

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF ATTACHMENT STYLES
AND CONFLICT BEHAVIORS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS

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

BY

SELİN PANCAROĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

NOVEMBER 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Ali Yıldırım
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.

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir (METU, EDS) _____

Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer (METU, EDS) _____

Prof. Dr. Hürol Fıfşılıođlu (METU, PSY) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Selin Pancarođlu

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF ATTACHMENT STYLES AND CONFLICT BEHAVIORS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Pancaroglu, Selin

M.S., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir

November, 2007, 58 pages

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationships of attachment styles and conflict behaviors among male and female university students.

Three hundred and twelve university students from various departments and grades of Middle East Technical University in Ankara participated in the study. Turkish version of Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R, Selçuk, Günaydın, Sümer and Uysal, 2005), and Conflict Behaviors Questionnaire (Tezer, 1986) was applied to students to collect data.

The results of cluster analysis employed on the scores of ECR-R yielded four clusters corresponding to four attachment styles (fearful, dismissing, preoccupied, and secure).

A two-way ANOVA (2 gender X 4 Attachment Style) was applied to each of the five conflict behaviors. Results yielded a significant main effect for gender in accommodating behavior and a significant main effect for attachment styles in compromising behavior. In accommodating behavior, independent samples t-test was used to find out any significant difference between males and females and the results

showed that the males were more inclined to use accommodating behavior than females. No significant difference was found in any of the other conflict behaviors as a function of attachment styles between males and females.

Key words: Attachment, attachment styles, conflict, conflict behaviors.

ÖZ

KIZ VE ERKEK ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ARASINDA BAĞLANMA TÜRLERİ VE ÇATIŞMA DAVRANIŞLARININ İLİŞKİSİ

Pancaroglu, Selin

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir

Kasım, 2007, 58 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, bağlanma türleri ve çatışma davranışlarının arasındaki ilişkiyi kız ve erkek üniversite öğrencilerinde incelemektir.

Bu çalışmaya, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversite'sinin farklı bölümlerinde ve sınıflarında okuyan 312 öğrenci katılmıştır. Bu araştırmada, öğrencilere Türkçe'ye uyarlanmış olan Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II (YİYE-II, Selçuk, Günaydın, Sümer ve Uysal, 2005), ve Çatışma Davranışları Ölçeği (ÇDÖ, Tezer, 1986) uygulanmıştır.

YİYE-II'den elde edilen puanlara uygulanan gruplama analizi sonucu, dört bağlanma türüne (güvenli, korkulu kaçınan, kayıtsız kaçınan ve saplantılı) karşılık gelen dört grup vermiştir.

Çift-yönlü varyans analizi (2 Cinsiyet X 4 Bağlanma Türü) beş çatışma davranışından her birine uygulanmıştır. Sonuçlar, 'uyma' davranışının cinsiyete göre ve 'uzlaşma' davranışının da bağlanma türlerine göre anlamlı bir etki gösterdiğini vermiştir. 'Uyma' davranışında bağımsız ölçülü t-testi sonuçları erkeklerin kızlardan daha fazla 'uyma' davranışını kullandığını göstermiştir.

Diğer çatışma davranışlarının hiçbirinde bağlanma türleri açısından kızlar ve erkekler arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bağlanma, bağlanma türleri, çatışma, çatışma davranışları

To My Family,

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would firstly like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir for his invaluable guidance, support and encouragement during the research and my graduate education.

I am also thankful to Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer and Prof. Dr. Hürol Fıfılođlu for their contributions and recommendations to the study.

All members of the Educational Sciences department helped me to improve my knowledge and skills in the area. So, I would also like to thank for their invaluable help.

Moreover, I am thankful to my friends in the department for their understanding and encouragement throughout the study.

Lastly, for my success, I would like to express my deepest thanks to my family for their unconditional love, trust, and support in all circumstances throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Purpose of the Study.....	5
1.2. Research Question	5
1.3. Definitions of the Terms	6
1.4. Limitation of the Study	7
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	7
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
2.1. Attachment Theory	9
2.1.1. Research on Attachment Styles	13
2.2. Conflict	16
2.3. Conflict Behaviors.....	18
2.3.1. Research on Conflict and Conflict Behaviors.....	20
2.4. Relationship of Attachment Styles to Conflict Behaviors.....	23
3. METHOD.....	26
3.1. Sample	26
3.2. Data Collection Instruments.....	26
3.2.1. Experiences in Close Relationships- Revised (ECR-R).....	26
3.2.2. Conflict Behaviors Questionnaire (CBQ)	28
3.3. Data Collection Procedure	28

3.4. Data Analysis Procedure..... 29

4. RESULTS 31

4.1. Attachment Styles and Accommodating Behavior 31

4.2. Attachment Styles and Compromising Behavior 33

4.3. Attachment Styles and Avoiding Behavior..... 34

4.4. Attachment Styles and Collaborating Behavior 36

4.5. Attachment Styles and Competing Behavior 37

5. DISCUSSION 39

5.1. Discussion 39

5.2. Recommendations 44

6. REFERENCES 46

7. APPENDICES 54

A. EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS-REVISED 55

B. CONFLICT BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE 58

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Accommodating Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles	31
Table 4.1.2. The Results of ANOVA Applied to Accommodating Behavior	32
Table 4.1.3. The Results of Independent Samples T-test Applied to Accommodating Behavior	33
Table 4.2.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Compromising Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles	33
Table 4.2.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Compromising Behavior	34
Table 4.3.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Avoiding Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles.....	35
Table 4.3.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Avoiding Behavior.....	35
Table 4.4.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Collaborating Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles	36
Table 4.4.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Collaborating Behavior	36
Table 4.5.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Competing Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles	37
Table 4.5.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Competing Behavior	38

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Correspondence of Adult Attachment Styles with Conflict Behavior	4
--	---

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Humans experience many types of relationships which involve family, friends, romantic partners and others like supervisors, teachers, etc. In each of these relationships, an individual's interactions based on his/her attachment orientations has its roots as an infant with a caregiver, who is the attachment figure (Bowlby, 1982).

In the formulation of the attachment theory, Bowlby (1982) asserted that individuals can have only one attachment style as a persistent-trait-like characteristic. It is generally based on one's early experiences that are derived from various interactions with his/her primary caregiver. Later, these experiences are organized by the individual into internal working models that contain beliefs about self and others.

Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Walls (1978) did the first detailed study on individual differences in attachment. As a result, three types of attachment patterns identified depending on internal working models and responsiveness of the primary caregiver. Bowlby's attachment theory and Ainsworth's assessment technique dealt primarily with the infant and caregivers relationship. According to Bowlby, two sets of stimuli trigger fear for infant: presence of clues to danger or the absence of an attachment figure.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) state that childhood attachment representations are translated into later dyadic relationships. In Hazan and Shaver's study (1987), anxious ambivalent strategy was associated with inconsistent responsiveness, and anxious/ambivalent individuals see their parents as unfair. Therefore, they develop a strategy to spend much of the time and effort to keep others close. In addition, it is marked by a chronic fear of interpersonal rejection and abandonment. People displaying an avoidant or resistant adult attachment orientation, have internalized negative expectations about their personal competence and lovability, the

availability, and responsiveness of intimate others in their social worlds, or both sets of expectations.

The type of the attachment style either secure or insecure depends on some factors that the infant seeks for such as the need for care, support, comfort and reassurance (Fraley & Davis, 1997; Hazan & Zeifman, 1999). If caregivers who are especially mothers give enough care and support for the infant, then s/he forms a secure attachment style. But, some of the mothers vary in giving care, some being avoidant or anxious and some are overprotective and produce children with insecure attachment styles.

Securely attached infants are able to explore their environments using their mothers, who are available and responsive to their children. Insecure infants do not seem to be affected by the absence of their mothers; still they show their distress by sudden anger and frustration. Moreover, mothers of insecure infants are found to be rejecting and even hostile toward the needs of their children for comfort. Anxious/ambivalent infants are ready to display high distress and are difficult to soothe. Mothers of these infants tend to give incompatible responses to their infants (Ainsworth, Blehar, Walters, & Wall, 1978).

When the infant grows and becomes an adult, the attachment system continues to function because the adult's need for care, support and comfort persists (Bowlby, 1980; 1982; 1988). However, in adulthood significant others can turn out to be attachment figures such as friends, romantic partners, etc. since they are the ones the individual seeks for proximity, protection and care. Thus, the individual's attachment style in early childhood has effects on the individual's relations throughout the life. These experiences give rise to working models of self and others (Bowlby, 1973). For instance, positive beliefs about self and positive beliefs about others form secure attachments and similarly negative beliefs about self and negative beliefs about others produce insecure attachment types. These can be categorized by four-group model of attachment such as, secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Attachment style is strengthened through repeated interactions with attachment figures and so has a good likelihood to remain unchanged throughout the individual's life, unless confronted by a new interpersonal

environment (Bowlby, 1980). There is a strong argument that attachment styles are most likely to be activated in stressful situations like conflict conditions (Kobak & Duemmler, 1994).

Conflict is one aspect of communication which can be both constructive and destructive for the individual and for the relationship (Coser, 1967; Deutsch, 1969; Simmel, 1955). An individual can either collaborate with the other part as well try out some solutions in order to satisfy both parties or can escape from giving effort by avoiding the conflict or by forcing the other party to satisfy only her/his concern (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000).

There is some patterned response to a conflict which involves repeated use of behaviors in order to resolve disagreements (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991). This patterned response makes up conflict styles on which some theorists worked. One of them is Thomas's (1976) work on conflict styles which are categorized as competing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising and collaborating. Competing is dominating over the conflict issue by being assertive but uncooperative. On the other hand, collaborating is a win-win way of integration for the resolution of the conflict by being both assertive and cooperative. Compromising is sharing of decisions in the middle of concern for self and concern for others. Further, avoiding is neglecting one's and other's concerns and needs by being unassertive and uncooperative for the resolution of the conflict; it is a way of escaping from the conflict situation. Lastly, accommodating is obliging to meet other's needs and concern by sacrificing one's own concern and needs by being cooperative but unassertive (Thomas, 1976).

The relation between attachment styles and conflict behavior was investigated by Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000). In the study, conflict behaviors developed by Rahim (1983) were used. These are namely, dominating, avoiding, obliging, integrating and compromising. These five behaviors were mapped on two dimensions of concern for self and concern for other. In the study, it was proposed that conflict behavior might be related to an underlying general orientation to close relationships. Because the two dimensions of concern for self and concern for others in Rahim's (1983) model are similar to the constructs of working models of self and others proposed in attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973). Thus, it was asserted that

attachment styles might influence conflict behaviors. This correspondence between attachment styles and conflict behaviors was given by the Figure 1.

Concern for Self (Working Model of Self)	Concern for Others (Working Model of Others)	
	High (Positive)	Low (Negative)
High (Positive)	Integrating (Secure)	Dominating (Dismissing)
Low (Negative)	Obliging (Preoccupied)	Avoiding (Fearful)

Figure 1. Correspondence of Adult Attachment Types with Conflict Styles (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000)

Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000) explained the correspondence between attachment styles and conflict behaviors by social competencies. They suggested that childhood experiences with caregivers and early peer friendships influence adult relationships through the development of social competencies which include personal dispositions shaped by working models of self and others that form the basis of adult attachment styles, and the skills needed to gain and maintain close relationships. As an example, individuals with dismissing attachment style may have difficulty in trusting others because their working models lead them to expect negative outcomes from close relationships and also they lack social competencies for building a trusting relationship. In the study, one of the important social competencies was pointed out as the ability to understand the perspective of others. In conflict resolution, understanding the perspective of the other party is essential in order to develop solutions to meet the needs of both parties. In this respect, it was hypothesized that low concern for self and others (obliging, avoiding, dominating) in conflict behaviors would be positively associated with negative working models of self and others (preoccupied, dismissing, fearful) in attachment styles. As a result, the hypothesis was approved. It was found out that integrating and compromising behaviors were positively associated with secure attachment style.

By the light of these findings, it can be hypothesized that avoidance and anxiety in attachment styles would be positively related to avoidance and anxiety in conflict

behaviors. Moreover, two mutually focused conflict behaviors, namely collaborating and compromising which require concern for self and others would be negatively related with attachment anxiety and avoidance. Therefore, it is expected to find an association between secure attachment style and collaborating behavior which have high concern for self and others. Similarly, same kind of association is expected between dismissing attachment style and dominating behavior, preoccupied attachment style and accommodating behavior and lastly, fearful attachment style and avoiding behavior. At that point it can be proposed that the individual's attachment style and the way s/he handles the conflict situation play an important role. If the individual has secure attachment style and handles the conflict in a collaborative way, in other words, if s/he has positive concern for both self and others in attachment style and conflict behavior, then the problem can be solved by making the both parties satisfied with the outcome. It can be predicted that if the individual has insecure attachment style and destructive way of handling the conflict situation by having negative concern for both self and others, then the outcome grows out to be a problem which makes the relation and the communication unhealthy as well neither party has enough satisfaction from that relationship.

In this study, it was examined the relationships of each of the five conflict behaviors (Competing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, collaborating) with four attachment styles (Fearful, dismissing, preoccupied, secure) among male and female university students.

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the differences in each of the five conflict behaviors (Competing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, collaborating) of male and female university students as a function of four attachment styles (Fearful, dismissing, preoccupied, secure).

1.2. Research Question

The research question of the study is formulated as:

1. What is the effect of the attachment styles on each of the five conflict behaviors among male and female university students?

1.3. Definitions of the Terms

Attachment: It is an affectional bond that is formed with another individual, who is perceived as an attachment figure as a need for maintaining proximity, security and comfort (Bowlby, 1988).

Attachment styles: Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) identified the four-group model of attachment styles:

Secure attachment style: It refers to positive beliefs about self and positive beliefs about others.

Preoccupied attachment style: consists of negative beliefs about self and positive beliefs about the others and refers to a sense of unworthiness to receive love.

Dismissing attachment style: It involves positive beliefs about self and negative beliefs about the others; these individuals feel that they are worthy of love but believe that others will reject them.

Fearful attachment style: It refers to negative beliefs about self and negative beliefs about the others. This style of attachment was marked by avoidance of social settings because of the anxiety associated with connecting to others.

Conflict: Interpersonal process that occurs whenever the actions of one individual interfere with the actions of another (Peterson, 1983).

Conflict behaviors: Thomas (1976) identified following five conflict behaviors:

Competing: It refers to high concern for self and low concern for others. It is meeting one's needs above another's.

Accommodating: It involves high concern for others and low concern for self as well having a tendency to be ready to accept the demands of other party.

Avoiding: It refers to low concern for meeting the needs of both self and others. So, there is avoidance of engaging in discussions about the conflict.

Collaborating: It involves high concern for both self and others. So, there is a search for a resolution that maximally meets the needs of both parties

Compromising: Individuals offer solutions at a midpoint between their positions without seeking a solution that maximally meets their gains.

1.4. Limitations of the Study

The present study has some limitations. First, the sample included only some of the students in the campus of METU. Therefore, the results of the study should be treated carefully while making generalizations. Second, self-report type of data seemed less powerful than interview method in understanding the students' actual conflict behaviors and attachment styles. Thirdly, in the directives of ECR-R, it was mentioned whether the participant has a romantic relationship or not at the moment. However, in the results part, the participants are not differentiated in terms of the presence of their relationships. Instead, the results are interpreted in the light of close relationships and this can be a limitation to the study.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Although there are many studies carried out separately on attachment styles and conflict behaviors, there are not various research for the relationship between these concepts among male and female university students in Turkish literature. For this reason, investigating this relationship may make some contributions to our understanding of conflict behaviors of male and female university students in Turkey in relation to their attachment styles.

Bowlby (1969) posited that humans have an innate attachment that keeps caregivers/parents in close proximity to their infants. He believed that infants have certain behavioral and emotional reactions associated with separation (e.g. crying, protest, etc.) that are integral parts of the system. Although the system is proposed to be innate, it is also sensitive to certain environmental circumstances such as the type of care provided by the caregivers. Depending on the availability and responsiveness of the caregiver, the early attachment experience of the infant has effect on his/her relationships throughout the life. Although Bowlby (1988) acknowledged that attachment styles are difficult to change in adulthood, he also believed that the experience of appropriate counseling could be sufficient for such changes. Thus, the present study may be helpful in recognizing the attachment styles of university students and may help university counselors to gain further insight in making plans for university students to change their attachment styles.

The present study may also provide significant signs for understanding the role of attachment styles in conflict behaviors and may help counseling staff to make appropriate programs for students to manage conflict effectively.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter includes the attachment theory, conflict and conflict behaviors and research made about attachment styles and conflict behaviors. Then the relationship of four attachment styles to five conflict behaviors is described.

2.1. Attachment Theory

Relationships vary in terms of the degree of attachment or intimacy between partners. This attachment is largely due to the investments and rewards accumulated over time (Aune & Comstock, 1997). Besides, individuals form expectations and enter interactions that are appropriate for that relationship. In brief, they behave in accordance with what they expect from one another (Shulman et al., 2000).

Studies made by Stroufe and Fleeson (1986) showed that individual's orientation towards others, his or her availability and likely responses, increases the likelihood of responses that are strongly shaped by early experiences. With this perspective, they suggested that individual projects his or her representation of relationships onto future social contacts. Bowen (1986) formulated that the emotional atmosphere, interpersonal relationship patterns, role-related behaviors and expectations, and rules that characterize relationships with family of origin serve as models for future family relationships.

An individual, from infancy to an old age has close relationships with significant others, including not only family members, but also other persons with whom they share emotions and experiences. In this respect, attachment theory is characterized in the focus of close relationships such as the relationships providing humans with their caregiver's protection, for comfort and security as stated by Ainsworth (1989) and Main (1999).

When historical background of attachment theory is considered, it is seen that it has origins during World War II (Erber & Erber, 2001). As a result of massive destruction and loss of life, many social service agencies began to wonder about effects of motherly care. In 1950, World Health Organization asked Bowlby to undertake a study of mental health problems of children who had been separated from their families and were cared for in hospitals. These observations resulted in the theory of attachment (Bowlby, 1969; 1973; 1980).

According to Bowlby (1969), the accessibility of parental figures is uniquely capable of sustaining children's feelings of security and so, he used the term 'attachment' in order to refer to the relational bond. For Bowlby (1982), the presumed biological function of the attachment system is to protect a person (especially during infancy and early childhood) from danger by assuring that s/he sustains closeness to caring and supportive others who are called attachment figures in the theory. In his view, the need to seek out and maintain closeness to attachment figures grew in relation to the prolonged helplessness and complete dependence of human infants, who are unable to protect themselves from dangers.

Bowlby (1988) asserted a theory that has three attachment components as secure, anxious/resistant, and anxious/avoidant. Secure attachment was defined as confidence about the parent's availability and responsiveness in frightening situations. Anxious/resistant was explained as feeling uncertainty about the parent's availability, responsiveness and helpfulness in times of need. Finally, anxious/avoidant was described as having no confidence about the availability of the parent when needed.

In order to test Bowlby's theory (1969; 1973; 1980), Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth, Bell & Stayton, 1971; Ainsworth et al., 1978) devised 'Strange Situation' experiment that allows for the observation of children's behavior in response to being separated from their mothers. The experiment contains mother and her 12- to 18-month old child arrived at laboratory which was set as a playroom and they were greeted by a stranger who then leaves in order to let mother and child to spend a period of time together, during which the child played with toys. Then without warning, the mother leaves the room, the stranger enters and after a short

period mother returns. Since children below age 18 months show distress when mother is absent, the researchers are able to observe the child's behavior. According to the experiment, Bowlby's theory about attachment is confirmed.

Besides Bowlby's theory (1988) about infant attachment, Ainsworth (1991) had foundations that infants have three types of orientations towards attachment. Mothers who provide infants with consistent care and emotional support tend to have children with *secure* attachment style. These children have high levels of exploratory behavior and use their mothers as a secure base to regulate distress and anxiety. On the other hand, mothers who vary in their care, sometimes being overprotective and sometimes being inattentive tend to have children with an *anxious/ambivalent* style. These children tend to be less exploratory and make inconsistent and conflicted attempts to secure support from caregivers. Finally, mothers who are not responsive to an infant's needs produce children with an *avoidant* attachment style. These children typically do not seek support from their caregivers and indeed actively avoid their mothers when distressed. These early parental care experiences give rise to internal working models of the self and others, which form a basis for generating expectations about relationships and provide a context for interpreting what happens in those relationships (Bowlby, 1973). It is essential to note that attachment behavior continues to function with new figures chosen for proximity in life (Bowlby, 1969) such as siblings (Buist, Dekovic, Meeus, & Aken, 2002), peers and romantic partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In late adolescence, patterns of interaction with the caregiver from early experiences become generalized interaction styles that are derived from the individual's internal working models (Bowlby, 1973).

Hence, these early working models of attachment formed in the specific relationships with parental caregivers have a profound effect on people's relationships throughout their lives. However, external stressors such as unemployment, prolonged illness or conflict with the family (Lyons-Ruth et al, 1991; Main & Weston, 1981) can turn secure attachment into anxious one. Beyond these factors, attachment patterns are generally stable and appear to be present through adulthood (Bowlby, 1982).

Apart from three types of attachment styles, four-group model of attachment style was presented by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). This model is based on

Bowlby's (1973) argument that attachment patterns reflect working models of self and the attachment figure. According to Bartholomew (1990), models of self can be categorized as either positive (the self is seen as worthy of love and attention) or negative (the self is seen unworthy). Similarly, attachment figure can be either positive (the other is seen as caring and available) or negative (the other is seen as distant, rejecting and uncaring).

Thus, positive beliefs about self and positive beliefs about others was labeled as 'secure' attachment, and the description of it was consistent the definition described in the three-category model. 'Preoccupied' consisted of negative beliefs about self and positive beliefs about the other. Preoccupied individuals were described as having a sense of unworthiness to receive love, and a belief that others are so good that they will not love them. Positive beliefs about self and negative beliefs about the other represent the 'dismissing' style of attachment; these individuals feel that they are worthy of love but believe that others will reject them. Negative beliefs about self and negative beliefs about the other were labeled 'fearful' attachment. This style of attachment was believed to have similar characteristics to the avoidant attachment style described by the three-category model—that is, their behavior is marked by avoidance of social settings because of the anxiety associated with connecting to others (Hollist & Miller, 2005).

In adulthood, the partner in close relation becomes the attachment figure, completing a period of transition. According to Hazan and Shaver (1994), attachment is transferred to adults as they provide the emotional support and security that the individual needs and other functions that were once fulfilled by the early caregivers. The transition of attachment to parents to attachment to peers takes place gradually. First of all, individuals seek proximity with their peers who become safe place. Then, individuals seek support from their peers and finally, by receiving comfort and response for their distress, peers become a secure base for individuals.

Furthermore, Bowlby (1969; 1973) links working models of attachment and communication when he suggests that the internal models of self and caregiver are formed as a result of the actual communication patterns between the individual and attachment figure. Bretherton (1988) also argues that a secure relationship between

an infant and his/her attachment figure is related to each partner's ability to engage in emotionally open, fluent and coherent communication. This effect both applies to the communication within the attachment relationship and to the individual's communication about the relationship. So, children whose mothers are insensitive to their signals continually receive messages about the inadequacy of their communication.

2.1.1 Research on Attachment Styles

Many studies were conducted about attachment theory and the relationship between attachment styles and other concepts such as mother-child interaction (Escher-Graeb & Grossmann, 1983), adult attachment style (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), stability (Waters et al., 2000) and quality in close relationship (Monteoliva & Garcia-Martinez, 2005).

A study (Escher-Graeb & Grossmann, 1983) is made to analyze mother-child interaction. Sensitivity of mothers of secure infants was shown in two ways. First, these mothers were less likely to ignore signals from their infants; second, they were more likely to watch their children quietly when their children were playing happily and did not need help, but in times of need, they joined immediately to their children. On the other hand, avoidant mothers withdrew the signals of their children. Bretherton (1988) summarizes the findings about parent-child communication and states that secure children and parents are able to communicate about attachment issues easily and coherently and they also accept each other's imperfections. Avoidant children and their parents defend against closeness by restricting the flow of ideas about the attachment relationship; they seem distant and nonempathic in their one-to-one interactions. Moreover, ambivalent-anxious children tend to show ambivalent feelings toward their parents during reunion. They also show preoccupation with attachment issues in adulthood, especially when there is conflict.

Waters et al. (2000) performed a research in order to find out the extent of stability and change in attachment patterns from infancy to early adulthood. Sixty-five infants were seen in Ainsworth Strange Situation in 12-months of age and fifty of these

participants were contacted again twenty years later. As predicted by attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982), negative life events defined as loss of a parent, parental divorce, life-threatening illness of parent or child, parental psychiatric disorder and physical or sexual abuse by a family member were important factors in change. According to the results, the infants whose mothers reported negative life events changed attachment styles from infancy to adulthood. The results support Bowlby's (1982) theory that individual differences in attachment security can be stable across time. These studies (Escher-Graeb & Grossmann, 1983; Waters et al., 2000) pointed out that attachment styles continue to function from infancy to adulthood by focusing on the negative outcomes of having insecure attachment and positive aspects of establishing secure attachment with significant others. Especially, attachment styles have effect on communication and conflict as an aspect of communication.

As mentioned before, in adulthood, the partner in close relation becomes the attachment figure, completing a period of transition. So, attachment styles between infant and mother should be evident in the sense that adults can be attached to significant others through their lives in secure, anxious or avoidant way. In a study of Hazan and Shaver (1987) over one thousand two hundred adults, the questionnaire asked the feelings of participants about relationships. Individuals, who responded that it was easy to get close to others, were more comfortable depending on them and classified as securely attached. Those, who were reluctant to get close and worried about the other's love, were classified as anxiously attached. Finally, those, that were uncomfortable in being close and felt that they had problems in trusting their partner, were classified as avoidantly attached.

Related with Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) four-category model of attachment theory, Monteoliva and Garcia-Martinez (2005) made a research to find out whether there was a relationship between attachment style and the quality in close relationships. The participants with a secure attachment style reported that they were more satisfied with their relationship and had the highest degree of stability and intimacy. The fearful and dismissing group showed the lowest levels of satisfaction of the four attachment styles. The secure and preoccupied groups showed longer lasting relationships than did both fearful and dismissing group. The secure group reported the lowest probability of breakup. The fearful and dismissing groups

reported a higher likelihood that their relationship would break up in the following six months than did the other two groups. In turn, the preoccupied group reported a lower probability of breakup than did the fearful and dismissing groups. For secure individuals, the self-perceived probability of their relationship ending in marriage was significantly greater than those of the other groups. Of the four groups, the secure and preoccupied ones showed the most positive attitudes toward telling their partner about their intimate aspects and toward expressing their feelings. According to the results, they found out that attachment style and communication methods were central aspects of the relationship of a couple that jointly contributed to its satisfaction and stability.

There are various studies made in Turkey about attachment styles and its relation with some settings like peer, family and romantic relationships and schools (Amado, 2005; Çelik, 2004; İmamoğlu & İmamoğlu, 2006; Karakurt, 2001). Karakurt (2001) performed a study to observe the effect of attachment styles on jealousy in romantic relationships. The results showed that attachment styles had impact on behavioral jealousy. It was found out that fearful individuals had high level of behavioral jealousy and preoccupied individuals had high level of negative affect and the feeling of inadequacy. On the other hand, secure individuals had more tendencies to maintain the relationship and showed less negative emotions related with jealousy on the contrary of dismissing individuals.

Additionally, Çelik (2004) carried out a study in order to investigate the effect of an attachment-oriented-psychoeducational-group-training on the university students with preoccupied/insecure attachment style. Results showed that students with low self-esteem were found to be high in fearful and preoccupied attachment styles, while students with high self-esteem were high in secure attachment style. In the second phase of the study, control and experimental groups were formed and the experimental group received training. Results indicated that experimental group significantly increased the scores of secure attachment style after taking training.

Amado (2005) also contributed a study in order to examine the effect of family functioning, attachment styles in romantic relationship and city of origin on the emotional well-being of university students. According to the results, participants

with fearful attachment style tended to have more depressive symptoms and hopelessness when compared to those with preoccupied and secure attachment styles. So, the findings support that perception of others seems to be critical in the development of the symptoms of depression and hopelessness.

Furthermore, İmamoğlu and İmamoğlu (2006) made a study about attachment orientations in specific contexts of relationships including family, peers and romantic partners. It was hypothesized that participants would report different attachment orientations in response to their family, peer and romantic relationships. Also, the individual who tended to be high on a particular attachment orientation would more likely to display that orientation across different contexts than ones who tended to be low. One hundred ten undergraduate students participated in the study. The results showed that participants felt more secure in family and peer relationships than in romantic relationships. They felt more fearful and preoccupied in romantic and peer relationships than in family relationships, dismissing tendencies were low. Family relationships tended to be more secure context; whereas romantic relationship is the least secure one.

When the results of these studies above is taken into consideration, it is seen that individuals with insecure attachment styles (dismissing, fearful, preoccupied) are associated with negative outcomes like high level of behavioral jealousy, negative affect, feeling of inadequacy (Karakurt, 2001), low self-esteem (Çelik, 2004), and depressive symptoms and hopelessness (Amado, 2005). On the other hand, individuals with secure attachment styles are found to pursue positive outcomes.

2.2. Conflict

One of the earliest approaches viewed conflict as negative events; they were regarded as destructive (Coser, 1956). So, conflict was seen as a sign of problems or weaknesses in a relationship. Therefore, people tried to avoid or resolve conflict at all costs. However, more recently, positive features of conflict is emphasized, that is, conflict as the creative impetus underlying social change (Gottman, 1993). According to this view, conflict can be either destructive or constructive (Coser,

1967; Deutsch, 1969; Simmel, 1955). In this respect, constructive conflict is described as the force for change and growth in a relationship. It is through conflict and conflict resolution that individuals achieve dyadic unity. On the other hand, destructive conflict leads to the termination of relationships. It is painful, harmful and damaging to its participants. So, it can be characterized by harmful communication. Honest, open communication will lead to highest degree of relationship satisfaction. Therefore, conflict consists not only of the negative but also positive and beneficial outcomes as well (Erber & Erber, 2001).

Some researchers believe that conflict is neither positive nor negative but is an inevitable result of natural process of change and growth (Crum, 1987). Effective conflict resolution occurs when each party collaborates in creating solutions that meet the needs of both parties. So, the key point in conflict resolution is a willingness to engage in mutual collaboration (Crum, 1987; Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1991). Rahim (1985) defines conflict as the perceived and/or actual incompatibility of needs, interests, and/or goals between two independent parties over task-related and/or affective issues. Boardman and Horowitz (1994) define conflict as an incompatibility of behaviors, cognition (including goals), and/or affect among individuals or groups that may or may not lead to an aggressive expression of this social incompatibility. In this definition behavior, cognition, and affect are incorporated specifically because all these factors are important in conflict.

According to Thomas, (1976) conflict begins on a perceptual basis and can be viewed as a process that begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern of his. The word concern includes such as needs desires, values, formal objectives, etc. Conflict includes emotions, behaviors, and outcome. In other words conflict model developed by Thomas (1976) attempts to understand conflict phenomena by studying internal dynamics of conflict episodes. This model is concerned with identifying events within each episode. These events are frustration, conceptualization, behavior, interaction, and outcome.

Accordingly, conflict starts with one party's experiencing frustration. If the frustration is dealt with consciously, then the party conceptualizes the situation that s/he defines the conflict as an issue. Based on his/her definition, the party engages in

behavior across the other party to cope with the situation. Then, the other party makes a reaction to this behavior, creating a connection between behavior and conceptualization of the party. When the interaction between the parties stops, some kind of an outcome has emerged. This outcome might be agreement, disagreement, unresolved etc. The outcome has consequences for both parties. In the case of neglect, compromise, accommodation, and domination by one party, some kinds of frustration remain in one or both parties. Thus, this frustration will provoke another conflict in the future (Thomas, 1976).

2.3. Conflict Behaviors

Conflict style refers to the patterned response to a conflict which involves repeated use of behaviors in order to resolve disagreements (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991). Many theorists identified conflict behaviors. One of them is Follett (1940) who described three main behaviors of dealing with conflict: domination, compromise, and integration; and two secondary ways: avoidance and suppression. She defined conflict as *difference* and suggested that rather than fearing from or avoiding conflict, it should be put to work for the benefit of those involved.

Blake and Mouton (1964) utilized the modes for handling interpersonal conflicts into five types: forcing, withdrawing, smoothing, compromising and confrontation. Later, Weider-Hatfield and Hatfield (1996) called forcing as dominating, withdrawing as avoiding, smoothing as accommodating, compromising as sharing, and confrontation as collaborating, problem solving, and integrating. Blake and Mouton (1964) classified the five modes of handling conflict along two dimensions related to the attitudes of the manager: concern for production and concern for people.

Thomas (1976) reinterpreted Blake and Mouton's (1964) approach to conflict management and classified the modes of handling conflicts into five types by utilizing two intensions of an individual, cooperativeness and assertiveness. He redefined conflict behaviors as competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding and accommodating.

Rahim (1983) used a conceptualization similar to that of Blake and Mouton (1964) and Thomas (1976). He differentiated the behaviors of handling interpersonal conflict along with two basic dimensions: concern for self and concern for others. A combination of the two dimensions resulted in five specific behaviors of handling conflict: Dominating, avoiding, obliging, compromising, and integrating.

The dimensions of cooperativeness and assertiveness named by Thomas (1976) and the dimensions of concern for self and concern for others (Rahim, 1983) resulted as two dimensional model. In this model, the first dimension is referred to as the assertiveness dimension or concern for self and is described as the individual's concern for their own needs. The concern for self is the extent to which an individual attempts to satisfy his or her own needs or goals in the conflict. The second dimension, known as the cooperative dimension or concern for other, is described as the individual's concern for seeing that the other party remains pleased with the conflict. The concern for others is the extent to which an individual wants to satisfy the goals of the others in the conflict.

The cooperative and assertive dimensions intersect and describe five specific types of handling conflict. Competing behavior is meeting one's needs above another's. An individual who has competing behavior is very assertive and interested only in getting his/her way and is not particularly interested in cooperating with other people. They have high concern for self and low concern for others. Individuals with accommodating behavior have high concern for others and low concern for self. These people tend to be ready to accept the demands of other party. In avoiding behavior, people have low concern for meeting the needs of both self and others. So, they avoid engaging in discussions about the conflict. On the other hand, people with collaborating behavior search for a resolution that maximally meets the needs of both parties. They have high concern for self and others. Further, in compromising behavior, people offer solutions at a midpoint between their positions without seeking a solution that maximally meets their gains. Thus, in collaborating and compromising behaviors, there is a mutual focus on concern for self and concern for others. The difference is that in collaborating behavior, there is a continuous search for a win-win solution that maximizes the benefits of both parties. However, in compromising behavior, people are eager to end the conflict as soon as a minimally

satisfactory solution is found for the benefits of both parties although more mutually beneficial solution can be reached with further attempt.

In sum, all theorists accepted five conflict behaviors but they were named differently (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983; Thomas, 1976).

2.3.1. Research on Conflict and Conflict Behaviors

Studies were performed about the conflict behaviors in different settings like business organizations, schools, marriages in order to understand the conflict behaviors of managers, teachers, students, and peers (Haar & Krahe, 1999; Laursen, Hartup, & Koplak, 1996; Laursen & Collins, 1994; Rahim, 1983)

Rahim's (1983) studies investigated the relationship between conflict behaviors of managers' and college students'. Findings showed no difference between two groups regarding to their first two preferences. Integrating and obliging were found out to be the first two preferred strategies by two groups.

Studies (Haar & Krahe, 1999; Laursen and Collins, 1994; Laursen, Hartup, & Koplak, 1996) which explored the preferences of adolescent's conflict behavior with parents, siblings, and peers, concluded that variation in adolescents conflict behavior were rooted in relationship differences. Laursen's (1993) results yielded high levels of accommodating and avoiding behaviors and low levels of compromising behavior in parent-adolescent relationships, whereas considerable level of compromising behavior and little level of avoiding behavior with close friends. Laursen, Hartup, and Koplak (1996) found that adolescents and young adults reported more compromising behavior with friends and less competing behavior within peer relationships than with family members.

There are also studies made in Turkey about conflict behaviors (Eğeci, 2005; Öner, 2001; Özen, 2006; Öztürk, 2006; Tezer, 1996; Tezer, 1999; Tezer, 2001; Tezer & Demir, 2001). Tezer (1996) performed a study to examine the difference in conflict-handling behaviors toward spouses and supervisors. Seventy-one married individuals

participated. It was observed that women behaved more competitively toward their husbands than husbands did toward their wives, whereas there was no difference in women's conflict behaviors toward their supervisors. On the other hand, men behaved more competitively toward their supervisors but more collaboratively toward their spouses. So, women seem to be less collaborative and compromising and more engaged in conflict in their marriages than men. On the contrary, men preferred to compromise and collaborate with their wives and they relied more on peace-making behavior. Based on the findings, it can be proposed that men are more work-oriented whereas women are more relationship-oriented by taking their conflict behaviors as a basis.

Related with conflict style, Tezer (1999) conducted another study to observe the extent of using conflict behaviors in the preference of becoming friends. Two hundred sixty-seven university students evaluated their conflict behaviors both in accomplishing their goals and becoming friends. The results showed that individuals who showed compromising behavior were more successful in accomplishing goals and establishing relationships. Further, students found out compromising and collaborating behaviors as more goal-oriented when compared with avoiding behavior. Also, they mostly preferred compromising behavior in preference of friendship. So, people who performed compromising behavior are more attractive.

Another study was done by Tezer (2001) in order to find out the relation of conflict behavior to popularity. One hundred twenty-seven college students participated in the study. Different conflict behaviors were investigated related with popularity and unpopularity. Results showed that the students employed more avoiding and compromising behaviors and perceived more forcing behavior in others. Also, unpopular group displayed more compromising behavior than the popular group. It is clear that college students engage in more avoiding behavior and less compromising behavior in conflict situations which is also compatible with previous findings (Peterson & Peterson, 1990, cited in Tezer, 2001).

Furthermore, Tezer and Demir (2001) constructed a study to observe the differences in conflict behaviors toward same-sex and opposite-sex among female and male late adolescents. Five hundred one undergraduate university students participated in the

research. According to the results, males were found to display more competing behavior toward same-sex peers than in opposite-sex peers whereas they showed more avoiding behavior toward opposite-sex peers than same-sex peers. It was also found out that males were more engaged in accommodating behavior than females. So, results supported the view that there are differences in conflict behaviors for males and females in displaying toward same-sex and opposite-sex. These findings point out the fact that, compromising and collaborating types of conflict behavior are related with positive outcomes or goals than avoiding or competing types.

Additionally, Öztürk (2006) made a study to examine the relationship of learned resourcefulness and conflict behaviors of university students. Results indicated that there are significant differences between high and low learned resourcefulness groups in collaborating behavior which means high resourceful group reported higher usage of collaborating behavior in conflict situations. Also, students in high resourcefulness group tended to use compromising behavior more than those in low resourcefulness group in conflict situations.

Eğeci (2005) performed a study to investigate the relationship among conflict distress, conflict attributions, perceived conflict behaviors and relationship satisfaction. Results revealed that higher levels of conflict distress and perceived difference in conflict behaviors predict lower levels of satisfaction. Also, conflict distress was found to be the only variable in predicting women's relationship satisfaction whereas for men similarity on perceived conflict behaviors and blaming self predicted relationship satisfaction.

Özen (2006) performed a study to find out the relation between marital adjustment, value similarity of spouses and conflict resolution styles of spouses. The results revealed that although value similarities as a whole were significant in predicting marital adjustment of wives, the unique contribution of each value type was not significant and value similarities of spouses did not have significant effect on husbands' marital adjustment. Moreover, conflict behaviors of spouses were found to be significant in predicting marital adjustment.

In these studies, conflict behaviors were investigated in different settings like university, marriage and business organizations. In each of these settings, individuals interact with each other and try out some solutions for managing conflict. Each individual uses one of the five behaviors (avoiding, competing, accommodating, compromising, collaborating) that Thomas (1976) has developed for resolving the conflict. Generally, results of the studies yielded that performing compromising or collaborating behaviors is more desirable in forming relationships than performing competing or avoiding behaviors.

2.4. Relationship of Attachment Styles to Conflict Behaviors

Attachment style is especially activated in stressful situations such as conflict interaction in family, peer or romantic relationships which emphasize the importance of sustaining a mutual unity and the need for psychological support from each party (Kobak & Duemmler, 1994). The relation between attachment styles and conflict behaviors is that two dimensions of concern for self and concern for others in Thomas' model (1976) is similar to constructs of working models of self and others in the attachment theory. For instance, attachment style has positive working models of self and others. Similarly, collaborating behavior has high concern for self and others. Therefore, an individual with secure attachment style can engage in collaborating behavior while managing conflict.

In previous research, it was found out that individuals with secure attachment styles employ high level of verbal engagement (Collins & Read, 1990), self-disclosure (Pistole, 1993) mutual discussion and understanding (Feeney, Noller, & Callan, 1994) and they are more likely to use integrating and compromising behaviors (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000).

Shi (2003) found out that secure individuals were more likely to be active problem solvers, integrative and compromising, and insecure individuals were likely to engage opposite behaviors. So, those who held positive perceptions about self and others were more likely to adopt conflict resolution behaviors which satisfy the concerns of both parties.

Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000) performed another study to observe the relation between adult attachment style and conflict style. It was hypothesized that avoidance or anxiety in attachment styles would be positively associative with avoidance and anxiety in conflict behaviors (dominating, obliging or avoiding). Also, two mutually focused conflict behaviors that require concern for both self and others (integrating and compromising) would be negatively associated with attachment anxiety and avoidance. Surveys were completed by parents in order to assess their children's attachment styles, conflict behaviors, social self-efficacy and perspective taking. As a result, hypotheses were supported. Mutually focused conflict behaviors require individuals to have positive working models of self and others in attachment styles.

To support the association between conflict styles and attachment styles, another study was developed by Creasey and Ladd (2004). The purpose of the study was to find out the relation between negative mood regulation expectancies, attachment styles, and conflict behaviors in a sample of college students involved in a romantic relationship. Negative mood regulation was described as the ability of adolescents to regulate emotions during a conflict encounters (Creasey et al., 1999). It was predicted that attachment styles would moderate between the negative mood regulation expectancies and conflict behaviors. The results confirmed the hypotheses. For instance, secure adolescents with high negative mood regulation expectancies showed constructive conflict behavior whereas dismissing adolescents who reported high confidence in negative mood regulation displayed undesirable conflict behavior.

Marchand (2004) constructed a research to assess couples' marital quality based on the relation between attachment styles and conflict behaviors. The results showed that only women's attachment styles significantly predicted their conflict behaviors and relationship satisfaction; women who had insecure attachment styles were less likely than women with secure attachment styles to use a constructive conflict resolution behavior and were more likely to report less relationship satisfaction.

In these studies (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Creasey & Ladd, 2004; Marchand, 2004; Shi, 2003) five conflict behaviors (integrating, compromising, obliging, avoiding, and dominating) developed by Rahim (1983) were used. In present study, conflict behaviors (collaborating, compromising, accommodating, avoiding, and

competing) which were categorized by Thomas (1976) was considered. Integrating refers to high concern for self and others just as collaborating behavior. Obliging refers to high concern for others and low concern for self and it is similar to accommodating behavior. Lastly, dominating refers to low concern for self and others which is like competing behavior.

Taken together, the research findings appear to indicate a relation between attachment styles and conflict behaviors. The present study intends to examine the possible relationship of attachment styles and conflict behaviors among male and female university students. It was expected that individuals with secure attachment styles would report positive conflict behaviors (collaborating, compromising) and individuals with insecure attachment styles (dismissing, fearful) would report negative conflict behaviors (avoiding, competing).

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The methodological procedures used in the study are included in this chapter. The topics are the sample, the data collection instruments, the data collection procedure, the data analysis techniques. The selection of the participants is included in the sample section. The instruments used in the study are explained in the second section. The data collection procedure is clarified in the third section. The fourth section introduces the statistical techniques for the analysis of the data.

3.1. Sample

A total of 312 (191 females, 121 males) participants participated in the study. Data were collected from Middle East Technical University in Ankara. In the selection of participants, convenience sampling method was used. Volunteer participants were recruited from different departments and classes of the faculties.

3.2. Data Collection Instruments

Three instruments were utilized in the study. Participants were administered Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised scale (ECR-R) (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) for evaluating attachment styles; Conflict Behaviors Questionnaire (CBQ) (Tezer, 1986) for assessing each participant's five conflict behaviors.

3.2.1. Experiences in Close Relationships- Revised (ECR-R)

The Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire was developed by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000). The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) Scale (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) is a revised form of Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) inventory which was developed by Brennan, Clark and Shaver

(1998). Brennan, Clark and Shaver (1998) collected most frequently used attachment scales together and they applied factor analysis to 323 items obtained from these scales. As a result of this analysis, they showed that adult attachment behavior can be defined by two dimensions as attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. In this analysis, Brennan et al. (1998) developed ECR inventory in which both of the two dimensions can be measured by eighteen items.

Fraley et al. (2000) analyzed the pool of items developed by Brennan and et al. (1998) and they selected the most discriminative items in order to create ECR-R which is composed of 36 items, 18 for attachment anxiety and 18 for attachment avoidance. It is a Likert-style questionnaire with 7- point response format, options scoring from 1 to 7 and ranging from either always agree to always disagree. The items measuring the relevant dimension are summed up separately and the mean is calculated. Then, the scores for anxiety and avoidance are found for each participant.

Fraley et al. (2000) examined reliability coefficients of the ECR-R in comparison with the Adult Attachment Scale-AAS, (Collins & Read, 1990); the Relationship Style Questionnaire-RSQ, (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994); the Experiences in Close Relationships- ECR, (Brennan et al., 1998). The ECR-R had higher test re-test reliability coefficients (ranging from .93 to .95) than the other measures.

ECR-R was adapted to Turkish by Selçuk, Günaydın, Sümer, and Uysal (2005). The internal consistency of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance was found to be satisfactory (.90 and .86, respectively). Selçuk et al. (2005) also found that test-retest reliability coefficients as .82 for anxiety subscale and .81 for avoidance subscale. In the present study, internal consistency was found as .88. For anxiety and avoidance subscales, coefficients are .85 and .86 respectively.

The ECR-R differs from the majority measures of attachment in that it does not specify attachment types. It rather places individuals' attachment orientations on the continuum of these two dimensions. The security of attachment is conceptually placed at lower levels of these two dimensions. The scores on these two dimensions can be converted to place respondents into three or four categories. In the current study, both avoidance and anxiety dimensions and attachment types yielded by these

dimensions are used. Nonhierarchical cluster analyses were used to assign participants into attachment patterns by using two underlying attachment dimensions; anxiety and avoidance.

3.2.2. Conflict Behaviors Questionnaire (CBQ)

In this study, Conflict Resolution Questionnaire (Tezer, 1986) was used to determine the subjects' conflict resolution strategies. The original form of the questionnaire (Tezer, 1986), consisted of five statements defining five different conflict behaviors, which were identified by Thomas (1976) as forcing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, and collaboration. Forcing represents an attempt to force one's viewpoint on the other party; avoiding represents an attempt to withdraw from the conflict; accommodating is a strategy when individual gives up his or her own needs and conforms what the other wants; compromising is based on bargaining and finding a middle ground solution; and collaborating is effective problem solving activities so that all parties can achieve mutually satisfying conclusions to the dispute.

Tezer (1976) reported test-retest reliability were .71 for forcing, .60 for avoiding, .69 for accommodating, .72 for compromising, and .76 for collaborating. Studies revealed that the original Turkish version of Conflict Resolution Questionnaire had adequate evidence regarding the validity of these conflict behaviors (Tezer, 1986; 1996). In the studies carried out by Tezer (1986; 1996; 1999; 2001) and Tezer and Demir (2001) in Turkey, conflict behaviors were identified and explained as different set of responses in conflict situations and in different type of relationships. In the present study, 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 'very little' to 5 'a lot' was used and participants were asked to rate their behaviors in five corresponding statements representing five types of conflict behavior. For each participant, five different scores were calculated for each of the conflict behavior. Higher score indicated the frequent use of that conflict resolution strategy.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

In the present study, Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) scale and Conflict Behaviors Questionnaire (CBQ) were administered to the students in Middle East Technical University campus in spring semester of 2006 which took one month. Convenience sampling was used and questionnaires were administered in various parts of the campus such as library, faculties, and dormitories. Students were asked for participation after explaining clearly the purpose of the study. Volunteer participants were given the questionnaires and the guidelines by mentioning ethical considerations for the confidentiality. The administration of the instruments took approximately 15 minutes.

3.4. Data Analysis Procedure

From a total of 323 students, 11 students were excluded due to missing data. As a result, 312 students were included to the analysis.

For Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) scale, anxiety score was found by taking the mean of odd numbered items and for avoidance score, the mean of even numbered items were calculated. Then, in order to find four attachment styles i.e., preoccupied, fearful, secure and dismissing, cluster analysis was employed to avoidance and anxiety.

Participants in the 'secure' category were expected to be scored low on both anxiety and avoidance dimension. As expected, secures were scored low on both anxiety ($M = 2.66$) and avoidance ($M = 1.92$) dimensions in contrast to the fearful individuals who were scored highest on both anxiety ($M = 4.30$) and avoidance ($M = 4.21$) dimensions. Moreover, dismissing individuals showed the higher anxiety ($M = 2.82$) and avoidance ($M = 3.44$) than secure attachment. On the other hand, preoccupied individuals were expected to be scored high on anxiety and low on avoidance. The cluster that corresponds to this group had a mean score of 4.14 for anxiety and 2.76 for avoidance.

Results showed that the intersection of low anxiety and high avoidance scores referred to dismissing attachment style, low avoidance and high anxiety scores referred to preoccupied attachment style, high anxiety and high avoidance scores referred to fearful attachment style and lastly low anxiety and low avoidance referred to secure attachment styles. Thus, out of 312 participants, 104 (33.3 %) were classified as preoccupied, 88 (28.2 %) of them as secure, 75 (24 %) of them as dismissing and 45 (14.4 %) of them as fearful attachment style.

To investigate the effect of attachment styles on conflict behaviors of the participants, two-way ANOVA was applied to each of the conflict behavior score of males and females.

For the statistical analysis, related subprogram of SPSS 11.5 was used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings about the relationships of attachment styles and conflict behaviors among male and female university students were presented. Firstly, the five conflict behaviors were explained in relation to four attachment styles. Then, the relationships of attachment styles and conflict behaviors among male and female university students were introduced.

4.1. Attachment Styles and Accommodating Behavior

The mean and standard deviation of accommodating conflict behaviors of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles was obtained. Table 4.1.1 shows the mean and standard deviation for accommodating behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles.

Table 4.1.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Accommodating Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles

Gender	Female			Male		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Dismissing	45	2.68	0.99	30	2.76	0.89
Preoccupied	55	2.92	1.32	49	3.12	1.07
Fearful	29	2.41	1.05	16	3.13	1.08
Secure	62	2.69	2.21	26	3.03	1.31

As shown in Table 4.1.1 females' accommodating behavior changed between the means of 2.41 and 2.92. Males' accommodating behavior changed between the means of 2.76 and 3.13.

Two-way ANOVA was applied to accommodating behavior as a function of gender and attachment styles. Table 4.1.2 shows the results of ANOVA

Each ANOVA was tested at the .025 (dividing .05 by the number of attachment styles which is 4) in order to control Type 1 error.

Table 4.1.2. The Results of ANOVA Applied to Accommodating Behavior

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>η²</i>
Gender	7.189	1	7.189	5.506*	.020	.018
Attachment styles	4.354	3	1.451	1.112	.345	.011
Gender x Attachment styles	2.916	3	.972	.745	.526	.007
Error(or residual)	396.909	304	1.306			
Total	2916	312				

* $p < .025$

The results of ANOVA showed that accommodating behavior for males and females were different. There was a statistically significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 304) = 5.50, p < .025, \eta^2 = .018$. The main effect for attachment styles, $F(3, 304) = 1.11, p > .025$ and the interaction effect $F(3, 304) = .74, p > .025$ were not statistically significant.

As shown in Table 4.1.3, an independent samples t-test was used to compare accommodating conflict behavior of females and males and the results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the accommodating scores between females ($M = 2.72; SD = 1.18$) and males ($M = 3.02; SD = 1.09$); $t(310) = 2.25, p < .05, \eta^2 = .016$.

Table 4.1.3. The Results of Independent Samples T-test Applied to Accommodating Behavior

	Levene's test for equality of variances			t-test for equality of means		
		<i>f</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Accommodating	Equal variances assumed	3.32	.069	2.25	310	.025
	Equal variances not assumed			2.29	270	.023

4.2. Attachment Styles and Compromising Behavior

The mean and standard deviation of compromising behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles was obtained. Table 4.2.1 shows the mean and standard deviation for compromising behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles.

Table 4.2.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Compromising Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dismissing	45	3.62	1.19	30	3.43	1.22
Preoccupied	55	3.93	1.05	49	4.16	0.89
Fearful	29	3.52	1.30	16	3.81	1.37
Secure	62	4.14	1.10	26	3.84	1.34

As shown in Table 4.2.1, females' compromising behavior changed between the means of 3.52 and 4.14. Males' compromising behavior changed between the means of 3.43 and 4.16.

Two-way ANOVA was applied to compromising behavior as a function of gender and attachment styles. Table 4.2.2 shows the results of ANOVA

Table 4.2.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Compromising Behavior

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Gender	0.008	1	.008	0.006	.939	0.000
Attachment styles	14.396	3	4.799	3.655*	.013	0.035
Gender x Attachment styles	4.621	3	1.540	1.173	.320	0.011
Error (or residual)	399.104	304	1.313			
Total	5082	312				

* $p < .025$

The results of ANOVA showed that compromising behavior for males and females were different. There was a statistically significant main effect for attachment styles, $F(3, 304) = 3.65, p < .025, \eta^2 = .035$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD and Scheffe tests indicated that the mean score for the dismissing group ($M = 3.54; SD = 1.20$) was significantly different from the preoccupied ($M = 4.03; SD = 0.98$) and secure groups ($M = 4.06; SD = 1.18$). The fearful group ($M = 3.62; SD = 1.32$) did not differ significantly from either of the other groups. The main effect for gender $F(1, 304) = .006, p > .025$ and interaction effect $F(3, 304) = 1.17, p > .025$ were not statistically significant.

4.3. Attachment Styles and Avoiding Behavior

The mean and standard deviation of avoiding behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles was obtained. Table 4.3.1 shows the mean and standard deviation for avoiding behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles.

Table 4.3.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Avoiding Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles

<i>Attachment styles</i>	<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dismissing	45	2.37	1.26	30	2.50	0.97
Preoccupied	55	2.22	1.08	49	2.90	1.19
Fearful	29	2.79	1.32	16	3.19	1.51
Secure	62	2.55	1.30	26	2.23	1.58

As shown in Table 4.3.1, females' avoiding behavior changed between the means of 2.22 and 2.79. Males' avoiding behavior changed between the means of 2.23 and 3.19.

Two-way ANOVA was applied to avoiding behavior as a function of gender and attachment styles. Table 4.3.2 shows the results of ANOVA

Table 4.3.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Avoiding Behavior

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Gender	3.143	1	3.143	1.994	.159	.007
Attachment styles	10.775	3	3.592	2.279	.080	.022
Gender x Attachment styles	11.197	3	3.732	2.368	.071	.023
Error(or residual)	479.116	304	1.576			
Total	2524	312				

The results of ANOVA showed that avoiding behavior for males and females were not different. There was no statistically significant main effect for attachment styles, $F(3, 304) = 2.28, p > .025, \eta^2 = .022$, for gender, $F(1, 304) = 1.99, p > .025, \eta^2 = .007$ and for interaction effect $F(3, 304) = 2.37, p > .025, \eta^2 = .023$.

4.4. Attachment Styles and Collaborating Behavior

The mean and standard deviation of collaborating behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles was obtained. Table 4.4.1 shows the mean and standard deviation for collaborating behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles.

Table 4.4.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Collaborating Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles

<i>Attachment styles</i>	<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dismissing	45	3.53	1.60	30	3.33	1.12
Preoccupied	55	3.33	1.10	49	3.65	1.13
Fearful	29	3.52	1.09	16	3.56	1.31
Secure	62	3.48	1.29	26	3.46	1.33

As shown in Table 4.4.1, females' collaborating behavior changed between the means of 3.33 and 3.53. Males' collaborating behavior changed between the means of 3.33 and 3.65.

Two-way ANOVA was applied to collaborating behavior as a function of gender and attachment styles. Table 4.4.2 shows the results of ANOVA.

Table 4.4.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Collaborating Behavior

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>η²</i>
Gender	.090	1	.090	.064	.80	.000
Attachment styles	.319	3	.106	.075	.97	.001
Gender x Attachment styles	3.170	3	1.057	.750	.75	.007
Error (or residual)	428.202	304	1.409			
Total	4212	312				

The results of ANOVA showed that collaborating behavior for males and females were not different. There was no statistically significant main effect for attachment styles, $F(3, 304) = .075, p > .025, \eta^2 = .001$, for gender, $F(1, 304) = .064, p > .025, \eta^2 = .000$ and for interaction effect $F(3, 304) = .75, p > .025, \eta^2 = .007$.

4.5. Attachment Styles and Competing Behavior

The mean and standard deviation of competing behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles was obtained. Table 4.5.1 shows the mean and standard deviation for competing behavior of male and female students as a function of their attachment styles.

Table 4.5.1. Means and Standard Deviations of Females' and Males' Competing Behavior as a Function of Attachment Styles

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dismissing	45	2.91	1.24	30	2.73	1.26
Preoccupied	55	2.83	1.12	49	2.71	1.08
Fearful	29	2.86	1.18	16	3.06	1.23
Secure	62	3.00	1.16	26	2.88	1.48

As shown in Table 4.5.1, females' competing behavior changed between the means of 2.83 and 3.00. Males' competing behavior changed between the means of 2.71 and 3.06.

Two-way ANOVA was applied to competing behavior as a function of gender and attachment styles. Table 4.5.2 shows the results of ANOVA.

Table 4.5.2. The Results of ANOVA applied to Competing Behavior

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Gender	.188	1	.188	.131	.72	.000
Attachment styles	1.768	3	.589	.411	.74	.004
Gender x Attachment styles	1.047	3	.349	.243	.86	.002
Error (or residual)	436.078	304	1.434			
Total	3007	312				

* $p < .025$

The results of ANOVA showed that competing behavior for males and females were not different. There was no statistically significant main effect for attachment styles, $F(3, 304) = .411, p > .025, \eta^2 = .004$, for gender, $F(1, 304) = .131, p > .025, \eta^2 = .000$ and for interaction effect $F(3, 304) = .243, p > .025, \eta^2 = .002$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discussion implication and recommendations of the overall study based on the relationships of attachment styles and conflict behavior among male and female university students. First section presents the discussion about the results of this study. In the second section recommendations and implications for future research were specified.

5.1. Discussion

The main purpose of the study was to examine the relationships of attachment styles and conflict behaviors among male and female university students. Especially, present study investigated the differences in conflict behaviors of male and female university students as a function of their attachment styles.

The results of two-way ANOVA applied to CBQ scores of male and female students yielded significant main effects for attachment styles and gender but no significant interaction effect for gender x attachment styles. The results of independent samples t-test applied to accommodating behavior yielded a significant gender difference as a function of attachment styles.

The research made by Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000) yielded the results that integrating and compromising behaviors were positively associated with secure attachment style which arises from positive working model of self and others. Also dismissing attachment style was found to exhibit negative association with conflict behaviors that involve mutual concern.

Shi (2003) also found out similar results in the sense that individuals that were classified as secure were more likely to be active problem solvers, integrative and compromising in managing conflict. On the other hand, individuals classified as

insecure were more likely to engage in opposite behaviors. Moreover, Shi (2003) found no gender difference in attachment styles. The findings of the research made by Creasey and Ladd (2004) were that individuals with dismissing attachment styles displayed conflict behaviors that had low concern for self and others.

Based on these findings, it can be argued that the findings of the present study regarding gender differences in conflict behavior and significant effect for attachment styles seemed to be supported with the findings of the previous studies (Creasey & Ladd, 2004; Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Shi, 2003;).

In the present study, the results of analyses of variance (ANOVA) revealed a significant difference in gender for accommodating behavior also indicating that males used more accommodating behavior than females. This finding is consistent with the results of the study made by Tezer and Demir (2001). They also found out that males were inclined to use much of the time accommodating behavior than females. According to the definition of accommodating behavior, people who had high concern for others and low concern for self engage in accommodating behavior and they had tendency to be ready to accept the demands of other party. This was also suggested by the studies (Buunk, Schaap, & Prevo, 1990; Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000) that man tried to avoid an emotional discussion and preferred to soothe over differences by using the accommodating style in managing conflict.

Furthermore, in compromising behavior, it was found that there were significant differences in terms of attachment styles. Participants with preoccupied and secure attachment styles were found to engage in compromising behavior more than participants with dismissing attachment style. In both preoccupied and secure attachment styles, concern for others was high, whereas in dismissing style it was low. In compromising behavior, there was a mutual focus on concern for self and concern for others (Thomas, 1976) meaning that people offered solutions at a midpoint between their positions. So, results of the present study was consistent with the previous studies (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Creasey & Ladd, 2004; Marchand, 2004; Feeney, 1994; Shi, 2003) in the sense that there was a relation between conflict behaviors of mutual concern for self and others (compromising, collaborating) and attachment styles. That is, two dimensions of concern for self and

concern for others in Thomas' model (1976) was similar to constructs of working models of self and others in the attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973). This correspondence was explained in the study of Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000) and four attachment styles were matched with five conflict behaviors except compromising behavior which remained in the midpoint.

In the present study, it was expected to find students with secure attachment styles to report positive conflict behaviors (compromising and collaborating) and students with insecure attachment styles to report negative conflict behaviors (competing, avoiding).

Conflict is defined as stress evoking situation because it starts with the frustration of one's concern (Thomas, 1976). The way one handles the conflict situation constitutes its being constructive or destructive. (Coser, 1967; Deutsch, 1969; Simmel, 1955) Collaborating and compromising behaviors were described as constructive behaviors because of their definitions whereas competing and avoiding behaviors were handled as destructive. As discussed before, compromising behavior is a midway between both parties. On the other hand, collaborating behavior is linked with high concern for self and others; so there is a mutual focus for the resolution of the conflict in order to satisfy the both parties. So, there is an effective problem solving activity which is also related with open communication and understanding the perspective of the other party. Furthermore, secure attachment style is linked with positive working models of self and others. Also, secure individuals have the ability to communicate about attachment issues easily and coherently and they can accept each other's imperfections (Bretherton, 1988).

In the present study, it was found out that compromising behavior was utilized mostly by participants with secure and preoccupied attachment styles and less by participants with dismissing attachment style. As discussed before, both preoccupied and secure attachment styles had positive working model of others and dismissing attachment styles have negative working model of others. So, in this study, it is possible to propose that compromising behavior is more related to attachment styles that have positive working model of others.

Moreover, according to the present study, participants who had high concern for others (secure and preoccupied attachment styles) prefer a midpoint solution between their positions for the conflict situation (compromising behavior) more than the participants who had low concern for others (dismissing attachment style). The possible reason for the results of this study could be that individuals with dismissing attachment styles were engaged to show high levels hostility and coldness and low levels of emotional expressiveness, warmth and intimacy in personal relationships, whereas preoccupied individuals showed high levels of self-disclosure, emotional expressiveness, relied on others and were caregiving in personal relations, also secure individuals showed high levels of warmth, intimacy and were caregiving in personal relationships (Bartholomow & Horowitz, 1991). So, participants in both preoccupied and secure attachment styles engage in open communication with others different than participants in dismissing attachment style. For this reason, preoccupied and secure participants would be more inclined to hold compromising behavior while managing conflicts.

Similarly, Tezer (1999) and Öztürk (2006) found out the positive outcomes of engaging in compromising behavior. In the study for investigating the extent of using conflict behaviors in the preference of becoming friends, the results showed that individuals with compromising behavior were more successful in accomplishing goals and establishing relationships. Moreover, compromising and collaborating behaviors were found to be more goal-oriented when compared with avoiding behavior. Also, compromising behavior was chosen more in preference of friendship. So, Tezer's study (1999) showed that people who performed compromising behavior were more attractive. Öztürk's study (2006) for examining the relationship of learned resourcefulness and conflict behaviors of university students yielded the results that students in high resourcefulness group tended to use compromising behavior more than those in low resourcefulness group in conflict situations.

Furthermore, the results obtained from the present study were similar to the previous research made by Monteoliva and Garcia-Martinez (2005) who found out that the participants with secure attachment style had a high possibility to be satisfied with their relationship and had high degree of stability and intimacy when their way of conflict behaviors were considered. On the other hand, it was also stated that the

participants with fearful and dismissing attachment styles had the lowest levels of satisfaction of the four attachment styles when it was thought by the light of their preference of conflict behaviors. To add this, the secure and preoccupied groups were more tended to show longer lasting relationships than did both fearful and dismissing group because preceding ones used compromising behavior more than participants with other attachment styles. Since attachment style and communication methods are central aspects of the relationship of a couple that jointly contribute to its satisfaction and stability, the secure and preoccupied participants would show positive attitudes toward telling their partner about their intimate aspects and toward expressing their feelings.

In the present study, no significant relation was found between avoiding conflict style and attachment styles. However, the means of both females ($M = 2.79$; $SD = 1.32$) and males ($M = 3.19$; $SD = 1.51$) in fearful attachment style was higher when compared to other attachment styles. When the correspondence between attachment styles and conflict behaviors was considered, fearful attachment style was matched with avoiding conflict style. Both have low concern for self and others in terms of conflict behaviors and have negative working model of self and others in attachment style. Although there was a small sample size which was 45 in fearful group, if there was a significant relationship, then it could be suggested that participants with avoiding conflict behaviors were tended to have fearful attachment style. This result was supported by the study performed by Shi (2003). It was observed that individuals who displayed avoiding behavior were also high in avoidance and anxiety in attachment styles which refer to fearful attachment style. It was indicated that these individuals were uncomfortable with closeness are poor in generating win-win solutions in conflict situations. Corcoran and Mallinckrodt's study (2000) also supported the notion that insecure attachment styles were associated with nonmutual conflict behaviors indicating the correspondence between fearful attachment styles and avoiding behavior.

In the present study, no significant difference was found in collaborating behavior among male and female students as a function of their attachment styles. However, it was expected to find a correspondence between collaborating behavior and secure attachment style when the results of previous studies were observed (Creasey & Ladd, 2004; Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Shi, 2003). These studies yielded a

significant result for the relation between secure attachment styles and integrating or collaborating conflict behavior by emphasizing the mutual engagement in conflict behavior.

There was no significant difference in competing behavior among male and female students as a function of their attachment styles. It was expected a correspondence between competing behavior and dismissing attachment style in the light of the literature (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Creasey & Ladd, 2004; Shi, 2003). In these studies individuals with high avoidance and low anxiety engaged in competing behavior which was linked with high concern for self and low concern for others.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the present study, some implications and recommendations can be stated for future studies about attachment styles and conflict behaviors.

Firstly, present study made about the attachment styles and conflict behaviors, can bring useful findings for counseling profession. For example, university counselors may inform their clients about the relation between these concepts in order to make them get knowledgeable about their attachment styles and conflict behaviors. So, for a counselor, it may be important to detect either insecure attachment characteristics or one among five conflict resolution types (Thomas, 1976) of a client for further and clear exploration. By this way, clients can get a new vision about their peers, siblings, romantic partners and themselves and can try out some solutions to improve their circumstances in order to achieve more healthy, honest and open communication in their relationships.

For educators, the present study also has some implications. Firstly, there is a threat of violence in schools, which in fact does not seem to be fully justified. However, there is a serious concern about how students manage their conflicts. Therefore educators should pay attention to the way which students manage their conflicts in destructive or constructive ways.

When the results of the present study are interpreted in the frame of university counseling and education, it is seen that males' using accommodating behavior more than females in resolving conflict can bring out some implications in understanding male and female students. Firstly, in accommodating behavior, concern for self is low but the concern for others is high. So, they meet other's needs and concern by sacrificing one's own concern and needs by being cooperative but unassertive. This means, males prefer to soothe the problematic situation during conflict much of the time when compared to females. University counselors and educators can use this information while comparing males and females in terms of their behaviors in conflict situations.

Furthermore, in the present study, it is found that individuals who have secure attachment styles are more likely to use compromising behavior. This can also be beneficial for the university counselors and educators while assessing the conflict behaviors of the students. By knowing the attachment style of an individual, they can get clues about the conflict behavior that the individual would probably use. For this study, significant relationship is found only between secure attachment style and compromising behavior. However, for future studies, more research can be done to find out other associations between four attachment styles and five conflict behaviors.

Recommendation for future research would be better to make the studies in other Turkish universities. Longitudinal research can be beneficial for more clarification and confirmation.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Bell, S. M., & Stayton, D. J. (1971). Individual differences in strange- situation behavior of one-year olds. In H. R. Schaffer (Ed.). *The origins of human and social relations*. NY: Academic
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Walls, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachment beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 709-716.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1991). Attachment and other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 33-51). NY: Routledge.
- Amado, S. (2005). *Emotional well-being of first-year university students: Family functioning and attachment styles*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Aune, K. S., & Comstock, J. (1997). Effect of relationship length on the experience, expression, and perceived appropriateness of jealousy. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *137*(1), 23-31.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *7*, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 226-244.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf
- Boardman, S. K., and Horowitz, S. V. (1994). Constructive conflict management and social problems: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, *50*(1), 1-11.

- Bowen, B. (1986). Toward the differentiation of the self. In M. Bowen (Ed.), *Family therapy in clinical practice*. NY: Jason Aronson.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1, Attachment*. NY: Basic Books
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol.2, Separation: Anxiety and anger*. NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3, Loss*. NY: Basic Books
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol.1: Attachment (2nd ed.)*. NY: Basic Books. (Original edition published 1969).
- Bowlby, J. (1988). Developmental psychology comes of age. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *145*, 1-10.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self report of measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.). *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). NY: Guilford.
- Bretherton, I. (1988). Open communication and internal working models: Their role in development of attachment relationships. In *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 57-113). Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Buist, K. L., Deković, M., Meeus, W., & Aken, A. G. (2002). Developmental patterns in adolescent attachment to mother, father and sibling. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*, 167-176.
- Buunk, B. P., Schaap, C., & Prevoo, N. (1990). Conflict resolution styles attributed to self and partner in premarital relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *130* (6), 821-823.
- Collins, N., & Read, S. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*; *58*, 644-663.

- Corcoran, K. O., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2000). Adult attachment, self-efficacy, perspective taking, and conflict resolution. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 473-483.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The function of social conflict*. London: Free.
- Coser, L. A. (1967). *Continuities in the study of social conflict*. NY: Free.
- Creasey, G., & Ladd, A. (2004). Negative mood regulation expectancies and conflict behaviors in late adolescent college student romantic relationships: The moderating role of generalized attachment representations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*(2), 235-255.
- Creasey, G, Kershaw, K., & Boston, A. (1999). Conflict management with friends and romantic partners: The role of attachment and negative mood regulation expectancies. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28*, 523-543.
- Crum, T. F. (1987). *The magic of conflict*. NY: Touchstone.
- Çelik, Ş. (2004). *The effects of an attachment-oriented-psychoeducational-group-training on improving the preoccupied attachment styles of university students*. Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Deutsch, M. (1969). Conflicts: Productive and destructive. *Journal of Social Issues, 25*, 7-41.
- Eğeci, İ. S. (2005). *Conflict distress, conflict attributions and perceived conflict behaviors as predictors of relationship satisfaction*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Erber, R., & Erber, M. W. (2001). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and research*. MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Escher-Graeb, D., & Grossmann, K. E. (1983). Bindungssicherheit im zweiten lebensjahr-die Rebensburger Querschnittuntersuchung (Attachment security in the second year of life: the Regensburg cross-sectional study). University of Regensburg.

- Feeney, J. (1994). Attachment style, communication patterns and satisfaction across the life cycle of marriage. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 333-348.
- Feeney, J., Noller, P., & Callan, V. (1994). Attachment style, communication and satisfaction in early years of marriage. *Advances in Personal Relationships, 5*, 269-308.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). Constructive conflict. In H. C. Metcalf and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett*. NY: Harper.
- Fraley, R. C., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults' close friendships and romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4*, 131-144.
- 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*, 350-365.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. NY: Penguin Books.
- Gottman, J. M. (1993). The roles of conflict engagement, escalation, and avoidance in marital interaction: A longitudinal view of five types of couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 6-15.
- Haar, B. F., and Krahe, B. (1999). Strategies for resolving interpersonal conflicts in adolescence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*(6), 667-684.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment theory as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 1-22.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman, D. (1999). Pair-bonds as attachments: Evaluating the evidence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 336-354). NY: Guilford.

- Hocker, J. L., & Wilmot, W. W. (1991). *Interpersonal conflict*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Hollist, C. S., & Miller, R. B. (2005). Perceptions of attachment style and marital quality in midlife marriage. *Family Relations*, 54, 46-57.
- İmamoğlu, S., & İmamoğlu, E. O. (2006). Relationship between general and context-specific attachment orientations in a Turkish sample. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 261-274.
- Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Kobak, R. R., & Duemmler, S. (1994). Attachment and conversation: Toward a discourse analysis of adolescent and adult security. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.). *Attachment process in adulthood* (pp.121-149). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Laursen, B. (1993). Conflict management among close friends. In B. Laursen (Eds.), *Close friendships in adolescence: New directions for child development*, 39-59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Laursen, B. and Collins, A. (1994). Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 197-209
- Laursen, B., Hartup, W. W., and Koplas, A. L. (1996). Towards understanding peer conflict. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 42(1), 76-102.
- Lyons-Ruth, K., Repacholi, B., Mcleod, S., & Silva, E. (1991). Disorganized attachment behavior in infancy: Short-term stability, maternal and infant correlates, and risk-related subtypes. *Development and Psychopathology*, 3, 377-396.
- Main, M., & Weston, D. (1981). The quality of the toddler's relationship to mother and father: Related to conflict behavior and the readiness to establish new relationships. *Child Development*, 52, 932-940.
- Main, M. (1999). Attachment theory: Eighteen points with suggestions for future studies. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 845- 887). NY: Guildford.

- Marchand, J. F. (2004). Husbands' and wives' marital quality: The role of adult attachment orientations, depressive symptoms, and conflict resolution behaviors. *Attachment & Human Development, 6*(1), 99-112.
- Monteoliva, A, & Garcia-Martinez, J. M. A. (2005). Adult attachment style and its effect on the quality of romantic relationships in Spanish students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(6), 745-747.
- Öner, B. (2001). Factors predicting future time orientation for romantic relationships with the opposite sex. *Journal of Psychology, 135*(4), 430-439.
- Özen, A. (2006). *Value similarities of wives and husbands and conflict resolution styles of spouses as predictors of marital adjustment*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Öztürk, S. (2006). *The relationship between learned resourcefulness and conflict behaviors*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Peterson, D. R. (1983). Conflict. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L. A. Peplau, & D. R. Peterson (eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 360-396). NY: Freeman.
- Peterson, C., Peterson, J. (1990). Fight or flight: Factors influencing children's and adults' decisions to avoid or confront conflict. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 151*, 461-471.
- Pistole, M. C. (1993). Attachment relationships: Self-disclosure and trust. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15*, 94-106.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). Measurement of organizational conflict. *Journal of General Psychology, 109*, 189-199.
- Rahim, M. A. (1985). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflicts. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125*, 79-86.
- Selçuk, E., Günaydın, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal, A. (2005). Yetişkin bağlanma boyutları için yeni bir ölçüm: Yakın ilişkilerde yaşantılar envanteri-II'nin Türk örnekleminde psikometrik açıdan değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yayınları, 8*(16), 1-11.

- Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict resolution in romantic relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 31*, 143-157.
- Shulman S., Roseinheim E., & Knafo, D. (2000). Interface of adolescent and parent marital expectations. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 27*, 213-222.
- Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict*. NY: Free.
- Stroufe, L. A., & Fleeson, J. (1986). The coherence of family relations. In R. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.). *Relationship within families: Mutual families*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Tezer, E. (1986). *Evli eşler arasındaki çatışma davranışları: Algılama ve doyum*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Tezer, E. (1996). Conflict-handling behavior towards spouses and supervisors. *The Journal of Psychology, 130*(1), 281-292.
- Tezer, E. (1999). The functionality of conflict behaviors and the popularity of those who engage in them. *Adolescence, 34*(134), 409-416.
- Tezer, E. (2001). Conflict behaviors and their relationship to popularity. *Adolescence, 36*(144), 697-707.
- Tezer, E., & Demir, A. (2001). Conflict behaviors toward same-sex and opposite-sex peers among male and female late adolescents. *Adolescence, 36*(143), 525-534.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook for industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889-933). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- 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.

Weider-Hatfield, D., and Hatfield, J. D. (1996). Superior's conflict management strategies and subordinate outcomes. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10, 189-195.

APPENDICES

Değerli Katılımcı,

Bu araştırmada, ikili ilişkilerde bireylerin bağlanma tarzları ve çatışma çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişki incelenmektedir. Sizden istenen ilişkide bulunan ölçeklerin başındaki yönergeleri okuyarak yanıtlamanızdır. Ölçeklerde geçen “birlikte olduğunuz kişi” veya “eş” kelimeleriyle duygusal ilişki içinde olduğunuz kişi ifade edilmektedir. Tüm soruların yanıtlanması yaklaşık olarak 10-15 dakika sürmektedir. Vereceğiniz her türlü bilgi tamamen gizli kalacak ve sadece araştırma amacıyla kullanılacağından ölçeklerde isminizi belirtmeniz gerekmemektedir. Araştırmadan elde edilen bilgilerin güvenilirliği ve geçerliliği açısından tüm soruları tek başınıza ve içtenlikle yanıtlamanız büyük önem taşımaktadır. Araştırmaya katıldığınız için teşekkür ederim.

Selin Pancaroğlu

ODTÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik A.B.D.

APPENDIX A

YAKIN İLİŞKİLERDE YAŞANTILAR ENVANTERİ –II

Aşağıda yer alan ifadeler sizin beraber olduğunuz kişilerle ilişkilerinizde hissettiğiniz duygularla ilgilidir. Bu araştırmada, yalnız şu anki ilişkinizde değil, genel olarak ilişkilerinizde neler yaşadığınızla ilgilenilmektedir. Eğer şu anda romantik bir ilişki içinde değilseniz, aşağıdaki maddeleri bir ilişki içinde olduğunuzu varsayarak yanıtlayınız. Her bir maddenin ilişkinizde hissettiğiniz duygu ve düşünceleri ne oranda yansıttığını ilgi seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1 Hiç 2 Oldukça 3 Biraz 4 Kararsızım 5 Biraz 6 Oldukça 7 Tümüyle
Katılmıyorum Katılmıyorum Katılmıyorum Katılıyorum Katılıyorum Katılıyorum

1) Birlikte olduğum kişinin sevgisini kaybetmekten korkarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
2) Gerçekte ne hissettiğimi birlikte olduğum kişiye göstermemeyi tercih ederim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
3) Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin artık benimle olmak istemeyeceği korkusuna kapılırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
4) Özel duygu ve düşüncelerimi birlikte olduğum kişiyle paylaşmak konusunda kendimi rahat hissedirim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
5) Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin beni gerçekten sevmediği duygusuna kapılırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
6) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere güvenip inanmak bana zor gelir	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
7) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilerin beni, benim onları önemsedğim kadar önemsemeyeceklerinden endişe duyarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
8) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere yakın olma konusunda çok rahatımdır.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦

9) Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin bana duyduğu hislerin benim ona duyduğum hisler kadar güçlü olmasını isterim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
10) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere açılma konusunda kendimi rahat hissetmem.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
11) İlişkilerimi kafama çok takarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
12) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere fazla yakın olmamayı tercih ederim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
13) Benden uzakta olduğunda, birlikte olduğum kişinin başka birine ilgi duyabileceği korkusuna kapılırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
14) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişi benimle çok yakın olmak istediğinde rahatsızlık duyarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
15) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere duygularımı gösterdiğimde, onların benim için aynı şeyleri hissetmeyeceğinden korkarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
16) Birlikte olduğum kişiyle kolayca yakınlaşabilirim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
17) Birlikte olduğum kişinin beni terk edeceğinden pek endişe duymam.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
18) Birlikte olduğum kişiyle yakınlaşmak bana zor gelmez.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
19) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişi kendime olan güvenimi sarsar.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
20) Genellikle, birlikte olduğum kişiyle sorunlarımı ve kaygılarımı tartışırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
21) Terk edilmekten pek korkmam.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
22) Zor zamanlarımda, romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiden yardım istemek bana iyi gelir.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
23) Birlikte olduğum kişinin, bana istediğim kadar yakın olmadığını düşünürüm.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
24) Birlikte olduğum kişiye hemen hemen her şeyi anlatırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦

25) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiler bazen bana olan duygularımı sebepsiz yere değiştirirler.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
26) Başımdan geçenleri birlikte olduğum kişiyle konuşurum.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
27) Çok yakın olma arzum bazen insanları korkutup uzaklaştırır.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
28) Birlikte olduğum kişiler benimle çok yakınlaştığında gergin hissedirim.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
29) Romantik ilişkide olduğum bir kişi beni yakından tanıdıkça, benden hoşlanmayacağından korkarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
30) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere güvenip inanma konusunda rahatımdır.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
31) Birlikte olduğum kişiden ihtiyaç duyduğum şefkat ve desteği görememek beni öfkelenendirir.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
32) Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiye güvenip inanmak benim için kolaydır.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
33) Başka insanlara denk olamamaktan endişe duyarım.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
34) Birlikte olduğum kişiye şefkat göstermek benim için kolaydır.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
35) Birlikte olduğum kişi beni sadece kızgın olduğumda fark eder.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
36) Birlikte olduğum kişi beni ve ihtiyaçlarımı gerçekten anlar.	①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦

APPENDIX B

ÇATIŞMA DAVRANIŞLARI ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıdaki tabloda yer alan ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyarak, günlük yaşantınızda karşılaştığınız anlaşmazlıklarda bu davranışlardan her birini ne sıklıkla gösterdiğinizi düşünerek yanıtlayınız. Her bir maddenin sizin davranışınızı ne oranda yansıttığını ilgili seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1 = Çok az

2 = Az

3 = Orta

4 = Fazla

5 = Çok fazla

1. Kendi isteğimi kabul ettirinceye kadar tartışmayı sürdürürüm.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. Tartışma çıkacak konuları hiç açmamaya çalışırım, açıldığı zaman konuyu değiştiririm.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. Tam olarak onaylamasam bile karşımdakinin görüş ve isteklerini kabul ederim.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4. Ben biraz taviz (ödün) veririm, karşımdakinin de isteklerinden biraz taviz vermesini isterim ve uzlaşacak bir orta yol bulmaya çalışırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. Karşımdakini de isteklerinden vazgeçirecek ve ikimizi de mutlu edecek bir üçüncü yol bulmaya çalışırım.	①	②	③	④	⑤