

**THE ROLE OF ATTACHMENT STYLES IN PARTNER
PAIRING AND SATISFACTION WITHIN MARRIAGE IN
CRITICAL AND
NON-CRITICAL STAGES**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

113 947

BY

ÖZENÇ ERTAN

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE**

IN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

**T.C. YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU
DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ**

DECEMBER, 2002

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences



Prof. Dr. Bahattin AKŞİT

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science of Psychology.



Prof. Dr. A.Nuray KARANCI

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science of Psychology.



Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hürol FIŞILOĞLU

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hürol FIŞILOĞLU

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nebi SÜMER

Prof. Dr. Selim HOVARDAOĞLU



T.C. YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU
DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF ATTACHMENT STYLES IN PARTNER PAIRING AND SATISFACTION WITHIN MARRIAGE IN CRITICAL AND NON-CRITICAL STAGES

Ertan, Özenç

M. S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hürol Fıfılođlu

December, 2002 132 pages

The main purpose of the present study was to examine marital adjustment and comparison of the certain partner pairing's marital adjustment in the different stages of marriage according to individuals and their spouses' attachment style. The other purposes of the study were to understand mate preferences of the people to get marry according to adult attachment styles, and which kind of partner pairings have higher marital adjustment rating according to their attachment style. The nonreferred sample consisted of 70 married couples. The data gathered by administering three instruments ; Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR) (Appendix B)

for determining the participants attachment styles, Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Appendix A) for measuring marital satisfaction. Additionally a Demographic Information Form (Appendix C) was used in the present study.

Findings indicated that the most common marital dyad in the sample was dual insecure couples. The couples participated in the present study was paired non-randomly. Also, there was significant difference couples who have both insecure attachment style between while they during in critical and non-critical stages. Dual insecure pairs showed higher affectional expression when they are in non-critical marital stage than while in critical marital stage. In critical stages dual secure couples' affectional expressions were higher than the all other dyads. For consensus in non-critical stages insecurity of women had negative effect while in critical stages security of women have positive impact of dyadic consensus. Women's security also had positive impact on dyadic satisfaction in both critical and non-critical stages. In both critical and non-critical stages existing of at least one secure spouse in marital dyad had positive impact on dyadic satisfaction. Lastly, the highest dyadic adjustment scores were obtained from dual secure couples in both stages.

Key Words: Adult Attachment styles, marital adjustment, partner selection, stages of marriage.

ÖZ

BAĞLANMA STİLLERİNİN EŞ SEÇİMİ İLE KRİTİK VE KRİTİK OLMAYAN EVLİLİK DÖNEMLERİNDEKİ DOYUM ÜZERİNDEKİ ROLÜ

Ertan, Özenç

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Hürol Fışiloğlu

Aralık, 2002, 132 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı kişilerin ve eşlerinin bağlanma stillerine bağlı olarak, eşlerin evliliğin farklı aşamalarındaki evlilik doyumlarını incelemektir. Çalışmanın diğer amaçları ise belli bağlanma stiline sahip bireylerin evlilik için hangi bağlanma stiline bağlı eşleri tercih ettiğini ve hangi bağlanma stiline sahip eşlerin daha uyumlu bir evlilik sürdürdüklerini incelemektir.

Veriler, Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Ölçeği (ECR) (Ek B), Çiftlerarası Uyum Ölçeği (DAS)(Ek A)'nin 70 çifte uygulanması ile elde edilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre örnekleme en sık rastlanılan çiftler her iki eşin de güvensiz bağlandığı çiftlerdir. Çalışmaya katılan çiftlerin bağlanma stilleri arasında bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Her iki eşin de güvensiz bağlandığı çiftlerin duygusal ifadeleri

evliliğin kritik olan ve olmayan aşamalarında farklılık göstermiştir. Her iki eşin de güvensiz bağlama stiline sahip olduğu çiftler kritik olmayan evlilik aşamalarında daha yüksek duygu ifadeleri göstermişlerdir. Fikir birliği söz konusu olduğunda ise kritik olmayan dönemlerde kadının güvensiz bağlanması karşılıklı fikir birliğini olumsuz etkilemektedir, öte yandan kritik dönemlerde kadının güvenli bağlanması karşılıklı fikir birliğini olumlu olarak etkilemektedir. Kadınların güvenli bağlanması ayrıca her iki dönemde de karşılıklı doyumu olumlu olarak etkilemektedir. Her iki dönemde de eşlerden en az birinin güvenli bağlanma stiline sahip olması karşılıklı doyum üzerinde olumlu etkiye sahiptir. Son olarak, en yüksek evlilik uyumu puanlar her iki dönem için de çiftlerin güvenli olarak bağlandığı eşlerden edinilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri, evlilik uyumu, eş seçimi, evliliğin aşamaları.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indept to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hürol Fıfılođlu for his valuable supervision, kind interest and suggestions during the all proses of the study. I would like to special appreciation to Prof. Dr. Selim Hovardaođlu for his support and help during the study. I wish to thank also my thesis committee member Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer.

Finally my appreciation goes to my family and Dr. Sibel Gürsoy. Without invaluable encouragements of them, such a thesis would not have been possible. They unconditionally supported and trusted me throughout this project as well as along my life.

I am also indept to all my collegaues for their help, support and understand throughout my master education. Additionally, I should thank to Tufan Tuna who gave me the idea of thesis subject and Can Ilgazlı who motivated me to finish this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	III
ÖZ.....	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VII
LIST OF TABLES.....	XI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XII
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Goals of the Study.....	9
1.2 Significance of the Study.....	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	11
2.1 Definition of Attachment.....	11
2.2 Development of Concept of Attachment.....	12
2.3 Attachment in Infants.....	17
2.3.1 Secure Base Phenomenon.....	17
2.3.2 Inner Working Models.....	22

2.3.3 Attachment Styles in Infants.....	23
2.3.3.1 Secure Attachment.....	26
2.3.3.2 Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment.....	26
2.3.3.3 Anxious/Avoidant Attachment.....	27
2.3.4 Stability Versus Instability of Attachment Patterns.....	28
2.4 Attachment in Adults.....	31
2.4.1 Four Category Model of Adult Attachment.....	34
2.4.1.1 Secure Attachment Style.....	36
2.4.1.2 Preoccupied Attachment Style.....	37
2.4.1.3 Fearful Attachment Style.....	38
2.4.1.4 Dismissing Attachment Style.....	38
2.4.2 Stability Versus Instability of Adult Attachment.....	39
2.5 Attachment Theory and Marriage.....	42
2.5.1 Partner Selection.....	42
2.5.2 Attachment Style and Marital Adjustment in Different	

Stages of Marriage and Coping.....	44
3.METHOD.....	54
3.1 Subjects.....	54
3.2 Instruments.....	55
3.2.1 Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR).....	55
3.2.2 Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS).....	56
3.2.3 Demographic Information Form.....	57
3.3 Procedure.....	57
3.4 Analysis of Data.....	58
4.RESULTS.....	59
4.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables.....	60
4.2 Relationship Between Spouses' Attachment Styles.....	62
4.3 Results of ANOVA's.....	63
4.3.1 Affectional Expression.....	65

4.3.2 Dyadic Cohesion.....	71
4.3.3 Dyadic Consensus.....	75
4.3.4 Dyadic Satisfaction.....	81
4.3.5 Dyadic Adjustment.....	87
5.DISCUSSION.....	97
5.1 General Evaluation of the Results.....	97
5.2 Implications of the Study.....	110
5.3 Limitation of the Study and Future Direction.....	112
REFERENCES.....	113
APPENDICES.....	129
A. DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE (DAS).....	129
B. EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS (ECR).....	130
C. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM.....	131
D. EXPLANATION.....	132

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

- 1. Frequency Table of Genders Based on Their Attachment Styles**
- 2. Descriptive Statistics of DAS**
- 3. Relationship Between Spouses' Attachment Styles.**
- 4. Affectional Expression Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.**
- 5. The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Affectional Expression.**
- 6. Affectional Expression Mean Table of Couples With Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages**
- 7. The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Spouses' Affectional Expression.**
- 8. Dyadic Cohesion Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.**
- 9. The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Cohesion.**
- 10. Dyadic Cohesion Mean Table of Couples With Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.**
- 11. The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Spouses' Dyadic Cohesion.**
- 12. Dyadic Consensus Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.**
- 13. The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Consensus.**

14. Dyadic Consensus Mean Table of Couples With Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.
15. The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Spouses' Dyadic Consensus.
16. Dyadic Satisfaction Mean Table of Couples with Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.
17. The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Satisfaction.
18. Dyadic Satisfaction Mean Table of Couples With Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.
19. The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Spouses' Dyadic Satisfaction.
20. Dyadic Adjustment Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.
21. The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Adjustment
22. Dyadic Adjustment Mean Table of Couples With Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages.
23. The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Spouses' Dyadic Adjustment
24. Differences Between Secure and Preoccupied Husbands on Their Own and Partners' Outcome Variables
25. Differences Between Secure and Preoccupied Wives on Their Own and Partners' Outcome Variables

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

1. Precursors of Attachment
2. Four Category of Attachment



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years research on close relationship is increasing significantly. Since Hazan and Shaver (1987) first demonstrated that romantic love and other close relationship can be conceptualised as attachment process, research on close relationships has mostly focussed on association between adult attachment and close relationships. Related to increasing interest on this topic, subject of the present study is marital adjustment and comparing it with the couples in the different stages of marriage on the basis of their attachment style.

Adult attachment is the stable tendency of an individual to make substantial effort to seek and maintain proximity to and contact with one or a few specific individuals who provide the subjective potential for physical and/or psychological safety and security (Sperling & Berman, 1994). Recent attempts to understand adult's close relationships from an attachment perspective have been strongly influenced by Bowlby's seminal work on attachment and loss (Feeney & Noller, 1996). A basic premise of

Bowlby's attachment theory is that the attachment style developing the infant-caregiver relationship influences future relationships (Cook, 2000; Davila, Bradbury & Karney, 1999). According to Bowlby's attachment theory, caregiver's emotional availability and responsiveness to the child's needs determined the nature and quality of child's early relationships (Collins & Read, 1990).

Although, Bowlby's theory suggests attachment patterns are relatively stable, there is some evidence that individuals may develop different models in different relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1996). For instance, according to Read and Miller's study (1989) people develop working models of specific partners and relationship (Collins & Read, 1990). Similarly, Lamb et al., (1985) suggested a relationship between care-giving interaction and attachment quality, implying that the latter should be sensitive to circumstances that influence the extent or type of interaction (Feeney & Noller, 1996).

There is still argument among the researchers on stability of attachment styles through life span. However, first it must be pointed out the attachment styles. There are three types of attachment style described by Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall, 1978; Bell and Ainsworth, 1972 cited by Feeney & Noller, 1990). These styles are secure, avoidant and anxious-ambivalent styles. According to Shaver and Hazan's study (1987) these styles of infant attachment are determinants of adult romantic relationships. In the same study it was reported that secure subjects

comfortable with intimacy and able to trust and depend on other people while, avoidant subjects were experiencing discomfort with closeness and difficulty in depending on others and, the anxious-ambivalent subjects were seeking extreme levels of closeness and fearing that they will be abandoned or not loved sufficiently.

Recently Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) suggested a new model on attachment styles. They suggested that models of self could be divided into two categories as positive (the self is seen as worthy of love and attention) and negative (the self is seen as unworthy). Also, model of attachment figure can be divided in to two categories as positive (seen as available and caring) or negative (seen as rejecting, distant, or uncaring). By combining the working model of self and the working model of other, there are four styles of attachment arise. These attachment styles are secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful. Secure people have sense of worthiness and expectation that other people are generally expecting and responsive. People with this style are comfortable with intimacy and autonomy. Preoccupied people have sense of unworthiness and positive evaluation of others. This person strives for self-acceptance by gaining the acceptance of valued others. People with this style are preoccupied with relationships. Dismissing people have sense of unworthiness and expectation that others will be disposed as untrustworthy and rejecting. This style enables people to protect themselves against anticipated rejection by other by avoiding close involvement. People

with dismissing style are dismissing of intimacy and counter dependent. Lastly, fearful people have sense of love-worthiness and a negative evaluation of others. They protect themselves against disappointment in the way of avoiding close relationships and maintaining a sense of independence and invulnerability. The people with fearful attachment style are fearful of intimacy and socially avoidant (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). In the present study, Bartholomew's model of attachment style was used. But, in literature many studies (e.g. Cohn & Silver, 1992; Asendorph & Wilpers, 2000; Parker, Scannell, 1998) grouped attachment styles as secure and insecure. Insecure group contains preoccupied, fearful and dismissing attachment styles.

Attachment styles can be applied to romantic love and marriage relationships, too. First Hazan and Shaver suggested the idea that romantic love is an attachment process (Feeney & Noller, 1996). According to their study "not only that childhood experiences have an impact on adult romantic relationships, but also romantic love can be thought of as a process of becoming attached that shares important similarities with child parent attachment" (Collins & Read, 1990).

If romantic love can be conceptualised as an attachment process, it might be thought that several aspects of a close relationship influenced by attachment. Partner selection is one thing that is influenced by attachment (McCarthy, 1999). In McCarthy's

study it was found that insecure attachment style were significantly more likely than secures to have cohabited with a deviant partner. Another study by Collins and Read (1990) suggests that there is similarity between partners according to attachment style. Results of the same study showed that individuals have tendency to be in relationships with partners who shared similar beliefs and feelings about becoming close and intimate with others and dependability of others. But there are some exceptions. For example, anxious people don't have tendency to select a partner who shared the same worries with their own, like being abandoned and unloved (Collins & Read, 1990). Similarly, in Kirkpatrick and Davis's (1994) study it was found that there were no avoidant-avoidant or anxious-anxious pairs. Avoidant people tend to be paired with anxious partners. Secures have tendency to mostly pair with secure people.

The other dimensions are being influenced by attachment that relationship quality and marital adjustment. There is ambiguity on defining the term of marital adjustment because of existing a lot of related factors (Fışıloğlu & Demir, 2000). Although, there are many definitions of marital adjustment, Spanier's definition is the one to be used in this study. According to Spanier, marital adjustment is a matter of degree in a continuing and ever-changing process (Spanier, 1976 cited by Fışıloğlu & Demir, 2000). Collins and Read examined the role of attachment style dimensions in the quality of romantic relationships. They suggested attachment styles dimensions of a

subject's partner were strong predictors of relationship quality (Collins & Read, 1990). Similarly, Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) examine the role of own and partner attachment type in relationship satisfaction. The results of those two studies are similar. In Collins and Read's study it was found that greater anxiety in women was related lower overall satisfaction for their male partners. On the other hand, men's comfort with closeness and intimacy creates greater overall satisfaction of their partners (Collins & Read, 1990). Similarly, Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) found if the women are anxious both partners rated the relationship relatively negative, and if men are avoidant the men rated the relationship relatively negative. On the other hand, attachment style influences the way people cope with and adjust stressful events (Bowlby, 1973 cited in Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). Because of this effect people who have different attachment style have certain responses to difficulties arose in their relationships. Attachment style predicts the way people cope with and adjust stressful events. Secure partners have higher rates of marital adjustment because of their way of coping with the problems. Secure persons have the feature of handling the problems adequately due to their strong "secure base" (Bowlby, 1973; Kobak & Sceery, 1998 cited by Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). But, dismissing people restrict their awareness to unsolved distress to regulate it and emphasise self-reliance and control (Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). At the same time they have qualities of conflict avoidance or low expectations of their partners.

Of course these difficulties and the way coping with and adjust to them will have impact on marital adjustment.

Past studies showed that marital adjustment showed increases and decreases in the certain stages of marriage life cycle (Rollins & Cannon, 1974; Rollins & Feldman, 1970; Burr, 1970; Schram - Weinman, 1979; Spanier and Lewis, 1980 cited by Çelik, 1997). The family life cycle was divided into six categories: leaving home –being single young adults-, joining of families through marriage – being the new couple -, becoming parents and families with children, the family with adolescents, the family at midlife, the family in later life (Carter & McGoldrick cited by Santrock, 1997). All categories in family life cycle have their own characteristics. Several researchers agree on the idea that there is a major drop of satisfaction during the child-rearing stage (Rollins & Cannon, 1974; Rollins & Feldman, 1970; Burr, 1970; Schram - Weinman, 1979; Sanier and Lewis, 1980 cited by Çelik, 1997). So, especially the child rearing stage and living with adolescents stage will be thought as critical stages for marriages in present study because of these stages' specific difficulties. For example in child rearing stage commitment of time as a parent between spouses is important because problems that emerge when a couple first assumes the parental role are struggles with each other about taking responsibility. Again in living with adolescent stage, commitment of strategies to handle non-compliance of adolescents between spouses is important. In this

stage problems emerge when spouses prefer different strategies to handle non-compliance of adolescents (Santrock, 1997). In the present study it is expected that spouses with secure attachment style have the higher marital adjustment during these stages according to their own attachment style but there is no study in the literature dyadic marital adjustment according to both spouse's attachment style.



1.1 The Goals of the Study:

Main purpose of the present study is to examine marital adjustment and comparison of the certain partner pairing's marital adjustment in the different stages of marriage according to individuals and their spouses' attachment style. Second purpose of the present study was to examine dyadic pairings of spouses with respect to their attachment styles. For this purpose the hypothesis are:

- 1) There will be more secure – secure dyads in present sample of married couples and fewer insecure – insecure dyads.
- 2) Couples in the present sample are non-randomly pairing.
- 3) In non-critical stages secure-secure dyads have the highest dyadic adjustment rating, and insecure-insecure dyads have the lowest dyadic adjustment ratings. Additionally, there is one question research for the current study.
- 4) Question of research is that how is the couples' dyadic marital adjustment at the critical stages of marriage according to their own and their spouses' attachment style.

1.2 Significance of the Study

If marital adjustment is affected by partner's attachment style (Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994) and suitable mate selection (Rollins and Feldman, 1970 cited by Çelik, 1997) it is important to determine appropriate pairing according to their attachment style. The second importance of the study can be research question. Because the attachment styles and marital adjustment in different life cycle of family is really rarely studied topic, so this study may contribute the body of research on this topic. There is only one study by Feeney (1994) was found by the researchers in the literature.

Furthermore, this topic has not been studied in Turkish sample. Additionally, knowing the suitable and unsuitable pairing may help the practioners in the area while they are either counselling with premarried couples or couples in critical stages.



CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, definition of attachment, development of concept of attachment, attachment in infants, inner working models, attachment styles in infants, attachment in adults, attachment theory and marriage will be mentioned.

2.1 Definition of Attachment

It is useful to give a definition of attachment as a term before explaining the attachment theory. Freud described attachment in terms of derive reduction emerging mental structure that channel and transform instinctual drives, while social learning theorists and behaviourists discrete behaviours showed differentially toward the mother and maintained by her attention and responsiveness (Waters, Ikemura, Richters & Posada, 1991). According to Bowlby attachment is a tie that binds people each other over time and space (Waters et al, 1991).

In the literature, nearly every single theorist has developed his/her own definition of attachment. According to Ainsworth (1989) attachment is strong and enduring emotional ties, a desire to maintain proximity with the attachment figure and anxiety when that proximity is threatened or lost, and desire to use the attachment figure as a source of support under conditions of threat, and as a secure base from which to confidently engage in other activities Ainsworth, 1989 cited in (Bartholomew & Thompson, 1995). According to Bowlby (1969), attachment is affectional tie that one person or animal forms to another specific individual But all these definitions must include more or less same conceptions due to attachment's nature. For this reason recently, a general definition is used in attachment literature that attachment is a stable tendency of an individual to make substantial effort to seek and maintain proximity to and contact with one or a few specific individuals who provide the subjective potential for physical and/or psychological safety and security (Sperling & Berman, 1994).

2.2 Development of Concept of Attachment

As it is seen above, even definition of the attachment term show some difference and development in time, in spite of the similarity among them. The attachment theory, same as its definition, has developed and changed in time. Although it is generally believed that attachment theory first suggested by Bowlby in fact Freud first mentioned

this term in his work of “An Outline of Psychoanalysis” in 1949 (Waters et al., 1991).

In the same work Freud’s descriptive insights about human attachment as these:

1) An individual’s attachment to another cannot be equated with the amount of overt behaviour toward that person or with the amount or duration of protest that follows separation.

2) Loss of a loved one is always painful and is a major challenge to an individual’s adaptive resources.

3) Attachment is never given up voluntarily or completely.

4) Grief and mourning are processes rather than behaviour and they serve an adaptive function for the individual who experiences a significant loss.

5) The process of grieving is not concluded when the crying stops.

6) Human infants lead an exceedingly complex cognitive and emotional life.

7) Early attachment relationships are prototypes of later love relationships (Freud, 1949 cited in Waters et al., 1991, p.219).

These descriptive insights are still at the heart of the contemporary attachment theory.

At the beginning of his work, Bowlby had borrowed some Freud’s ideas but late he realized that he had to develop a new theory of motivation and behaviour control, based

on current science rather than Freud's psychic energy model (Bretherton, 1992). Thus, in short it can be said that the cornerstone of Bowlby's attachment theory was replacement of psychoanalytic drive reduction with a control system analysis (Water & Deane, 1985; Waters et al., 1991). According to Bowlby, infants' purposive behaviour toward their caregivers can be explained in terms of a behavioural control system. This control system maintains a balance between attachment and exploratory behaviour (Water & Deane, 1985; Waters et al., 1991). According to control system theory, control system integrates several functions. These functions are:

1) Defining a set goal that the system uses as a criterion for activation of adaptive behaviours. In the case of attachment, Bowlby defined the goal as a degree of proximity or access to the caregiver. The set goal can be modified in short term in response to contextual factors and, in the long term, in response to experience with a particular caregiver.

2) Collating information about the infant's previous experience with the caregiver, the infant's state, the caregiver's location and activities, interesting objects and events in the environment, special cues to danger (e.g. looming objects, darkness, novelty)

3) Comparing information about the current state of the infant, caregiver, and environment with criterion defined by the set goal.

4) Activating behaviour patterns that correct deviations from the set goal and maintain the infant within the bounds defined by the set goal. Critical behaviours here include crying, approach, following, clinging, and exploration. (Waters, et al., 1991. p.221).

At the same time control system has a function that help individual to survive in the environment (Water & Deane, 1985; Waters, et al, 1991) in the way that helps maintain supervision and thus reduce accidents and injuries. The other function of attachment is, to make infant to play an active role in its own behaviour and development and facilitates both social and cognitive development (Water & Deane, 1985). Control systems theory placed emphasis on adaptation to the real world rather than to drive states and emphasized actual experience rather than intra-psychic events as influences on development and individual differences. Later, this control system is referred as the secure base phenomenon (Waters, 1997.)

Interestingly, two major theorists of attachment theory; Bowlby and Freud haven't placed enough emphasis on the secure base figure's role until Ainsworth's early home studies in Baltimore (Waters et al., 1991). With Baltimore study of Ainsworth,

secure base figure's role became more important because, it was explored individual differences in attachment relationships and three distinct attachment styles were identified (Collins and Read, 1990). These styles and Baltimore study will be pointed out with more detail while discussing on attachment styles.

Later, Hazan and Shaver (1987) have used the infant attachment theory as a frame work for examining the adult close relationships. With this study romantic love itself determined as a process of becoming attached for the first time (Collins and Read, 1990). Again with this study, it has begun to believe that the attachment system in adults is functioning in much the same way as the infant system with the set goal of felt security (Collins and Read, 1990). In empirical research by Hazan and Shaver (1987) it was found that three attachment style determined by Ainsworth et al (1978) are valid to explain the adult attachment patterns.

Recently, Bartholomew (1991) suggested a new model with an empirical research for attachment classification in adults. With this empirical research she proposed a four- group model of adult attachment. Bartholomew suggested that models of self could be divided into two categories as positive (the self is seen as worthy of love

and attention) and negative (the self is seen as unworthy). Also, model of attachment figure can be divided in to two categories as positive (seen as available and caring) or negative (seen as rejecting, distant, or uncaring). By combining the working model of self and the working model of other, there are four styles of attachment arise (Feeney & Noller, 1996). These are named as secure group, preoccupied group, dismissing group and fearful group (Bartholomew, 1991).

Of course development of attachment theory hasn't come to an end with the Bartholomew four category model. Every new research may bring new improvements to the theory but the particular improvements pointed out here are some corner stones of the theory.

2.3 Attachment in Infants

2.3.1 Secure Base Phenomenon and Development of Attachment in Infants

Secure base phenomenon is very important part of the attachment theory because, without secure base concept it is impossible to have control systems that alternative to Freud's drive theory (Waters, 2001). As it is mentioned before, while discussing

development of concept of attachment, infants' attachment to their caregiver has very important functions such as surviving in and exploring the environment, rather than drive reduction. In this surviving and exploring process infant needs to use his primary care givers as a secure base from which to explore and, when necessary, as a haven of safety and a source of comfort (Ainsworth, 1971 cited in Waters & Deane, 1985).

According to Bowlby's developmental model, becoming of an adult a secure base for an infant occurs at third phase of attachment development. Here, it is important to distinguish the development of the attachment relationship from the appearance of attachment behaviours. Behaviours like crying, smiling or proximity seeking can serve the function of attachment. However, attachment refers to how those behaviours are organized with respect to the specific caregiver and the context. The history of the infant's relationship with the caregiver, provide the context for the development (Gale Encyclopaedia of Childhood and Adolescence, 1998). Bowlby (1969) divided attachment development into four phases. Figure 1 shows these phases.

First Phase was described as indiscriminating social responsiveness (0 - 3 months). This is a short period of indiscriminating responsiveness. The key observation of this phase is the lack of differential responsiveness to the primary care giver. In this period despite his/her ability to discriminate a person from another,

behaves in characteristic ways to people; the infant responds positively to a variety of cues regardless of the person providing them (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1969 cited in Waters, et al., 1991; Waters & Cummings, 2000).

Second Phase was described as preferential social responsiveness: (3 – 6 months). In this period infants can distinguish the caregiver from others. He shows differential behaviours toward the one or two people who infant has focused on. He stops crying differentially according to who holds him, he cries when his caregiver away, he smiles and vocalizes differentially, he maintains a differential visual – postural orientation to his caregiver and so on. During this phase the infant begins to learn the natural contingencies of this special relationship and to develop expectations about how the caregiver responds to various signals, but the infant does not protest separation during this phase (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1969 cited in Waters, et al., 1991; Waters & Cummings, 2000).

Third Phase was described as emergence of secure base behaviour: (6 – 24 months). This is the most significant phase of attachment. With the emergence of locomotion the baby begins to following, climbing exploring, clinging to his primary

caregiver and he begins to use his primary caregiver as a secure base from which to explore and as haven of safety to which to return for comfort if threatened or distressed. That's why separation from his primary care giver is actively protested especially in the situation that the infant is on unfamiliar ground (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1969 cited in Waters, et al., 1991; Waters & Cummings, 2000).

Fourth Phase was described as goal corrected partnership: (24 – 36+ months).

Very little is said about this period. Only it can be said for this phase is infant increasingly able and willing to take the primary caregivers' immediate goals and activities into account when attachment system is active. In this phase infant's behaviour like separation protests and proximity – seeking in relation to the attachment figure are on the wane (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1969 cited in Waters, et al., 1991; Waters & Cummings, 2000).

While Bowlby (1973) viewed proximity to the caregiver as the goal of the attachment system, later theorist have argued that “felt security” is a more appropriate goal of the system because it not only plays a major role for the emotional qualities of this intimate relationship between the infant and primary caregiver but also determines the person's

intimate relationships in future (Collins and Read, 1990). In development of attachment process experiences with primary caregivers leads to expectations and beliefs about the self, the world, and relationships also, cognitive constructs that are named inner working models (Bowlby, 1973, 1980; Mikulincer & Horesh, 1999). Mental models based on relation with primary caregiver and strategies for keeping proximity reflect individual differences about attachment (Feeney and Noller, 1996). That's why inner working models will be mentioned in details.

The Development of Attachment	
Phase	Age (months)
1. Non-focussed orienting and signalling	(0 – 3)
2. Focus on one or more figures	(3 – 6)
3. Secure base behaviour	(6 – 24)
4. Goal – corrected partnership	(24 – 36+)

Figure 1. Precursors of attachment: Bowlby's four phase model

2.3.2 Inner Working Models

In the first years of the life, reactions of primary caregivers to the infant and primary caregiver's reactions toward the infants' proximity seeking are encoded as mental representations by the infants (Bretherton, 1995; Bowlby, 1973, 1980; Feeney & Noller, 1996; Horesh & Mikulincer, 1999; Sperling & Berman, 1994). Bowlby named mental representations as internal working models (Bowlby, 1973, 1980; Bretherton, 1995). Bowlby use the term working model shortly, for describing the individuals' internal representations about the world and about the significant people and self (Collins, 1996). There are two key features of working model of attachment according to Bowlby; If the attachment figure is judged as a person who generally responsive in need for support and protection and if the self is judged as a person towards whom anyone and the attachment figure in particular, is respond in a helpful way. The first feature affects the child's image of other people and the second one affects the child's image of the self (Bowlby, 1973 cited in Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991).

In Bowlby's view working models are generalized to new relationships where they organized cognitions, affects, and behaviours. Moreover working models guide reactions to distress and working models are the main sources of continuity between infants' attachment experiences and later feelings and behaviours (Mikulincer and

Nachson, 1991). In this context infants' differential relationships patterns with their primary care givers are thought to reflect differences in the psychological organization of the attachment system. In early studies on different experiences of the infants with their primary care giver by Ainsworth and her colleagues, it has been observed that there are some certain regularities in the nature and quality of infant – caretaker relations and connectedly three attachment styles. These styles are closely connected with differences in caretaker warmth and responsiveness (Collins, 1996).

2.3.3 Attachment Styles in Infants

Attachment styles were first mentioned in the literature by Ainsworth's studies (Bretherton, 1992). That's why it can be useful to give some information about Ainsworth's three studies, which are known as infancy in Uganda (1953), Baltimore project (1962), and Strange Situation Paradigm (1978). The first one is the first empirical study on the attachment. In this study 26 families with unweaned babies (ages 1 - 24 months) were recruited; they were observed every two weeks for 2 hours per visit for nine months. These visits were made in the families' living rooms. The data, which were gathered from this study, were a rich source for the study of individual differences in the quality of mother - infant interaction. Three attachment patterns were observed based on the apparent strength and security of the attachment relation: Secure,

insecure, and unattached types (Bretherton, 1992; Feeney and Noller, 1996; Sperling and Berman, 1994).

Later, in 1962 Ainsworth conducted Baltimore longitudinal study. Interestingly two major theorists - Bowlby and Freud - of attachment theory haven't placed enough emphasis on the secure base figure's role until Ainsworth's early home studies in Baltimore (Waters, et al., 1991). In this project 26 families participated. Families recruited before their babies born. From babies first month to 54 weeks of age, 18 home visit made by Ainsworth. Each visit was four hours long and ethological model was followed since Ainsworth believed that only extensive naturalistic observations could provide a broad enough, net to capture the details of the attachment process as it was played out in each unique settings (Collins & Read, 1990).

After gathering data, separate analysis were conducted on feeding situations, mother - infant face to face interaction, crying, infant greeting and following the attachment exploration balance, obedience, close bodily contact, approach behaviour, and affectionate contact (Bretherton, 1992). From the analysis, striking individual differences were observed about how sensitively, appropriately, and promptly mothers responded to their infants. With Baltimore project of Ainsworth, secure base figure's role become more important because, it was explored individual differences in

attachment relationships and three distinct attachment styles were identified according to interaction between the infants and mothers. These attachment styles are secure, anxious/avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent (Ainsworth et al 1978 cited in Collins & Read, 1990). After these two descriptive studies; Ainsworth (1978) developed a laboratory procedure to assess attachment patterns. The goal of the procedure was to provide a novel environment that would arouse the infant motivation to explore while at the same time arouse a certain degree of security seeking. Separation in such an unfamiliar setting would also be likely to activate the attachment system and allow for a direct test of functioning (Feeney & Noller, 1996). The strange situation technique's aim is to observe the change in infant's behaviour toward the attachment figure in the situation of mild but gradually increasing stress for the infant (Sperling & Berman, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1996). This technique consists of seven episodes. In the first episode mother and infant are together in a strange room with toys, in the second episode mother and infant joined by a female stranger, in the third episode mother leaves the infant with the stranger, in the fourth episode mother returns and the stranger leaves, in the fifth episode mother leaves infant alone, in the sixth episode stranger returns and at the last episode mother. According to results of this laboratory procedure Ainsworth and her colleagues determined the characteristics of three major infant attachment styles returns (Ainsworth et al 1978 cited in Feeney & Noller, 1996; Ainsworth et al 1978 cited in

Waters, Hamilton, & Weinfield, 2000). In next, it will be tried to be detailed certain characteristics of every attachment style.

2.3.3.1 Secure Attachment

This style was found in the majority of the children. These infants show balance between exploration and play, and desire to remain near their caregiver in the unfamiliar laboratory context. They typically separate readily from the caregiver, but remain friendly towards her and to the stranger as well. They may however, be upset during the separation episodes but their contact with caregiver upon the reunion provides effective relief from this distress. Upon setting, they once again become engaged in play. Infants who show little distress during separation show that they are pleased by greeting their mothers upon their return and engaging them in social interaction by smiling and sharing discoveries. Generally infants with secure attachment style have the notion that their primary caregivers are accessible and responsive so, they believe that they are competent and deserving of empathy (Sperling & Berman, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1996).

2.3.3.2 Anxious / Ambivalent Attachment

This pattern characterized by emotional ambivalence and physical resistance to the mother. The infant is typically reluctant to separate from the mother and quick to show anxiety and distress in the unfamiliar setting. Their general wary attitude extends

to the stranger and they become highly distressed by the separation. The key behavioral criterion is the difficulty these infants have settling in the reunion episodes with the mother. The classification referred to as anxious – ambivalent because of the anger expressed by these infants towards their mother at the same time that they are expressing their need and contact and comforting. They often mix contact – seeking with active resistance squirming, fussing, and even striking out at their mothers when they are upset. They generally don't confidently expect that their mothers are accessible and responsive so, they may have a sense of unworthiness of comfort and help about themselves while viewing others as rejecting or unreliable (Feeney & Noller, 1996; Sperling & Berman, 1994).

2.3.3.3 Anxious - Avoidant Attachment Style

The key behavioural criterion of this pattern is the active avoidance of the mother when the infant is upset. These infants readily separate from their mothers to explore and may be more friendly toward the stranger than their mothers. Unlike securely attached infants they show little preference for the caregiver and little affective sharing when playing. Their emotional distance from the caregiver becomes more evident after separation. Some infants may become to seek proximity upon reunion, then suddenly break off the intended and turn away. The avoidance of the mother is typically more pronounced following the second separation. These approach – avoidance conflicts

sometimes result in displaced behaviours which appear out of sequence and have no apparent function (Feeney & Noller, 1996; Sperling & Berman, 1994).

2.3.4 Stability Versus Instability of Attachment Patterns

Working models tend to be stable according to Bowlby (1980). Because they developed and operate in fairly stable family setting. Additionally the ways of thinking linked with the models become habitual and automatic over time, the models come to operate largely outside of conscious awareness so they are more resistant to change (Feeney & Noller, 1996). Moreover, working models have self-fulfilling nature; for example, actions based on these models tend to produce consequences that reinforce them (Sperling & Berman, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1996). In other words when working models established they guide the attachment relevant information and tend to assimilate it to existing structure moreover, creating significant distortions. Because of this nature of working models, they thought to be continuing life - span process. At the other hand there is still argument on stability of attachment styles through life span. Next, it will be pointed out the stability of attachment through life span.

Although the attachment patterns are described as persistent by Bowlby they are yet open to revision according to real life experiences (Sperling & Berman, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1996; Waters, Weinfeild & Hamilton, 2000). Flexibility in working

models and openness to experience are also very important. Because of these two notions, patterns are called as “working” (Sperling & Berman, 1994). According to Bowlby (1980 cited in Feeney & Noller, 1996) attachment patterns vary in stability depending on the degree of satisfaction that each person derives from the pattern also, he acknowledges that attachment patterns may be changed by subsequent events that alter the behaviour of either of individuals in the relationship. Nevertheless, the results of the studies, which conduct on stability of attachment patterns during childhood, are controversial. First the idea of stability of attachment patterns was put forward by Matas, Arend and Sroufe (1978). After this research by Matas, Arend and Sroufe (1978), Arend, Gove and Sroufe (1979) were interested in the predictive validity of attachment classifications and they held the idea that attachment patterns are stable. A study by Waters, Wippman and Sroufe (1979) children were assessed while mothers were absent. The result of this study indicated that continuity could be demonstrated outside of the realm of direct maternal influence. There are many more studies in literature draw similar conclusions (e.g. Pastor, 1981; Jacobson & Wille, 1986; Elicker, Englund & Sroufe, 1992 cited in Feeney & Noller, 1996). In these studies significant relationships were observed between the early classifications of attachment and a number of dependent measures (e.g. autonomous problem solving, social emotional development across the preschool years, social functioning) were taken either concurrently or at later stages of infancy and toddlerhood.

At the other hand, there are several researchers who found unstable attachment patterns during childhood or toddlerhood. In a study by Vaughn, Egeland & Waters (1979) 1000 mothers and their infants participated from economically disadvantaged group. In this study it was suggested that changes in family circumstances, negative life events causes change in the children's attachment styles (Sperling & Berman, 1994; Feeney & Noller, 1996). Similarly Thompson, Lamb & Estes (1983) draw similar conclusions from their work (Sperling & Berman, 1994). In another study by Thompson, Gardner, Charnov and Estes (1985) it was reported that temporal stability of attachment is high only when there is stability of family and care-taking circumstances (Feeney & Noller, 1996). Additionally, Erickson, Sroufe and Egeland (1985) indicated that changes in the quality of caregiving produce changes in a child's behavioural profile and child's working models. Lately, Easterbrook & Goldberg (1990) examined correlates of and discontinuity in attachment, it was found that stability in family life was significantly associated with higher scores on ego resiliency, and instability was associated with lower such scores for children classified as secure at 20 months of age. The opposite pattern of effects emerged for children originally classified as insecurely attached that is increased stability was associated with lower ego resiliency (Sperling & Berman, 1994). Shortly it can be said the change in attachment style emerges because of the environmental changes which influence parental caregiving (Feeney & Noller, 1996).

Longitudinal studies suggest that a change in attachment style occurs when changes in circumstances occur (Pruett, Ard & Chappell ; Scharfe & Bartholomew,1994).

Researchers have considered not only changes in children's and adolescents' attachment styles but also changes in adult's attachment styles. Changes in adult attachment styles will be pointed out after mentioning adult attachment styles.

2.4 Attachment in Adults

Individual differences in adult attachment, behaviour are reflections of the expectations and beliefs people have formed about themselves and their close relationships on the basis of their attachment histories (Feeney & Noller, 1996). Most theorists believe that the infant's relationship with the primary care giver lays a foundation for subsequent relationships. In line with this idea Hazan and Shaver (1987) proposed that attachment processes similar to those characterizing attachment to primary caregivers during childhood should govern an individual's thoughts, feelings and behaviors in romantic relationships. Thus, Hazan and Shaver (1987) applied the infants' attachment styles to adults and developed single – item, self-report measure of attachment style. This measure of adult attachment style based on the Ainsworth and her friends' attachment descriptions but these descriptions were translated into appropriate for adults. Subjects were asked to choose the description that best characterized them. The result of this

study indicated that frequencies of the three attachment styles in population are similar found in infancy and in adulthood. Also, they found that differences in adult attachment were related to different beliefs about oneself and others in way consistent with attachment theory. According to same research secure subjects are able and willing to form close bond with others and are comfortable in interdependent relationships also viewed themselves as likable, appreciated, and easy to get to know, and viewed other people as generally well-intentioned and good-hearted also they reported warmer childhood relationships with both parents. Their love experiences were most often characterized as friendly, happy and trusting. They believe that romantic love exists in real life and it does not fade with time. Individuals with an avoidant attachment style are distrustful of others and afraid of intimate relationships; hence, these people tend to avoid close personal bonds. Avoidant subjects likely to perceive their mother as cold and rejecting. Their most important love experiences were marked by fear of intimacy and by difficulty in accepting their love partners. Lastly, people with an anxious ambivalent attachment style desperately desire close relations with others but suspect that other people do not truly care about them. Anxious ambivalent subjects tended to report that their fathers were unfair. They saw themselves as misunderstood by others and as having self-doubts. They reported that falling in love was easy but they rarely found real love and few people were as willing as themselves to commit to a long-term relationship. Anxious people's most important love relationships were characterise by

obsession and jealousy, desire for union and reciprocation, strong sexual attraction, and emotional extremes. In a study by Kobak and Sceery (1988) avoidant and ambivalent people were found both to be more anxious and more hostile than secure people and have more negative and mistrusting views of the social world and human nature in general.

Lately Feeney and Noller (1990) conducted a study that aimed to replicate Hazan and Shaver's study and to address unresolved issues concerning the proposed integration of theories of love. They reported attachment group differences on measures of early family history and mental models of relationships that largely support the work by Hazan and Shaver (1987). As an addition to Hazan and Shaver's work they found avoidant subjects were more likely than others to reports having experienced a lengthy period of separation from their mothers during childhood. Also according to Feeney and Noller's research (1990) secure subjects got higher scores on social, personal, and family-related self esteem and lower scores on self-conscious anxiety and unfulfilled hopes about love. Avoidant subjects were less likely than the other two groups to idealize their love relationships and were more likely to experience relationships in terms of intimacy avoidance. Anxious-ambivalent subjects had lower family related self-esteem than the other two groups and were more likely to experience love in neurotic fashion, characterized by idealization, mania, preoccupation, dependence and

heavy reliance on partners. In a study by Collins and Read (1990), results show that secure subjects had higher self-esteem than insecure subjects and feel more confident in social situations additionally they found themselves more expressive. Among insecure groups avoidant subjects have higher scores on measure of agency and self-assertiveness than anxious-ambivalent subjects. Secure subjects were more likely than the others believe in the trustworthiness of human motives. Avoidant subjects were less likely than the others believe in the dependability of people or the integrity of social agents. Additionally they have a more negative view of themselves than secure people. Lastly, anxious-ambivalent subjects were less likely than secure subjects to see others as altruistic or possessing strength of will, and more likely than avoidant subjects to believe in the complexity of human nature.

2.4.1 The Four – Category Model of Adult Attachment

Recently Bartholomew proposed an expanded model of adult attachment which, conceptualises adult attachment in intimate peer relations. This model is along with the lines pioneered by Hazan and Shaver but distinguishes between two forms of adult avoidance (Bartholomew, 1990 cited in Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bartholomew, 1997).

According to four category model that was proposed by Bartholomew (1990), models of self and models of the attachment figure are divided into two as either positive or negative. The positive model of self is seen as worthy of love and attention and the negative model of the self is seen as unworthy of love and attention. At the other hand, positive model of the attachment figure is seen as available and caring and negative model of negative model of attachment figure is seen as rejecting, distant, or uncaring. By combining the working model of self and the working model of other, there are four styles of attachment arise. These attachment styles are secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful. These four prototypic attachment patterns are defined in terms of the intersection of two underlying dimension; how positive to negative models of the self are and how positive to negative models of hypothetical others are (see Fig.2). The model of self dimension is associated with the degree of emotional dependence on others while negative model of self is associated with anxiety regarding acceptance and rejection in close relationship. The other model dimension reflects expectation of others' availability and supportiveness. Positive model of others facilitate actively seeking out intimacy and support in close relationships, while negative model of others lead to avoidance of intimacy (Bartholomew, 1997).

		MODEL OF SELF (Dependence)	
		Positive (Low)	Negative (High)
MODEL OF OTHER (Avoidance)	Positive (Low)	SECURE Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy	PREOCCUPIED Preoccupied with relationships
	Negative (High)	DISMISSING Dismissing of intimacy Counter-dependent	FEARFUL Fearful of intimacy Socially avoidant

Figure2. Four - category model of adult attachment

Certain Characteristics of Four Category:

2.4.1.1 Secure:

Individuals with secure attachment style have both positive image of self and positive image of others. Consistently responsive care-taking in childhood is hypothesized to have facilitated the development of both and internalised sense of self worth and trust that others will generally be available and supportive. So they are high both autonomy and intimacy, and they are comfortable using others as a source of

support when needed (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bartholomew, 1997; Feeney and Noller, 1996). Secure individuals are able to engage in direct and coherent communication with relationship partners and prefer long term relationships. They are not preoccupied with attachment related emotions, but they do not attempt to mask such emotions (Feeney and Noller, 1990). When they are under pressure, they try to find social support. They show positive and constructive manner toward their partners (Guardia, Ryan, Couchman and Deci, 2000).

2.4.1.2 Preoccupied:

Individuals with preoccupied attachment style have negative self- model and positive model of others. Inconsistent parenting may lead the children blame themselves for any lack of love from caretakers. These individuals are preoccupied with their attachment needs and actively seek to have those needs fulfilled in their close relationships. As a result an overly dependent style in which personal validation is sought through gaining others' acceptance and approval. The most evident feature of preoccupied attachment style is fear of abandonment. Because of this fear they are over engage in their partner's closeness to themselves, more over they mostly charge their partner as being not close enough to themselves (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bartholomew, 1997; Feeney and Noller, 1996).

2.4.1.3 Fearful:

Individuals with fearful attachment style have negative image of both self and others. Result of an unresponsive attachment figures, others are uncaring and unavailable, and they themselves are unlovable. Thus, although they desire acceptance by others and are aware of their attachment needs, the fearful avoid becoming close out of fear or expectation of being rejected (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bartholomew, 1997; Feeney and Noller, 1996).

2.4.1.4 Dismissing:

Individuals with dismissing attachment style have positive view of self by distancing themselves from attachment figures and developing a model of the self as self-reliant and invulnerable; but a negative view of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bartholomew, 1997; Feeney and Noller, 1996).

In short, preoccupied and fearful individuals are similar to each other in their dependence on others' acceptance and in their attachment anxiety, but they differ in their willingness to approach others for support. The fearful and dismissing people are similar in their avoidance of seeking support from others, but differ in their emotional reliance on others acceptance (Bartholomew, 1997).

2.4.2 Stability Versus Instability of Adult Attachment

Although most theorists believe that the infant's relationship with the primary care giver lays a foundation for subsequent relationships controversy about the stability and instability is still continuing.

Related to the controversy about the stability and instability of the attachment styles, claim of cross- age continuity is controversial, too (Carver, 1997; Mayseless, 1991). In another words, whether the attachment styles are enduring, traitlike characteristics of individuals or they reflect functioning specific to current relationships While some researchers assume that once attachment styles established they are tend to be stable and effect the person's relationships through life-span, the others assume that infants' attachment style subject to revision (Carver, 1997; Mayseless, 1991). In a study by Hazan and Shaver (1987) it was found that individuals' attachment with their parents are consistent with their attachment style in adulthood. Also Collins and Read's study in 1990 and Kirkpatrick and Davis's study in 1994 supported the Hazan and Shaver's proposition. In another study by Fraley and Davis (1997) by young adulthood, most individuals have begun to replace parents with peers as attachment figures (cited in Gaines, Work, Johnson, Youn, Lai, 2000). On the other hand some researchers (e.g., Baldwin and Fehr, 1995; Baldwin, Keelan, Fehr, Enns, & Koh-Rangarajoo, 1996) have found that individuals typically experience multiple attachment styles across multiple

relationship types during the course of their social – psychological development. Moreover, in a study by Foltz, Barber, Weinryb, Morse & Chittams (1999) it was speculated that individuals' ability to experience different attachment styles with different relationship partners at a given point in time may be an indicator of psychological well-being (cited in Gains et al, 2000). However, these contradict claims in fact emphasize the attachment related life experiences in marking continuity and change. Even Bowlby (1969,1973,1988 cited in Feeney and Noller, 1996) who suggested that working models are characterize human beings from the cradle to the grave does not claim the attachment styles are stable through life – span but he claims that early experience with the primary caregiver is very effective in the models developed in childhood, also he emphasizes that working models are active constructions that can be modified in response to experience. In line with this idea, conditions both promote to change and stability will be mentioned in short in next paragraph.

There are four factors promote the stability of attachment styles. The most important one of them is individuals' tendency to select environments consistent with their attachment styles. Second factor is the self-perpetuating nature of these models, which create kind of information processing biases. The third factor is occurrence of

unconsciously of attachment related behaviours. And the last factor is the tendency for these models to be self – fulfilling (Feeney & Noller, 1996).

At the other hand, there are two factors lead to change in attachment style. The first factor is major life transitions (Feeney & Noller, 1996). The important events like getting married, leaving home or having a baby, getting divorced or dying of a loved one may make significant changes in ones attachment styles (Collins and Read, 1994 cited in Collins, 1996). The second factor lead to change is getting a new understanding or new interpreting of attachment related past experiences (Feeney & Noller, 1996). In the light of these claims it can be said that children’s attachment styles are also useful to describe adults’ attachment styles (Collins and Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) because, patterns of co-regulation established within early social relationships provide a working model for later social relations (La Guardia, Ryan, Couchman and Deci, 2000).

Because of whether individual’s attachment same with attachment in their childhood or changed in life time and whether individuals have stable attachment styles or specific attachment style to partner; attachment styles have effect on adult relationships, attachment theory has recently come to attention of researchers studying adult love and marital relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1996).

If romantic love can be conceptualised as an attachment process, it might be thought that several aspects of a close relationship influenced by attachment. Partner selection, marital adjustment and the critical stages of marriage are those particularly influenced by attachment, so in next this concepts will be taken up.

2.5 Attachment Theory and Marriage

2.5.1 Partner Selection

First it was proposed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) that romantic love could be conceptualised as an attachment process and attachment theory could serve as the basis for romantic relationships. Consistent with the basic tenets of attachment theory, romantic love may take on different forms, depending on the individual's attachment history (Collins & Read, 1990). Because of attachment bond includes belief and expectations about both self and others, attachment styles not only have influenced individual's romantic love and marriage but also, their partner selection for this close relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1990). Bowlby (1973) suggested that working models of the self and of relationship partners tend to be confirming. Consistent with Bowlby's idea it was suggested that people may seek to continue or re-establish relationships that are congruent with past relationships in order to maintain coherence and consistency with the self. One research by Collins & Read (1990) showed that anxious women were dating with more avoidant men, and anxious men were more likely to be with less secure

women. Simpson (1990), also found that men who scored higher on the an anxious attachment index were involved with female dating partners who scored somewhat lower on the secure index, and men who scored higher on the avoidant index were dating women who scored somewhat higher on the anxious index; for women who scored higher on the secure index were dating men who scored lower on the avoidant index, and women who scored lower on the anxious index were dating men who scored higher on the secure index. In another study by Pietromonaco and Carnelly (1994) subjects were asked to imagine how they would feel in a relationship with potential partners whose characteristics exemplified with one of the three attachment styles. All subjects felt better with a secure partner than insecure partner, but avoidant subjects felt more comfortable with an anxious ambivalent partner than an avoidant one. Kirkpatric and Davis (1994), found no avoidant – avoidant or anxious – anxious pairs. More over avoidants tended to be paired with anxious partners and general tendency of sample was to be paired with a secure partner whatever their own attachment styles. They explained the absence of avoidant – avoidant and anxious – avoidant pairings as that similar insecure partner violets one’s expectations of how an attachment figure or romantic partner should behave. In a study by Volling, Notaro, &Larsen, (1998) with married couples found more marriages that included two secure spouses (%58) and fewer marriages that included two insecure couples (%7). Also, they found no couples in

which both spouses were anxious/ambivalent however, only two couples were both avoidant.

The another view about mate selection according to attachment style is that individuals seek partners who has similar attachment style with their own (e.g. Collins & Read, 1990; Bartholomew, 1990). But there is little evidence support this view in the literature. A result was found by Bartholomew (1990), she proposed that adult who avoid close relationships may choose persons similar to themselves to maintain a safe interpersonal distance. More recently Thelen, Wal, Thomas & Harmon, (2000) conducted a study which its results supported the Bartholomew's study.

2.5.2 Attachment Style and Marital Adjustment in Different Stages of Marriage and Coping

Due to individual differences in attachment style, close relationships vary in both their quality and their interpersonal nature, the other thing is being influenced by attachment is marital adjustment (Shaver, Hazan & Bradshaw, 1988). Marital adjustment may defined as “complex of factors such as amount of conflict, shared activities believed to be associated with the happiness or success of a given marriage” (Hoult, 1969,p. 192 cited in Fıfılođlu and Demir, 2000) or as “capacity for adjustment or adaptation, ability to solve problems” (LeMasters,1957, p.229 cited in Fıfılođlu and

Demir, 2000) Although, there are lots of definitions of marital adjustment, Spanier's definition is the one to be used in this study. According to Spanier, marital adjustment is a matter of degree in a continuing and ever-changing process (Spanier, 1976).

Several researchers examined the association between the quality and nature of relationship and attachment style. According to Bowlby (1973,1980) secure people should gravitate toward and develop stable, supportive relationships in which relatively higher levels of trust, interdependence, commitment and satisfaction while avoidant people should develop emotionally distant relationships defined by lower levels of trust, interdependence, commitment and satisfaction. On the other hand, anxious people should exhibit considerable ambivalence toward their romantic partners although they may yearn to develop stable, supportive relationships. Probably their insecurity about the stability of relationships should preclude them from developing relationships that defined by high levels of trust, commitment, interdependence and satisfaction. Collins & Read (1990) found that subjects' partners' attachment style were strong predictors of relationship quality. According to partners attachment style results showed that women's greater anxiety was related to more negative experiences and lower overall satisfaction for their male partners, while comfortable with closeness and intimacy of men predicts women's positive relationship experiences and greater overall satisfaction. Moreover, women's anxiety may reflect the lack of commitment and intimacy with in

the relationship rather than be cause of it. According to Simpson (1990) consistent with Collins and Read's study (1990) secure people involved in relationships characterized by higher levels of interdependence, trust, commitment and satisfaction. Moreover, secure people's relationships characterized by more occurrences of positive emotion whereas those who are anxious and avoidant experience more occurrence of negative emotion. However, contradictly to Collins and Read's same study, Simpson (1990) found that an individual's attachment style has less impact on the partner's perception of the relationship than it has on his or her own perceptions. However in a study by Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994), results failed to replicate this result, in their study the partners of avoidant men reported greater passion and less conflict than those with anxious partners but did not differ with respect to satisfaction. In the same study they found, in couples which woman was classified as anxious, both partners rated the relationship relatively negatively; in couples which the man was classified as avoidant, the men rated the relationship negatively. Feeney, Noller and Callan (1994) conducted a longitudinal study, which examined the relations among attachment, communication, and relationship satisfaction during the first two years of marriage. Gender was found effective on relationship satisfaction consistently with previous researches. Also they found contribution of partner attachment style to marital quality; women's anxious-ambivalence negatively related to partner's satisfaction and commitment while men's comfort with closeness predicts partner's rating of trust and communication quality.

Feeney (1994) conducted a study that examines the satisfaction of couples with particular attachment pairings such as dual secure couples, dual insecure couples and mixed couples. This study showed that dual secure couples reported less suppression of their negative feelings than dual insecure couples and were less likely to perceive their partners as suppressing their negative emotions. Mixed couples were between the dual-secure and dual-insecure couples with respect to their suppression of negative affect. In sum, adults with secure attachment style report more positive relationship experiences than those with preoccupied or avoidant styles and secure individuals generally characterize their relationship as intimate, stable, and satisfying, whereas avoidant adults tend to report low levels of intimacy, commitment, and satisfaction and preoccupied individuals report jealousy, conflict, and high levels of negative emotional experiences (Collins, 1996).

The other contributed factor to marital adjustment is marital life-cycle which was very less studied in connection with adult working models. The span of time from beginning of a family with marriage of a young couple, the bearing, rearing and launching of their children, through the time when they are again alone together, until the retirement and inevitable death of one or both of them is referred to as the family life cycle (Duvall, 1971 cited in Çelik). Many studies showed that marital adjustment show increases and decreases in the certain stages of marriage life cycle (Rollins & Cannon, 1974; Rollins &

Feldman, 1970; Burr, 1970; Schram - Weinman, 1979; Spanier and Lewis, 1980 cited by Çelik, 1997). The family life cycle was divided into six categories: leaving home – being single young adults-, joining of families through marriage – being the new couple -, becoming parents and families with children, the family with adolescents, the family at midlife, the family in later life (Carter & McGoldrick cited by Santrock, 1997). All categories in family life cycle have their own characteristics. Several researchers agree on the idea that there is a major drop of satisfaction during the child-rearing stage (Rollins & Cannon, 1974; Rollins & Feldman, 1970; Burr, 1970; Schram - Weinman, 1979; Sanier and Lewis, 1980 cited by Çelik, 1997). So, especially the child rearing stage and living with adolescents stage will be thought as critical stages for marriages in present study because of these stages' specific difficulties. Of course partners' way of coping with stress will determine their adjustment in this certain stages. Next, individual's way of coping with stressful events and its connection to marital adjustment will be discussed according to their attachment styles.

The last thing is being influenced by attachment style that, the way people cope with and adjust stressful events (Bowlby, 1973 cited in Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). The way of coping and adjustment play important role especially in critical marital stages. Because of this effect people who have different attachment style have certain responses to difficulties arose in their relationships. Attachment style

predicts the way people cope with and adjust stressful events (Bowlby, 1973 cited by Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). Further more, although adult attachment relationships differ in some respects from child- parent attachment, they share a central feature of an attachment relationship – that under conditions of stress, the individual will seek proximity to the primary figure as a means of deriving comfort and security (Ainsworth, 1985; Weiss, 1986 cited in Cohn & Silver, 1992). Moreover, because attachment behaviour is particularly activated under conditions of acute or chronic stress, it is precisely under these conditions that individual differences in attachment behaviour should be most pronounced (Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992). For example when perceiving threat to the attachment relationship, ambivalent people may exaggerate negative emotions in an effort to gain the attention of the attachment figure (Davila, Bradbury, & Fincham, 1998) Avoidant people may inhibit or minimize negative emotions so as not to threaten the relationship further (Davila, Bradbury, & Fincham, 1998). People with secure attachment style at the other hand because they don't fear the loss of the relationship, may openly and directly express negative affect, without exaggeration or minimization (Davila, Bradbury, & Fincham, 1998). In line with this view, in a study by Kobak and Hazan (1991) showed that women who described themselves as relying less on their husbands and described their husbands as less psychologically available, displayed more rejection toward their husbands during problem solving. In short it can be said that insecurely attached wives may become

more negative and contribute to the escalation of negative affect cycles. Results were same for husbands who describe themselves and their wives like those wives mentioned above. But those husbands who perceived their wives as psychologically available were less rejecting and more supportive toward them during problem solving.

Perception and search for social support in need is another aspect of the issue. Simpson and colleagues (1992) conducted a study for investigating the effect of an environmental stressor on attachment behaviour. Dating couples were participated in this study and female partners were told that she would be exposed to a situation and set of experimental procedures that arouse considerable anxiety and distress in most people. Then, couples were videotaped unobtrusively during the waiting time. Results showed that support seeking and giving were jointly influenced by attachment styles; women who are more secure showed high levels of support seeking associatedly higher levels of anxiety while avoidants showing emotional and physical withdrawal from their partners. Similarly men who are secure showed high levels of support giving when their partner's stress arouse while avoidants showed low levels of support giving.

Florian and Mikulincer (1995) examined the effects of adult attachment style on the perception of and search for social support in need. In this study they found secure people have tendency to see significant others as providing relatively high levels of support so, they have tendency to seek support in need while, insecure people have

tendency to perceive relatively low level of support from others and in line with this they have relatively low tendency to seek social support in times of need. Ofcourse these difficulties and the way coping with and adjust to them will have impact on marital adjustment. Secure partners have higher rates of marital adjustment because of their way of coping with the problems. Secure persons have the feature of handling the problems adequately due to their strong "secure base" (Bowlby, 1973; Kobak & Sceery, 1998 cited by Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). But, dismissing people restrict their awareness to unsolved distress to regulate it and emphasise self-reliance and control (Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). At the same time they have qualities of conflict avoidance or low expectations of their partners. Lastly, a study conducted to test how adult attachment orientations are related to perceptions of spousal support and indicators of marital functioning across a major life stressor- the transition to parenthood by Rholes, Simpson, Campbell, and Grich (2001). They assumed that, becoming a parent requires many significant adaptations and is acutely stressful for most couples. Result of this study showed that women's ambivalence and prenatal perceptions of social support interact to predict marital functioning for both wives and their husbands during to transition to parent hood. Especially wives who were more ambivalent and perceived lower levels of spousal support showed comparatively large declines in perceptions of spousal support across the transition period. They also, showed comparatively large declines in support seeking and marital satisfaction.

Results also showed that more avoidant women sought less support from their husbands, additionally more ambivalent women and their husbands experienced lower levels of marital satisfaction and functioning.

To sum up several studies indicated that attachment style is associated with characteristic strategies for directing attention and coping with affect. Avoidant attachment is related to devaluating attachment (Main, Kaplan, Cassidy, 1985), restricting attention from attachment information, seeming deactivation of the attachment system (Dozier & Kobak, 1992 cited in Pistole, 1996) and distancing coping strategies (Mikulincer and Florian, 1995). Contradictly, preoccupied attachment is associated with attention to distress (Kobak & Sceery, 1988) and emotionally focused coping strategies (Mikulincer and Florian, 1995). Secure attachment is associated with non defensive coping strategies that gain support (Simpson et al, 1992) and with problem solving that includes effective affect management despite distress (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

In the light of the attachment literature main purpose of the present study is to examine marital adjustment and comparison of the certain partner pairing's marital adjustment in the different stages of marriage according to individuals and their spouses'

attachment style. Second purpose of the present study was to examine dyadic pairings of spouses with respect to their attachment styles. For this purpose the hypothesis are:

There will be more secure – secure dyads in present sample of married couples and fewer insecure – insecure dyads.

Couples in the present sample are non-randomly pairing.

In non-critical stages secure-secure dyads have the highest dyadic adjustment rating, and insecure-insecure dyads have the lowest dyadic adjustment ratings.

Additionally, there is one question research for the current study.

Question of research is that how is the couples' dyadic marital adjustment at the critical stages of marriage according to their own and their spouses' attachment style.



CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 Subjects

In the present study, data from 71 married couples were investigated. The original sample reduced to 70 couples by excluding one couple with one of the spouse's missing values over than ten percent on attachment style variable. As a sampling procedure snowball sampling (Kumar, 1999) was used. Ages of the all participants ranged from 21 to 75 with a mean of 40,72 years ($SD = 10,92$). While the range of the females' age was from 21 to 69 with a mean of 38,25 ($SD = 10,44$) and range of the males age was from 27 to 75 with the mean of 43,15 ($SD = 10,95$). Couples' marriage length ranges from 0,08 to 48 years with the mean of 14,63 ($SD = 11,29$). Average acquaintance between the spouses before the date of the marriage was 3,15 years ($SD = 4,66$, range = 0,12 – 30 years). %23 of participants have arranged type of marriage in present study ($N = 38$). %14,8 of participants have no children ($N = 21$), % 35,2 of them have one child ($N = 50$), %36,7 of them have two children ($N = 69$), %1.4 of them have three children ($N = 2$). The first children's age range was from 1 to 46 with the mean of 13,30 ($SD = 10,86$) and second children's age range was from 4 to 41 with the mean of 7,92 ($SD = 10,68$).

3.2 Instruments

Two instruments were used in the current study. Participants were administered Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR) (Appendix B) for determining the participants attachment styles, Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Appendix A) for measuring marital adjustment. Additionally a Demographic Information Form (Appendix C) was used in the present study. These scales are described below.

3.2.1 Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR)

The ECR (Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998) consist of 36 items measuring anxiety and avoidance dimensions. An 18-item subscale measures each dimension was derived from a factor analysis of 60 constructs represented by 482 items extracted from a thorough literature search of previous attachment measure research. From this, they produced a instrument based around the two primary constructs of avoidance and anxiety. This scale was shown to be consistent with Bartholomew and Horowitz's Relationship Questionnaire (Sümer and Güngör, 2000) but showed stronger relationships with other target variables than those found using this measure. Each question is scored on a seven item Likert scale. Odd questions relate to the avoidance dimension (alpha = .94) whilst even questions relate to the anxiety dimension (alpha = .91). By cluster analysis as suggested Brennan at al. people who gain relatively low

points from both avoidance and anxiety dimensions were grouped as secure, people who gain relatively high points from two dimensions were grouped as fearful. People who gain low points from avoidance dimension and high points from anxiety dimension were grouped as preoccupied, people who gain high points from avoidance dimension and low points from anxiety dimension were grouped as dismissing. ECR was translated into Turkish by Sümer and Güngör (2000). Sümer and Güngör (2000) used ECR in a study with Turkish university students and they obtained two factors similar to those obtained by Brennan and her colleagues. Alpha coefficients for the avoidance and anxiety subscales were .90 and .86, respectively.

3.2.2 Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)

The DAS (Spanier, 1976) was used to assess the perceived quality of marital relationships of married or cohabited couples. DAS is widely used measure of marital adjustment. Scale items reflect attitude toward marriage. It consists of 32 items, primarily utilizing the 5 and 6 point response format. There are also two items that are answered as either “yes” or “no”. According to factor analysis there are four factors identified as Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion, Dyadic Consensus and Affectional Expression. The DAS has satisfactory validity and reliability with cronbach alpha's for the subscales ranging from .73 to .97, and an alpha of .96 for the entire scale. It was used as general satisfaction measure in an intimate relationship by using total score. The possible total score obtained from DAS range from 0 to 151. Higher scores reflect a

higher perception of the quality of the relationship. The DAS was translated into Turkish and its reliability study was carried out by Fıfılođlu and Demir (2000). The alpha coefficient for the DAS was .90. Split –half reliability coefficient was .85 and the alpha for part one was .89 and for part two was .73. The construct validity of the DAS was .82.

3.2.3. Demographic Information Form

The demographic data sheet was prepared to collect information about gender, age, length of marriage, whether spouse's first marriage, duration of acquaintance of couples before marriage, meeting type, number of children and their age and lastly whether couple have children who live separately from them. Most of the questions in the form were "open-ended" and some of them were "multiple choice" type questions.

3.3 Procedure

Between August 2001 and June 2002 scales were administered to married couples in İzmir and Ankara. Snowball sampling (Kumar, 1996) was used for the present study. Before the administration of the instruments, verbal instruction was given both spouses at the same time. An information form was attached at the beginning of the instruments. These forms included necessary information about the aim of the study

and important points about filling the scales (Appendix D). More over, each scale had its own instructions. The total administration time of the instruments was approximately 40 minutes. All of the subjects participated in the study on a voluntary basis.

Instruments were given to couples at the same time, under the observation of the researcher. All of the participants completed instruments at their home and they were not allowed to see each others answers.

3.4 Analysis of Data

At the beginning of the data analysis, descriptive statistics were used in order to find out main demographic characteristics of the sample. The first hypothesis were tested by conducting Chi-Square. Other hypothesis and research question tested by conducting 2x4 ANOVA's. The significant difference examined by Tukey –Kramer test. Prior to ANOVA analysis affectional expression, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and dyadic adjustment scores were converted to z scores because of inequality of groups, and ANOVA's was conducted by using these z scores. Additionally, t-test was conducted for examining difference between the men who married with secure and preoccupied women.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the present study, data from 71 married couples were investigated. The original sample reduced to 70 couples by excluding one couple with one of the spouse's missing values over than ten percent on attachment style variable. Except for the demographic variables, missing values taking place on the variables of the study and missing values were replaced by the mean of all cases.

In the following section, descriptive statistics of the study variables, Chi-Square analysis, the results of ANOVA's will be presented.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

Participants of the study were grouped based on their attachment styles.

According to this grouping subjects dispersion according to their attachment styles are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequency Table of Genders Based on Their Attachment Styles

Attachment Style	Female		Male	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Secure	27	38,6%	26	7,1%
Fearful	6	8,6%	8	11,4%
Preoccupied	35	50%	33	47,1%
Dismissing	2	2,9%	4	4,3%
Total	70	100%	70	100%

As seen on Table 1 the distribution of groups was non- random, as it was expected. But this non-random distribution could cause difficulties when conducting ANOVA's so participants of the study divided into two groups as secure and insecure by the way of grouping preoccupied, fearful and dismissing attachment styles as insecure. Additionally, as seen on Table 1, secure and preoccupied attachment style were the most common groups in the present sample. That's why ANOVA's replicated for couples with secure and preoccupied attachment styles.

The other variable of the study was the dyadic marital adjustment of couples. This variable was measured by Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). This measure has four dimensions; dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction and affectional expression. Descriptives of these variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of DAS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ADJUST	140	49,00	143,00	113,5131	18,0863
COHESION	140	3,00	24,00	15,5214	4,6634
CONSENS	140	26,00	65,00	49,8731	8,1500
SATISFAC	140	13,00	49,00	38,6743	6,9566
EXPRESSI	140	1,00	12,00	9,4443	2,2205

The last variable of the study was the marital stages of the couples. Couples' marital stage determined whether they have a child between 0 – 18 ages. Couples that have children between 0 – 18 ages determined as in critical stage while others

determined as in non-critical stage. 64 (47,7%) of participants of the study were in non-critical marital stage and 76 (54,3%) of the participants were in critical marital stage.

Concerning the first hypothesis the sample divided into four marital groups based on their attachment styles: 1) dual secure couples (n=11; 15,7%); 2) wife secure – husband insecure (n=16; 22,9%); 3) wife insecure – husband secure (n=15; 21,4%); 4) dual insecure couples (n=28; 40%). Interestingly, dual insecure couples were the most common marital dyads in the present sample.

4.2 Relationship Between Spouses' Attachment Styles

The second hypothesis of the present study was non – random pairing of married couples. In order to examine the relationship Chi-Square was conducted. Table 3 showed relationship between spouses' attachment styles.

Table 3

Relationship Between Spouses' Attachment Styles.

		sec-insec		Total	
		secure	insecure		
sex	women	Count	27	43	70
		% within sex	38,6%	61,4%	100,0%
		% within sec-insec	50,9%	49,4%	50,0%
		% of Total	19,3%	30,7%	50,0%
	men	Count	26	44	70
		% within sex	37,1%	62,9%	100,0%
		% within sec-insec	49,1%	50,6%	50,0%
		% of Total	18,6%	31,4%	50,0%
Total		Count	53	87	140
		% within sex	37,9%	62,1%	100,0%
		% within sec-insec	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	37,9%	62,1%	100,0%

$$X^2 (1, N = 140) = 0,30$$

As seen in table 3, there is no significant relationship between couples' attachment styles. Concerning the second hypothesis this result can show that the couples' pairings of their attachment style are non-random for this sample.

4.3 The Results of ANOVA's

According to test the third hypothesis and research question , 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA's employed in this section. In the first ANOVA, dependent variable was affectional expression is presented in table 5; in the second ANOVA dependent variable was affectional expression again but groups were different

from the first ANOVA, is presented in table 7; in the third ANOVA, dependent variable was dyadic cohesion is presented in table 9; in the fourth ANOVA dependent variable was dyadic cohesion again but groups were different from the third ANOVA, is presented in table 11; in the fifth ANOVA, dependent variable was dyadic consensus is presented in table 13; in the sixth ANOVA dependent variable was dyadic consensus again but groups were different from the fifth ANOVA, is presented in table 15; in the seventh ANOVA, dependent variable was dyadic satisfaction is presented in table 17; in the next ANOVA dependent variable was dyadic expression again but groups were different from the seventh ANOVA, is presented in table 19 and in the ninth ANOVA, dependent variable was dyadic adjustment is presented in table 21; in the tenth ANOVA dependent variable was dyadic adjustment again but groups were different from the ninth ANOVA is presented in table 23. Affectional expression mean of couples with different attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 4 and affectional expression mean table of couples with secure and preoccupied attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 6 , dyadic cohesion mean table of couples with different attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 8 and dyadic cohesion mean table of couples with secure and preoccupied attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 10 , dyadic consensus mean of couples with different attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 12 and dyadic consensus

mean tables of couples with secure and preoccupied attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 14, dyadic satisfaction mean of couples with different attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 16 and dyadic satisfaction mean of couples with secure and preoccupied attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 18, dyadic adjustment mean of couples with different attachment pairs in critical or non-critical marital stages is presented in table 20 and dyadic adjustment mean table of couples with secure and preoccupied attachment pairs in critical and non-critical marital stages is presented in table 22 .

4.3.1 Affectional Expression

To determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 4, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA was conducted. However, because of inequality of groups, affectional expression, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and dyadic adjustment scores were converted to z scores and ANOVA was conducted by using these z scores. The results of ANOVA on spouses' dyadic affectional expression are shown on table 5.

Table 4.

Affectional Expression Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Insecure man	Insecure woman Secure man	Insecure woman Insecure man	
Non-critical					
X	10,45	9,42	9,00	9,51	9,54
s	(0,46) 1,51	(-0,01) 2,02	(-0,2) 2,22	(0,03) 1,76	(0,05) 1,90
Critical					
X	11,64	9,37	9,87	8,25	9,36
s	(1,00) 0,67	(-0,03) 1,87	(-0,20) 1,96	(-0,54) 2,84	(-0,04) 2,46
X	11,05	9,39	9,47	8,83	
S	(0,73) 1,29	(-0,02) 1,90	(0,01) 2,10	(-0,27) 2,47	

Table 5

The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Affectional Expression.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,22	1	0,22	0,248
B	15,26	3	5,09	5,70**
AB	7,19	3	2,40	2,70*
Error	117,72	132	0,89	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles *p<,05; **p<,01

As seen on table 5, there is significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles ($F(3 - 132) = 5,70; p < ,05$) on affectional expression. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test. According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in critical marital stage couples who have both secure attachment style have higher affectional expression scores than the pairs with secure women and insecure men ($q=4,54; p < ,01$), pairs with insecure women and secure men ($q=3,4; p < ,01$) and pairs with both insecure attachment style ($q=7,21; p < ,01$). In the same stage couples with secure women and insecure men have higher affectional expression scores than both insecure spouses ($q=2,94; p < ,05$) and couples with insecure women and secure men have higher affectional expression scores than those couple who are both insecure ($q=3,95; p < ,01$).

Also, there is significant two way interaction was showed in same ANOVA table . The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test. According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, it was found that the couples who have both insecure attachment style show higher affectional expression when they are in non-critical marital stage than while in critical marital stage ($q=3,6$; $p< ,05$).

As an addition, ANOVA was also, conducted for couples with secure and preoccupied couples to determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 6, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles). The results of ANOVA on secure and preoccupied attached spouses' dyadic affectional expression are shown on Table7.

Table 6.

Affectional Expression Mean Table of Couples with Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Preoccupied man	Preoccupied woman Secure man	Preoccupied woman Preoccupied man	
<u>Non-critical</u>					
X	10,33	9,20	10,00	9,92	9,54
s	(0,40)	(-0,11)	(0,25)	(0,22)	(0,05)
	1,86	2,59	1,22	1,84	1,90
<u>Critical</u>					
X	11,33	10,17	8,86	8,84	9,36
s	(0,86)	(0,33)	(-0,26)	(-0,27)	(-0,04)
	0,82	2,13	2,34	1,94	2,46
X	10,83	9,72	9,33	9,29	
S	(0,63)	(0,13)	(-0,48)	(-0,69)	
	1,47	2,28	1,97	1,92	

Table 7

The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Attached Spouses' Affectional Expression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	1,01	1	1,01	0,01
B	3,59	3	1,20	1,57
AB	2,83	3	0,94	1,24
Error	33,60	44	0,76	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles

As seen on Table7, there is no significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles.

4.3.2 Dyadic Cohesion

To determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were shown in table 8, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA was conducted. The results of ANOVA on spouses' dyadic cohesion are shown on table 9.

Table 8

Dyadic Cohesion Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Insecure man	Insecure woman Secure man	Insecure woman Insecure man	
Non-critical					
X	17,55 (0,44)	15,25 (-0,05)	15,93 (0,10)	14,04 (-0,31)	15,30 (-0,04)
S	3,67	4,41	3,73	3,70	3,97
Critical					
X	16,45 (0,21)	16,80 (0,29)	16,00 (0,11)	14,53 (-0,20)	15,70 (0,05)
S	2,88	5,15	5,80	5,51	5,18
X	17,00 (0,33)	16,22 (0,16)	15,97 (0,11)	14,30 (-0,25)	
S	3,27	4,87	4,86	4,72	

Table 9

The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Cohesion.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,09	1	0,09	0,09
B	6,69	3	2,23	2,26
AB	1,05	3	0,35	0,35
Error	130,15	132	0,98	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles

As seen on Table 9, there is no significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles. As an addition, ANOVA was also, conducted for couples with secure and preoccupied couples to determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 10, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles). The results of ANOVA of secure and preoccupied attached spouses' dyadic cohesion are shown on Table 11.

Table 10.

Dyadic Cohesion Mean Table of Couples with Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Preoccupied man	Preoccupied woman Secure man	Preoccupied woman Preoccupied man	
Non-critical					
X	17,50	14,40	17,4	14,86	15,30
s	(0,43)	(-0,22)	(0,41)	(-0,13)	(-0,04)
	3,62	4,39	3,85	4,60	3,97
Critical					
X	17,00	18,67	14,29	15,3	15,70
s	(0,32)	(0,68)	(-0,25)	(-0,36)	(0,05)
	2,45	3,20	7,99	6,09	2,46
X	17,25	16,73	15,58	15,12	
S	(0,38)	(0,27)	(0,25)	(-0,75)	
	2,96	4,22	6,54	5,37	

Table 11

The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Attached Spouses' Dyadic Cohesion

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	4,27	1	4,27	0,03
B	1,64	3	0,54	0,46
AB	3,61	3	1,20	0,39
Error	51,63	44	1,17	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles

As seen on table 11, there is no significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles.

4.3.3 Dyadic Consensus

To determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were shown in table 12, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA was conducted. The results of ANOVA on spouses' dyadic consensus are shown on table 13.

Table 12

Dyadic Consensus Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-Critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Insecure man	Insecure woman Secure man	Insecure woman Insecure man	
<u>Non-critical</u>					
X	52,91 (0,37)	53,41 (0,43)	46,92 (-0,37)	47,50 (-0,30)	49,44 (-0,06)
S	6,43	6,09	7,30	8,80	7,99
<u>Critical</u>					
X	55,82 (0,73)	52,84 (0,36)	47,68 (-0,27)	47,79 (-0,26)	50,23 (0,04)
S	5,36	8,61	8,90	7,44	8,31
X	54,36 (0,55)	53,06 (0,39)	47,33 (-0,32)	47,65 (-0,28)	
S	126,61	7,66	8,06	8,03	

Table 13

The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Consensus.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,34	1	0,34	0,36
B	18,84	3	6,28	6,85*
AB	0,625	3	0,21	0,22
Error	121,137	132	0,91	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles **p<,01

As seen on table 13, there is significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles ($F(3 - 132) = 6,85; p < ,01$) on dyadic consensus. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test. According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic consensus than couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=11,09; p < ,01$), and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=11,27; p < ,01$). In same stage couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic consensus than both those couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=12,24; p < ,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=12,57; p < ,01$).

On the other hand, in critical stages secure- secure pairs have higher dyadic consensus than couples with secure women and insecure men ($q=5,96; p < ,01$), couples

with insecure women and secure men ($q=15,65$; $p<,01$), and couples with both insecure attachment styles ($q=17,86$; $p<,01$). Additionally in critical stages, couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic consensus than couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=12,62$; $p<,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=13,28$; $p<,01$).

As an addition, ANOVA was also, conducted for couples with secure and preoccupied couples to determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 14, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles). The results of ANOVA of secure and preoccupied attached spouses' dyadic consensus are shown on table 15.

Table 14.

Dyadic Consensus Mean Table of Couples with Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Preoccupied man	Preoccupied woman Secure man	Preoccupied woman Preoccupied man	
Non-critical					
X	53,50 (0,45)	55,78 (0,73)	47,6 (-0,28)	49,57 (-0,40)	49,44 (-0,06)
s	7,45	5,83	5,64	11,44	7,99
Critical					
X	55,67 (-0,71)	59,83 (1,22)	44,70 (-0,64)	47,69 (-0,27)	50,23 (0,04)
s	5,28	6,65	8,78	6,09	8,31
X	54,58 (0,58)	57,99 (0,99)	45,91 (-0,49)	48,46 (-0,18)	
S	6,26	6,34	7,47	8,75	

Table 15

The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Attached Spouses' Dyadic Consensus

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	2,45	1	2,45	0,02
B	15,51	3	5,17	5,79**
AB	1,49	3	0,49	0,55
Error	39,27	44	0,89	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles **p<,01

As seen on table 15, there is significant difference among groups of preoccupied and secure attached spouses' attachment styles ($F(3-44) = 5,79; p < ,01$) on dyadic consensus. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test. According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have lower dyadic consensus than couples with secure women and preoccupied men ($q=5,7; p < ,01$). However, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic consensus than couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=14,75; p < ,01$), and also they have higher dyadic consensus than couples with both preoccupied attachment style ($q=10,62; p < ,01$). In same stage couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic consensus than both those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=19,47; p < ,01$) and couples with

both preoccupied attachment style ($q=15,92$; $p<,01$). Couples with preoccupied women and secure men have lower dyadic consensus than those couples with both preoccupied spouses ($q=5,05$; $p<,01$).

In critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic consensus than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=29,67$; $p<,01$), and also couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=23,47$; $p<,01$); but lower dyadic consensus than those couples with secure women and preoccupied men ($q=10,94$; $p<,01$). Couples with secure women and preoccupied men have also higher dyadic consensus than preoccupied men and secure women ($q=40,89$; $p<,01$); and couples with both preoccupied spouses ($q=35,70$; $p<,01$). Lastly, both preoccupied spouses have higher dyadic consensus than those spouses with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=9,34$; $p<,01$).

4.3.4 Dyadic Satisfaction

To determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were shown in table 16, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA was conducted. The results of ANOVA on spouses' dyadic satisfaction shown on table 17.

Table 16

Dyadic Satisfaction Mean Table of Couples with Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses					
Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Insecure man	Insecure woman Secure man	Insecure woman Insecure man	
Non-critical					
X	43,68 (0,71)	42,17 (0,49)	38,64 (-0,01)	35,46 (-0,47)	38,88 (0,02)
s	3,65	2,44	6,41	6,92	6,50
Critical					
X	44,73 (0,86)	39,59 (0,12)	37,38 (-0,20)	36,11 (-0,38)	38,51 (-0,03)
s	2,90	7,18	7,67	7,23	7,35
X	44,20 (0,79)	40,55 (0,26)	37,97 (-0,11)	35,81 (-0,42)	
S	3,26	5,94)	7,02	7,03	

Table 17

The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Satisfaction.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,18	1	0,18	0,21
B	26,98	3	8,99	10,57**
AB	1,41	3	0,47	0,55
Error	112,24	132	0,85	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles **p< ,01

As seen on Table 17, there is significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles ($F(3 - 132) = 10,57; p < ,01$) on dyadic satisfaction. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test.

According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic satisfaction than couples with secure women and insecure men ($q=2,79; p < 05$), couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=9,69; p < ,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=17,86; p < ,01$). Couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=6,92; p < ,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=14,91; p < ,01$). Additionally couples with

insecure women and secure men have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=7,39$; $p<,01$).

In critical marital stages results were similar to in non-critical stages. Couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic satisfaction than couples with secure women and insecure men ($q=10,07$; $p<01$), couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=14,7$; $p<,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=19,1$; $p<,01$). Couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=5,13$; $p<,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=9,40$; $p<,01$). Additionally couples with insecure women and secure men have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=3,17$; $p<,05$).

As an addition, ANOVA was also, conducted for couples with secure and preoccupied couples to determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 18, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles). The results of ANOVA of secure and preoccupied attached spouses' dyadic consensus are shown on table 19.

Table 18.

Dyadic Satisfaction Mean Table of Couples with Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Preoccupied man	Preoccupied woman Secure man	Preoccupied woman Preoccupied man	
Non-critical					
X	44,17	41,6	41,55	36,71	38,88
s	(0,78) 2,92	(0,41) 2,7	(0,40) 2,94	(-0,29) 4,42	(0,02) 6,50
Critical					
X	42,5	41,79	35,14	35,57	38,51
s	(0,54) 3,39	(0,44) 5,22	(-0,52) 9,89	(-0,46) 7,72	(-0,03) 7,35
X	43,33	41,7	37,81	36,04	
S	(0,66) 3,14	(0,43) 4,07	(-0,13) 8,21	(-0,39) 6,42	

Table 19

The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Attached Spouses' Dyadic Satisfaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	1,31	1	1,31	1,80
B	8,94	3	2,98	4,09*
AB	1,51	3	0,50	0,69
Error	32,09	44	0,73	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles *p<,05

As seen on table 19, there is significant difference among groups of preoccupied and secure attached spouses' attachment styles ($F(3, 44) = 4.09; p < .05$) on dyadic satisfaction. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test.

According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic satisfaction than couples with secure women and preoccupied men ($q=7,13; p<,01$), and couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q= 7,27; p<,01$) and both preoccupied couples ($q=22,6; p<,01$). In same stage, both couples with secure women and preoccupied men ($q=13,97; p<,01$) and preoccupied women and secure men ($q=13,82; p<,01$) have higher dyadic satisfaction than both preoccupied couples.

In critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=22,30$; $p<,01$) and also couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=22,35$; $p<,01$). In same stage couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=20,15$; $p<,01$), and those couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q= 20,06$; $p<,01$).

4.3.5 Dyadic Adjustment

To determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were shown in table 20, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles) ANOVA was conducted. The results of ANOVA on spouses' dyadic adjustment are shown on Table 21.

Table 20

Dyadic Adjustment Mean Table of Couples With Different Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Insecure man	Insecure woman Secure man	Insecure woman Insecure man	
Non-critical					
X	124,59 (0,71)	120,24 (0,37)	110,49 (-0,17)	106,51 (-0,39)	113,17 (-0,02)
S	10,97	5,35	17,35	18,39	16,65
Critical					
X	128,64 (0,84)	118,60 (0,28)	110,93 (-0,15)	106,68 (-0,38)	113,80 (0,01)
S	7,12	18,49	21,79	18,21	19,29
X	126,61 (0,73)	119,22 (0,32)	110,72 (-0,16)	106,60 (-0,39)	
S	9,26	14,84	19,51	18,13	

Table 21

The Results of ANOVA of Spouses' Dyadic Adjustment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,05	1	0,05	0,06
B	23,93	3	7,97	9,03**
AB	0,32	3	0,10	0,12
Error	130,15	132	0,98	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles **p<,01

As seen on table 21, there is significant difference among groups of spouses' attachment styles ($F(3 - 132) = 9,03; p < ,01$) on dyadic adjustment. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test.

According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic adjustment than couples with secure women and insecure men ($q=7,9; p < ,01$), couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=26,6; p < ,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=45,2; p < ,01$). Couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=18,75; p < ,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=29,8; p < ,01$). Additionally couples with insecure

women and secure men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=9,25$; $p<,01$).

In critical marital stages results were similar to in non-critical stages. Couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic adjustment than couples with secure women and insecure men ($q=20,48$; $p<01$), couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=34,72$; $p<,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=47,73$; $p<,01$). Couples with secure women and insecure men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with insecure women and secure men ($q=17,43$; $p<,01$) and couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=31,36$; $p<,01$). Additionally couples with insecure women and secure men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with both insecure attachment style ($q=10,36$; $p<,01$).

As an addition, ANOVA was also, conducted for couples with secure and preoccupied couples to determine whether there is significant difference among the means that were showing in table 22, 2 (marital stages) X 4 (spouses' attachment styles). The results of ANOVA of secure and preoccupied attached spouses' dyadic adjustment are shown on table 23.

Table 22

Dyadic Adjustment Mean Table of Couples with Secure and Preoccupied Attachment Pairs in Critical or Non-critical Marital Stages. (The scores in parenthesis are standard scores).

Attachment style of spouses

Marital Stage	Secure woman Secure man	Secure woman Preoccupied man	Preoccupied woman Secure man	Preoccupied woman Preoccupied man	
Non-critical					
X	125,5 (0,67)	120,98 (0,41)	116,55 (0,17)	111,06 (-0,14)	113,17 (-0,02)
S	13,19	4,08	8,18	16,65	16,65
Critical					
X	126,5 (0,72)	130,46 (0,94)	102,98 (0,59)	107,40 (-0,34)	113,80 (0,01)
S	7,61	12,64	27,31	19,17	19,29
X	126,00 (0,69)	126,15 (0,70)	108,64 (-0,27)	108,91 (-0,26)	
S	10,28	10,54	21,91	19,21	

Table 23

The Results of ANOVA of Secure and Preoccupied Attached Spouses' Dyadic Adjustment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
A	0,11	1	0,11	0,123
B	10,54	3	3,51	3,95*
AB	2,44	3	0,81	0,91
Error	39,10	44	0,89	

A: Marital Stages B: Spouses' Attachment Styles *p<,05

As seen on table 23, there is significant difference among groups of preoccupied and secure attached spouses' attachment styles ($F(3-44) = 3,95; p < ,05$) on dyadic adjustment. The source of this difference was examined by Tukey – Kramer test. According to the results of Tukey – Kramer Test, in non – critical stages, couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with secure women and preoccupied men ($q = 11,3; p < ,01$); those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q = 22,38; p < ,01$); and those couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q = 39,02; p < ,01$). In same stage couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q = 10,54; p < ,01$); and those couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q = 25,44; p < ,01$). Also, couples with preoccupied women and secure

men have higher dyadic adjustment than couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=14,07$; $p<,01$).

In critical stages, couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with both secure attachment styles ($q=10,42$; $p<,01$); those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=74,27$; $p<,01$); and those couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=67,82$; $p<,01$). Couples with both secure attachment styles have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men ($q=63,56$; $p<,01$) and those couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=56,17$; $p<,01$). Couples with preoccupied women and secure men have higher dyadic adjustment than couples with both preoccupied attachment styles ($q=13,81$; $p<,01$).

Outcome Variables

Variables	Secure Husband (n=26)		Preoccupied Husband (n=33)		F	p
	X	sd	X	sd		
Husband Variables						
Consensus	52,11	6,52	49,72	7,69	1,59	0,21
Satisfaction	42,06	4,71	40,41	6,82	1,10	0,29
Aff.Expression	10,57	1,47	9,49	1,96	5,40	0,02*
Cohesion	16,73	3,63	15,96	4,87	0,44	0,51
Adjustment	121,48	12,94	115,60	17,18	2,09	0,15
Wife Variables						
Consensus	48,49	9,00	51,72	8,99	1,86	0,17
Satisfaction	39,14	7,69	38,13	5,81	0,32	0,56
Aff.Expression	9,69	2,27	9,55	1,89	0,06	0,80
Cohesion	16,07	4,84	15,57	4,85	0,15	0,69
Adjustment	113,4	20,97	114,98	17,72	0,09	0,75

*p <0,05

Two one way analysis of variance were conducted to evaluate the relationship between the husbands and their wives' dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction, affectional expression, dyadic cohesion and dyadic adjustment. Considering the limitation in sample size, only secure and preoccupied couples were included in these analysis. Hence

independent variable was attachment groups including only secures and preoccupieds, and dependent variables were husbands and wives' scores on the dimensions of the DAS scale. The results of the ANOVA as well as the means and standard deviations for the two attachment groups were represented in Table 24. Regarding to differences between secure and preoccupied husbands, only significant difference was observed on the husbands' affectional expression $F(1,57)=5,41, p < .05$. Secure husbands reported higher levels of affectional expression ($M=10,57$) than the preoccupied husbands ($M=9,49$).

Table 25

Differences Between Secure and Preoccupied Wives on Their Own and Partners'

Outcome Variables

Variables	Secure Wife (n=26)		Preoccupied Wife (n=33)		F	p
	X	sd	X	sd		
Wife Variables						
Consensus	55,14	7,19	47,24	8,31	15,42	0,000**
Satisfaction	41,13	5,44	35,63	7,65	10,01	0,002**
Aff.Expression	9,88	2,10	8,96	2,36	2,54	0,11
Cohesion	16,70	3,73	14,68	5,51	2,66	0,10
Adjustment	122,87	13,59	106,53	19,92	13,34	0,001**
Husband Variables						
Consensus	52,03	6,53	48,93	7,74	2,78	0,10
Satisfaction	42,94	5,10	38,21	7,01	8,69	0,005**
Aff.Expression	10,23	1,59	9,11	2,56	3,99	0,05*
Cohesion	16,37	4,81	15,34	4,85	0,68	0,41
Adjustment	121,58	13,17	111,60	18,88	5,47	0,02*

*p < 0,05 **p < 0,01

The results of the ANOVA as well as the means and standard deviations for the two attachment groups, were represented in Table 25. Regarding the differences between secure and preoccupied wives, significant differences were observed on the wives

consensus ($F(1,60)=15,42, p < .01$) satisfaction, ($F(1,60)=10,01, p < .01$) and adjustment ($F(1,60)=13,34, p < .01$) Secure wives reported higher levels of dyadic consensus ($M=55,14$), satisfaction ($M=41,13$) and adjustment ($M=122,87$) than preoccupied wives. Also, regarding differences between husbands' who married with a secure women and husbands married with a preoccupied women, significant differences were observed on satisfaction ($F(1,60)=8,69, p < .01$); affectional expression ($F(1,60)=3,99, p < ,5$); and dyadic adjustment ($F(1,60)=5,47, p < .05$). Those husbands who married with a secure woman reported higher levels of the dyadic satisfaction ($M=42,94$), affectional expression ($M=10,23$) and dyadic adjustment ($M=121,58$) than those husbands who married with preoccupied women.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 General Evaluation of the Results

The present study was mainly designed to examine marital adjustment and comparison of the certain partner pairing's marital adjustment in the different stages of marriage according to individuals and their spouses' attachment style. The researcher was also interested in investigating general distribution of dyadic pairings of spouses with respect to their attachment styles in population.

In the present study dispersion of four attachment style was: 37.8% of population grouped as secure, 10 % of population grouped as fearful, 48.5% grouped as preoccupied and 3.5% of the population was grouped as dismissing. This distribution is quite a bit different from previous studies. For example Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) found 47% of population as secure, 21% of population as fearful, 14% of population as preoccupied and 18% of population as dismissing. In another study secures were the most frequent group with 40 – 50 % (Sümer & Güngör, 1999). However, in the present study, the most frequent group was preoccupied with 48.5%.

This difference can be result of culture difference. However in a study by Sümer and Güngör (1999) on Turkish sample it was found similar results to Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) study. According to this study 38% of Turkish sample were secure, 7% of them were fearful, 33% of them were preoccupied and 22% of them were dismissing. Although, secure and fearful groups were found in present study similar to Sümer & Güngör's (1999) study, distribution of preoccupied and dismissing groups are still quite different. The main cause of difference of these two studies can be rooted in different sample groups. Because in Sümer and Güngör's (1999) study the sample was single students while in present study the sample was married couples. This situation may effect the results in two ways. Firstly, adolescents with limited experiences on close relationships can behave in more unconcern manner than married people and answer the questions in line with this manner. Secondly, some questions in Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR) may be interpreted different by single adolescents and by married individuals. For example the item of fear of abandonment probably have different meanings for singles and married couples. Probably married people have higher rates on this item so, similar items can raise the preoccupied rates in married population.

The present study also revealed interesting results about distribution of marital dyads. Present results showed that dual insecure couples were the most common marital

dyads while dual secure couples the least common marital dyads in this sample. In the literature most previous studies revealed that dual secure were the most common marital dyads in the sample. For example a study by Davis and Kirkpatric (1994) and Volling, Notaro, & Larsen (1998) showed that dual secure dyads were the most common and dual insecure couples were the least common dyads in the sample. This sharp difference between the previous studies and present study can cause the distribution of attachment styles. As it was mentioned above this difference due, in part to the higher proportion of insecure spouses in the sample than the previous researches. However, Brennan and Shaver (1995) conducted a study with a sample was more similar to the present study. They used biased sample that contained larger than normal proportion of insecure subjects. Although they used similar sample to the present study they found secure – insecure marital dyads as the most common pairing of the population. Cultural differences again can cause this difference. In western based cultures dual insecure couples' relationships generally shorter in length than those with at least one of the spouse has secure attachment style, but in our culture even couples have negative relationships they mostly have tendency to carry on this relationship especially if they were married. This situation can raise the proportion of dual insecure couples in present sample. As a result the first hypothesis of the present study was not supported.

No significant correlation between spouses' attachment styles. This can show the non – random pairing of the couples in the present study. Therefore second hypothesis of the study was supported. This result obtained from present result is consistent with the previous researches. One research by Collins & Read (1990) showed that anxious women were dating with more avoidant men, and anxious men were more likely to be with less secure women. Simpson (1990), also found that men who scored higher on the an anxious attachment index were involved with female dating partners who scored somewhat lower on the secure index. Men who scored higher on the avoidant index were dating women who scored somewhat higher on the anxious index; for women who scored higher on the secure index were dating men who scored lower on the avoidant index. Women who scored lower on the anxious index were dating men who scored higher on the secure index. In another study (Pietromonaco & Carnelly, 1994) subjects were asked to imagine how they would feel in a relationship with potential partners whose characteristics exemplified with one of the three attachment styles. All subjects felt better with a secure partner than insecure partner, but avoidant subjects felt more comfortable with an anxious ambivalent partner than an avoidant one. Kirkpatric & Davis (1994), found no avoidant – avoidant or anxious – anxious pairs. More over avoidants tended to paired with anxious partners and general tendency of sample was to be paired with a secure partner whatever their own attachment styles. They explained the absence of avoidant – avoidant and anxious – avoidant pairings as

that similar insecure partner violates one's expectations of how an attachment figure or romantic partner should behave. In a study by Volling, Notaro, & Larsen, (1998) with married couples found more marriages that included two secure spouses (58%) and fewer marriages that included two insecure couples (7%). And they found no couples in which both spouses were anxious/ambivalent however, only two couples both spouses were avoidant.

There were no significant difference between critical and non-critical stages of marriages on dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction and dyadic adjustment. Also it was found no significant difference among marital dyads in non-critical marital stages on affectional expression. The reason of this situation that securely attached spouses hold positive views of their partners, experience more positive and less negative affect (Fuller & Fincham, 1995). And secure people may openly and directly express negative affect, without exaggeration or minimisation (Davila, Bradbury, & Fincham, 1998). So, marital dyads which at least one of the spouses was secure would not show difference on affectional expression. Only dual insecure couples' affectional expression significantly different in critical and non-critical stages. Dual insecure couples in non-critical stages, have higher affectional expression than those dual insecure couples in critical stages. This difference can be explained in the light of literature. Adults with different attachment styles have different strategies for

regulating and expressing emotion and these strategies may be automatically evoked in stress conditions (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). In a study revealed that insecure couples reported greater control of negative emotions than did other couples (Feeney, 1995). Additionally another study showed similar results to Feeney's study. According to this study preoccupied people less likely to assert their personal needs directly for fear of provoking their partner's further disengagement (Lopez, 1995). As a result this reciprocal effort for controlling negative feelings of dual insecure couples can cause a decline in affectional expression especially in critical marital stages.

The present study showed that the affectional expression of dual secure couples were higher than marital dyads with insecure women and secure men, secure woman and insecure men and dual insecure spouses in critical marital stages. In short, it can be said that dual secure couples have higher affectional expression than pairs with at least one insecure spouse. This can be interpreted as one of the spouses' insecurity can cause decline of affectional expression in critical stages. Of course the reason of this difference among marital dyads on affectional expression during the critical marital stages was the same reason that mentioned above; in stressful situations insecure couples especially preoccupied individuals show effort, not to assert their feelings so, as a function of this characteristic of insecure people when they are in stressful situation may make them show less affectional expression than dual secure couples. Consistently, the

other finding of the present study was couples with at least one spouse was secure had higher affectional expression than dual insecure couples in critical marital stages.

On the other hand, when secure and preoccupied attached pairs compared there was found no significant differences among four marital dyads and between critical and non-critical marital stages on affectional expression. This results consistent with the comparison of secure and insecure attached marital dyads in non-critical stages, but inconsistent in critical stages. It was expected that, dual secure couples had higher affectional expression than those couples with secure women and preoccupied men, and couples with preoccupied women and secure men, and dual insecure couples in critical stages. This situation may make us to think that; the difference among secure and insecure marital dyads originated from dismissing and fearful subjects. A study by Mikulincer and Nachshon (1991) revealed that consistent findings with the current result. This study showed that secure and ambivalent people show more self-disclosure than avoidant people also, they disclosed more personal information to partner.

For dyadic consensus, it was found significant differences among some marital dyads either during the critical or non-critical marital stages. According to results, in non-critical stages dual secure couples showed higher dyadic consensus than dual insecure couples, and couples with insecure woman and secure man. In short, it can be

said that women's insecurity can lead low dyadic consensus in non- critical marital stages. On the other hand, in critical stages dual secure couples had higher dyadic consensus rates than all other marital dyads. Additionally, couples with secure woman and insecure man had higher dyadic consensus than couples with insecure woman and secure man, and dual insecure couples in critical stages. Security of women effects dyadic consensus positively in critical marital stages.

For couples with secure and preoccupied attachment styles, it was found significant difference among some marital dyads either during the critical and non-critical stages, too. In both non-critical stages and critical stages, couples with secure women and preoccupied men have the highest dyadic consensus rates, more over dual preoccupied couples have higher dyadic consensus rates than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men. Preoccupied attachment style of husbands rises the dyadic consensus of secure and preoccupied attached pairs. There is no finding that support or refuse this result in the literature. Rise of dyadic consensus by the husbands' preoccupied attachment style may be unique to Turkish culture.

For dyadic satisfaction, it was found significant differences among all marital dyads in either critical or non-critical marital stages. In non-critical and critical stages dual secure couples had the highest satisfaction rate among all other marital dyads. This

result was fitting with expectation because all of the previous finding consistent with this result. For example a study by Simpson (1990) showed that people who securely attached have tendency to be involved in relationships characterized by higher levels of satisfaction. In both stages marital dyads with secure woman and insecure man had higher dyadic satisfaction than the couples with insecure woman and secure man, and also dual insecure pairs. In short it can be said that the security of women led the higher rates of dyadic satisfaction. Both in critical and non-critical marital stages marital dyads with insecure woman and secure man had higher dyadic satisfaction than dual insecure dyads. Accordingly, existing of at least one secure spouse in dyads is effecting dyadic satisfaction positively.

For secure and preoccupied pairs, there is significant difference among marital dyads both in critical and non-critical stages. In non-critical stages dual secure pairs have highest dyadic satisfaction. Additionally, couples with secure women and preoccupied men, and couples with preoccupied women and secure men have higher dyadic satisfaction than dual preoccupied pairs. It can be said that existing of at least one secure spouse in dyads is effecting dyadic satisfaction positively in non-critical stages. In critical stages, dual secure couples have higher dyadic satisfaction than those couples with preoccupied women and secure husband; and dual preoccupied couples. Also, those couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic

satisfaction than the couples with preoccupied women and secure men, and dual preoccupied couples. This finding can be interpreted as, preoccupied attachment style of women affects the dyadic satisfaction negatively. Consistently, Collins and Read (1990) found that greater anxiety in women was related to more negative experiences and lower overall satisfaction because anxious women were less trusting and more likely to behave jealously.

For the dyadic adjustment, it was found significant differences among all marital dyads during both critical and non-critical stages. In non-critical and critical stages dual secure couples had the highest adjustment rate among all other marital dyads. Also, comparison of secure and preoccupied dyads showed similar results; dual secure couples have the highest dyadic adjustment rating. Therefore, the third hypothesis of the present study was supported.

In both stages marital dyads with secure woman and insecure man had higher dyadic adjustment than the couples with insecure woman and secure man, and also dual insecure pairs. Similarly, for dyads with secure and preoccupied attachment styles couples with secure women and preoccupied men have higher dyadic adjustment than those couples with preoccupied women and secure men, and dual preoccupied couples. So, it can be said that the security of women led the higher rates of dyadic adjustment.

This result is consistent with the previous research. Although there were very few studies in the literature, which examined relationship issues dyadic, first Simpson (1990) paid attention to within-dyad results. According to his study insecurity of females was negatively correlated with their male partner's degree of satisfaction within relationships and Collins and Read (1990) obtained similar results in a study on individual level rather than within-dyad. However, a study which, used the same marital groups by Volling, Notaro, & Larsen (1998) found contradict results to the present study. In this study no difference were found among the four attachment groups with respect to their reports of relationship adjustment.

Both in critical and non-critical marital stages marital dyads with insecure woman and secure man had higher dyadic adjustment than dual insecure dyads. Consistently, finding from secure and preoccupied couples showed that marital dyads with preoccupied women and secure men had higher dyadic adjustment than dual preoccupied couples. Accordingly, existing of at least one secure spouse in dyads is effecting dyadic adjustment positively. This finding was consistent with the study by Brennan & Shaver (1995). Results of the this study showed that person's adjustment was related mainly to the their partner's attachment security. The cause of this result of present study especially in critical stages may be due to attachment security led people to adopt a more altruistic, emphatic attitude to close relationship partners (Mikulincer,

Gillath, Halevy, Avihou, Avidan & Eshkoli, 2001). Also, attachment security led more emphatic responses toward other's plight and to inhibit the arousal of personal distress (Mikulincer, et. al., 2001).

As it was mentioned before, in the present study the couples who have a child aged zero to eighteen determined as in critical stage. In fact, in literature couples who have a child aged zero to six were considered as in critical stage (Carter & McGoldrick cited by Santrock, 1997). So, ANOVAs were replicated for couples who have zero to six aged children. According to results of ANOVA there was significant difference among groups of preoccupied and secure attached spouses' attachment styles ($F(2, 44) = 3,88; p < ,05$) on dyadic satisfaction; dual secure couples got the highest score on dyadic satisfaction. Also, there is significant difference among groups of preoccupied and secure attached spouses' attachment styles ($F(2, 44) = 3,39; p < ,05$) on dyadic consensus. It was found significant difference between the couples in critical and non-critical stages ($F(2, 44) = 4,05; p < ,05$) on dyadic consensus. However, it is difficult to discuss this result because one group contains 20 persons while the other group contains 120 persons. So, in future research it will be better to study with a bigger sample size to get more reliable results.

Lastly, One-way ANOVAs showed that women's attachment style had effect on both their own and their partners relationship evaluation. Secure wives reported significantly higher levels of dyadic consensus, satisfaction and adjustment. Difference between the secure and preoccupied women's relationship can be caused by main characteristics of secure and preoccupied attachment style. That is secure attachment was reported as linked with high levels of trust, commitment and satisfaction while preoccupied attachment style linked with low levels of trust, satisfaction and commitment by Simpson (1990). In an other study by Collins and Read (1990), it was reported that especially for women anxiety over relationships was strong correlate of relationship quality, being linked with jealousy and with low levels of communication, closeness, partner responsiveness and satisfaction. Additionally, preoccupied women's characteristics of showing heightened awareness and heightened expression of negative feelings may cause decline in preoccupied women's own relationship evaluation.

Wives' attachment style had effect on not only their own relationship evaluation but also their husbands' relationship evaluation. Husbands of secure women's reported higher levels of satisfaction, affectional expression and adjustment. than the husbands of preoccupied wives. This result was consistent with the literature. Collins and Read (1990) found partner's attachment style predict the person's own relationship evaluation. Especially women's anxiety over abandonment was related negatively to their partner's

evaluation. Also, Simpson (1990) and Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) reported similar results. Additionally, Kobak and Hazan (1991) found that husbands of secure wives listens more effectively during problem solving. So, it can be said that satisfaction, communication and adjustment predicted by the person's own and the partner's attachment style.

On the other hand, husbands' attachment style had not been effected their partner's relationship evaluation, also secure and preoccupied husbands' own relationship evaluation only differ in affectional expression. According to Collins and Read (1990) men's comfort with closeness was related to partners' relationship evaluations. However, in the present study because of the limitation of the sample size secure and preoccupieds were included. Because secure and preoccupied husbands' levels of comfort with closeness didn't show difference from each other (Collins and Read, 1990), their partners' relationship evaluation had not been affected by their partner attachment.

5.2 Implications of the Study

The results of the current study enhance our understanding of the role of attachment in marital functioning. Especially very little was known about the role of attachment in marital functioning in Turkish sample. The present research showed us

some cultural differences which were discussed in previous chapter. This new information may lead practitioners pay attention to these differences in their works. The special difficulties of marital stages and certain attachment pairings may be determined and used therapy settings of couples. Furthermore, these specific difficulties and coping ways can be used as preventive service. For example, there is no pre-marriage education service in Turkey but such a preventive service, may protect couples from emerge marital problems.

If marital adjustment is affected by partner's attachment style (Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994) and suitable partner selection (Rollins and Feldman, 1970 cited by Çelik, 1997) it is important to determine appropriate pairing according to their attachment style. Related to this idea the present study revealed some advantages and disadvantages of particular partner pairings.

The third implication of the study can be research question. Because the marital adjustment according to attachment styles in different life cycle of family is really rarely studied topic. There is only one study by Feeney (1994) was found by the researchers in the literature. Furthermore, this topic has never studied in Turkish sample. Because couples with different attachment styles most likely have different cognitive expectations about themselves and their relationships, as well as different strategies for

regulating affect and its expression, evaluating these different marital components may help practitioners in their works again. Because any effort for cognitive or emotional change in marriages needs take into consideration the cognitions and emotions specific to the attachment style of the couple.

5.1 Limitations of the Study and Future Direction

The current work was limited in some respects. The small sample size of the study was the first limitation of the study. Because of the small sample size the four attachment groups couldn't be examined separately, rather participants grouped as secure and insecure based on their attachment styles. In fact, ability to examine the attachment groups separately may yield more detailed more specific results. Future research may replicate the study with a larger sample.

The present research was also limited by its reliance on self-report measure of marriage and by its examination of marriage and attachment styles at only one point in time. Future work examining the association between attachment and marriage would benefit by using multiple time points and multiple measures, such as observations of marital interaction and physiological measures of affect regulation.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1969). Object relations: A theoretical review of the infant – mother relationship. Child Development, 40, 969 – 1025.
- Asendorpf, J. B., & Wilpers, S. (2000). Attachment security and available support: closely linked relationship qualities. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17 (1), 783 – 802.
- Baldwin, M. W., Fehr, B., Keedian, E., Seidel, M., & Thomson, M. (1993). An exploration of the relational schemata underlying attachment styles: self-report lexical decision approaches. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19 (6), 746 – 754.
- Baldwin, M. W., Keelan, J. P. R., Fehr, B., Enns, & Koh – Rangarajoo, E. (1996). Social – cognitive conceptualization of attachment working models: availability and accessibility effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71 (1), 94 – 109.
- Barnas, M. V. & Pollina, L. (1991). Life – span attachment: relations between attachment and socioemotional functioning in adult women. Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, 117 (2), 177-200.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: an attachment perspective. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 147 – 178.
- Bartholomew, K. (1997). Adult attachment process: Individual and couple perspectives. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 70, 249-263.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 226-244.

Bartholomew, K., & Thompson, J. M. (1995). The application of attachment theory to counselling psychology. Conselling Psychologist, 23 (3), 484 – 491.

Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1997). Validity scores on three attachment style scales: exploratory and confirmatory evidence. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57 (3), 477-494.

Bell, C. D., & Richard, A. J. (2000). Caregiving: the forgotten element in attachment. Psychological Inquiry, 11 (2), 69 –83.

Birnbaum, G. E., Orr, I., Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). When marriage breaks up- does attachment style contribute to coping and mental health? Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14, 643- 654.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment. New York: Basic Books.

Brennan, K. A., & Bosson, J. K. (1998). Attachment style differences in attitudes toward and reactions to feedback from romantic partners: an exploration of the

relational bases of self – esteem. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24 (7), 699 – 715.

Brennan, K. A., & Morris, K. A. (1997). Attachment styles, self – esteem, and patterns of seeking feedback from romantic partners. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23 (1), 23 – 32.

Brennan, K., A. & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21 (3), 267-284.

Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. Developmental Psychology, 28, 759 – 775.

Carver, C. S. (1997). Adult attachment and personality, converging evidence and a new measure. Personality and social Psychology Bulletin, 23 (8), 865 – 884.

Cohn, D. A., & Silver, D. H. (1992). Working models of childhood attachment and couple relationships. Journal of Family Issues, 13 (4), 432 – 450.

Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: implications for explanation, emotion and behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71 (4), 810-832

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

Cook, W. L. (2000). Understanding attachment security in family context. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 285-294.

Corcoran, K., & Malinckroolt, B. (2000). Adult attachment self – efficacy, perspective taking, and conflict resolution. Journal of Counselling and Development, 78 (4), 473 – 484.

Cozzarelli, C., Hoekstra, J. S., & Bylsma, W. (2000). General versus specific mental models of attachment : are they associated with different outcomes? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26 (5), 605-618.

Çelik, M. (1997). Marital satisfaction, parental agreement on child rearing and parental perception of child's adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkiye.

Davila, J., Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. (1998). Negative affectivity as a mediator of the association between attachment and marital satisfaction. Personal Relationships, 5, 467 – 484.

- Davila, J., Burge, D., & Hammen, C. (1997). Why does attachment style change? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *73* (4), 826 – 838.
- Davila, J., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. H. (1999). Attachment change process in the early years of marriage. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *76*, 783-802.
- Feeney, J. A. (1994). Attachment style, communication patterns, and satisfaction across the life cycle of marriage. Personal Relationships, *1*, 333 – 348.
- Feeney, J. A. (1995). Adult attachment and emotional control. Personal Relationships, *2*, 143 – 159.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *58* (2), 281-291.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1991). Attachment style and verbal description of romantic partners. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, *8*, 187 – 215.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1996). Adult attachment, Ca:Sage
- Fıfılođlu, H., & Demir, A. (2000). Applicability of the dyadic adjustment scale for measurement of marital quality with Turkish couples. European Journal of Psychological Assessment, *16*, 214-218.

Fraley, R. C., Garner, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult attachment and the defensive regulation of attention and memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *79* (5), 816 – 826.

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G. & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self – report measures of adult attachment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *78* (2), 350 – 365.

Fuller, T. L., & Fincham, F. D. (1995). Attachment style and married couples: relation to current marital functioning stability over time and method of assessment. Personal Relationships, *2*, 17 – 34.

Gaines, S. O., Work, C., Johnson, H., Youn, M. S. P., & Lai, K. (2000). Impact of attachment style and self – monitoring on individuals' responses to accommodative dilemmas across relationship types. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, *17* (6), 767-789.

Green, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2000). Attachment and exploration in adults: chronic and contextual accessibility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *26* (4), 452 – 462.

Guerrero, L. K., & Burgeon, j. K. (1996). Attachment styles and reactions to nonverbal involvement change in romantic dyads. Human Communication and Research, 22 (3), 335 – 371.

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

Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: love, satisfaction and staying together. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54 (6), 980- 988.

Hovardaoğlu, S. (1994). Statistics. Hatiboğlu: Ankara

Hughes, F. M., Tomcik, N. D., & Gordon, C. K. (2001). Adult attachment style: Implications for individual and marital functioning. Paper presented at the 34th annual AABT conference, New Orleans, LA.

Kelly, L. E., & Conley, J. J. (1987). Personality and compatibility: a prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. . Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52 (1), 27 - 40.

Kirkpattick, L. A. (1999). Individual differences in attachment and reproductive strategies: commentary on Buss & Greiling. Journal of Personality, 67 (2), 245 – 258.

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.

Kobak, R., & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: effects of security and accuracy of working models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60(6), 502-512.

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: working models, affect regulation and representations of self and others. Child Development, 59, 135-146.

Kumar, R. (1996). Research Methodology. London: Sage Publication.

La Guardia , G. L., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Within – person variation in security of attachment: self – determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfilment, and well – being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(3), 367 – 384.

Le Poire, B. A. & Haynes, J. (1997). Attachment as a function of parental and partner approach- avoidance tendencies. Human Communication and Research, 23 (3), 413 – 442.

Lopez, F. G. (1995). Attachment theory as an integrative framework for family counselling. Family Journal, 3 (1), 11 – 18.

Maysless, O. (1991). Adult attachment patterns and courtship violence. Family Relations, 40 (1), 21-29.

McCarty, G. (1999). Attachment style and adult love relationships and friendships: a study of a group women at risk of experiencing relationship difficulties. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 72, 305-321.

Meyers, S. A. (1998). Personality correlates of adult attachment style. Journal of Social Psychology, 138(3), 407 – 410.

Mikulincer, M. & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal and coping with a real life stressful situation: the contribution of attachment styles. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21 (4), 406 – 415.

Mikulincer, M. & Florian, V. (1995). Effects of adult attachment style on the perception on and search for social support. Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied, 129 (6), 665 – 677.

Mikulincer, M. & Florian, V. (1999). The association between spouses' self – reports of attachment styles and representations of family dynamics. Family Process, 31 (1), 69-83.

Mikulincer, M. & Florian, V. (2000). Exploring individual differences in reactions to mortality salience: does attachment style regulate terror management mechanisms? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79 (2), 260 – 273.

Mikulincer, M. & Florian, V., & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment styles and fear of personal death. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (2), 273 - 280.

Mikulincer, M., Gillat, O., Halevy, V., Avihou, N., Avidan, S., & Eshkoli, N. (2001). Attachment theory and reactions to others' needs evidence that activation of the sense of attachment security promotes emphatic responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81 (6), 1205 – 1224.

Mikulincer, M., & Horesh, N. (1999). Adult attachment style and the perception of others: the role of projective mechanisms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76 (6), 1022 – 1034.

Mikulincer, M. & Nachson, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61 (2), 321 – 331.

Milardo, R. M. & Duck, S. (Ed.). (2000). Families as Relationships. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Morrison, T. L. & Goodlin – Jones, B. L. (1997). Attachment and the presentation of intimate relationships in adulthood. Journal of Interdisciplinary and Applied, 131 (1), 57 –62.

O'Connor, T. G., Croft, C., & Steele, H. (2000). The contributions of behavioural genetic studies to attachment theory. Attachment & Human Development, 2 (1), 107 – 122.

Parker, R. A., Scannel, E. D. (1998). Attachment and marital adjustment. Family Matters, 51, 24 – 29.

Pistole, M. C. (1998). Caregiving ,and attachment relationships: a perspective for counsellors. Journal of Counselling and Development, 77 (4), 437 – 447.

Pistole, M. C., & Watkins, C. E. (1995). Attachment theory, counselling process and supervision. Counselling Psychologist, 23 (3), 457 – 479.

Pistole, M. C. (1996). After love: attachment styles and grief themes. Family journal, 4 (3), 199 – 208.

Reis, H. T. (2000). Caregiving, attachment, and relationships. Psychological Inquiry, 11 (2), 120 - 123.

Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J. A., Campbell, L., & Grich, J. (2001). Adult attachment and the transition to parenthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(3), 421 – 435.

Robins, R.W., Caspi, A., & Moffit, T. E. (2000). Two personalities, one relationship: both partners's personality traits shape the quality of their relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79 (2), 251 - 259.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Myake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture. American Psychologist, 55 (10), 1093 – 1104.

Santrock, W. J. (1997). Life-span development, (6. Edition), New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Scharfe, E., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. Personal Relationships, 1, 23 – 43.

Shaver, P. R., & Fraley, R. C. (2000). Attachment theory and caregiving. Psychological Inquiry, 11 (2), 109 -114.

Shaver, P. R., & Norman, A. J. (1995). Attachment theory and counselling psychology. Counselling Psychologist, 23 (3), 491 – 501.

Simpson, J. A. (1987). Dissolution of romantic relationships: factors involved in relationship stability and emotional distress. . Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53 (4), 683 -692.

Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59 (5), 971 – 980.

Simpson, J. A., Grich, J., & Ickes, W. (1999). When accuracy hurts: reactions of anxious – ambivalent dating partners to a relationship threatening situation. . Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76 (5), 754 – 769.

Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (2000). Caregiving, attachment theory, and the connection theoretical orientation. Psychological Inquiry, 11 (2), 114 - 120.

Sperling, M. B., & Berman, W. H. (Ed.). (1994). Attachment in adults, London: Guilford Press.

Sümer, N. (1996). The impact of mental models of attachment on partner and self attributions and relationship satisfaction. Unpublished Dissertation, Kansas State University

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin Bağlanma Stilleri Ölçeklerinin Türk Örneklemleri Üzerinde Psikometrik Değerlendirmesi ve Kültürlerarası Bir Karşılaştırma [Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish sample and cross – cultural comparison of them]. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14, (43), 71 – 106.

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Çocuk Yetiştirme Stillерinin Bağlanma Stilleri, Benlik Değerlendirmeleri ve Yakın İlişkiler Üzerindeki Etkisi [Effects of parenting styles on attachment styles, self – evaluation and close reallionships]. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14, (44), 35 – 58.

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (2000). The Relationship between anxiety and avoidance dimensions of adult attachment and affective aspects of the self. Presented Paper at the International Conference on Personal Relationships, Brisbane, Australia

Thelen, M. H., Wal, V. J. S., Thomas, A. M., & Harmon, R (2000). Fear of intimacy among dating couples. Behavior Modification, 24 (2), 223 – 240.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics. NY: Harper and Collins.

Tidwell, M. C. O., Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. R. (1996). Attachment, attractiveness, and social interaction: a dairy study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(4), 729 - 745.

Tucker, J. S. & Anders, S. L. (1999). Attachment style, interpersonal perception accuracy, and relationship satisfaction in dating couples. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25 (4), 403-412.

Volling, B. L., Notaro, P. C., & Larsen, J. J. (1998). Adult attachment styles: Relations with emotional well – being, marriage, and parenting. Family Relations, 47 (4), 355 – 367.

Waters, E., & Deane, K. E. (1995). Defining and assessing individual differences in attachment relationships: Q – methodology and the organisation of behaviour in infancy and early childhood. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50 (1 – 2), 41 – 65.

Waters, E., Hamilton, C. E., & Weinfield, N.S. (2000). The stability of attachment security from infancy to adolescence and early adulthood: general introduction. Child Development, 71 (3), 678- 683.

Waters, E., Kondo – Ikemura, K., Richters, J. E., & Posada, G. (1991). Learning to love. Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology, 23, 217 – 255.

Waters, E., Merrick, S., Treboux, D., Crowell, J., & Albersheim, L. (2000). Attachment security in infancy and early adulthood: a twenty – year longitudinal study. Child Development, 71 (3), 684 – 689.

White, K. M., Speisman, J. C., Jackson, D., Bartis, S., & Costos, D. (1986).
Intimacy maturity and its correlates in young married couples. Journal of Personality
and Social Psychology, 50 (1), 152 – 162.



APPENDIX A

ÇİFTLER UYUM ÖLÇEĞİ

Örnek Maddeler:

1. Ne sıklıkla boşanmayı, ayrılmayı ya da ilişkinizi bitirmeyi düşünür ya da tartışırsınız?
2. Eşinize güvenir misiniz?
3. Aşağıdaki olaylar siz ve eşiniz arasında ne sıklıkla geçer?
 1. Birlikte gülmek.....
 2. Birşeyi sakince tartışmak.....

Yazışma Adresi: Doç. Dr. Hürol Fıfılođlu, Ortadođu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji
Bölümü, Ankara

APPENDIX B

Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Anketi

Örnek Maddeler:

1. Terk edilmekten korkarım.
2. İlişkilerim konusunda oldukça kaygılıyım.
3. Birlikte olduğum kişiye hemen herşeyi anlatırım.
4. Birlikte olduğum kişilere güvenip dayanmakta rahatımdır.

Yazışma Adresi: Nebi Sümer, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü, Ankara

APPENDIX C
EŞLER BİLGİ FORMU

- 1) Cinsiyetiniz:
- 2) Yaşınız:
- 3) Evliliğinizin süresi
- 4) Bu ilk evliliğiniz mi?
- 5) Evlenmeden ne kadar süre önce tanıştınız?.....
- 6) Nasıl tanıştınız?
 - a. Görücü usulü
 - b. Değil
- 7) Çocuğunuz var mı? Evet Hayır
- 8) Varsa çocuklarınızın cinsiyet ve yaşları.....
- 9) Çocuklarınız arasında sizden ayrı yaşayanlar var mı?
 - a) Evet b) Hayır
- 10)Çocuklarınız arasında sizden ayrı yaşayanlar varsa yaşları ve ne sebeple ayrı

oldukları

.....

.....

APPENDIX D

AÇIKLAMA

Bu çalışma Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans eğitiminin bir gereği olarak yapılmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı eşlerin bağlanma stilleri ve evlilik doyumları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Çalışmada üç ayrı soru formu bulunmaktadır. Lütfen bu soru formlarını dikkatlice okuyup soruları uygun biçimde yanıtlayınız. Verdiğiniz yanıtlar çalışma için çok önemli olduğundan lütfen mümkün olduğunca gerçek yanıtlar vermeye çalışınız.

Verdiğiniz yanıtlarla ilgili kimseye bilgi verilmeyecektir, adınızı yazma zorunluluğunuz yoktur.

Katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Özenç Ertan

O.D.T.Ü. Klinik Psikoloji

Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi