından yardım almadan ya da onunla konuyu tartışmadan kendim hallederim____
103) Bir arkadaşımın konuyu tartışırım____
104) Babamın ne yapmam gerektiğini bildiğini düşünürüm____
105) Arkadaşlarımla konuştuktan sonra durumu çözemediysem babama dönerim____

Yardım almak için babama yöneldiğimde

- 106) Sorunları kendim halletme yeteneğime daha fazla güvenirim____
107) Güvensiz hissetmeye devam ederim____
108) Bir arkadaşımın daha fazla anlayış göreceğimi ve daha fazla rahatlayacağımı hissedirim____
109) Babamın tavsiyelerini dinlediğim sürece işlerin yolunda gideceğine güvenirim____
110) Onun cevabı beni hayal kırıklığına uğrattır____

APPENDIX D

Interview for the Assessment of Reflective Functioning

1) a) Çocukluğunuzda annenizle olan ilişkinizi düşünün. Hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak annenizle ilişkinizi tanımlayan dört sözcük, sıfat, cümlecik vs. bulmaya çalışın. Önce bunları bana söyleyin.

Annemle bir ilişkim var dediniz. Bunu açıkla mısınız? Aklınıza sizin neden bu ilişkiyle ilgili bu tanımlı seçtiğinizi anlatan bir örnek, anı geliyor mu?

b) Çocukluğunuzda babanızla olan ilişkinizi düşünün. Hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak babanızla ilişkinizi tanımlayan dört sözcük, sıfat, cümlecik vs. bulmaya çalışın. Önce bunları bana söyleyin.

Babamla bir ilişkim var dediniz. Bunu açıkla mısınız? Aklınıza sizin neden bu ilişkiyle ilgili bu tanımlı seçtiğinizi anlatan bir örnek, anı geliyor mu?

2) Çocukken anne-babanızın size soğuk veya ilgisiz davrandığını ya da bir kenarda bırakıldığınızı düşündüğünüz oldu mu? Şimdi aslında böyle yapmadıklarını düşünebilirsiniz, ama çocukken böyle hissettiğinizi oldu mu?

3) Annenizle olan ilişkinizin ve deneyimlerinizin sizin şu anki kişiliğinizi nasıl etkilediğini düşünüyorsunuz?

a) Annenizle olan deneyimlerinizin sizin gelişiminizi engellediğini ya da sizi olumsuz olarak etkilediğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı?

4) Babanızla olan ilişkinizin ve deneyimlerinizin sizin şu anki kişiliğinizi nasıl etkilediğini düşünüyorsunuz?

a) Babanızla olan deneyimlerinizin sizin gelişiminizi engellediğini ya da sizi olumsuz olarak etkilediğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı?

5) Anne-babanızla olan ilişkinizi konuştuk.

a) Sizce neden anneniz çocukluğunuzda sizin anlattığınız şekilde davrandı?

b) Sizce neden babanız çocukluğunuzda sizin anlattığınız şekilde davrandı?

6) Çocukluğunuzdan şimdiye dek annenizle olan ilişkinizde değişimler oldu mu? Neden?

7) Çocukluğunuzdan şimdiye dek babanızla olan ilişkinizde değişimler oldu mu? Neden?

APPENDIX E

Informed Consent Form

Bilgilendirilmiş Olur Formu

Bu çalışma ebeveynleriniz ile ilişkileriniz üzerine bir araştırmadır. Araştırmaya katılmadan evvel sizlere bu çalışma hakkında bilgi vermek istiyoruz. Aşağıdaki bilgileri okuduktan sonra araştırmaya katılmak istiyorsanız lütfen bu formu imzalayınız.

Bu çalışma 2 ayrı bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk olarak ebeveynlerinizle ilişkilerinize dair bir görüşme yapılacak ve daha sonra bazı anketleri doldurmanız istenecektir. Görüşme, ses kayıt cihazı ile kayıt edilecektir. Çalışmanın toplam süresi yaklaşık olarak 40 dakikadır. Bu çalışmaya katılarak PSY 101 dersi için 1 kredi alacaksınız.

Size ait kişisel bilgiler (ad-soyad, yaş, e-mail) gizli tutulacaktır. Elde edilen verilerin tüm grup için ortalama değerleri kullanılacaktır.

Araştırmanın sağlıklı devam edebilmesi için bu deneyin içeriğinden daha sonra deneye katılacak arkadaşlarınıza bahsetmemenizi rica ediyoruz.

Çalışma bittikten sonra çalışmayla ilgili sormak istediğiniz tüm sorular için aşağıdaki e-mail adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya katılmaya karar verdim.

Araştırmacı

Işıl Aracı
isil.araci@boun.edu.tr

Katılımcı

Adı Soyadı:

Tarih:

İmza:

APPENDIX F

Sample Interviews

Interview about Parental Relationships with a Female Participant:

S: Önce çocukluğunuzda annenizle olan ilişkinizi düşünmenizi istiyorum.

Hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak onunla olan ilişkinizi tanımlayan dört sözcük, sıfat, cümlecik bulup bana söyler misiniz? Önce bunları not edeceğim, sonra tek tek..

C: Sıfat...

S: Cümlecik. Yani tanımlayabilecek herhangi bir şey.

C: Evet. Tamam. ııı . Eğitim geliyor aklıma. ııı . Nasıl diyeyim, böyle değerler, etik değerler falan. ııı . Başka, dört tane olması için... Sağlık geliyor, sağlığa çok önem verir. Üç olsa olmaz mı (gülme)? Gelmiyor aklıma şu anda.

S: Gelirse eklersiniz o zaman sonradan. Eğitim dediniz ilk olarak, açar mısınız bunu?

C: Eğitim şöyle, ya zaten kendisi öğretmen olduğu için, ve bizim ailede çoğu kişi öğretmendir yani sülaleye bakarsak, o yüzden genelde, ay konuşamıyorum bununla ama (gülme). Ya şey, ne bileyim böyle, kuzenlerim falan çoğu zaten üniversite mezunudur, o yüzden böyle bir baskı altında büyütülüyorsunuz yani, siz de öyle olmak zorundaymışsınız gibi, o yüzden eğitim dedim. Yani böyle her zaman ders çalış (gülme), ders çalış, ders çalış diye hiç kendinizi rahat hissedemezsiniz. Öyle işte. Ondan bahsediyorum (gülme) .

S: Spesifik bir anı geliyor mu aklınıza bununla ilgili?

C: ııı . Ne bileyim, böyle küçük şeyler aslında. Hani okuldan gelince, dersaneden gelince doğrudan hadi otur, işte akşam bir şey, ne bileyim televizyonda o zamanlar zaten şimdi beraber yaşamadığımız için hep liseye, ortaokula dair anılar geliyor aklıma, hep böyle televizyonda bir şey olurdu izleyeceğim, izlemek istediğim.

“İzleme boşver, yazın işte aynısı gösterilir zaten” falan filan diye, öyle şeyler geliyor.

Başka yok.

S: Peki, etik deęerler dediniz.

C: Etik deęerler... İşte şey zaten, ... 'da yaşıyorduk, yaşıyor annemler, ben de oralıyım. O küçük bir şehirdir zaten. Böyle ne bileyim kız erkek ilişkileri hakkında falan demek istedim. Böyle, aslında çok karşı deęillerdir böyle şeylere ama onlar da herhalde çevreden çekiniyorlar, işte hani insanlar ne der, şöyle der böyle der falan diye. O geliyor aklıma.

S: Somut bir örneęi var mı bunun aklınıza gelen?

C: (gülme). Var. Şey anı gibi mi anlatayım? Şey olmuştu bir kere, arkadaşım la ki normal bir arkadaşım la dersaneden çıkıp eve gelirken bizim böyle bir tanıdığımız vardır böyle (gülme) ona, o bir şey duyarsa bütün şehir duymuş demektir yani (gülme) , öyle söyleyeyim, onunla karşılaşmıştık ve böyle çok şey bir insandır, baęnaz bir insandır. O yüzden işte yanlış anladı herhalde. Aslında normaldi ama yani 'da, ... dedim ya küçük bir şehirdir böyle, herkes birbirini tanır falan, o yüzden. Bunu anneme söylediğinde işte bana kızmıştı, (gülme) o şey yüzünden deęil, ben diyorum “ne var bunda” diyorum, o da işte “o öyle ama dikkat etmen lazım insanlar ne düşünür” falan filan diye. Çok önem verir yani böyle şeylere, babam da aynı şekilde (gülme).

S: Siz nasıl hissediyordunuz peki? Yani onların bu önem vermesi karşısında?

C: Ya ben ne bileyim, onların benim yanımda olmalarını düşünür, isterdim yani.

Böyle bir durum karşısında onların şey demesini, yani onlara ne ki ben sana güvindikten sonra demelerini beklerdim ama öyle demiyorlar (gülme) .

S: Peki, üçüncü olarak da saęlık dediniz.

C: Saęlık dedim. Saęlıkla ilgili, yani ne bileyim her zaman işte zeytinyaęı kullanır falan filan (gülme). Öyle çok dikkat eder böyle şeylere de o yüzden, şeker yeme çok falan (gülme).

S: Bunun var mı örneği aklınıza gelen?

C: Bunun örneği değil de, bizim ailede kalıtsal şeker hastalığı falan var, böyle kalp hastalığı falan çok var, onlardan dolayı. Öyle işte, o kadar.

S: Peki eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı bunlara?

C: Sonra belki, aklıma gelince söylerim.

S: Bu sefer çocukluğunuzda babanızla olan ilişkinizi düşünmenizi istiyorum. Yine aynı şekilde hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak onunla olan ilişkinizi tanımlayan dört sözcük, cümlecik, sıfat..

C: Onun için de eğit, ya aynı şeyleri söyleyebilirim. O sağlık o kadar değildir ama. Babamla ne bileyim, zaten çok yakın değilizdir, o yüzden onun için ikinci söylediğim şey, yani bu işte kız erkek ilişkileri daha ön plana çıkıyor. Dersler daha arka plana düşüyor. ııı . Başka ne olabilir ki...

S: Yani çok yakın değiliz demeniz de aslında bir tanım.

C: Ha evet. Tamam. Çok yakın değilizdir ama ııı ne bileyim, onunla annemle olduğundan daha yakın konuş, daha şey konuşurum, samimi konuşurum. Öyle söyleyeyim. Yani çok sık konuşmam ama konuştuğumda daha rahatlatıcıdır. Öyle. (gülme)

S: Tanımlara ekleyeceğiniz bir şey var mı? Başka...

C: Başka... Yok (gülme).

S: Yok. Tamam. Yine o zaman üstünden geçerse, çok yakın değiliz anlattınız gerçi ama...

C: hıhı .

S: Yine ekleyeceğiniz bir şey, yani çocukluktan beri mi bu böyle?

C: o.. ya ocukluęumda zaten bir ara annemle araları pek iyi deęildi. O yzden ne bileyim aslında doęrusunu isterseniz ok ocukluęumu hatırlamıyorum ama (glme) ... ııı Yakın deęilizdir... yle iřte ya. Yani severim kendisini (glme) iyi bir insandır.

S: Byle hissettięinizi hatırladıęınız bir anı var mı aklınıza gelen?

C: řyle bir řey var, ııı o ailesine karřı, yani babaannelere karřı bayaęı dřkndr. İřte bir keresinde onlarla ilgili bir sor, yani nasıl diyeyim, konuyu anlatayım ben (glme) , yle daha kolay olacak genellemektense. İřte onlara gidecektik, halamlara gidecektik, iřte ben gitmek istememiřtim, tabi o zamanlar daha řey olduęu iin, hani biliyorsunuz hep genler byle gitmek istemezler falan filan, istememiřtim, o da gideceksin diye tutturmuřtu. Ben de gitmeyeceęim diye tutturmuřtum. Sonra bana baęırmıřtı, ben bunun karřısında anlayıřlı olmasını beklerdim falan. Ne bileyim o zaman ok etkilenmiřtim bundan. řimdi dřnnce ok sama geliyor ama tabii ergenlik falan olunca herhalde (glme) ok takıyorsunuz kafaya (glme).

S: Kız erkek iliřkileri onun iin daha n planda dediniz.

C: Hıhı . O hani konuyu annem babama atıęında babam ok ok fazla tepki gstermiřti. Hatta byle “dolařmayacaksın artık normal arkadaşlarınla bile” falan demiřti, ben byle aaa nasıl ya, ne olur ya falan diye, nerede yaşıyorum ben diye (glme), kim bunlar diye řařırmıřtum yani. (glme).

S: Ve dersler onun iin daha arka planda dediniz.

C: Arka planda, zaten annem daha ok, daha řeydir, annem ok nem verdięi iin yani, gereęinden fazla nem verdięi iin, aslında babam da nem verir ama bazen řey yapar byle tamam bırak iřte ocuk izlesin řunu falan filan diye rahat etsin diye yle benim yanımda olabilir (glme) bazen.

S: Aklınıza anı geliyor mu bununla ilgili?

C: Yok gelmiyor.

S: Peki çocukken anne babanızın size soğuk veya ilgisiz davrandığını düşündüğünüz oldu mu? Yani şu anda, büyüyünce böyle düşünmüyor olabilirsiniz ama çocukken böyle hissetmiş olabilirsiniz.

C: ıı İlgisiz... Evet oldu canım, çok oldu (gülme) , hep oluyor zaten herhalde (gülme) . Abime karşı ilgili olup bana karşı ilgisiz olduğunu düşündüklerim olmuştu. Abimin şeyi vardı, konuşma bozukluğu vardı, o yüzden ona daha üst, onun daha çok üstüne düşüyorlardı işte düzelsin falan filan diye. İşte biraz sorunlu bir çocuktuk, o yüzden onun daha çok üstüne düşerlerdi, ben de böyle beni ikinci plana attıklarını düşünürdüm hep ama çok saçma yani şimdi düşünüyorum (gülme) .

S: O zaman nasıl hissederdiniz peki?

C: Ya ne bileyim işte, bir şey diyemezdim tabii, tabii kıskandığımı belli etmek istemez insan işte (gülme) , o yüzden arada sırada böyle laf sokardım falan, öyle hatırlıyorum. (gülme) .

S: Peki, annenizle olan ilişkinizin, deneyimlerinizin sizin şu anki kişiliğiniz üzerinde nasıl bir etkisi var sizce?

C: ıı . Ay çok zor bir soru (gülme) .

S: Düşünebilirsiniz tabii.

C: Ya doğrudan ilk aklıma gelen şey oldu ya, bu kız erkek ilişkileri hakkında, yani çok onların öyle düşünmelerinin saçma olduğunu biliyorum. Yani benim kafama uymadığını biliyorum ama sanki böyle içten içe yerleştirmişler. O yüzden rahat davranamıyorsunuz, yani böyle saçma olduğunu biliyorsunuz ama ne bileyim normal bir arkadaşınızla bile samimi konuşamıyorsunuz, böyle bir etkisi var. Ders üzerine etkisi var, ben (gülme) bu, yani ne bileyim, böyle olmasını aslında çok istemezdim çünkü şey, böyle sizi itekleye itekleye çalıştırdıkları zaman yalnız kaldığınızda çalışmıyorsunuz. O zaman da zorlanıyorsunuz. O kötü bir şey yani bence öyle

olmaması gerekiyor (gülme) . Yani, bırakmaları gerekiyor sizi, siz de böyle ne bileyim, nereyi yapabilecekseniz orası olsun yani. Öyle, başka? Diğer sağlık demiştim, onunla ilgili... Onunla ilgili bir şey yok yani, doğru yapmış, tebrik ediyorum (gülme) . Öyle.

S: Peki onunla olan deneyimlerinizin sizin gelişiminizi engellediğini ya da sizi olumsuz etkilediğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı?

C: Hı, işte bu ilkte söylediğim şey olumsuz etkilediğini düşünüyorum. Yani şu anda bakıyorum, yani ne diyeyim büyük şehirde yetişmiş insanlar, İstanbul'da, İzmir'de olan insanlar çok daha rahat olabiliyorlar yani. Çok daha ne bileyim, kendilerine güvenli olabiliyorlar yeri geldiğinde falan. Ama işte annem böyle, öyle deme terbiyeli ol, işte böyle yapmayın terbiyeli ol falan filan... ki şey dediğini hatırlıyorum yani misafirliğe gittiğimizde “tamam ikinci bardak çayı içme” dediğini hatırlıyorum yani, bu kadar da olmaz. (gülme). Öyle (gülme).

S: Babanızla olan ilişkinizin, deneyimlerinizin şu anki kişiliğiniz üzerinde nasıl bir etkisi var sizce?

C: Babam şeydir, yani onu da ekleyebiliriz sıfatlara, böyle pek hayır demez, yani ne bileyim hı olur der, olur der, tamam der iyi der böyle, sonra yine kendi bildiğini okur. Bunu ondan almışım herhalde (gülme), pek hayır demiyorum insanlara ama her dediklerini de yapmıyorum. Bu kötü mü bilmiyorum aslında, hem kırmamış oluyorsunuz, ama sonra söz verip yapmıyorsunuz, o da kötü, bilmiyorum (gülme) .

S: Nasıl sizce bu özelliği babanız siz yansıttı? Yani siz nasıl aldınız ondan bu özelliği?

C: Ya şimdi şöyle söyleyeyim, annem şeydir, böyle dominant demeyeyim de, böyle dominant kadar da değil de (gülme) , daha baskındır böyle babama çok kızar falan. Babam da sıkıldığı zaman hı tamam, mesela akşam eve erken gel der, o da tamam

tamam der, işte üçte geleceğim der atıyorum, sonra beşte gelir (gülme) . Ya ne bileyim, o sırada annemle tartışmak istemediği için üç der ama yani yalan söylemiş olur. Bilmiyorum. (gülme) . Ben de ondan öğrendim evet (gülme) .

S: Peki onunla olan deneyimlerinizin sizi olumsuz etkilediğini ya da gelişiminizi engellediğini düşündüğünüz yönleri var mı?

C: Başka... Yok ya. İyidir (gülme) .

S: Peki. Bir önceki soruda dediğinizi nasıl kabul ediyorsunuz?

C: İyi mi kötü mü mü? İyi ya (gülme) . Evet. Ne bileyim küçük yalanlar iyidir (gülme) .

S: Annenizle olan ilişkinizi konuştuk çocukluğunuzdaki. Sizce neden anneniz çocukluğunuzda anlattığınız şekilde davrandı?

C: Çünkü o da anne, ailesinden öyle görmüş. Onun annesi daha şeymiş, yani daha despot bir kadınmış anneannem. Şu an öyle değil ama, şu an çok yumuşak ama yani ki işte böyle zaten arkadaşına bile göndermezmiş. Ve annemin dayısı falan işte, anneannem de onlardan etkilendiği için böyle anneme yani kitap okuyor bu kız, kitap okuyor bu kız ileride başımıza ne olacak falan filan demişler, Sefiller okuyormuş annem, çok komik (gülme). Yani o da ailesinden böyle gördüğü için, tabii onlar kadar olmamış neyse ki ama öyle. O yüzden.

S: Peki babanız? O neden yine çocukluğunuzda anlattığınız şekilde davrandı?

C: Babam işte ailesine çok önem veriyor. O yüzden ne bileyim, böyle etrafın ne düşüneceğini çok önemsiyor. Diğer özellikleri de, yalnız büyümüş, o yüzden babam şeydir, böyle ilgili bir insandır. Ya sever herkesi falan, o da yalnız büyüdüğü için herhalde yani, ailesinden ayrı büyümüş falan, o yüzden.

S: Peki, annenizle ilişkinizi düşünürseniz, çocukluğunuzdan şimdiye dek bu ilişkide değişimler oldu mu? Neden oldu?

C: 111 . Evet oldu (gülme) . Önceden bana pek güvenmezdi, şey açısından, böyle dersler açısından falan, ama artık güveniyor, yani şey değil. Ne bileyim, böyle benim mesela üniversiteyi kazanacağımı biliyordu da yani böyle iyi bir yer kazanacağımı tahmin etmiyordu. Hatta ben böyle Boğaziçi'ni düşünüyorum falan dediğimde şey diyordu, sen nerede kazanacaksın gibisinden demiyordu ama içinden geçiyordu, sonradan da açıkladı bunu. Ondan sonra kazanınca böyle ona da bir güven geldi, hı benim kızım yapabiliyormuş falan diye, ki ben normalde şeyimdir, böyle biraz saf dururum. Biliyorum (gülme) kötü bir şey yani, bunu açıklamak çok zor geliyor ama (gülme) işte öyle. Ne bileyim... (gülme) .

S: Neden oldu sizce bu değişiklik?

C: Dedim ya, yani bazı şeyleri yapabildiğimi gördü sanırım, o yüzden. Bir de eskisi kad.. önceden tartıştık bayağı şimdi zaten çok görüşmediğimiz için tartışmıyoruz, tartıştığımız zamanlarda da çok önemli şeyler olmuyor.

S: Babanızla ilişkinizi düşünürseniz, onunla çocukluğunuzdan bu yana değişimler oldu mu?

C: Babamla eskisinden daha yakınız. Çünkü önceden az konuşurduk, işte zaten ben küçük olduğum için falan, bir de o pek evde olmadığı için az konuşurduk. Şimdi emekli oldu. Ben 'ya gittiğimde hep evde oluyor. Bir de telefonda falan çok konuşuyoruz. O yüzden babamla daha iyi aramız şu an, önceye göre.

S: Neden böyle oldu yine sizce?

C: İşte önceden çok görüşmüyorduk, çok konuşmadığım bir insandı, bir de artık büyüdüğümü düşünüyor sanırım. Onlara güven verdiğimi düşünüyorum, çünkü ne bileyim, buraya geldiğimde, İstanbul'a geldiğimde, yalnız olduğum için çok güvenmiyorlardı. Daha işte küçük, işte başına ne gelecek acaba, nasıl yaşayabilecek

tek başına falan diye, ama hiç bir sorun çıkmadığı için şimdiye kadar güven verdiğimi düşünüyorum. O yüzden de aramız iyi oldu (gülme) .

S: Peki benim sorularım bu kadar. Eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı anlattıklarımıza?

C: Yok..

Interview about Parental Relationships with a Male Participant:

S: İlk olarak çocukluğunuzda annenizle olan ilişkinizi düşünmenizi istiyorum. Yani hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak onunla olan ilişkinizi tanımlayan dört tane sözcük, sıfat veya cümlecik bulup bana söyler misiniz? Ben önce bunları not edeceğim.

C: Paylaşmak. Yakınlık. Sevgi. İyi Saygı.

S: Tamam. İlk olarak paylaşmak dediniz. Açar mısınız ne, ne anlama geliyor sizin için?

C: Biz küçüklüğümüzden beri annemle her şeyi konuşabiliyoruz. Yani, benim için bayağı önemli bir şey bu, bu aile içinde paylaşım, paylaşabilmek. Küçüklüğümde beri her sorunumu anneme anlatıyordum. Gece, küçükken yanıma gelip yani dinliyordu bütün sorunlarımı. Şimdi büyüdüğümüzde o da bize sorunlarını anlatabiliyor artık. Yani böyle bir alışveriş gibi bir şey oluyor, yani bütün sorunlarımı paylaştığım bir insan.

S: Anladım. Peki bununla ilgili aklınıza gelen bir örnek var mı?

C: Eskiden mi olsun?

S: Eskiden olursa daha iyi olur.

C: Küçükken..

S: Bunu yansıtan, sizin bu hislerinizi yansıtan..

C: Birçok var da şimdi aklıma mesela şey, küçükken benimle bir ara okulda bir çocuk vardı, bayağı dalga geçiyordu (gülme). Her gün işte ne yaptığını anneme söyleyebiliyordum gece gidince. O da işte ondan sonra benim haberim olmadan okula gidip konuşuyormuş (gülme).

S: Peki, yakınlık dediniz.

C: Paylaşmak işte bunların hepsinden doğan bir şey yani. Bayağı yakınız bütün ilişkilerimizde. Haftasonları beraber bir şeyler yapabiliyoruz kendisiyle. Muhabbet edebiliyoruz çok rahat. Ondan sonra, birlikte bir yerlere gidiyoruz. Alışveriş falan yapıyoruz, hiç, her şeyden, yani yaptığım her şeyden zevk alıyorum onunla. Yani bana bayağı yakın, benim duygularımı biliyor, neden hoşlandığımı, neyi sevdiğimi biliyor. Ne yapmam gerektiğini işte, yani, ona karşı benim de duygularım işte aynı. Her şeyimi biliyor benim yani bütün paylaştıklarımız şeyler, bayağı çok onunla yakın oluyoruz.

S: Peki yine bununla ilgili hani spesifik bir örnek geliyor mu aklınıza?

C: Yine mesela ben, şimdi bir saniye... Şöyle bir örnek vereyim, mesela demiştim daha önce de, her gece mesela çağırdığımda hiç aksatmadan yanıma geliyordu geceleyin. Uyuyana kadar muhabbet edebiliyorduk. Güzel bir şeydi bu yakınlık için.

S: Peki. Sevgi dediniz.

C: Sevgi (gülme) . Tabii doğal olarak anne çocuk sevgisi mutlaka var ama yani bence daha öte bir şey vardı, biz arkadaş gibiydik yani, sorunlarımızı paylaşabiliyorduk. Herşeyden doğan işte, sonuçta sevgi. Ben küçükken mesela konuşamazken falan, bazı şeylerimi anlatıyor bana. “Anne cici falan böyle diyordun, böyle çok güzel oluyordu, çok hoşuma gidiyordu” gibi şeyler söylüyor. Yani küçüklükten beri doğal olarak anne sevgisi var yani. Odaki çocuk sevgisi ama bence bizimki artık arkadaş gibi olduğundan bayağı ileri bir sevgi oldu diye düşünüyorum.

S: Yine bir anı geliyor mu aklınıza?

C: Sevgiden (gölme). Öyle bir anı... Bir düşüneyim. Mesela şu demin anne cici falan dediğim örneği vereyim ben size. Şey, küçükten, ben hatırlamıyorum annem anlatıyordu, iki üç yaşında olduğumda mesela annem bir hastalanmış galiba. Ben yanağına gidip, yanağını okşayıp anne cici falan yapmışım ama yani bu sevgiden başka bir şeyin sebebi olamaz herhalde.

S: Bir de saygı dediniz.

C: Saygı doğal olarak çok önemli bir şey zaten her şeyde. Saygıyı yitirince her şey yitiriliyor. Sevgiden doğan bir şey saygı da yani böyle. Aranızda sonuçta mesafe olmasa bile yani birbirinize gösterdiğiniz bir saygı oluyor. Say, yani düşüncelerine saygı duyuyorum, görüşlerine. Yani bunun gibi. Zaten bütün yaptığı hareketleri genellikle saygı (gölme). Aramızda bir saygı çerçevesi de var tabii.

S: Buna verebileceğiniz bir örnek var mı?

C: Buna bir örneğim... Bulabilir miyim acaba? Şimdi... Mesela, yani bazen benim düşüncelerim farklı olduğunda onunkilerden, benim düşüncelerime saygı gösteriyor.

Tamam sen öyle düşünüyorsun ama bu da benim düşüncem diyebiliyor yani.

S: Peki, aynı soruyu babanız için soracağım. Yine onunla olan ilişkinizi çocukluğunuzdan bu yana düşünürseniz, hatırlayabildiğiniz en erken dönemden başlayarak, tanımlayan yine dört tane sözcük, sıfat, cümlecik söyler misiniz?

C: Otorite. Genellikle sevgi var tabii ki. Babamla ilgili. Saygı diyelim yine biz. Sevgi, saygı. İki bir de koruma, yani beni genellikle kötü şeylere karşı genelde koruma duygusu.

S: Peki, ilk olarak ilişkinizi tanımlarken babanızla, otorite dediniz.

C: Babam bize yakın olduğu kadar uzaktı da diyelim. Öyle yani çok yakın olduğumuzda bazen küçük bir şeye kızabiliyordu. Ve evde otorite sahibi bir insandır

kendisi. Yani genellikle onun dediği yapıldığından onun için söyledim yani. Mesela, bizim böyle bazen oluyordu, mesela annemden izin alıp, annemden izin alıp babamdan izin alamadığım. Ama genellikle yani hep otoritesini konuşturduğundan herkes onun dediğine göre genellikle hareket ediyor. Düşünce öyle oluyor. Genellikle doğru bilen o oluyordu küçükken biz ama şimdi değişti. 11 sonra, yani mesela şöyle diyeyim, 11 şimdi biz küçükken annem şöyle yapma oğlum, yapma oğlum diyordu, ondan sonra babam bir kere söylüyordu, ondan sonra tamamen bitiyordu. Yani bu en güzel örnek olur herhalde (gülme). Otorite hakkında bu kadar yani.

S: Peki. Sevgi dediniz.

C: Yine aile içinde babama yakındık yani. Bayağı bütün haftasonları falan bütün aile toplanıp bir yerlere gidebiliyorduk. Ben babamın yanında bayağı dolaşıyordum küçükken sevgiyle. Sonra büyüyünce şimdi arkadaşlarıyla tanıştıyor. Gayet iyi bir şekilde, sevgi de var yani.

S: Yine sizde bu hissi canlandıran bir anı geliyor mu gözünüzün önüne?

C: Anı yok da, mesela ben babamla haftasonu bütün gün dışarı çıksam, sıkılmadan onunla bütün gün dolaşabiliyorum yani. Bu güzel bir şey, yani sıkılmadan bütün gün bir adamla birlikte olmak. Bence sevginin örneğidir yani.

S: Saygı dediniz.

C: Saygı. Evet saygı duyulacak (gülme) insanlar. Ben şöyle diyeyim, mesela bütün hayatı boyunca bize bakan bir insan. Zaten saygıyı bekliyor, saygı da duyuyoruz zaten. Genellikle onun istemediği şeyleri yapmamaya çalışıyoruz. Saygı... Biz mesela şimdi ailede, daha önce de söylediğim işte, otoritesi vardır, zaten otorite saygı ile oluyor genellikle yani. Saygı bu kadar herhalde (gülme). Başka bir şey de gelmiyor şu anda aklıma.

S: Anı geliyor mu aklınıza?

C: Anı, ya şöyle diyeyim, küçüklüğümde işte bazen babamla falan bir yerlere gittiğimizde ıı arkadaşlarının yanında falan bazen, ya örnek bulamadım şimdi açıkçası. Örnek de, bunu aklıma gelen bir örnek yok ama şimdi. (gülme). Geçsek olur mu?

S: Olur. Bir de ilişkiniz için koruma dediniz. Yani korumacı bir yanı var.

C: Korumacı bir yanı var yani. Bize bazen haberimiz bile olmadan, bazı şeyleri yani bizi korumak amaçlı yaptığını sonra annemden öğreniyoruz. Mesela gece her genç gibi biz de küçükken dışarı çıkmak istiyorduk yani ortaokulda, lisede. Fazla izin vermezdi, nedenleri de işte ne yapacaksın oğlum boşver falan diyordu. Biz ama yine de gitmek istiyorduk. Gidince ondan sonra başımıza falan bir şey gelince sonuçta hep o ilgilenmek zorunda, hep o yapmak zorunda. Bu sonuçta koruma amaçlı yapılan bir şey. Ama küçükken olduğundan sen dışarı çıkmak istiyorsun genellikle insan olarak. Mesela şey, ben, internet kafesi vardı bir ara, ben internet kafecide çalışıyordum. Orada işte, oradaki gençlere fazla şey yapmıyordu, bazen rahatsız edici olaylar olduğunda fazla bir şey yapmıyordu, sonra benim oğluma gelip bir şey yapmasınlar burada falan, yalnız kaldığında diye. Böyle şeyler işte örnek olarak.

S: Peki, çocukken anne babanızın size ilgisiz veya soğuk davrandığını ya da bir kenarda bırakıldığınızı düşündüğünüz oldu mu?

C: Yok, hiç olmadı.

S: Yani, bunu şöyle soruyorum hani, şimdi böyle düşünebilirsiniz yapmadıklarını böyle ama çocukken böyle düşünmüş olabilirsiniz.

C: Yok. Çocukken olmadı genellikle.

S: Peki. Annenizle olan ilişkinizin, deneyimlerinizin sizin şu anki kişiliğinizi nasıl etkilediğini düşünüyorsunuz?

C: İı Şu andaki kişiliğim, yani hiç değılse kendi düşüncelerimi paylaşabiliyorum yani insanlarla. Yakın ilişkiler kurduğumda sorun olmuyor. Annem genellikle işte mesela sigara, alkol konusunda, babam da annem de işte kendileri istersen iç falan, bizim yanıımızda iç dediklerinden şu an sigara kullanmıyorum yani. Alkolü de fazla kullanmıyorum. Kişilik bazında kendime güvenim geldi biraz daha, büyüyünce. Küçükken biraz daha çekingendim. Okul hayatımda başarılı oluyordum (gülme) genellikle, motive ediyorlardı.

S: Peki. Annenizle özel olarak düşünürseniz, bu etkileri size nasıl yansımış olabilir?

C: Nasıl?

S: Yani sizi nasıl etkilemiş olabilir, hani bu yönlerinizi annenizden nasıl almış olabilirsiniz?

C: Ne gibi yönlerim?

S: İşte ilk saydıklarınız, hani duygularımı rahat paylaşıyorum falan dediniz.

C: Bu şeyden dolayı yani, ben küçüklüğümde beri hep annemle her şeyimi paylaştığım için yani biliyorum ki hiç, sıkıyacağımda paylaşabileceğim bir insan var sorunlarımı. Sonuçta böyle bir, insan arayış içine giriyor zaten annesinden uzak kaldığında da. Ondan dolayı zaten yakın arkadaşlıklarınızda da bunları yaşayabiliyorsunuz, paylaşabiliyorsunuz. Eskiden mesela, ben küçükken şey yapardık, bir şeyi, mesela bir yere bir şey sorulacağıında ben utanırdım soramazdım, ablam gidip sorardı. Annem bana işte şey yapardı, niye sen sormuyorsun falan diye. Bu yavaşça işte geçmeye başladı büyüyünce. Artık yani ablamın yerine ben koşturup sorabiliyorum. Bunun böyle etkileri de var. Güzel bir şey aslında, ben de özeniyordum ablama ama yapamıyordum yani. Şimdi bunun artıları birçok var yani bu gibi.

S: Peki babanızla olan ilişkinizi, deneyimlerinizi yine düşünürseniz. Onun sizin şu anki kişiliğiniz üzerinde nasıl bir etkisi oldu?

C: Babam. Ben babamın yanında çalıştığımndan iş hayatından da bayağı böyle bana bir şeyler katmıştı. Beni, otoritesi hiç değilse durmamız gereken yeri gösteriyordu bize. Yani hala şu anda durmamız gereken yeri bilebiliyoruz. Gerektiği yerde nasıl hareket etmemiz gerektiğini, arkadaşlarının yanında gezdirdiğinden ne ortamlarda, nasıl konuşmamız gerektiğini. Bir de, ileride biz, ben erkek çocuk olduğum için daha çok babam şey yapıyordu böyle yani, işi olduğunda hem çalışmayı bilmemi gösteriyordu yani, hem de yani herhangi bir yerde yemek yemek, yatabilmek, uyumak gibi böyle şeyleri. Yani pis olursa olsun bunu alışkanlık edinmek, yani bunları aşabilmek, bunlardan tiksindenmeden geçebilmek gibi şeyler yapıldı yani bana.

S: Peki. Annenizle olan ilişkinizi düşünürseniz, konuştuğumuz, neden o sizin anlattığınız şekilde davrandı? Yani, bütün iyi yönlerini ve varsa kötü yönlerini de hesaba katarak.

C: Annem. Anne şefkati büyük ihtimalle (gülme). Ama nedenini bilemem, sonuçta karakter meselesi. Paylaşmayı seven bir insan kendisi. Küçüklüğümüzden beri her şeyi konuştuğumuz için de bu yaşımıza kadar çok rahat oldu. Nedenini açıkçası tam bilmiyorum ama sonuçta çocuklarıyla muhabbet etmekten zevk aldığından olabilir bence.

S: Peki babanız için sorsam aynı soruyu. Yine o neden hani çocukluğunuzda sizin anlattığınız gibi davrandı?

C: Babam, genellikle çalışan bir insan olduğundan yorgun zamanları oluyordu.

Sonuçta durmamız gereken yeri o gösteriyordu yani. Ama şöyle etkileri, mesela, yani arkadaşlarının yanına götürdüğü, çalışmamı sağlaması, bunlar hep yani öğrenmem

için, gerektiğinde işte ne yapmam gerektiğini bilmem için, insanlarla nasıl iletişim kurmam gerektiğini bilmem için gibi nedenlerden yapmıştır.

S: Peki, çocukluğunuzdan şimdiye dek annenizle olan ilişkinizi düşünürseniz değişimlerin olduğu zamanlar oldu mu bu ilişkide?

C: Son bir sene, üniversiteye geldiğimden beri işte, burada ayrı yaşamaya başladığımızdan beri bayağı bir süre görüşmemiştik. Değişenler, yani biraz annemin görüşlerine artık bayağı bir karşı çıkmaya başladım. Herhalde ayrılıktan dolayı, burada insanın tek başına kalınca görüşleri değiştiğinden dolayı. Ama bunun haricinde başka, yani bazı yaptığı şeyler garip geliyor.

S: Ne gibi?

C: Yani, ne gibi... Mesela annem şey yapardı, biz eskiden de yapıyordu belki ama fark etmiyorduk. Mesela bir konu hakkında fazla düşünürdü, neden böyle oldu, ay keşke olmasaydı bu, keşke olmasaydı gibi. Bu garip gelmeye bana başladı. Belki eskiden de yapıyordu ama şimdi artık gözüme batmaya başladı.

S: Sizce neden?

C: Nedeni, bilmiyorum ben. Belki belki artık yani ayrı kaldığımdan onun o şeyini kaybettim belki, yani alışkanlığı, onu. Belki artık garip geliyor büyük ihtimalle. Belki o eskiden de yapıyordu ama aklımda değil eskiden yapıp yapmadığı.

S: Başka bir şey geliyor mu aklınıza değişim anlamında?

C: Değişme anlamında... Sonuçta (gülme) konuştuğumuz konular değişti tabii bayağı bir, yaştan dolayı. Ayrıca burada yalnız yaşamak, biraz zorlanmışım yalnız yaşamaktan (gülme). Alışmamışım başlangıçta. Ondan sonra alışınca da işte, mesela gece falan dışarı çıkıyordum yalnız olunca, orada çıkamıyor, ev hayatı olunca fazla çıkamadığım için. Bu değişmişti (gülme) yani fazla, böyle ekstrem, fazla bir şey değişmedi yani.

S: Peki, yine çocukluğunuzdan şimdiye dek babanızla olan ilişkinizi düşünürseniz, bu ilişkide değişimler oldu mu? Niye oldu?

C: (gülme). Babam, bana daha şey erkeksi yaklařmaya başladı biraz daha, o hoşuma gidiyor tabii. Yani sonuçta düşüncelerime falan artık saygı duyuyor, dinliyor beni, eskiden olsa fazla şey yapmazdı. Yani daha erkeksi yaklařmaya başladı, artık düşüncelerimi falan, dinliyor beni. Sonra, mesela geçen sene yazın onun yanına gittiğimde, yurt dışındaydık biz daha önce, onun yanına gittiğimde, artık yani yanında dolařtırmaktan daha çok zevk alır yani. Böyle hani kendi boyunda bir insan olunca böyle arkadaşlarına falan gezdirmekten, bütün gün yanında dolařtırmaktan daha zevk alır bir insan. Geldiğimde eskiden çocuk gibi baktığından artık büyümüş adam olmuş diye bakıyordu, “üniversiteye gidiyor benim oğlum” diyordu. Böyle bir fark vardı ama başka řu anda aklıma gelen yok açıkçası.

S: Peki, bu değişimler sizce neden oldu? Yani biraz açıkladınız gerçi ama aklınıza başka bir şey geliyor mu?

C: Ya, büyük ihtimal yařtan dolayı, üniversiteye geldiğimizden dolayı. Artık belki büyüdüğümüzü kabul etmiştir belki de. Bir sene ayrı olduğundan dolayı o geçen işte tatile onun yanına gitmeden önce bir sene ayrı olduğumuzdan dolayı belki özleminden oldu ama büyük ihtimal büyüdüğümüzden dolayı yani.

S: Anladım. Benim sorularım bu kadar. Sizin hani eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı bu konuştuklarınıza?

C: Yok herhalde.

S: Tamam.

REFERENCES

- Adam, E. K., Gunnar, M. R., & Tanaka, A. (2004). "Adult attachment, parent emotion, and observed parenting behavior: Mediator and moderator models." *Child Development*, 75, 110-122.
- Akhondzadeh, S. M. (2002). Enhancement of self-esteem in hierarchical relationships. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Allen, J. G., (2003). "Mentalizing". *Bulletin of the Meninger Clinic*, 67(2), 91-112.
- Arıkoğlu, A. P. (2003). Attachment styles and social-emotional adjustment in Turkish college students. Unpublished master's thesis. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Armsden, G. C. & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). "The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16, 427-454.
- Armsden, G. C., McCauley, E., Greenberg, M. T., Burke, P. M., & Mitchell, J. (1990). "Parent and peer attachment in early adolescent depression." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18, 683-697.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). "Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Bartholomew, K. & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge?. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25-45). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bekiroğlu, B. C. (1996). Attachment style, family environment depression and anxiety. Unpublished master's thesis. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Bernier, A., Larose, S., & Whipple, N. (2005). "A potentially stressful event for adolescents with preoccupied attachment patterns." *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(2), 171-185.
- Bleiberg, E. (2001). *Treating personality disorders in children and adolescents: A relational approach*. New York: Guilford
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock.

- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative Overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press
- Carlivati, J. (2001). "Adolescent attachment, peer relationships, and school success: predictor, mediator, and moderator relations." Distinguished majors thesis, University of Virginia, The United States.
- 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. A. , Treboux, D., & Waters, E. (1999). "The adult attachment interview and the relationship questionnaire: Relations to reports of mothers and partners." *Personal Relationships*, 6, 1-18.
- De Wolff, M. S. & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1997). "Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment". *Child Development*, 68, 571-591.
- Dunn, J., Bretherton, I. & Munn, P. (1987). "Conversations about feeling states between mothers and their young children". *Developmental Psychology*, 23, 132-139.
- Feeney, B. C. & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1996). "Effects of adult attachment and presence of romantic partners on physiological responses to stress". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 255-270.
- Fişek, G. O. (1991). "A cross-cultural examination of proximity and hierarchy as dimensions of family structure." *Family Process*, 30, 121-133.
- Fişek, G. O. (1994). "Paradoxes of intimacy: an analysis in terms of gender and culture." *Boğaziçi Journal*, 8(1-2), 177-186.
- Fonagy, P. (1999). Transgenerational Consistencies of Attachment: A New Theory. Paper to the Developmental and Psychoanalytic Discussion Group, American Psychoanalytic Association Meeting, Washington DC. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from <http://psychematters.com/papers/fonagy2.htm>.
- Fonagy, P. (2001). *Attachment theory and psychoanalysis*. New York: Other Press.
- Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. L., & Target, M. (2002). *Affect Regulation, mentalization, and the development of the self*. New York: Other Press.
- Fonagy, P., Leigh, T., Kennedy, R., Mattoon, G., Steele, H., Target, M., Steele, M., & Higgitt, A. (1995a). Attachment, borderline states and the representation of emotions and cognitions in self and other. In: D. Cicchetti and S. L. Toth (Eds.), *Rochester symposium on developmental psychopathology: Emotion, cognition*

and representation, Vol 6 (pp. 371-414). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Fonagy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., Leigh, T., Kennedy, R., Mattoon, G., & Target, M. (1995b). Attachment, the reflective self, and borderline states: The predictive specificity of the adult attachment interview and pathological emotional development. In S. Goldberg, R. Muir & J. Kerr (Eds.), *Attachment Theory: Social, Clinical, and Developmental Perspectives*. New Jersey: The Analytic Press.

Fonagy, P. & Target, M. (1997). "Attachment and reflective-function: Their role in self-organization". *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 679-700.

Fonagy, P. & Target, M. (2005). "Bridging the transmission gap: An end to an important mystery of attachment research?". *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(3), 333-343.

Fonagy, P., Target, M., Steele, H., & Steele, M. (1998). *Reflective-Functioning Manual for Application to Adult Attachment Interviews* (Vol. 5). London: University College London.

Fraley, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (1997). "Adult attachment and the suppression of unwanted thoughts". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(5), 1080-1091.

Fraley, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (2000). "Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions". *Review of General Psychology*, 4(2), 132-154.

Frijda, N. H. & Mesquita, B. (1994). The social roles and functions of emotions. In S. Kitayama and H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 51-87). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Garbarino, J. J. (1998). "Comparisons of the constructs and psychometric properties of selected measures of adult attachment". *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 31(1), 28-46.

Gergely, G. & Csibra, J. (1997). "Teleological reasoning in infancy: The infant's naive theory of rational action. A reply to Premack and Premack". *Cognition*, 63, 227-233.

Goldberg, S. (2000). *Attachment and development: Texts in developmental psychology*. London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). "Cultural pathways through universal development." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 461-482.

- Greig, A. & Howe, D. (2001). "Social understanding, attachment security of preschool children and maternal mental health". *The British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2001(19), 381-393.
- Grienenberger, J., Kelly, K. & Slade, A. (2005). "Maternal reflective functioning, mother-infant affective communication, and infant attachment: Exploring the link between mental states and observed caregiving behavior in the intergenerational transmission of attachment". *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(3), 299-311.
- Günaydin, G., Selçuk, E., Sümer, N. & Uysal, A. (2005). "The psychometric evaluation of the short form of Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment". *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 8(16), 13-23.
- Haden, C. A. (2003). Joint encoding and joint reminiscing: Implications for young children's understanding and remembering of personal experiences. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 49-69). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haigler, W. F., Day, H. D., & Marshall, D. D. (1995). "Parental attachment and gender role identity." *Sex Roles*, 33(3/4), 203-220.
- Halfon, S. (2006). Attachment in a cultural framework. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1987). "Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1990). "Love and work: An attachment theoretical perspective". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 270-280.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1994). "Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships". *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 1-22.
- Hortaçsu, N. (1989). "Targets of communication during adolescence." *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 253-263.
- Hortaçsu, N., Gencöz, T., & Oral, A. (1994). "Perceived functions of family and friends during childhood, adolescence, and youth: Developmental theories of two Turkish groups." *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 591-606.
- Humfress, H., O'Connor, T. G, Slaughter, J., Target, M. & Fonagy, P. (2002). "General and relationship-specific models of social cognition: explaining the overlap and discrepancies". *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43(7), 873-883.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: a view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kenny, M. E. (1987). "The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year college students." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16, 17-27.

- Kenny, M. (1990). "College seniors' perceptions of parental attachments. The value and stability of family ties". *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 39-46.
- Kenny, M. E., & Donaldson, G. (1991). "Contributions of parental attachment and family structure to the social and psychological functioning of first-year college students." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38 (4), 479-486.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. & Davis, K. E. (1994). "Attachment style, gender and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 502-512.
- Kuşçu Orhan, Ş. (1998). Prediction of prolonged separation anxiety in preschoolers from maternal and child related variables. Unpublished master's thesis. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Küntay, A., Nakamura, K. (2004). Linguistic strategies serving evaluative functions: A comparison between Japanese and Turkish narratives. In S. Strömquist and L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative, Volume 2: Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 329-358). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leichtman, M. D., Wang, Q. & Pillemer, D. B. (2003). Cultural variations in interdependence and autobiographical memory: Lessons from Korea, China, India, and the United States. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 73-97). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Levy, K. N., Blatt, S. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). "Attachment styles and parental representations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(2), 407-419.
- Maier, M. A., Bernier, A., Pekrun, R., Zimmermann, P., & Grossmann, K. E. (2004). "Attachment working models as unconscious structures: An experimental test." *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(2), 180-189.
- Main, M. (1994). "A move to the level of representation in the study of attachment organisation: Implications for psychoanalysis". Annual Research Lecture to the British Psycho-Analytical Society: London.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation." *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implications for social behavior. In S. Kitayama and H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 89-130). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McAdams, D. P. (2003). Identity and the life story. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 187-207). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Meins, E. (1997). *Security of attachment and the social development of cognition*. East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.
- Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Russell, J. & Clark-Carter, D. (1998). "Security of attachment as a predictor of symbolic and mentalising abilities: A longitudinal study". *Social Development*, 7(1), 1-24.
- Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., Wainwright, R., Das Gupta, M., Fradley, E., and Tuckey, M. (2002). "Maternal mind-mindedness and attachment security as predictors of theory of mind understanding". *Child Development*, 73(6), 1715-1726.
- Meltzoff, A. N. (1995). "Understanding the intentions of others: Re-enactment of intended acts by 18-month -old children". *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 838-850.
- Nelson, K. (2003). Narrative and self, myth and memory: Emergence of the cultural self. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-28). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Paterson, J. E., Field, J., & Pryor, J. (1994). "Adolescents' perception of their attachment relationships with their mothers, fathers, and friends." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 23(5), 579-600.
- Raja, S. N., McGee, R. & Stanton, W. R. (1992). "Perceived attachments to parents and peers and psychological well-being in adolescence". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21(4), 471-485.
- Reese, E. & Farrant, K. (2003). Social origins of reminiscing. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 29-48). Mahwah, N.J.:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Repacholi, B. M. & Gopnik, A. (1997). "Early reasoning about desires: Evidence from 14- and 18-months olds". *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 12-21.
- Repacholi, B. & Trapolini, T. (2004). "Attachment and preschool children's understanding of maternal versus non-maternal psychological states". *The British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(3), 395-416.
- Roland, A. (1988). *In search of self in India and Japan*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sefer, N. (2006). Paternal representations in late adolescence. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The Developing Mind: Toward a Neurobiology of Interpersonal Experience*, New York: Guilford.

- Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. A. (1998). Attachment in adulthood. In J. A. Simpson & W. A. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 3-21). New York: Guilford.
- Slade, A., Grienemberger, J., Bernbach, E., Levy, D. & Locker, A. (2005). "Maternal reflective functioning, attachment and the transmission gap: A preliminary study". *Attachment & Human Development*, 7(3), 283-298.
- Stein, H., Jacobs, N. J., Ferguson, K. S., Allen, J. G. & Fonagy, P. (1998). "What do adult attachment scales measure?". *Bulletin of the Meninger Clinic*, 62 (1), 33-82.
- Sunar, D. (2002). "Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family." In E. Özdalga and R. Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in the family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspectives* (pp. 217-239). Swedish Research Institute in İstanbul.
- Sunar, D., & Fişek, G. O. (2005). Contemporary Turkish families. In U. Gielen and J. Roopnarine (Eds.), *Families in global perspective* (pp. 169-184). United States: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sümer, N. & Güngör, D. (1999). "Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish samples and a cross-cultural comparison". *Turkish Psychology Journal*, 14(43), 71-76.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Major cultural syndromes and emotion. In S. Kitayama and H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 285-306). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1995). "Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the Adult Attachment Interview". *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 387-403.
- van Ijzendoorn, M. H. & De Wolff, M. S. (1997). "In search of the absent father- Meta-analyses of infant-father attachment: A rejoinder to our discussants". *Child Development*, 68 (4), 604-609.
- Vivona, J. M. (2000). "Parental attachment styles of late adolescents: Qualities of attachment relationships and consequences for adjustment." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(3), 316-329.
- Wang, Q. (2001a). "Culture effects on adults' earliest childhood recollection and self-description: Implications for the relation between memory and the self." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 220-233.
- Wang, Q. (2001b). "Did you have fun?: American and Chinese mother-child conversations about shared emotional experiences." *Cognitive Development*, 16, 693-715.

- Wang, Q. & Brockmeier, J. (2002). "Autobiographical remembering as a cultural practice: Understanding the interplay between memory, self and culture." *Culture & Psychology*, 8(1), 45-64.
- Wellman, H. M., Cross, D. & Watson, J. (2001). "Meta-analysis of theory-of-mind development: the truth about false belief". *Child Development*, 2001(3), 655-684.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1994). Emotion, language, and cultural scripts. In S. Kitayama and H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 133-196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.