


Article Arrival : 20/04/2021

Published : 25.06.2021

Doi Number  <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sss.j.3284>Reference  Ozeren, G.S. & Eren, N. (2021). "Investigation Of The Relationship Between Dysfunctional Attitudes And Attachment Styles In Young University Students" International Social Sciences Studies Journal, (e-ISSN2587-1587) Vol:7, Issue:84; pp:2866-2874

# INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DYSFUNCTIONAL ATTITUDES AND ATTACHMENT STYLES IN YOUNG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Assistant Professor. Gul Sultan OZEREN

Sinop University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Sinop/TURKEY

Assistant Professor. Nurhan EREN

Istanbul University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Mental Health and Diseases, Social Psychiatry Service, Istanbul/TURKEY

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** Young people go through a critical period of development that involves either building a strong identity and achieving true intimacy or being doomed to isolation and deprived of productivity. Research on mental health in young people focuses generally on the concept of functionality. The aim of this study was to determine the correlation between dysfunctional attitudes and attachment styles in young university students in terms of some variables.

**Material and Method:** The study sample consisted of 759 students from the various faculties and departments of a public university. Data were collected using a Short Demographic Information Form, the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale and the Relationship Scales Questionnaire.

**Results:** Participants had the highest and lowest "dismissing attachment" and "preoccupied attachment" scores, respectively, while they had the highest and lowest "autonomous attitude" and "performance evaluation" scores, respectively. Secure attachment styles were correlated with functional attitudes while insecure attachment styles were correlated with dysfunctional attitudes.

**Conclusion:** The higher the secure attachment, the less the need for approval and the more autonomous and flexible attitudes. The results show that early parental attachment styles have a significant impact on functionality in young people. Further research and trainings for parents are needed.

**Key Words:** dysfunctional attitudes, attachment styles, personality, youngs, university students.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Erikson's theory of psychosocial development, young people go through a critical period of transition from building a strong identity to achieving intimacy (Vogel-Scibilia et al., 2009). If they fail to do that, they turn into isolated people who cannot establish realistic and close relationships and cannot put their skills and productivity into practice, resulting in dysfunctional attitudes that arise from patterns of negative thinking about the self, the others, and the world. Early attachment determines our ability to form deep and trusting relationships with others in adulthood. The World Health Organization (2001) defines mental health as a state of well-being extending beyond the absence of mental illness and enabling individuals to realize their abilities, cope with challenging situations effectively, work productively, and contribute to society. The determining factors of mental health become visible in youth. A mental disorder is defined as a syndrome characterized by clinically significant disturbance in an individual's cognition, emotion regulation, or behavior that reflects a dysfunction in the psychological, biological, or developmental processes underlying mental functioning. Mental disorders are often associated with marked distress or impairment in social or work life or other important functional areas (APA, 2013). Beck (1995) defines dysfunctional attitudes as the erroneous processing of unproven and challenging information arising from basic beliefs and schemes, and negative experiences and involving cognitive distortions about the self, the other, and the world. Early attachment with the mother or primary caregiver is associated with the quality of relationships and expectations of people in adulthood. Attachment is the first and most crucial

relationship with the other and the core of interpersonal patterns. People with adverse early childhood experiences are more likely to have insecure attachment patterns, which also play a key role in their personality construction (Schoe, 2003; Cozolino, 2006; Couzolino, 2016).

Bowlby uses the concept of “mental models” to formulate his attachment theory, which posits that everyone makes predictions about the future based on their perceptions, make plans based on those predictions, and develop “internal working models” of the world and their position in the world (Bowlby, 1982; Bowlby, 1988). Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) developed a four-category attachment model by bringing together two types of internal working models of self and other based on Bowlby's early definitions of attachment. They developed four attachment patterns (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful) to the degree of positive or negative image of self and other (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991).

Bowlby's internal working models overlap with Young's early maladaptive schemas. Children employ working models to predict the behavior of attachment figures and to prepare for their own responsibilities. Therefore, the type of the internal working models is of paramount importance. In this context, early maladaptive schemas are dysfunctional internal working models. After a while, working models become consolidated, unconscious, and resistant to change as a result of mutual expectations (Young at all, 2003).

There are no studies investigating the relationship between dysfunctional attitudes and attachment styles and their interaction with various variables in young people in Turkey. The aim of this study was, therefore, to define and determine dysfunctional attitudes and attachment styles in terms of some variables in young people. We, therefore, believe that this study will contribute to the literature and pave the way for further research.

### 1.1. Research Questions:

1. Is there any relationship between dysfunctional attitudes and attachment styles in young people?
2. Do dysfunctional attitudes differ in young people by sex, parents' marital status, number of siblings, birth order, and perceived income?
3. Do attachment styles differ in young people by sex, parents' marital status, number of siblings, birth order, and perceived income?

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Research Type

This was a descriptive correlational study.

### 2.2. Participants

The study population consisted of 4500 undergraduate students of the faculties and colleges of a public university. The faculties and colleges were in the city center and within the scope of normal education. Cluster sampling was used. The faculties and colleges were regarded as clusters. The study sample consisted of 800 volunteer participants. Only fully completed scales (n= 759) were used for statistical analysis.

### 2.3. Inclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria were (1) being voluntary and (2) an undergraduate student of the university where the study was conducted.

### 2.4. Data Collection Tools

Data were collected using a short demographic information form, the relationship scales questionnaire and the dysfunctional attitude scale.

The short demographic information form developed by the researcher was used to collect data on participants' gender, parents' marital status, birth order, and number of siblings.

The dysfunctional attitude scale (DAS-A) was developed by Weissman and Beck (1978) to measure the frequency of depression-related dysfunctional attitudes. The DAS-A consisted of 40 items scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = fully agree, 7 = fully disagree). The total score ranged from 40 to 240. Higher

scores indicate more dysfunctional attitudes in cognitive patterns. The DAS-A has a test-retest reliability of 0.73 and a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90.

The DAS-A was adapted to Turkish language by Sahin and Sahin (1992). However, there were problems due to cultural differences. Prior to reverse coding, a factor analysis was performed, which yielded four factors: "perfectionism," "approval," "autonomy," and "erratic." The DAS-TR had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 to 0.92 and a test-retest reliability of 0.54 to 0.84 (Savasir and Sahin, 1997). In this study, the calculation method proposed by Sahin and Sahin was used, and the Cronbach' alpha of the DAS-TR was found to be 0.79.

The relationship scales questionnaire (RSQ) was developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) to measure the prototypes of the four attachment styles: "secure," "fearful," "dismissing," and "preoccupied." It consisted of 30 items scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1= Not at all like me, 7= Very much like me). It had a Cronbach' alpha of 0.82 and a test-retest reliability of 0.78. Its subscales had a Cronbach' alpha of 0.27 to 0.61. It was adapted to Turkish language by Sumer and Gungor (1999). The RSQ-TR consisted of 17 items. Higher "fearful," "dismissing," and "preoccupied" scores indicated insecure attachment. A total score was not calculated; instead, subscale scores were calculated. The RSQ-TR had a Cronbach' alpha of 0.63 in this study. The highest subscale score indicates the respondent's attachment style (Gungor, 2000).

## 2.5. Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 23 for Windows. Frequencies and percentages were used for descriptive statistics of qualitative data while means, standard deviations, and median, minimum, and maximum values were used for descriptive statistics of quantitative data. The Shapiro Wilk test was used for normality testing. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for inter-group comparison of non-normally distributed data. The Spearman correlation was used to test the relationship between scale scores.

## 2.6. Ethical Considerations

This study was derived from the data analysis in the descriptive stage of a descriptive and applied research project. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the university.

## 3. RESULTS

Of the participants, 425 were women (55.9%); 89.5% had parents who were married and living together; 8.9% had parents who were married but living separately; 1.6% had divorced parents; and 7.5% had one sibling. The proportion of participants who were the first, middle, and last child was similar. More than half (62.0%) of the participants reported inadequate income.

### Insert Table 1

Participants had the highest and lowest "dismissing attachment" and "preoccupied attachment" scores, respectively, while they had the highest and lowest "autonomous attitude" and "perfectionism" attitudes, respectively.

### Insert Table 2

Secure attachment was negatively correlated with approval attitude and positively and weakly correlated with autonomy and erratic attitudes. Preoccupied attachment was positively correlated with perfectionism and approval attitudes and negatively and weakly correlated with autonomous attitude. Fearful attachment was positively correlated with perfectionism and approval attitudes and negatively and weakly correlated with erratic attitude. Dismissing attachment was positively correlated with perfectionism attitude and negatively and weakly correlated with autonomous attitude.

### Insert Table 3

There was a statistically significant difference in "perfectionism attitude," "approval attitude," and "erratic attitude" scores between male and female participants ( $p < 0.05$ ). Female participants had higher "perfectionism attitude" ( $p < 0.001$ ), "approval attitude" ( $p = 0.030$ ), and "erratic attitude" ( $p = 0.015$ ) scores than males. There was no statistically significant difference in "autonomous attitude" scores between male and female participants ( $p > 0.05$ ).

There was a statistically significant difference in all RSQ subscale scores between male and female participants ( $p < 0.001$ ). Female participants had higher RSQ "secure attachment" ( $p < 0.001$ ) and



“preoccupied attachment” ( $p=0.011$ ) and lower “fearful attachment” ( $p=0.025$ ) and “dismissing attachment” subscale scores than males ( $p=0.035$ ).

#### Insert Table 4

Participants with parents who were either divorced or living separately had higher DAS “approval attitude” ( $p=0.041$ ), and “erratic attitude” ( $p=0.002$ ) scores than those with parents who were married and living together.

Participants’ RSQ scores did not significantly differ by their parents’ marital status.

Table 5 shows the distribution of participants’ mean DAS and RSQ subscale scores based on their parents’ marital status.

#### Insert Table 5

Participants’ “perfectionism attitude” ( $p=0.001$ ) and “erratic attitude” ( $p=0.001$ ) scores significantly differed by the number of siblings. Those with only one sibling had higher “perfectionism attitude” scores than others, while those with four or more siblings had higher “erratic attitude” scores than others. Participants’ “approval attitude” and “autonomous attitude” scores did not significantly differ by the number of siblings.

Participants’ RSQ “preoccupied attachment” scores significantly differed by the number of siblings. Those with four or more siblings had higher “preoccupied attachment” scores than others ( $p=0.004$ ). Participants’ “secure attachment,” “dismissing attachment,” and “fearful attachment” scores did not significantly differ by the number of siblings.

Participants’ DAS scores did not significantly differ by birth order.

Participants’ RSQ scores significantly differed by birth order. Participants who were the “middle children” had the highest “secure attachment” score ( $p=0.040$ ), while those who were the oldest had the lowest “dismissing attachment” score ( $p<0.001$ ). Participants’ “fearful” and “preoccupied attachment” scores did not differ by birth order.

Participants’ mean DAS subscale scores did not differ by perceived income.

Participants who reported inadequate had the highest and lowest “dismissing attachment” and “preoccupied attachment” scores, respectively ( $p=0.002$ ).

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Participants had the highest and lowest “dismissing attachment” and “preoccupied attachment” scores, respectively, while they had the highest and lowest “autonomous attitude” and “perfectionism attitude” scores, respectively. The perfectionism attitude subscale consists of strict statements, and therefore high “perfectionism attitude” scores indicate negative attitudes toward the self. This means that our result is positive. Autonomous attitude means being free from the need for approval of others. It is noteworthy that, of all DAS subscales, participants had the highest “autonomous attitude” score, indicating that they have low expectations of themselves and do not care about other people's expectations.

Secure attachment is the ideal attachment because it involves a positive view of the self and others. It is sad but not surprising that many of our participants had dismissing attachment because young people become more and more likely to avoid responsibilities, resort to virtual reality to mask the need for others and be selfish in relationships, which are all in line with dismissing attachment style.

Secure attachment was negatively correlated with dysfunctional attitudes, whereas insecure attachment styles (dismissing, fearful, and preoccupied) were positively correlated with dysfunctional attitudes, which was confirmed by Andersson and Perris (2000): Dysfunctional attitudes and low self-confidence mediate the correlation between insecure attachment and symptoms of depression and anxiety (Lee and Hankin, 2009). From the perspective of schema and mental structures, it can be predicted that attachment styles affect interacting behaviors concerning flexibility and irrational beliefs (Doron et al., 2009; Stackert and Bursik, K., 2003). Secure attachment and dysfunctional beliefs support this prediction. Thomas and Altareb (2012) conducted a study on 450 university students to investigate how cognitive theory and response styles theory of depression might account for susceptibility to depression and reported that dysfunctional attitudes and rumination were predictors of depressive symptoms.



Participants with higher secure attachment were less likely to seek the approval of others and more likely to have autonomous and flexible attitudes. Secure attachment promotes future social, emotional, and mental development, and positively affects relationships, worldview, self-perception, and personality in adulthood. Our result indicates that young people with secure attachment styles are more likely to develop autonomous attitudes than those with insecure attachment styles.

Participants with a fearful attachment style were more likely to develop perfectionist attitudes and seek the approval of others and less likely to develop flexible attitudes. Such people have low self-worth and think that others are unreliable (Sumer and Gungor,1999). Individuals with a fearful attachment style crave social interactions and intimacy, but they do not trust others and have a fear of rejection. Therefore, they avoid social interactions and close relationships to avoid rejection and getting hurt, resulting in isolation (Bartholomew,1990).

Participants with a dismissing attachment style were more likely to develop perfectionist attitudes and less likely to be free from the need for approval of others. Individuals with a dismissing attachment style pretend like they do not need bonding. As Bowlby argues, dismissing attachment represents a much more complex strategy by which the attachment system is brought to a halt. The only way to maintain a positive self-image after being rejected by an attachment figure is to develop a model of self to keep oneself away from that figure and trivialize negative emotions. Therefore, individuals with a dismissing attachment style passively avoid close relationships, overrate autonomy, and convince themselves that relationships are not that important (Bartholomew, 1990).

There was a statistically significant difference in “perfectionism attitude,” “approval attitude,” and “erratic attitude” scores between male and female participants. Female participants had higher “perfectionism attitude,” “approval attitude,” and “erratic attitude” scores than males. There was, however, no statistically significant difference in “autonomous attitude” scores between male and female participants. A study investigating university students’ values and dysfunctional attitudes in terms of some variables reported that men had more dysfunctional attitudes than women (Bilgin, 2001). Haliloglu (2007) investigated the correlation between loneliness levels and attachment styles and dysfunctional attitudes in ninth graders, but he could not find a statistically significant difference in “perfectionism attitude,” “autonomy attitude” and “erratic attitude” scores between male and female participants. Another study looked at the correlation between interpersonal problem-solving skills and dysfunctional attitudes in a group of university students and reported that gender had no effect on the correlation between them (Qin et al., 2020). Another study reported that male students had higher mean “perfectionism,” “approval” and “autonomy” scores than females (Pesen and Celik, 2019). Lichtenberg and Johnson (1992) found that women needed a sense of competence, approval, and success more than men did. Our female participants had higher perfectionism, approval, and erratic attitude scores than males. This indicates that women use some patterns more often than men in order to develop a healthy self and to feel safe and valuable under current circumstances. It can, therefore, be stated that women who prepare for careers have inflexible attitudes, high expectations of themselves, and a very low tolerance for failure.

There was a statistically significant difference in RSQ subscale scores between male and female participants. Female participants had higher secure and preoccupied attachment and lower fearful and dismissing attachment scores than males. According to Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), dismissing attachment is more common in men while anxious attachment is more common in women. Gumus and Guler (2018) also reported that secure attachment was more common in women than in men. Although sex differences in attachment styles have been documented, there are still conflicting results in the literature. Therefore, further research is warranted to better understand sex differences in attachment styles.

Our results show that young people with secure attachment styles are less likely to seek the approval of others and more likely to have autonomous and flexible attitudes. These results indicate that attachment styles have a significant effect on functionality in young people and that further research and trainings for parents are needed.

## REFERENCES

Andersson, P. & Perris, C. (2000). Attachment styles and dysfunctional assumptions in adults. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 7(1), 47-53.





- APA (2013). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* American Psychological Association.
- 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(2), 226-244.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Beck AT. (1979). *Cognitive Therapy and Emotional Disorders*. New York, A Meridian Book
- Bilgin, M. (2001). Üniversite öğrencilerinin değerlerinin ve fonksiyonel olmayan tutumlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Cukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, 16-32.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published in 1969)
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*. New York: Basic Books
- Couzolino, L. (2016). *Why Therapy Works – Using Our Minds to Change Our Brains* United States, W.W.Norton & Company
- Cozolino L. (2006). *The Neuroscience of Human Relationships*. United States, W.W.Norton & Company.
- Doron, G., Moulding, R., Kyrios, M., Nedeljkovic, M. & Mikulincer, M. (2009). Adult attachment insecurities are related to obsessive compulsive phenomena. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(8), 1022-1049.
- Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(3), 430-445.
- Gumus, Z. & Guler, K. (2018). Yetişkin bireylerdeki bağlanma stillerinin demografik özellikleri ve yaşam kaliteleriyle olan ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 6(78), 505-521.
- Gungor, D. (2000). The role of parenting styles in the intergenerational transmission of attachment styles and mental models. Retrieved from <http://genclikbirikimi.org/kunye-32923-baglanma-stilleri-zihinsel-modellerin-kusaklararasi-aktariminda-anababalik-stillerinin-rolu-tez> on 10 February 2020.
- Haliloglu, S. (2007). Investigation of the relationship among loneliness levels, attachment styles, and dysfunctional beliefs of adolescents (Sample of Malatya) Retrieved from <http://genclikbirikimi.org/kunye-4294-ortaogretim-9-sinif-ogrencilerinin-yalnizlik-duzeyleri-baglanma-bicimleri-islevsel-olmayan-tutumları-arasındaki-iliskinin-incelenmesi-tez> on 20 January 2020.
- Lee, A. & Hankin, B.L. (2009). Insecure attachment, dysfunctional attitudes, and low self-esteem predicting prospective symptoms of depression and anxiety during adolescence. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*, 38(2), 219-31.
- Lichtenberg, J.W. & Johnson DeVore, D. (1992). Physical illness and subscription to Ellis's irrational beliefs. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71(2), 157-163.
- Pesen, A. & Celik, M. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin fonksiyonel olmayan tutumlarının incelenmesi. *E-International Journal of Educational Research*, 10(2), 1-13.
- Qin, X., Sun, J., Wang, M., Lu, X., Dong, Q., Zhang, L., Liu, J., Ju, Y., Wan, P., Guo, H., Zhao, F., Zhang, Y., Liu, B. & Li, L. (2020) Gender Differences in Dysfunctional Attitudes in Major Depressive Disorder. *Front. Psychiatry* 11:86, 1-8.
- Sahin, N. & Sahin, N. (1992). How dysfunctional are the dysfunctional attitudes in another culture. *Br J Med Psychol*, 65, 17-26.
- Savasir, I., Sahin, N.H. (1997). *Bilissel-Davranisci Terapilerde Değerlendirme: Sık Kullanılan Ölçekler*. [Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Scales Commonly Used in the Assessment]. Turk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları, Ankara.

Schore, A.N. (2003). *Affect Regulation and the Disorder of the Self*. United States of America, W.W. Norton & Company.

Stackert, R.A. & Bursik, K. (2003). Why am I unsatisfied? Adult attachment style, gendered irrational relationship beliefs, and young adult romantic relationship satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(8),1419-1429.

Sumer, N. & Gungor, D. (1999). Yetiskin baglanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örnekleme üzerinde psikometrik degerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 14(43), 71-106.

Thomas, J. & Altareb, B. (2012). Cognitive vulnerability to depression: an exploration of dysfunctional attitudes and ruminative response styles in the United Arab Emirates. *Psychol Psychother*, 85(1), 117-121.

Vogel-Scibilia, S.E., McNulty, K.C., Baxter, B., Miller, S., Dine, M. & Frese, F.J. (2009). The recovery process utilizing Erikson's stages of human development. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 45(6), 405-414.

Weissman, A.N. & Beck, A.T. (1978). *Development and the validation of the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale: A preliminary investigation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Toronto, Ontario.

WHO: The World Health Report 2001: Mental Health: New Understanding, New Hope.

Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. Guilford Press.

**Table 1.** Participants' demographic characteristics.

		<b>n (759)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Sex</b>	Female	425	55.9
	Male	334	45.1
<b>Parents togetherness</b>	Married, living together	679	89.5
	Married, living separately	68	8.9
	Divorced	12	1.6
<b>Number of siblings</b>	Not	57	7.5
	1	150	19.8
	2	193	25.4
	3	215	28.3
	4+	144	19.0
<b>Birth order</b>	First	251	33.1
	Medyan	266	35.2
	Last	240	31.7

**Table 2.** Participants' mean DAS-A and RSQ subscale scores.

		<b>Mean ± SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min-Max</b>
<b>DYSFUNCTIONAL ATTITUDES</b>	<b>Performance evaluation</b>	2.71 ± 0.86	2.61	1-5.78
	<b>Need for approval</b>	3.62 ± 0.92	3.55	1-6.82
	<b>Autonomy</b>	5.02 ± 1.05	5.17	1.33-7
	<b>Tentativeness</b>	3.79 ± 0.97	3.80	1-6.4
<b>ATTACHMENT STYLES</b>	<b>Sekure</b>	4.25 ± 0.91	4.20	2-7
	<b>Preoccupied</b>	3.79 ± 1.04	3.75	1-7
	<b>Fearful</b>	4.14 ± 1.20	4.25	1-7
	<b>Dismissing</b>	4.60 ± 0.99	4.60	1.2-7

**Table 3.** Correlation between DAS and RSQ scores.

	Sekure	Preoccupied	Fearful	Dismissing	Performance evaluation	Need for approval	Autonomy	Tentativeness
Sekure								
Preoccupied	r=-0.029 p=0.503	-						
Fearful	r=-0.306 p<0.001	r=-0.046 p=0.270	-					
Dismissing	r=-0.015 p=0.733	r=-0.227 p=0.003	r=0.483 p<0.001	-				
Performance evaluation	r=-0.081 p=0.057	r=0.309 p<0.001	r=0.294 p<0.001	r=0.284 p<0.001	-			
Need for approval	r=-0.213 p=0.007	r=0.340 p<0.001	r=0.202 p=0.015	r=0.020 p=0.632	r=0.756 p<0.001	-		
Autonomy	r=0.270 p<0.001	r=-0.263 p<0.001	r=-0.032 p=0.452	r=0.201 p=0.017	r=-0.294 p<0.001	r=-0.309 p<0.001	-	
Tentativeness	r=0.241 p=0.001	r=-0.065 p=0.121	r=-0.227 p=0.002	r=-0.037 p=0.386	r=-0.250 p<0.001	r=-0.046 p=0.273	r=0.469 p<0.001	-

r: Spearman Korelasyon test

**Table 4.** Distribution of participants' mean DAS and RSQ subscale scores based on sex.

	Sex	Female	Man	p
		ort±ss med (min-max)	ort±ss med (min-max)	
<b>DYSFUNCTIONAL ATTITUDES</b>	<b>Performance evaluation</b>	2.93 ± 0.90 2.92 (1-5.22)	2.63 ± 0.83 2.50 (1.22-5.78)	<0.001
	<b>Need for approval</b>	3.77 ± 1.02 3.82 (1-6.82)	3.56 ± 0.87 3.45 (1.64-5.91)	0.030
	<b>Autonomy</b>	5.02 ± 1.14 5.17 (1.33-7.00)	5.02 ± 1.02 5.17 (2.33-7.00)	0.621
	<b>Tentativeness</b>	3.93 ± 1.02 4.00 (1.00-6.40)	3.73 ± 0.94 3.80 (1.20-6.20)	0.015
<b>ATTACHMENT STYLE</b>	<b>Sekure</b>	4.59 ± 0.91 4.6 (3-7)	4.12 ± 0.88 4 (2-6.40)	<0.001
	<b>Preoccupied</b>	3.98 ± 1.08 4.0 (1.5-6.5)	3.72 ± 1.02 3.75 (1-7)	0.011
	<b>Fearful</b>	3.96 ± 1.07 4.0 (1.5-5.75)	4.21 ± 1.24 4.25 (1-7)	0.025
	<b>Dismissing</b>	4.47 ± 0.89 4.4 (2-6.40)	4.65 ± 1.02 4.60 (1.2-7)	0.035

#Mann Whitney U test

**Table 5.** Distribution of participants' mean DAS and RSQ subscale scores based on their parents' marital status.

	Parents Togetherness	Living together	Divorced / Living separately	p
		ort±ss med (min-max)	ort±ss med (min-max)	
<b>DYSFUNCTIONAL ATTITUDES</b>	<b>Performance evaluation</b>	2.71 ± 0.87 2.61 (1-5.78)	2.73 ± 0.87 2.72 (1.39-5)	0.874
	<b>Need for approval</b>	3.33 ± 0.88 3.36 (1.55-5.45)	3.65 ± 0.93 3.54 (1-6.82)	0.041
	<b>Autonomy</b>	5.04 ± 1.07 5.17 (1.33-7)	4.88 ± 0.90 5.0 (2.5-6.17)	0.284
	<b>Tentativeness</b>	3.39 ± 0.87 3.20 (2.2-5)	3.82 ± 0.97 3.80 (1-6.4)	0.002



<b>ATTACHMENT STYLE</b>	<b>Sekure</b>	4.26 ± 0.91 4.2 (2-7)	4.15 ± 0.92 4.2 (2.6-6)	0.326
	<b>Preoccupied</b>	3.79 ± 1.05 3.75 (1-7)	3.67 ± 0.99 3.25 (1.75-5.75)	0.439
	<b>Fearful</b>	4.14 ± 1.23 4.0 (1-7)	4.29 ± 0.93 4.5 (2.5-6)	0.474
	<b>Dismissing</b>	4.59 ± 0.97 4.6 (1.2-7)	4.75 ± 1.08 5.0 (2.2-6.8)	0.243

#Mann Whitney U test