

THE ROLE OF ATTACHMENT DIMENSIONS, RELATIONSHIP STATUS, AND
GENDER IN THE COMPONENTS OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

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

BY

ZEYNEP ZELAL KANKOTAN

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

FEBRUARY 2008

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. Esin Tezer
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir	(METU, EDS)	-----
Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer	(METU, EDS)	-----
Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz	(METU, FLE)	-----

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 : Zeynep Zelal Kankotan,

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF ATTACHMENT DIMENSIONS, RELATIONSHIP STATUS, AND GENDER IN THE COMPONENTS OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Kankotan, Zeynep Zelal

M.S., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

February 2008, 83 pages

The present study investigated the role of attachment dimensions, relationship status, and gender in subjective well-being. The participants were 389 (288 females, 101 males) volunteered students from the Faculty of Education at Middle East Technical University. Three questionnaires, namely Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI) Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), and Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) were administered to the students. Three separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the predictive power of the avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, gender (coded as dummy variable), and relationship status (coded as dummy variable) on three components of subjective well-being identified as positive affect, negative affect, and satisfaction with life. Findings revealed that avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment predicted the life satisfaction of university student as measured by Satisfaction with Life Scale. Results also yielded that avoidance dimension of attachment predicted positive affect scores of the students whereas anxiety dimension of attachment predicted negative affect scores of the students as measured by Positive Affect and Negative Affect subscales of Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS).

Keywords: Avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, positive affect, negative affect, life satisfaction.

ÖZ

BAĞLANMA BOYUTLARI, İLİŞKİ DURUMU VE CİNSİYETİN ÖZNEL İYİ OLUŞUN BOYUTLARI ÜZERİNDEKİ ROLÜ

Kankotan, Zeynep Zelal

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Esin Tezer

Şubat 2008, 83 sayfa

Bu araştırmada, bağlanma boyutları, ilişki durumu ve cinsiyetin öznel iyi oluşun olumlu duygu, olumsuz duygu ve yaşam doyumu boyutları üzerindeki rolü incelenmiştir. Araştırmaya Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nden araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan 389 (288 kadın, 101 erkek) öğrenci katılmıştır. Öğrencilere Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri, Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği ve Pozitif ve Negatif Duygu Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın bağımsız değişkenleri olan bağlanmanın kaygı boyutu, bağlanmanın kaçınma boyutu, cinsiyet (dummy değişken) ve ilişki durumunun (dummy değişken) öznel iyi oluş halinin boyutları olarak tanımlanan yaşam doyumu, pozitif duygu ve negatif duyguyu yordama gücünü incelemek için üç farklı adımsal çoklu lineer regrasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, bağlanmanın kaygı ve kaçınma boyutları ile cinsiyetin yaşam doyumunu yordadığını göstermiştir. Sonuçlar, ayrıca, bağlanmanın kaçınma boyutunun pozitif duyguyu; bağlanmanın kaygı boyutunun ise negatif duyguyu yordadığını ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bağlanmanın kaçınma boyutu, bağlanmanın kaygı boyutu, pozitif duygu, negatif duygu, yaşam doyumu.

To Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer
To Burcu Dayiođlu and Tuđba Erol
and
To Huseyin Can Morođlu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all members of Department of Educational Sciences at Middle East Technical University. Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gül Aydın, Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir, Assist. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Hatipoğlu Sümer, Assist. Prof. Dr. Yeşim Çapa Aydın, Assist. Prof. Dr. Hanife Akar along with administration, remaining academic staff, research assistants and other personnel contributed to my educational experience. Each has been a source of personal development and professional support. It has been a pleasure working with them.

I would especially thank Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer. She was always with me throughout every step of this study, providing me with insight, challenge, support, and guidance. Without her support it would be difficult for me to move forward when I felt stuck in various aspects of my life. It is an honor for me to know her.

I would also like to express my special thanks to examining committee member Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz for her helpful feedbacks, contributions, and comments.

I thank my committee member Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir. He has always expressed such an interest in my education that gave me confidence to accomplish such a demanding work.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gül Aydın (1946-2007). Not only her actual existence but also her picture looking at me through my books has given meaning to my work.

I also thank Hüseyin Can Moroğlu. It was his love that gave me such a beautiful sense of security and power to face challenges in life including those associated with present work. His importance in my life is unexplainable.

I would like to thank and acknowledge the efforts of Tuğba Erol, Burcu Dayıoğlu,

Talat Demirsöz, Mehmet Akif Güzel, Bahar Öz, Ceyda Öztekin and Ayça Özen. They provided significant assistance to present study. I also thank them for being so genuine and supportive. I will always feel their warmth when I think them.

I am grateful to my friends Nergiz Bozok, Feraye Gül Yavru, Cansu Dinler, Tuçe Aras and Erhan Öztürk along with the other members of grup_da_buyukmus who are the constant source of love and who have also been by my side throughout the process.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my mother, Nezihe Bahar; my father and his wife, Mehmet Ali Kankotan and Hülya Kankotan, my brother, Ekim İnan Kankotan, my grandmothers, Rukiye Kankotan and Nuriye Bahar (1923-2008). I appreciate their contribution to my existence.

I am grateful to all of the individuals who participated and gave their time to complete questionnaires.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LISTOFTABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study.....	5
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5 Definitions of Terms.....	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
2.1 The Conceptualization of Subjective Well-Being.....	10
2.2 Research on Subjective Well-Being.....	13
2.3 The Conceptualization of Attachment.....	15
2.4 Research on Attachment.....	17
2.5 Research on Relationship between Attachment and Subjective Well-Being.....	22
2.6 Research on Subjective Well-Being and Attachment in Turkey.....	25
III. METHOD.....	27
3.1 Participants.....	27
3.2. Data Collection Instruments.....	28
3.2.1 Demographic Questionnaire	28
3.2.2 Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI)	28

3.2.2.1	Factor Analysis of ECRI for the Present Study	29
3.2.2.2	Reliability of ECRI for the Present Study.....	30
3.2.3	Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)	31
3.2.3.1	Factor Analysis of PANAS for the Present Study.....	31
3.2.3.2	Reliability of PANAS for the Present Study.....	33
3.2.4	Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)	33
3.2.4.1	Factor Analysis of SWLS for the Present Study.....	33
3.2.4.2	Reliability of SWLS for the Present Study.....	34
3.3	Data Collection Procedure.....	34
3.4	Data Analysis.....	35
3.5	Limitations.....	35
IV.	RESULTS.....	36
4.1	Preliminary Analyses	36
4.2	Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables	37
4.3	Correlation Matrix of the Study Variables	38
4.4	Results of Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analyses	40
4.4.1	Results Concerning the Predictors of Life Satisfaction	41
4.4.2	Results Concerning the Predictors of Positive Affect.....	43
4.4.3	Results Concerning the Predictors of Negative Affect.....	43
V.	DISCUSSION.....	46
5.1	Discussion of the Results	46
5.1.1	Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Life Satisfaction	46
5.1.2	Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Positive Affect.....	49
5.1.3	Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Negative Affect.....	51
5.2	Implications of the Findings and Recommendations for Further Research.....	53
	REFERENCES.....	56
	APPENDICES.....	65
A.	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET.....	65
B.	EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS INVENTORY (in Turkish).....	66

C. POSITIVE AFFECT AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE (in Turkish).....	69
D. SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE (in Turkish).....	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Item Loadings and Communalities of ECRI	30
Table 3.2 Item Loadings and Communalities of PANAS	32
Table 3.3 Item Loadings and Communalities of SWLS.....	34
Table 4.1 Mean and Standard Deviation of the Variables by Gender and Relationship Status.....	37
Table 4.2 Correlations among Independent (gender, relationship status, anxiety dimension of adult attachment and avoidance dimension of adult attachment) and Dependent Variables (satisfaction with life, positive affect and negative affect scores) in the Total Sample.....	38
Table 4.3 Correlations among Variables for Males (Lower Triangle) and Females (Upper Triangle)	39
Table 4.4 Correlations among Variables for Those Who Have a Romantic Relationship (lower triangle) and for Those Who Have No Relationship (upper triangle)	40
Table 4.5 R and R Square Change Predicting the Life Satisfaction Scores	42
Table 4.6 R and R Square Change Predicting the Positive Affect Scores	43
Table 4.7 R and R Square Change Predicting the Negative Affect Scores	44

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Theoretical and research interest in positive psychology has grown increasingly over the last decades (Myers & Diener, 1995; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). With this new positive view of human beings, the interest has been shifted from studying human's weaknesses to capabilities and potentials of individuals. Based on this positive view, several concepts have been proposed referring to the potentials of the human beings such as happiness, hope, optimism, responsibility, and self-determination (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Besides these concepts, some broader and more comprehensive constructs, wellness and well-being, have been presented which refer to optimal experience and functioning, and quality of life (Diener, 1984; Myers & Diener, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Although wellness and well-being have been used interchangeably, they differ in the sense that wellness was defined as the individuals' functioning as a whole –physically, psychologically, socially- and explains a life style and standard providing satisfaction in life (Myers, 1999) whereas well-being has been specifically used as a general mental health term, indicating life satisfaction, positive mental health, and happiness (Diener, 1984; Keyes, Shmothkin, & Ryff, 2002; Ryff & Singer, 1998; Myers & Diener, 1995).

Well-being literature pointed out that there are two fundamental approaches to the study of well-being (see Ryan & Deci, 2001 for a review). One of these approaches has been conceptualized as psychological well-being. Eudemonism has been considered as the philosophical groundwork of psychological well-being and proposes that actualization of human potentials and experiencing a meaningful life are the core aspects of well-being. Ryff and Singer (1998) proposed six domains of

psychological well-being: autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relationships with others, personal growth, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. In the literature (Rothman, Kirsten, & Wissing, 2003), there are some other definitions regarding the nature of psychological well-being, such as good physical health or not experiencing severe symptoms of psychopathology, but an interest in the world, a general attitude of optimism and sense of coherence as well as affect balance and life satisfaction.

Subjective well-being is the second approach in the conceptualization of well-being. Hedonism has been considered as the philosophical groundwork of subjective well-being and views well-being as consisting of pleasure or happiness (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999). Kahneman et al. (1999), defined hedonic psychology as the study of “what makes experiences and life pleasant and unpleasant” (p. ix) in their book titled *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*, in which the terms subjective well-being and hedonism are used interchangeably.

In the literature, another distinction was made between psychological and subjective well-being in such a way that psychological well-being takes experts’ definitions of well-being into consideration while subjective well-being perspective argues the importance of people’s own reactions and appreciations while evaluating their own well-being (Diener, Sapyta, & Suh, 1998; Ryff & Singer, 1998). Diener and his colleagues (1998) consider subjective well-being as essential for positive well-being and argue that the researchers should turn to people’s own reactions in evaluating their well-being as well as turning to psychologists, counselors or other experts in defining well-being. They further argue that although positive psychological well-being refers to one’s purpose in life, positive relations with others, high self-acceptance and mastery; one may imagine a person who has mastery and high self-regard but still is not happy. Therefore, values that lead to well-being or happiness can change from person to person and it is better to ask people to evaluate their own well-being rather than dictating an expert definition of well-being. Researchers (Diener et al., 1998) further concluded that a conception of well-being without

subjective well-being seems to be inadequate. Thus, based on the belief that each individual tries to search for the ways of being happy, the interest in assessing the subjective well-being and exploring the correlates of it have increased in order to reach a more comprehensive theory of well-being and positive mental health.

Assessment of subjective well-being was an attempt to appraise the pleasure/pain continuum within the new hedonic psychology perspective (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Based on this perspective, Myers and Diener (1995) identified three domains of subjective well-being: life satisfaction, positive affect, and the negative affect. High subjective well-being is defined by frequent positive affect, infrequent negative affect, and a global sense of satisfaction with life. Other researchers (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999) added some specific components of life satisfaction, namely satisfaction with family, work, and self as the fourth component of subjective well-being and proposed that subjective well-being is composed of cognitive dimensions including general life satisfaction and domain-specific life satisfaction as well as affective dimensions referring to positive affect and negative affect. Thus, based on all these theoretical arguments, in the present study, cognitive and affective dimensions of subjective well-being are separately assessed in terms of general life satisfaction, positive and negative affect in order to understand the contributions of each component to subjective well-being.

Research regarding the correlates of subjective well-being generally indicated that a large number of college students around the world considered affective components of subjective well-being and life satisfaction as very important (Diener, et al., 1999). Exploring that demographic variables such as income explain only a small variance in happiness, researcher focused more on psychological correlates of subjective well-being (Diener, 1984; Diener, et al., 1999). Among these psychological variables, social relationship was found to be much more strongly linked to satisfaction than objective measures like income (Argyle & Martin, 1991) and relatedness was among the major factors which influence happiness (Myers, 1999; Myers & Diener, 1995). Similarly, as personality characteristics, relationship-

enhancing traits were found the most strongly related variables with subjective well-being among other traits (DeNeve, 1999). Considering that the topic of relationships is a complex one, studies concentrated on some specific aspects of relationships that contribute to subjective well-being. Among the relationship variables, attachment, as an aspect of close relationships, has been reported as the one which might be especially relevant to subjective well-being (Myers, 1999) or enjoyment of life (Bowlby, 1969). However less is known about the relationship between attachment in close relationships and the experience of subjective well-being.

Bowlby (1969) conceptualized “attachment” as an emotional bond which is experienced with another individual who is perceived as a security source and who gives a secure basis for exploration of environment. Internal cognitive-affective working models, which are mental representations of self, others, and relationships constructed originally from child-parent interactions, are supposed to give shape to child’s attachment behavior and exert long-term influences on an individual’s subsequent relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Thus, adult romantic relationships are asserted to be the extensions of infant-caregiver attachment. Depending on perceived trustworthiness and availability of others and perceived worthiness of self, different attachment categories are defined, namely secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Underlying these categories or styles, two dimensions were identified: Anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). Researchers (Brennan, et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006) have recently argued that anxiety and avoidance experienced in close relationships are two fundamental dimensions of attachment and that attachment is better defined with dimensions than with categories/styles. Accordingly, avoidance dimension refers to the extent to which individuals desire limited intimacy and prefer to remain psychologically and emotionally independent whereas anxiety dimension is defined as the extent to which individuals worry that relationship partners may not be available or could abandon them.

Although limited in number, studies that concentrated on the relationship between

attachment categories and subjective well-being indicated that securely attached individuals displayed less negative affect and more positive affect (Simpson, 1990) and that attachment dimensions were related to daily subjective experiences of emotion (Torquati & Raffaelli, 2004). Another study (La Guardia, Ryan, Couchman, & Deci, 2000) also provided some direct evidence regarding the relationship between attachment and subjective well-being, indicating the association between greater security in people's general attachment and greater well-being. Overall, the findings of these studies seem to suggest the relationship between attachment and affective dimensions of subjective well-being.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

In the light of all these theoretical arguments and empirical findings, in the present study, the relationships of anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment, and three components of subjective well-being, namely life satisfaction, positive and negative affects were explored among university students. It was expected that anxiety and avoidance dimensions are differently associated with each of the components of subjective well-being, i.e., anxiety dimension might be positively correlated with negative affect, negatively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction whereas avoidance dimension might be negatively correlated with negative affect, positive affect and life satisfaction. More specifically, in the present study, the predictive power of attachment dimensions in subjective well-being components of negative affect, positive affect and life satisfaction were examined. Gender and the relationship status, defined as those who are experiencing or not experiencing romantic relationship at the present, were also controlled based on the suggestions of both attachment and subjective well-being literature (Ayyash-Abdo & Alamuddin, 2007; Cenkseven; 2004; Köker, 1991; Özkan, Ceyhan, İlhan, Aksakal, & Aygün, 2004; Webster, 1998).

1.3. Research Questions

More specifically, the research questions of the study are formulated as follow:

1. To what extent life satisfaction as measured by Satisfaction with Life Scale is predicted by gender, relationship status, and anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment?
2. To what extent Positive Affect as measured by Positive and Negative Affect Schedule is predicted by gender, relationship status, and anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment?
3. To what extent Negative Affect as measured by Positive and Negative Affect Schedule is predicted by gender, relationship status, and anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment?

1.4. Significance of the Study

The present study aims at investigating the role of attachment dimensions in different components of well-being among male and female university students with different relationship status. The importance of the present study is two fold: Research and counseling practices.

Although there are several studies separately investigating attachment styles and subjective well-being, as stated very recently, the relationship between attachment and subjective well-being has not been sufficiently investigated (Quimby & O'Brien, 2006). Besides, the research on attachment generally concentrated on attachment categories rather than dimensions. As it was previously mentioned, researchers (Brennan et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006) recently emphasized that attachment is better defined with dimensions than with categories. On the other hand, research on subjective well-being generally used the concepts of either happiness or life satisfaction as the measures of subjective well-being. Therefore, the present study is

of importance in studying all the dimensions of both attachment and subjective well-being together.

There is cross-cultural evidence regarding the importance of happiness in the life of university students (Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998) and some Eastern researchers drew attention to cultural variations in predictors of happiness (Uchida, Norasakkunkit, & Kitayama, 2004). It is pointed out that, in East Asian cultural contexts, happiness tends to be more associated with interpersonal connectedness (Uchida et al., 2004). Uchida et al. (2004) suggested that care and support provided by close others and approvals of close others are likely to be associated with happiness of people from collectivistic cultures. Keeping Uchida et al's (2004) argument in mind, it could be a fruitful way to start with understanding the relationship between attachment and subjective well-being in Turkish culture. However, subjective well-being has just been recently started to be investigated in Turkey (Cenkseven, 2004; Kuzucu; 2006; Özen, 2005; Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). Thereby, the present study aims at contributing to the Turkish literature by making up the deficiency with respect to the investigation of different components of subjective well-being.

The study is of importance in terms of practices in counseling. Several preventive steps might be taken. For example, parents can be informed about the importance of the role of attachment in the life of their children and child rearing practices. This might be supported by focusing on the role of attachment in future relationships, emotions, and life satisfaction. Adolescents might be informed regarding the role of attachment in their romantic relationships and subjective well-being. Considering the role of attachment in individuals' romantic relationships and happiness, adolescents can be helped to be aware of whether they experience anxiety or avoidance dimensions of attachment. Although the degree of stability of attachment orientation over time is open to debate (Zhang & Labouvie-Vief, 2004), some researchers (Pickover, 2002; Shorey and Snyder, 2006) stated the possibility of intentionally changing the attachment styles through related interventions since

attachment styles are cognitively accessible. Counselors might use attachment style and underlying dimensions as a means to increase subjective well-being. By utilizing these examples and by developing a deep understanding regarding individuals' desires to fulfill attachment needs, psychological counselors might contribute to subjective well-being.

1.5. Definitions of Terms

Anxiety Dimension of Attachment: Refers to attachment anxiety with respect to being abandoned and rejected (Brennan et al., 1998). The variable is measured by Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI).

Avoidance Dimension of Attachment: Refers to discomfort with respect to being close to and dependent on others (Brennan et al., 1998).

Subjective Well-Being: Refers to the variable consisting of positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction domains (Diener, 1984). It is measured by Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) and Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Positive Affect: Refers to the degree to which individuals experience enthusiasm, alertness and pleasurable engagement with the environment (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). It is one of the two affective domains of subjective well-being and is measured by ten adjectives of PANAS.

Negative Affect: Refers to the degree to which individuals experience aversive mood states and subjective distress (Watson et al., 1988). It is one of the two affective domains of subjective well-being and is measured by the remaining ten adjectives of PANAS.

Satisfaction with Life: Refers to the extent to which individuals are satisfied with life in general (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). It is the cognitive domain

of subjective well-being and is measured by Satisfaction with Life Scale.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents the literature related with subjective well-being and attachment. The first section is devoted to the presentation of conceptualization of subjective well-being. The second section includes research on subjective well-being. The third section presents the conceptualization of attachment. The fourth section includes research on attachment. The fourth section reviews the association between subjective well-being and attachment. Finally, in the fifth section, Turkish literature on subjective well-being and attachment are presented.

2.1. The Conceptualization of Subjective Well-Being

Well-being is a psychological framework offering insight into the concept of happiness and the development of one's full potentials (Vaillant, 2002 as cited in Carruthers, Hood, Parr, 2005). As it was mentioned in the Introduction Chapter, there are two main approaches to the study of well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The first approach is psychological well-being and this perspective ties well-being to personal growth and one's ability to actualize his/her potentials (Ryff & Singer, 1998). Experiencing psychological well-being is associated with having a sense of autonomy, competence, self-acceptance, belongingness and purpose. The second approach is hedonic or subjective well-being. This approach ties well-being to life satisfaction, presence of positive mood, and relative absence of negative affect.

Hedonism, as being the philosophical groundwork of subjective well-being, is a doctrine which holds that maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain is the basic motivation of human existence (Watson 1895 as cited in Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005). According to Arristupus (435-366 BCE), who was a student of Socrates, achieving pleasure and immediate sensory gratification is the only intention of human beings. Today, the philosophy of hedonism has been examined

scientifically in the field of hedonic psychology (Kahneman, et al., 1999).

In hedonic psychology, the concept of hedonism has been operationally defined as subjective well-being which is now over 30 years old (Andrews & Withey, 1976 as cited in Cummins, 2005; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976 as cited in Cummins, 2005). The publications of Bradburn (1969), Andrews and Withey (1976) and Campbell et al. (1976) are frequently cited references of the study of subjective well-being. Before the 1970s, well-being was assessed in objective terms such as wealth or health. Economists asserted that money was essential for happiness (Wilson 1972, as cited in Cummins, 2005). However, the perspectives concerning the predictors of well-being, happiness and quality of life were modified by the results of studies focusing on subjective definitions of well-being rather than objective determinants, making the research outcomes inconsistent with that of economists.

The term “subjective well-being (SWB)” refers to people’s cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives (Diener, 1984; Myers & Diener, 1995). Thus, this multidimensional concept includes a cognitive aspect (contentment) and an affective aspect (hedonic level) implying how well a person likes the life he/she leads (Diener et al., 1999; Venhoven, 1991). SWB deals with the scientific research of what common sense might define as happiness or satisfaction (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003). Major components of subjective well-being have been proposed as including three components, namely life satisfaction, presence of frequent positive affect and relative infrequency of negative affect (Andrews & Withey, 1976 as cited in Diener, 1984; Myers & Diener, 1995). In a more recent study, researchers (Arthaud-Day, Rode, Mooney, & Near, 2005), by using structural equation modeling, found empirical support for this argument, indicating that subjective well-being consists of three domains which are life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect.

Life satisfaction is defined as “*a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his chosen criteria*” (Shin & Johnson, 1978, p. 478, as cited in Diener, 1984). Comparison of actual circumstances with ideal standards constitutes a basis

of judgments of satisfaction and each individual sets different standards for satisfaction. Thus, not the externally imposed standards of satisfaction but rather internal judgments regarding satisfaction level are taken for granted (Diener, 1984).

The term *affect* is made up of moods and emotions (Cropanzano, Weiss, Hale, & Reb, 2003; Diener et al., 1999). Negative affect captures emotional continuum from aversive mood states and subjective distress to calmness and relaxation while positive affect captures emotions from enthusiasm and pleasurable engagement with environment to lack of vitality (Watson et al., 1988). It is indicated that in a given period of time one may experience both positive and negative emotions and information about one of these can not inform us about the extent to which the person experiences the other (Bradburn, 1969). As it was mentioned by the researchers (Watson et al., 1988), positive and negative affects are not negatively correlated, meaning that they are not bipolar but they are uncorrelated or independent, that is, they are orthogonal dimensions. It was found that there is a weak correlation between positive and negative emotions (Bradburn, 1969). Stating differently, knowing the global amount of good feeling a person experiences over time does not give information related to the global amount of bad feeling the same person experiences (Myers & Diener, 1995).

With all these three components, the construct of SWB has been discussed from different perspectives by most of the researchers. Writings of Ryff and Singer (1998), who associated well-being with personal growth and self-actualization tendencies, reflect the idea that perceiving “pleasure” as a central value and goal of life is associated with selfishness, living only for personal satisfaction, and focusing on self-centered passions. Indeed, SWB is confused with physical hedonism (Diener, et al, 1998). However, SWB is not solely associated with entertainment. Researchers found that causes of SWB reflect the values of people (Oishi, Diener, & Suh, 1997, as cited in Diener et al., 1998). Thus, achieving personal values and goals result in high levels of SWB. Anti-hedonists have argued that enjoyment of life would results in irresponsible optimism, individualism, egotism and these

consequences would negatively affect moral consciousness and social bonds. However, better personal relations, better health and active involvement were found to be the predictors of happiness by humanist psychologists (Veenhoven, 1991).

2.2. Research on Subjective Well-Being

Specific features, processes and resources that underlie happiness are investigated in the field of subjective well-being. By 2005, more than 4000 studies are listed under life satisfaction and approximately 4000 studies are listed for happiness in PsychInfo (Kim-Prieto, Diener, Tamir, Scollon, & Diener, 2005). Researchers (Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996) mentioned that the components of SWB have moderate correlations and these reflect some degree of independence. Therefore, several studies have been conducted to examine the components of SWB individually (Diener, et al., 1999; Diener et al., 2003).

A large scope study was conducted in various countries, including Turkey, aiming at understanding viewpoints related to happiness among college students (Suh et al., 1998). Results indicated that happiness was rated as to be the most important value by %69 of the sample while only %6 rated money as more important than happiness. Moreover, life satisfaction was rated as the most important value by %62 of the respondents (Suh et al., 1998).

Regarding the role of demographic variables in SWB, it was found that external demographic factors such as income and health have small effects on SWB (Schwarz & Strack, 1991) and that SWB is moderately stable across lifespan (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Research findings suggested that temperament is one of the main predictors of SWB, while demographic factors such as age, income, education, marital status and external factors such as life events, work, and leisure time activities accounted for a distinctly smaller amount of variance in SWB (Ayyash-Abdo & Alamuddin, 2007; Diener, 1984; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Eddington & Shuman, 2005). Diener (1984) reported that approximately 15 percent of the

variance in subjective well-being is accounted for by demographic factors. Argyle (1999) reported that although demographic factors and environmental factors affect happiness, the effects are mostly small.

In terms of the relationship between personality characteristics and well-being, it was found that SWB depends primarily on personality and even after 20 years, personality has a power to predict SWB (Costa & McCrea, 1980). Investigating in various countries, Diener and Diener (1995) reported that self-esteem is more strongly correlated with subjective well-being in individualistic, European-American cultural contexts than in collectivistic, East Asian cultural contexts. Headey and Wearing (1989) concluded that although life events make people more happy or unhappy, in time people turn back to their base line levels of positive and negative affect which is constituted by personality. Lykken and Tellegen (1996) found that personality explained 50 and 80 % of the variance in immediate and long-term SWB respectively (as cited in Diener & Lucas, 1999). Eddington and Shuman (2005) concluded that personality shapes our reactions and not the events themselves but the personal reactions to events are important for well-being. Indeed, research findings introduced above provides a strong ground for such an assertion.

In addition, apart from personality, close relationships, which are components of social relationships, are listed among variables giving valuable clues to well-being (Myers & Diener, 1995). Researchers showed that parental intrinsic support, which is defined as child's perceptions that the parent loves and cares about him/her, predicted the life satisfaction of their adolescent offspring (Young, Miller, Norton, & Hill, 1995). On the other hand, in marriage literature, it has long been recognized that married people are happier than couples and couples are happier than single people, although the benefits of marriage depend on the quality of the relationship (Argyle, 1987). The researcher concluded that social relationships are among major sources of happiness and relief from distress. Furthermore, he suggested that one of the hallmarks giving way to high-quality-relationships is social support which is defined as the amount of affection, intimacy, acting as confidant, and providing

reassurance of self-worth. With the increased interest in attachment and its role in close relationships, Headey and Wearing (1991) presented a panel study which, with many other findings, reflected the positive relationship between availability of intimate attachments and SWB. In a more recent study (Ayyash-Abdo, & Alamuddin, 2007), it was found that the satisfaction with the interaction of friends was not a significant predictor of subjective well-being whereas satisfaction with dating relationship was a significant predictor of SWB among young people. It might be asserted that the results of all these studies are of importance as they show how perceptions formed in close relationships are crucial for life satisfaction.

Considering the relationship between gender and SWB, it was found that men had higher positive affect than women among college youths (Ayyash-Abdo, & Alamuddin, 2007). Studies also showed that females tend to report lower levels of emotional well-being and subjective well-being (Diener, 1984 for a review; Koo, Rie, & Park, 2004,). Conversely, another study revealed no gender differences in terms of SWB (Suhail & Chaudhry, 2004).

2.3. The Conceptualization of Attachment

Attachment theory might be regarded as one of the fundamental theories reflecting the “embeddedness-of-self- in social relationships” and taking account of nature-nurture interactions. Thus, the theory was introduced to be a model for social and personality development (Bowlby, 1969/1982, 1973). Bowlby proposed that the ties of infants to mother develop as a result of a biologically based desire for proximity and this desire arises from the process of natural selection. A set of built-in-behaviors increases the chance of survival for infant baby by ensuring the proximity to principal attachment figure, which is generally mother as the primary caregiver. These “attachment behaviors” that are directed towards caregiver, give rise to the formation of “attachment bond” which is the affectional bond that infant has to primary caregiver. It was proposed that the affectional bond between child and caregiver has a survival value.

Attachment bond is described as to (1) be a characteristic of individual rather than a bond formed between two people as it is reflected in mental representations, (2) be persistent, (3) involve an attachment figure who is the person that can not be interchanged with anyone else, (4) involve an emotionally significant relationship, (5) consist of a desire to maintain proximity, (6) reflect an urge to experience security and comfort in the relationship and (7) give rise to distress in case of separation from the attachment figure (Ainsworth, 1989).

Quality of the attachment figure's social interactions with the infant is attached special importance to in terms of its contributions to the development of enduring cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dispositions. More specifically, caregiver's emotional availability and responsiveness to child's needs reflects the quality of the stated relationship. As a consequence of continued interactions and based on the joint history with principal attachment figure, a child develops internal working models. The term internal working models refers to mental representations, or a cognitive map, reflecting beliefs and expectations about whether the attachment partner is someone who is caring and responsive and whether the self is worthy of care and attention. Internal working models are acknowledged by many researchers as guiding perceptions, interpretations, expectations, and emotions concerning the self and other's attitudes and behavior in close relationships throughout one's life. (Bretherton & Munholland, 1999; Collins & Read, 1990; Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003).

An internal model of self as worthy of love and a model of others as trustworthy and predictable develop if caregivers were consistently available, sensitive and responsive to infant's needs (Bowlby, 1969/1982). Infants and children need to experience a sense of security in relationships with their primary caregivers in order to be able to explore unfamiliar situations. As such confidence in self and trust in others for providing help develop, the child experiences a sense of security in the relationship and uses this security as a base to explore new, unfamiliar situations. Conversely, in case of parental rejection, insensitivity to child's needs and

unreliability, the infant develops an internal model of self as unworthy and a model of others as untrustworthy. As a result of lack of confidence in self and lack of trust in others the child does not feel secure enough to explore unfamiliar situations. Thus, while sensitive caring gives rise to secure attachment while insensitive caring generates insecure attachment.

2.4. Research on Attachment

Ainsworth and her colleagues (1978, as cited in Bretherton & Munholland, 1999) performed naturalistic home observations of parent-infant relationships and additionally, they used a laboratory procedure called “Strange Situation”, which includes observations of infant, caregiver, and their interactions in various situations and accordingly they identified three attachment styles. The children who were classified as having secure attachment style had sensitively responsive mother and they calmed down in response to reunion with their mother. The children who were classified as having avoidant attachment style had caregivers who were insensitive to child’s cry, displayed limited number of bodily contact and affectional holding. These children did not display any significant attachment behavior in response to reunion with their mother. Indeed they appeared as if ignoring their mother. Behavior of these children is interpreted as self-protected adaptation in response to very likely/inevitable/continual maternal rejection. Children who were classified as having anxious/ambivalent had caregivers who displayed inconsistent sensitivity to their child’s needs. Although they wanted to be picked up, these infants failed to experience relief in response to reunion with their mother (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978 as cited in Bretherton & Munholland, 1999).

Through internal working models child’s relationships with primary caregivers are integrated into personality structure (Bowlby, 1969/1982). These models of self and significant others serve to regulate individual’s thoughts, feelings and behaviors not only during infancy but also during subsequent relationships such as relationships with parents, peers and romantic partners throughout life. In other words, new

figures for proximity are chosen later in life. Mental models and related behaviors are fundamental components of personality (Hazan and Shaver, 1987).

Attachment is also considered to be functional during adolescence and adulthood. Ainsworth, (1989) stated that similar to the attachment process in infancy, individuals continue to look for security and support in romantic relationships. It is mentioned that features of attachment relations are also observed in marital and committed nonmarital relationships (Weiss, 1982, 1986, 1991 as cited in Feeney, 1999). The person resists separation and tries to maintain proximity to the partner, protests the unavailability of the partner, uses partner as a source of security and comfort, explores the environment as long as the person experiences a secure relation, and turns back to partner for relief in case of a stress (Weiss, 1982, 1986, 1991 as cited in Feeney, 1999).

Hazan and Shaver (1987) conceptualized romantic love as an attachment process. Results of their study pointed out that the frequencies of attachment styles among adults were similar to the ones experienced in infancy. 56% of the adult respondents were classified as secure, 25% were classified as avoidant and 19% were classified as anxious. The research indicated that secure, avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent respondents reported distinct kind of love relationship experiences. Love experiences of secure individuals were characterized by *trust*, *support*, positive emotions, and friendship. While the experiences of lovers with avoidant attachment style were characterized by *fear of intimacy*, the experiences of anxious/ ambivalent respondents were characterized by obsessions, preoccupation with the partner with a desire for reciprocation. It was interpreted that, among two insecure groups, avoidant individuals try to hide their feelings of insecurity by detachment from others while, anxious/ambivalent group did not repress the feelings of insecurity, but rather, they displayed unfulfilled attachment needs by preoccupation with the partner. Moreover, the study showed that the three groups were distinct in terms of internal working models. Secure respondents gave credit to trustworthiness of others and found themselves likeable. Avoidant individuals reported doubt in terms of

existence of a real love and they rejected the necessity of romantic love to be happy and they believed that it is hard to find a person whom they can love. Anxious/ambivalent respondents reported experiencing difficulty in finding true love. However, they fall in love frequently. Lastly, it is indicated that the best predictor of adult attachment styles are the respondents' relationships with their parents. Secure individuals reported warm relationships with their parents. Avoidant individuals defined their mother as rejecting and cold. Anxious/avoidant individuals defined their father as unfair. Still, Hazan and Shaver used forced choice self-report measures; the measures were brief and simple and this limitation in the area of attachment was overcome by later studies (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan et al., 1998).

Consequently, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) defined a four-category model of adult attachment styles by using intersections of two underlying dimensions: the positivity/negativity of models of the self and others. Bowlby's two internal working models which are beliefs related to self and others are used as principal dimensions in the study. Negative self image reflects the belief that one is not worthy of love and support while negative other image reflects the belief that others are rejecting and unreliable. Conversely, positive self image reflects the belief that self is worthy of love and support while positive other view reflects the belief that others are trustworthy and available in case of need. Subjects of their study were university students with a mean of 19.6 ages old. According to their study, secure individuals have positive images of both self and others, preoccupied individuals have a positive view of other and a negative image of self, fearful/avoidant individuals have a negative image of both self and others, and lastly dismissive avoidant individuals have a positive image of self and a negative view of others. Thus, they defined separable patterns of avoidance in adulthood. Their study was the first to use multiple assessment methods including attachment interview, self-reports and friend reports.

Following Bartholomew and Horowitz's studies, Brennan et al. (1998) assessed

underlying dimensions of adult attachment by using 323 items taken from various attachment scales. Factor analysis revealed that “avoidance” and “anxiety” experienced in close relationships were the basic dimensions underlying the self report measures of attachment styles. These dimensions were reported to be parallel to the internal working models of self and others. Anxiety dimension of attachment refers to attachment anxiety concerning rejection and abandonment in close relationships. Avoidance dimension of attachment refers to discomfort with respect to being close to and dependent on others. As a result of factor analysis, Brennan et al. (1998), developed Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory which assesses avoidance and anxiety dimensions of adult attachment. Bartholomew and Horowitz’s four category model of attachment parallels with Brennan et al.’s classification of attachment styles as intersections of anxiety and avoidance dimension of attachment. According to Brennan et al. (1998), people who are low both on avoidance and anxiety dimensions are secure, people who are high both on avoidance and anxiety dimensions are fearful, people who are high on avoidance dimension and low on anxiety dimension are dismissing and people who are high on anxiety dimension and low on avoidance dimension are classified as preoccupied.

Mikulincer and Shaver (2003) proposed that attachment security facilitates the use of security-based strategies of affect regulation, anxiety dimension of attachment facilitates the use of hyperactivating strategies and avoidance dimension of attachment facilitates the use of deactivating strategies (as cited in Mikulincer and Shaver, 2005). Mikulincer and Shaver (2003, as cited in Mikulincer and Shaver, 2005) described secure individuals as the ones unconcerned about security needs as their attachment figure is sensitive and accepting. Thus, securely attached individuals, who are the ones scoring low on anxiety and avoidance dimension of attachment, use *security based strategies* of affect regulation which is the ability to alleviate distress and self-efficacy about dealing with threats.

People high on anxiety dimension of attachment are characterized by overdependence on relationship partners as a source of security, having perceptions of themselves as incompetent at affect regulation. Caregivers of preoccupied

children are described to be inconsistent and unpredictable in terms of their reactions to their children. By trying to catch a chance of experiencing security among these unpredictable responses preoccupied children maximize their attachment behaviors or efforts to maintain proximity, care and support, which in turn, inclines them to be *hypervigilant* to the signs of rejection. These individuals display cognitive efforts to minimize the perceived unavailability of the partner, constant concerns and insistent attempts and to attain proximity, support, and love through clinging actions and these attempts are called hyperactivating strategies (Shaver & Hazan, 1993 as cited in Mikulincer et al., 2003). The strategy stems from appraising, insisting on proximity seeking behaviors and preoccupation with partner as a means of dealing with attachment insecurity. This strategy, in turn, intensifies the negative emotional responses and increases the rumination on threat related concerns.

On the other hand, people scoring high on avoidance dimension of attachment hide or repress their feelings of insecurity by detachment from others (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005 for a review). Avoidant/dismissing children maintain proximity by behaving as if the caregiver was not needed since their caregiver who was already insensitive and rejecting would possibly react with further reactions to attachment behaviors. In turn these children give up and appear to *deactivate* proximity seeking efforts by suppressing the expressions of distress. Being rejected by their primary caregivers, these individuals appraise proximity seeking as a faulty way of dealing with attachment insecurity. Inhibition of support seeking and commitment to handling distress alone are referred to as deactivating strategies. Individuals using this strategy keep attachment system down to avoid pain and frustration associated with unavailability of attachment figure.

It was asserted that attachment orientations are stable across life span (Ainsworth, 1989). Bowlby (1969/1982) proposed attachment styles are trait-like characteristics underlying human beings' thoughts, emotions, and behaviors until they die. Despite trait-like conceptualization of attachment styles, Zhang and Labouvie-Vief, (2004) argued for the existence of a considerable room for change in adult attachment styles.

In a very recent study Shorey and Snyder (2006) presented attachment theory as a model for understanding how the attachment styles formed in infancy affect subsequent psychological functioning across the life span. According to the researchers, as adult attachment orientations dictate how people perceive and respond to their social environments, they are determinants of development of psychopathology and of how clients respond differentially to various treatments. Their study offers insight into the role attachment plays in psychopathology and psychotherapy outcomes. However, this recent study along with other recent studies (Amado, 2005; Rönnlund & Karlsson, 2006; Simonelli, Ray, & Pincus, 2004) also reflects a general research trend to focus on attachment as a determinant of ill-being rather than its role in well-being. Indeed, Bowlby (1969/1982, 1973) emphasized the principal role of attachment in providing a basis not only for abnormal development but also for normal development. According to Ainsworth and Bowlby (1991), understanding attachment across life span contributes to the understanding of well-being. Therefore, the present study was intended to fill an empirical gap in the literature on adult attachment by determining its contributions to subjective well-being.

2.5. Research on Relationship between Attachment and Subjective Well-Being

As it was reported by the researchers (Quimby & O'Brien, 2006), the relationship between attachment and SWB is poorly understood. Indeed, the examination of literature investigating the relationship between attachment and SWB is rather complex in terms of both the dimensions of attachment and the components of SWB. For example, the results of a study indicated that secure and dismissively attached individuals scored higher than preoccupied and fearful respondents on happiness measures (Webster, 1998). College students who had higher scores on worry had lower life satisfaction than the respondent who scored lower on worry (Paolini, Yanez, & Kelly, 2006). Quimby and O'Brien (2006) found that secure attachment predicted life satisfaction among female university students with children. In general, research findings suggested that attachment styles are

differentially related to positive outcomes such as life satisfaction. Studies also indicated that securely attached individuals displayed less emotional distress and negative affect and more positive affect (Simpson, 1990). La Guardia et al. (2000) replicated the previous findings that there is a significant association between overall security of attachment and greater well-being. The results of the same study contributed to the understanding of how attachment orientations are related to well-being by suggesting that the ability to satisfy basic needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness might play an important role in promoting well-being.

According to Ryan and Deci (2001), the role of interpersonal relationships which are characterized by warmth, trust, and support, in wellbeing has been increasingly appreciated within psychology. Indeed, Argyle (1987), Myers (1999, for a review) and Myers and Diener (1995) reported remarkable contributions of close relationships, intimate attachments and relatedness to well-being. However, Ryan and Deci (2001) drew attention to the complexity of close relationships. In that sense, it is recommended to focus on the specific aspects of relationships in terms of their contribution to well-being. Attachment is listed among these specific aspects of relationships as a possible contributor to SWB. The association between attachment and wellbeing was confirmed by Simpson (1990) who reported that insecure late adolescents experience more negative affect in their romantic relationships, while the ones with a secure attachment style experience more positive affect.

Nickerson and Nagle (2004) investigated the influence of parent and peer attachment on life satisfaction in middle childhood and early adolescence. According to the results of the study, both parent and peer attachments predicted life satisfaction. Similarly, among older adolescents and college students, secure attachment to parents is reported to be correlated with life satisfaction (Cottarelli, 1992 as cited in Nickerson and Nagle, 2004). A partial support for these findings comes from Webster (1998). The researcher found a main effect for attachment style on happiness among elderly adults. It was reported that secure and dismissively attached individuals scored significantly higher on wellbeing measures. Still, the

result is interesting since dismissively attached individuals do not have positive expectations related to attachment figures. Webster (1998) provides the readers with two possible explanations: First, a self-schema overemphasizing self reliance could be correlated with happiness. The second explanation is that dismissive individuals could appraise their happiness levels in a biased way and so deny possibilities of negative affect reaching consciousness awareness. It deserves special consideration that Webster's research which was done in 1997 and its replication which was done in 1998 reached the same conclusion that secure and dismissive individuals scored significantly higher on wellbeing measures than preoccupied and fearful groups.

In a study conducted by Kerr, Melley, Travea, and Pole (2003), the relationships of positive and negative affect to adult attachment styles among university students were explored. Results suggested that participants with secure attachment reported the highest levels of positive affect. Participants with an insecure/anxious attachment style reported the highest level of negative affect. Participants with insecure/avoidant attachment style reported the lowest on measures of both positive and negative affect.

Results of another study which was conducted among university students pointed out that both securely attached participants and participants with an avoidant attachment style had lower negative affect scores compared to participants with preoccupied or fearful attachment styles (Wearden, Perryman, & Ward, 2006). However, the positive affect scores of participants did not change as a function of their attachment styles.

Another study explored the daily emotions of young adults with different global attachment styles (Torquati, & Raffaelli, 2004). The results indicated that secure college students reported more positive emotions compared to insecure college students. According to the researchers, the results provided support for the conceptualization of attachment styles as an organizational construct for emotions.

Mikulincer and Sheffi (2000) investigated the moderating effect of attachment style on cognitive reactions to positive affect inductions. The results showed that securely attached persons reacted to positive affect with broader categorization whereas anxious–ambivalent adults reacted to positive affect with constricted categorization, thereby, showing an opposite pattern of cognitive reactions to positive affect. Avoidant persons, on the other hand, showed no difference in terms of cognitive reactions to positive affect inductions. Once again, the results provided empirical support for attachment-related strategies of affect regulation.

In a recent study, it was demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between having intimate relationships and subjective well-being (Lucas & Dyrenforth, 2006, as cited in Perlman, 2007). However, as Perlman (2007) stated, even at the present time, the degree to which having intimate relationships versus the quality of those relationships contribute to SWB is still open to debate.

2.6. Research on Subjective Well-Being and Attachment in Turkey

In Turkey, there are a limited number of studies that directly investigate the concept of subjective well-being and its correlates (Cenkseven, 2004; Kuzucu, 2006, Şimşek, 2005; Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). For example, Cenkseven (2004) found that neuroticism, extraversion, perceived satisfaction of interaction with partners and gender are the significant predictors of subjective well-being among university students. There are some other studies which examined the variables in relation to subjective well-being (Deniz, 2006; Gençöz, 2000; Gündoğar, Sallan Gül, Uskun, Demirci, & Keçeci, 2007; Köker, 1991; Nalbant, 1993; Selçukoğlu, 2001). Deniz (2006) reported a positive relationship between problem-focused coping, seeking social support and life satisfaction among university students according to the results of the study, which showed individuals having life satisfaction are better able to cope with stress. There are studies investigating the positive and negative affect dimension of SWB (Gençöz, 2000; Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2004) and life satisfaction dimension of SWB (Deniz, 2006; Gündoğar, et al., 2007; Köker, 1991; Nalbant, 1993; Siviş,

2005). Still, there are other studies revealing that life satisfaction was higher among women physicians (Ünal, Karlıdağ & Yoloğlu, 2001). However, there are very limited numbers of comprehensive studies aiming at investigating all three domains of SWB (Cenkseven, 2006; Şimşek, 2005).

Regarding attachment, research findings indicated that secure individuals reported low attachment related anxiety and low avoidance, low distress, high self-restraint, and high negative mood regulation (Arıkoğlu, 2003). In addition, the results revealed that dismissing avoidant individuals were high in negative mood regulation. Preoccupied individuals reported high attachment related anxiety, low avoidance, high distress, low restraint, and low negative mood regulation. Contrary to the predictions, there were no significant relationships among attachment style, relationship satisfaction and psychological problems.

Results of an empirical study which was conducted by İmamoğlu and İmamoğlu (2006) indicated that attachment related findings from a Turkish sample tend to be consistent with attachment literature. Frequencies of attachment styles among Turkish young adults were similar to the ones from Western cultures. The result is presented as an indication of the cross-cultural validity of attachment orientations. The same study investigated the relationship between general and context specific attachment orientations. Participants were asked to report how they generally felt in close relationships and they were also asked to report their attachment orientations with respect to different contexts including family, peer and romantic context. Results supported the specific context-related-tendencies in terms of attachment orientations since participants reported that they felt relatively more secure in some relationship contexts than in others. However, it is also reported that participants who were generally high on a particular attachment orientation tended to be high across three contexts, involving family, peer, and romantic contexts. Therefore, the result is interpreted as a support for the trait-like conceptualization of attachment orientations.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this chapter methodological details of the study are introduced. The first section presents the characteristics of the participants. The second section introduces the data collection instruments. The procedure followed in the study is explained in the third section. In the fourth section, data analyses employed to the data are presented. Finally, the fifth section deals with the limitations of the study.

3.1. Participants

Convenient sampling procedure was used in the present study. Participants were 389 (101 males, 288 females) volunteered students of the Faculty of Education at Middle East Technical University (METU). They were taking the service courses offered by the Department of Educational Sciences to sophomore, junior, and senior students of four departments. These Departments are Computer Education and Instructional Technology ($n = 37$), Elementary Science Education ($n = 86$), Foreign Language Education ($n = 251$), and Secondary Science and Mathematics Education ($n = 15$). Most of the students (65%) were from the Department of Foreign Language Education (FLE) where the number of students is the largest in the Faculty. However, the number of the students in other departments is not large enough since the distribution largely depends on students' course requirements of taking the service courses. Considering that the variables of department and grade are not used in this study the sample was considered as representative for the present study. The age range of the participants was between 18 and 27, with the mean age of 21.3 ($SD = 1.46$).

3.2. Data Collection Instruments

Instruments used in the collection of data included a demographic questionnaire (Appendix A), the Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (Appendix B), Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Appendix C), and Satisfaction with Life Scale (Appendix D).

3.2.1. Demographic Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire was developed for the present study (App. A). In the questionnaire, information was gathered regarding age, sex, department, and grade of the students. The questionnaire also included three closed questions concerning whether or not they have a boy/girl friend at the present; have physical disabilities; and have health problems which require continuous treatment.

3.2.2. Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI)

The Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI) was originally developed by Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) to measure anxiety and avoidance dimensions of adult attachment (App. B). In the construction of ECRI, 323 items from various attachment scales were included in the Inventory. The results of the study indicated that, out of 323 items, 36 items measure avoidance and anxiety dimensions of adult attachment on a 7-point Likert type scale, ranging from “1 = disagree strongly” to “7 = agree strongly.” ECRI yields two subscale scores, anxiety and avoidance, each of which was measured by 18 items. The highest and lowest scores that can be obtained from each of these subscales changed between 18 and 126 where higher scores indicate higher anxiety and avoidance experienced in close relationships. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were reported as .94 for the avoidance subscale and .91 for the anxiety subscale (Brennan et al., 1998).

ECRI was adapted into Turkish by Sümer (2006). The results of factor analysis

revealed two factors, avoidance and anxiety, as they were in the original scale. The first factor (avoidance dimension of attachment) explained 22% and the second factor (anxiety dimension of attachment) explained 16% of the variance. Cronbach alpha coefficients were reported as .90 for avoidance and .86 for anxiety subscales. It was also reported that attachment dimensions had stronger predictive power than the attachment styles.

3.2.2.1. Factor Analysis of ECRI for the Present Study

Exploratory factor analysis of ECRI was reassessed for the present sample. Initially, principle component analysis with varimax rotation was carried out for the 36 items of ECRI. The resulted yielded an 8-factor solution, explaining a total of 61.9 % of the variance. However, the examinations of the scree-plot and the variance explained by each factor showed that the first 2 factors mainly represented the factor structure of the avoidance and anxiety dimensions of the original scale. Therefore, a second analysis was performed, this time forcing the factor structure to 2 factors. The results yielded the same factor loadings of the original scale, indicating that the first factor (avoidance dimension of attachment) explained 21.3% and the second factor (anxiety dimension of attachment) explained 16.2% of the variance. The eigen values associated with each factor were 7.66 for avoidance and 5.86 for anxiety dimensions. The item loadings and communalities of the items are presented in Table 3.1.

As seen in Table 3.1, which is presented in the next page, the item loadings changed between .37 (item 1) and .68 (item 17) for avoidance dimension and between .23 (item 4) and .69 (item 24) for anxiety dimension. Although the item 4 was loaded in anxiety dimension with a higher loading (.30), it was scored in the avoidance dimension since it was the only item loaded in two dimensions which can be ignored for the sake of preserving the original structure of the instrument. Overall, results revealed that, when forced to 2 factors, the same factor structure of the original scale was obtained in the present study.

Table 3.1

Item Loadings and Communalities of ECRI

Avoidance dimension of attachment			Anxiety dimension of attachment		
Item No.	Item-loadings	Communalities	Item No.	Item-loadings	Communalities
1	.37	.13	2	.61	.42
3	.62	.39	4	.23	.14
5	.65	.47	6	.56	.43
7	.59	.39	8	.65	.43
9	.56	.36	10	.44	.20
11	.66	.53	12	.27	.11
13	.64	.48	14	.66	.44
15	.67	.44	16	.29	.11
17	.68	.54	18	.61	.39
19	.65	.42	20	.56	.32
21	.44	.29	22	.55	.31
23	.66	.46	24	.69	.49
25	.66	.49	26	.49	.34
27	.67	.50	28	.55	.30
29	.67	.45	30	.65	.43
31	.54	.33	32	.68	.47
33	.60	.40	34	.62	.38
35	.53	.40	36	.57	.34

3.2.2.2. Reliability of ECRI for the Present Study

In the present study, it was found that the corrected-item total correlation coefficients of ECRI changed between .30 (item 1) and .66 (item 17) for avoidance and .28 (item 12) and .62 (item 24) for anxiety subscales. Internal consistency coefficients calculated by Cronbach alpha formula were found as .89 for avoidance

dimension and .87 for anxiety dimension.

3.2.3. Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) was originally developed by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1998) (App. C). In PANAS, the items are grouped into a positive affect (PA) scale and a negative affect (NA) scale. Each PANAS scale is composed of 10 mood-related adjectives. The positive affect mood adjectives are active, alert, attentive, determined, enthusiastic, excited, inspired, interested, proud, and strong. The negative affect mood adjectives include afraid, ashamed, distressed, guilty, hostile, irritable, jittery, nervous, scared, and upset. The high scores in PA are a reflection of enthusiasm, alertness and pleasurable engagement with the environment; low PA is a reflection of a state of depression and a lack of vitality. On the other hand, high NA indicates aversive mood states and subjective distress whereas low NA indicates calmness and relaxation. On a 5-point Likert-type scale, participants are asked to rate how frequently they experience the emotions in a general time frame, ranging from “1 = never” to “5 = always”. Researchers (Watson et al., 1988) reported that two factors, PA and NA together, accounted for the 68.7 % of the total variance in general ratings. Internal consistency reliabilities were found as .88 and .87 for PA and NA, respectively when general time frame is used as a time instruction.

The adaptation of the scale to Turkish was made by Gençöz (2000). It was reported that the results of the factor analysis revealed two factors accounting for the 44 % of the total variance. Internal consistencies for PA and NA were found as .83 and .86, respectively. In a study carried out by Şimşek (2005), the reliability and validity of the scale were re-evaluated and he reported satisfactory psychometric properties for the 7-point Likert type version of the scale.

3.2.3.1. Factor Analysis of PANAS for the Present Study

In the present study, on a 7-point, Likert-type rating system, participants are asked to

rate how frequently they experience the emotions in a general time frame. The answers ranged from “1 = never” to “7 = always”. For the purpose of reassessing the factor structure for the present sample, initially, principle component analysis with varimax rotation was carried out for the 20 items of the positive and negative affect scale. This resulted in a 5-factor solution, explaining a total of 59.2% of the variance. However, the examination of the scree-plot and the variance explained by each factor showed that the first 2 factors mainly represented the factor structure of the positive and negative affect scale. Therefore, a second analysis was performed, this time forcing the factor structure to 2 factors, in order to assess whether the items of the scale load on the positive affect and negative affect factors of the original scale. Results revealed that when forced to 2 factors, the same factor structure is portrayed in the present study. The item loadings and communalities of the items are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Item Loadings and Communalities of PANAS

Positive affect dimension			Negative affect dimension		
Item No.	Item-loadings	Communalities	Item No.	Item-loadings	Communalities
1	.60	.37	2	.61	.41
3	.39	.28	4	.65	.47
5	.66	.49	6	.59	.36
9	.67	.47	7	.67	.47
10	.36	.15	8	.58	.34
12	.50	.26	11	.63	.40
14	.55	.33	13	.52	.28
16	.73	.56	15	.61	.37
17	.63	.42	18	.68	.47
19	.69	.51	20	.67	.47

In the present study, a 2-factor solution to the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

explained a total of 39.3% of the variance. The first factor (positive affect) explained 15.2% and the second factor (negative affect) explained 24.1% of the variance. The eigen values associated with each factor were 4.82 for negative affect and 3.05 for positive affect scales.

3.2.3.2. Reliability of PANAS for the Present Study

In the present study, it was found that the corrected-item total correlation coefficients ranged from .23 (item 10) to .62 (item 16) for PA scale; and from .35 (item 13) to .57 (item 4) for NA scale. Internal consistency coefficients calculated by Cronbach alpha formula for PA and NA scales were found as .77 and .81, respectively.

3.2.4. Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) was originally developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) to identify the individual differences concerning the cognitive evaluation of one's life. SWLS is supposed to allow individuals to evaluate their lives according to their subjective criteria. Thus, SWLS is developed in order to define the extent to which individuals are satisfied with life in general. Factor analysis revealed a single factor accounting for 66% of the total variance. The internal consistency of the scale was reported as .87 and test-retest reliability with two-month intervals was found to be .82 (Diener et al., 1985).

SWLS was translated into Turkish by Köker (1991). Item-total correlations changed between .71 and .80. Internal consistency coefficient calculated by Cronbach Alpha Formula was reported as .89. Test-retest reliability coefficient was found as .85.

3.2.4.1. Factor Analysis of SWLS for the Present Study

Item loadings were re-examined by analyzing 5 items through principal component

with varimax rotation and setting an eigenvalue of 1.00 as the criterion. Results of factor analysis yielded a 1-factor solution to the Satisfaction with Life Scale explaining a total of 57.8% of the variance. The eigenvalue associated with the factor was 2.89. The item loadings and communalities of the items are presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Item Loadings and Communalities of SWLS

Item No.	Item loadings	Communalities
1	.77	.59
2	.79	.62
3	.85	.73
4	.84	.71
5	.49	.24

As seen in Table 2, the item loadings changed between .85 (item 3) and .49 (item 5) and the communalities ranged from .24 (item5) to .73 (item 3). The results supported one-factor structure of SWLS which was found in previous studies.

3.2.4.2. Reliability of SWLS for the Present Study

In the present study, it was found that the corrected-item total correlation coefficients of SWLS changed between .34 (item 5) and .67 (item 3). Internal consistency coefficients calculated by Cronbach alpha formula was found as .74.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The instruments were administered to the participant students during class hours. The researcher explained the purpose of the study to the students and they were guaranteed about the anonymity of their responses and confidentiality of the data. Instruments were then administered to those who volunteered to participate in the

study. Administration of the instruments took approximately 30-35 minutes.

3.4. Data Analysis

Prior to the main analyses, exploratory factor analyses and internal consistencies of ECRI, PANAS, and SWLS were reassessed for the present sample. In the main part of the study, three separate multiple regression analyses were carried out for negative affectivity (NA), positive affectivity (PA) and life satisfaction (SWLS) scores as being the dependent variables. Independent variables were gender (a nominated dichotomous variable with dummy coded categories of 0 = female and 1 = male), presence or absence of romantic relationship (a nominated dichotomous variable with dummy coded categories of 0 = having a relationship and 1 = not having a relationship), anxiety scores and avoidance scores of ECRI. The statistical analyses were carried out by using subprograms of SPSS, version 11.50.

3.5. Limitations

The present study has some limitations. First, the data were collected from the Faculty of Education at Middle East Technical University (METU). Thus, the results cannot be generalized to the students either in METU or in other universities. Second, all measurement tools utilized in the present study are self-report measures and prone to validity problems. The use of self-report measures instead of experimentations and actual behavioral observations makes it impossible to draw causal inferences.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter consists of two major sections. In the first section, preliminary analyses of the data are presented. In the second section descriptive statistics of the study variables are introduced. Third section includes correlation matrix of the study variables. Finally, in the fourth section results of stepwise multiple linear regression analyses are presented.

4.1. Preliminary Analyses

Before conducting the main analyses, all the major variables were checked for missing data and for the scores that were out-of-range. The missing values were replaced by a series of mean scores since the percentage of missing values was not greater than 5%. Crucial assumptions were also checked out for stepwise multiple linear regression analyses. First dummy coding for the categorical variables (gender: female = 0, male = 1; relationship status: have a relationship = 0, have no relationship = 1) was done. Then, *multivariate outliers* were analyzed by taking into consideration Mahalanobis distance. The maximum Mahalanobis distance should not exceed the critical chi-squared value with degrees of freedom equal to the number of predictors and Alpha Level = .001, otherwise outliers may be a problem in the data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). In the present study, Mahalanobis distance was taken into consideration with $p < .001$ and $\chi^2 = 24.32$. Among 389 participants, 15 subjects were excluded from the data because of being outlying cases. Besides, in the demographic questionnaire, 28 (10 males, 18 females) students reported that they had physical disabilities and/or serious health problems which require continuous treatment. Considering the research findings regarding the negative effects of physical health in subjective well-being (Diener & Seligman, 2004 for a review), these students were also excluded from the data. Thus, the analyses were

carried out with 346 (87 male and 259 female) students. Out of 346 students, 163 (32 male, 131 female) students reported that they have romantic relationship whereas 183 (55 male, 128 female) of them reported that they have no such relationship. The mean age of the participants was 21.35 and 1.46 was the standard deviation for age.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

The means and standard deviations were presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Variables by Gender and Relationship Status

Variables	Relationship status	Gender				Total	
		Male		Female		M	SD
		M	SD	M	SD		
SWL	Have a relationship	12.3	2.60	16.0	4.15	15.3	4.15
	Have no relationship	14.6	3.67	14.3	4.16	14.4	4.01
	Total	13.8	3.48	15.2	4.23	14.8	4.10
PA	Have a relationship	48.2	6.05	49.0	6.55	48.8	6.45
	Have no relationship	47.9	7.54	46.2	6.80	46.7	7.05
	Total	48.0	6.99	47.6	6.81	47.7	6.85
NA	Have a relationship	32.1	7.45	32.9	7.57	32.8	7.53
	Have no relationship	32.4	6.91	31.7	7.23	31.9	7.12
	Total	32.3	7.07	32.3	7.42	32.3	7.32
Anxiety	Have a relationship	69.6	17.70	70.3	19.26	70.2	18.9
	Have no relationship	70.7	16.18	71.3	16.65	71.1	16.47
	Total	70.3	16.66	70.8	17.99	70.7	17.64
Avoid	Have a relationship	46.7	16.74	46.7	16.08	46.7	16.16
	Have no relationship	60.7	13.61	66.2	16.6	64.6	15.96
	Total	55.5	16.22	56.3	19.03	56.1	18.34

Note. SWL: Satisfaction with life scale; PA: Positive affect; NA: Negative affect; Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment; Avoid: Avoidance dimension of attachment

In the present study, the independent variables were anxiety dimension of attachment, avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and relationship status. The dependent variables were life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect. The means and standard deviations of dependent and independent variables used in the present study were presented by gender and relationship status in Table 4.1. As can be seen from Table 4.1., the means for the dependent variables of SWL, PA and NA were 14.8, 47.7, and 32.3. Standard deviations were 4.10, 6.85, and 7.32, respectively. The means and standard deviations were 70.7 and 17.64 for anxiety dimension of attachment, and 56.1 and 18.34 for avoidance dimension of attachment subscales.

4.3. Correlation Matrix of the Study Variables

The results of the correlations among the variables of gender, relationship status, avoidance and anxiety dimensions of adult attachment, and satisfaction with life scores for the total sample of the study are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Correlations among Independent (gender, relationship status, anxiety dimension of attachment and avoidance dimension of attachment) and Dependent Variables (satisfaction with life, positive affect and negative affect scores) in the Total Sample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	1						
2. Relationship status	.12	1					
3. Avoidance	-.02	.49*	1				
4. Anxiety	-.01	.03	.16*	1			
5. Satisfaction	-.15*	-.16*	-.18*	-.18*	1		
6. Negative affect	.03	-.06	.13	.41*	-.34*	1	
7. Positive affect	-.00	-.11	-.26*	-.12	.39*	-.15*	1

* $p < .01$, two tailed. Note. Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment; Avoidance: Avoidance dimension of attachment; Satisfaction: Satisfaction with life

As can be seen from Table 4.2, correlation coefficients changed between -.34 and .49, indicating no multicollinearity among the variables. The highest negative correlation was observed between satisfaction with life and negative affect scores. The highest positive correlation was between relational status and avoidance dimension of attachment subscore.

The intercorrelations of independent and dependent variables are presented for males (lower triangle) and for females (upper triangle) in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Correlations among Variables for Males (Lower Triangle) and Females (Upper Triangle)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Relationship status		.51*	.03	-.20*	-.08	-.21*
2. Avoidance	.42*		.13	-.27*	.06	-.28*
3. Anxiety	.03	.26		-.22*	.40*	-.13
4. Satisfaction with life	.32*	.19	-.05		-.36*	.44*
5. Negative affect	.02	.40*	.41*	-.27		-.18*
6. Positive affect	-.02	-.20	-.11	.25	-.05	

* $p < .01$, $n = 87$ for males, $n = 259$ for females. *Note.* Avoidance: Avoidance dimension of attachment; Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment

As can be seen from Table 4.3., the correlations were changed between -.27 and .42 in males, and between -.36 and .51 in females. In males (lower triangle), the highest positive correlation was between relationship status and avoidance dimension of attachment score whereas the lowest negative correlation was between satisfaction with life and negative affect scores. For females (upper triangle), the highest positive and the highest negative correlations were between relationship status and avoidance dimension of attachment, and between satisfaction with life and negative affect scores, respectively.

The intercorrelations of independent and dependent variables are presented for those who recently have a romantic relationship (lower triangle) and for those who have no such relationship (upper triangle) in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Correlations among Variables for Those Who Have a Romantic Relationship (lower triangle) and for Those Who Have No Relationship (upper triangle)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Gender		-.16	-.02	.03	.04	.11
2. Avoidance	.00		.14	-.11	.08	-.17
3. Anxiety	-.01	.19		-.18	.34*	-.15
4. Satisfaction with life	-.35*	-.19	-.18		-.37*	.41*
5. Negative affect	-.04	.28*	.47*	-.33*		-.16
6. Positive affect	-.05	-.26*	-.09	.34*	-.17	

* $p < .01$; $n = 163$ have a romantic relationship, $n = 183$ have no romantic relationship

Note. Avoidance: Avoidance dimension of attachment; Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment

As can be seen from Table 4.4., the correlations were changed between -.35 and .47 for those who recently have romantic relationship (lower triangle) and, between -.37 and .41 for those who have no such a relationship (upper triangle). For those who have a romantic relationship, the highest positive correlation was between anxiety dimension of attachment and negative affect scores whereas the highest negative correlation was between gender and satisfaction with life score. For those who have no romantic relationship, the highest positive and negative correlations were between satisfaction with life and positive affect and negative affect scores, respectively.

4.4. Results of Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analyses

In the present study, three separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were

conducted to predict the effect of the independent variables (gender coded as dummy variable, relationship status coded as dummy variable, avoidance dimension of attachment and anxiety dimension of attachment) on three separate components of subjective well-being (positive affect, negative affect, satisfaction with life). Additionally, the assumption for Multiple Regression normality, linearity, independence observation, independence observation, and independence of error (residual) were performed. In order to examine the *normality* descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis; visual inspection of data including P-P plots, and histograms with curves (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) were conducted. For the normality assumption it was assumed that the dependent variables which had life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect scores were distributed normally in the population. In the light of information obtained from descriptive statistics and normality test; it was assumed that normality was not violated. In order to check the *linearity* between the dependent and independent variables of the study, scatterplots as well as Q-Q plots were performed and it was found that linearity assumption was not violated. Finally, *multicollinearity*, which was defined as “very high correlations among predictor variables” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), was checked for the assumptions of Multiple Regression. Intercorrelation among the independents above .70 signals a possible problem (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Any intercorrelation higher than .70 among independent variables was not obtained for the present study.

4.4.1 Results Concerning the Predictors of Life Satisfaction

In order to examine how well avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, relationship status and gender predict life satisfaction scores of the students, a Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted by taking avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, dummy coded relationship status and dummy coded gender as predictors, and life satisfaction scores of the students were taken as dependent variables. Table 4.5 presents the summary of Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression

Analysis results.

Table 4.5

R and R Square Change Predicting the Life Satisfaction Scores

Variables	Multiple R	Adjusted R Square		R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Significant F Change
		R Square	R Square					
Avoid	.181	.033	.030	.033	11.657	1	344	.001
Gender	.238	.056	.051	.024	8.609	1	343	.004
Anxiety	.283	.080	.072	.024	8.814	1	342	.003

Note. Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment; Avoid: Avoidance dimension of attachment

As can be seen in Table 4.5., the regression equation with the avoidance dimension of attachment scores was significant, $R^2 = .03$, $F(1, 344) = 11.657$, $p < .001$. This variable alone accounted for approximately 3% of the variance. Gender, being the second variable that entered into the equation, was also significant with the values of $R^2 = .06$, $F(1, 343) = 8.609$, $p < .01$. Gender alone accounted for an additional 3% of the variance. Finally, the third variable entered into the equation was the anxiety dimension of attachment. The regression equation with the anxiety dimension of attachment scores was also significant, $R^2 = .08$, $F(1, 342) = 8.814$, $p < .01$. The anxiety dimension of attachment alone accounted for an additional 2% of the variance. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment were significantly and negatively predicted life satisfaction scores with Beta values of $\beta = -.181$, $p < .001$; $\beta = -.154$, $p < .01$; $\beta = -.156$, $p < .01$, respectively.

In sum, avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment appeared as significant predictors explaining approximately 8% of the total variance of life satisfaction scores of the students. Results indicated that females who scored lower in anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment

tended to score higher in life satisfaction. Results also showed that the relationship status did not make a contribution to the explanation of variance.

4.4.2 Results Concerning the Predictors of Positive Affect

The second Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to evaluate how well avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, relationship status and gender predict positive affect scores of the students. Table 4.6 presents the summary of multiple linear regression analysis predicting the positive affect scores of the students.

Table 4.6
R and R Square Change Predicting the Positive Affect Scores

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Significant F Change
Avoid	.256	.066	.063	.066	24.183	1	344	.000

Note. Avoid: Avoidance dimension of attachment

As can be seen in Table 4.6, the only variable entered into the equation was the avoidance dimension of attachment. The regression equation with the avoidance dimension of attachment was significant, $R^2 = .07$ $F(1, 344) = 24.183$, $p < .001$. This variable alone accounted for the 7% of the total variance. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that avoidance significantly and negatively predicted positive affect scores with Beta values of $\beta = -.256$, $p < .001$. Overall, the results indicated that students who scored lower in avoidance dimension of attachment tended to have higher scores in positive affect.

4.4.3 Results Concerning the Predictors of Negative Affect

The third Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to evaluate

how well avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment, relationship status and gender predict negative affect scores of the students. Table 4.7 presents the summary of multiple linear regression analysis predicting the negative affect scores of the sample.

Table 4.7
R and R Square Change Predicting the Negative Affect Scores

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Significant F Change
Anxiety	.405	.164	.162	.164	67.512	1	344	.000

Note. Anxiety: Anxiety dimension of attachment

As can be seen in Table 4.7, the only variable that entered into the equation was anxiety dimension of attachment. The regression equation with the anxiety dimension of attachment was significant, $R^2 = .16$ $F(1,344) = 67.512$, $p < .001$. This variable alone accounted for the 16% of the total variance. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that anxiety dimension of attachment significantly and positively predicted negative affect scores with Beta values of $\beta = .405$, $p < .001$. Overall, the results indicated that students who scored higher in anxiety dimension of attachment tended to have higher scores in negative affect.

In sum, the first regression analysis demonstrated that avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment appeared as significant predictors explaining approximately 8 percent of the total variance of the life satisfaction scores of the students. This means that females who scored lower in anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment tended to score higher in life satisfaction. The second regression analysis demonstrated that avoidance dimension of attachment was the only significant predictor explaining 7 percent of the total variance of the positive affect scores of the students. This result indicated that students who scored lower in avoidance dimension of attachment tended to have

higher scores in positive affect. Finally, the third regression analysis demonstrated that anxiety dimension of attachment was the only significant predictor explaining 16 percent of the total variance of the negative affect scores of the students. This means that students who scored higher in anxiety dimension of attachment tended to have higher scores on negative affect.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, discussion regarding the findings obtained from statistical analyses was presented. The first section is devoted to the discussion of the predictors of life satisfaction, positive and negative affects, respectively. In the second part, implications of the present study and recommendations for future studies are presented.

5.1. Discussion of the Results

The purpose of the present study was to examine the predictive power of avoidance and anxiety dimensions of attachment, gender and the relationship status (defined as those who are experiencing or not experiencing a romantic relationship at the present) in subjective well-being components of life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect. In the present study, since subjective well-being was defined as being composed of three components, three separate Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analyses were conducted for each dependent variable. Therefore, in the following sections, the results are discussed separately for life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect.

5.1.1 Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Life Satisfaction

The results of Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis indicated that, although they explained a small portion of the variance, avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment were found to be the significant predictors of life satisfaction. These three independent variables explained approximately 8% of the total variance of life satisfaction scores of the students. Avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of

attachment accounted for the 3%, 3%, and 2% of the variance respectively. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that avoidance dimension of attachment, gender, and anxiety dimension of attachment were significantly and negatively predicted life satisfaction scores ($\beta = -.181, p < .001$; $\beta = -.154, p < .01$; $\beta = -.156, p < .01$, respectively). However, the results showed that relationship status was not a significant predictor of life satisfaction scores of the students. Overall, these results indicated that females who scored lower on anxiety dimension of attachment and avoidance dimension of attachment tended to score higher on life satisfaction.

As it was mentioned in the literature review chapter, most of the attachment studies used *categories rather than dimensions* of attachment. Based on the Bartholomew and Horowitz's four category model of attachment, Brennan et al., (1998) identified two dimensions of attachment, which are anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment with the intersections of four categories of secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful. Accordingly, avoidance dimension refers to the extent to which individuals desire limited intimacy and prefer to remain psychologically and emotionally independent whereas anxiety dimension is defined as the extent to which individuals worry that relationship partners may not be available or could abandon them. Thus, low scores on anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment correspond to secure attachment category. Attachment literature also suggested that a child's attachment behaviors exert long-term influences on his/her subsequent relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Within this framework, some discussions could be made and some indirect inferences could be drawn in order to interpret the findings of the current study.

Several studies indicated that parental intrinsic support, which is defined as child's perceptions that the parent loves and cares about him/her, predicted the life satisfaction of the adolescent offspring (Young, et al., 1995) and that secure attachment in romantic relationships predicted the scores on general well-being measure which included items reflecting life satisfaction (La Guardia et al., 2000). In a recent study, Quimby and O'Brien (2006) found that secure attachment

predicted life satisfaction among female university students. All these findings seemed to suggest that internal working models formed in attachment relations reflecting the degree to which one is worthy of love and care, and the degree to which others are supportive and available, are important for life satisfaction.

Although research regarding gender differences in subjective well-being in general and in life satisfaction in particular revealed inconsistent findings, there are some studies showing that females reported higher life satisfaction than males both in Turkey (Cenkseven, 2004; Köker, 1991) and abroad (Ayyash-Abdo & Alamuddin, 2007). However, limited number of research investigating the relationship between attachment and life satisfaction makes the discussion on gender differences that appeared in relation to attachment more complex. One explanation might be related with two general conclusions: (a) females are more relationship-oriented than males and (b) relational aspects play an important role in life satisfaction. Based on these conclusions, it can be speculated that females who are reared with more care and love might be securely attached and receive more satisfaction from life than males in general. Another explanation can be made from the cultural perspective. As it was mentioned by the researchers (Chen, et al., 2006), some constructs related to social context and interpersonal relationships are regarded as more fundamental for life satisfaction in collectivistic cultures. In Turkey, being a collectivist culture, daughters might receive more love and care from their parents than sons which make them more secure in their relationships. Yet, such an explanation should be taken cautiously considering the nature of the sample studied since they are female students with a high level of achievement who cannot be the representative of Turkish females.

However, the results of this part of the present study appeared fruitful as the concept of attachment captures the perceptions related to self and others. Indeed, although not strongly the results concerning the relationship between avoidance and anxiety dimension of attachment and life satisfaction reflect the importance of an healthy attachment bond for well-being in our culture.

5.1.2 Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Positive Affect

Results yielded that, although explaining a small portion of the variance, the avoidance dimension of attachment was the only predictor of positive affect. This variable alone accounted for the 7% of the total variance. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that avoidance dimension of attachment significantly and negatively predicted positive affect scores with Beta values of $\beta = -.256$, $p < .001$. Overall, the results indicated that students who scored lower in avoidance dimension of attachment tended to have higher scores in positive affect.

Previous research indicated that securely attached individuals displayed more positive affect (Simpson, 1990; Torquati & Raffaelli, 2004). As securely attached individuals display less attachment avoidance compared to insecure groups (Arıkoğlu, 2003), these results support the present finding reflecting the link between avoidance dimension of attachment and positive affect. However, another characteristic of secure individuals is that they also display less anxiety in close relationships compared to insecure groups (Arıkoğlu, 2003; Brennan, et al., 1998). However, present study did not acknowledge any link between anxiety dimension of attachment and positive affect.

By making a further distinction between insecure styles as avoidant and anxious style, Kerr et al., (2003) explored the relationships of positive affect, negative affect and adult attachment styles. Confirming the findings of the present study, the researchers suggested that participants with secure attachment reported the highest levels of positive affect while participants with insecure/avoidant attachment style reported the lowest on measures of positive affect. Conversely, results of another study which was conducted among university students pointed out that positive affect scores of participants did not change as a function of their attachment styles (Wearden et al., 2006).

Based on studies of Bowlby (1969/1982), Mikulincer and Shaver (2003) defined

deactivating strategies which consist of efforts to inhibit support seeking behavior and handle distress alone as the emotion regulation strategies used by individuals who are high in avoidance dimension of attachment (as cited in Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). They defined the goal of deactivating strategies as keeping the attachment system down in order to avoid the frustration and pain associated with attachment-figure unavailability. People high in avoidance dimension of attachment disengage from challenging and demanding social interactions. On the other hand, positive affect captures emotions from enthusiasm and pleasurable engagement with environment which is lack of vitality (Watson, et al., 1988). In this respect, as the present study illustrates, it is plausible to explore a negative association between avoidance dimension of attachment which is associated with disengagement with environment in order to avoid pain and positive affect which is associated with pleasurable engagement with environment. Furthermore, it is also plausible not to detect any relationship between attachment anxiety and positive affect as attachment anxiety is associated with activation of aversive mood states and in this regard it is related to negative affect rather than the degree of pleasurable engagement with environment, namely positive affect. Shiota, Keltner, and John (2006) also provided an alternative point of view for the moderate and inconsistent relationship between anxiety dimension of attachment and positive affect. According to the researchers, people high in anxiety dimension of attachment or with preoccupied attachment styles are still trying to derive positive emotions from close relationships although the association between anxiety dimension of attachment and positive emotions was not a strong one. From their perspective, insecure attachment might also be associated with some positive emotional outcomes.

Overall, the results concerning the relationship between avoidance dimension of attachment and positive affect obtained in the present study seemed to be supported by the results and explanation of other studies. Thus, it can be concluded that those who score less in avoidance dimension of attachment tend to experience high level of positive affect.

5.1.3 Discussion Regarding the Predictors of Negative Affect

In the present study, the results of regression analysis yielded that anxiety dimension of attachment appeared as the only significant predictor of negative affect scores of the students, explaining approximately 16% of the total variance. Thus, the variable accounted for more than a quarter of the total variance in negative affect. In the analyses of Beta values, it was seen that anxiety dimension of attachment significantly and positively predicted negative affect scores with Beta values of $\beta = .405$, $p < .001$. Overall, the results indicated that students who scored higher in anxiety dimension of attachment tended to have higher scores in negative affect.

Negative affect captures emotional continuum from aversive mood states and subjective distress to calmness and relaxation (Watson, et al., 1988). Attachment anxiety refers to consistent concerns with respect to rejection and abandonment in close relationships. Mikulincer and Shaver (2003) defined hyperactivating strategies, which are emotion regulation strategies used by individuals high in attachment anxiety, as constant attachment system activation in terms of emotional responses to attachment and threat related clues (as cited in Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). This constant activation of emotional responses results in a cycle of distress. Thus, the results of the present study which reflect the predictive power of attachment anxiety for negative affect is supported by literature since attachment anxiety is characterized by a cycle of distress.

Besides, in the present study, no significant relationship between avoidance dimension of attachment and negative affect was explored. People high in avoidance dimension of attachment disengage from close social interactions in order to avoid distress related to unavailability of attachment-figure and use this way in order to deal with attachment insecurity (Mikulincer and Shaver, 2003 as cited in Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). Hence, by keeping the attachment system down they avoid distress and negative affect. This might be a possible explanation for the lack of relationship between attachment anxiety and negative affect. Moreover, lack of mentioned

relationship could be the benefit of attachment avoidance. On the other hand, Cassidy reported that, although people using deactivation strategies get the activation of overt distress under control (Cassidy 1994 as cited in Magai, 1999), it was shown that negative emotions remained active at an unconscious level (Dozier & Kobak, 1992 as cited in Magai, 1999).

Many studies support the present findings. Results of a study which was conducted among university students pointed out that both securely attached participants and participants with an avoidant attachment style had lower negative affect scores compared to participants with preoccupied or fearful attachment styles (Wearden, et al., 2006). Another study indicated that ready access to painful memories and an automatic spread of negative emotions from one remembered incident to another were much in evidence among people who scored high on anxiety dimension of attachment (Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). Consistently, results of another study found that individuals with secure and dismissive/avoidant attachment styles scored higher than preoccupied and fearful respondents on happiness measures (Webster, 1998). Kerr et al., (2003) presented that participant with an insecure/anxious attachment style reported the highest level of negative affect.

Considering relationship status, results of stepwise multiple linear regression analysis did not yield a significant contribution of romantic relationship status to any of the three components of subjective well-being of university students defined in the present study. This finding seemed to be consistent with some of the studies in the literature. For example, in a study comparing happiness scores of married and unmarried (i.e., *single*, separated, divorced, and widowed adults) with respect to their attachment styles, Webster (1998) found that attachment style, but not relationship status accounted for variance in happiness scores. According to the researcher, the findings suggested that one's security reflected in one's mental representation of attachment relationships is a more powerful predictor of happiness than an actual relationship. The researcher's interpretation seems to be confirmed in the present study. On the other hand, a more recent study presented the positive

association between having relationships and subjective well-being (Lucas & Dyrenforth, 2006 as cited in Perlman, 2007). However, according to Perlman, (2007), “the degree to which having relationships versus the quality of those relationships is fundamental for SWB” is open to debate. Indeed, in the present study relationship status and quality of relationship with respect to attachment security reflected in attachment dimensions are investigated and the result confirms the relative importance of attachment quality in terms of cognitive dimension of SWB.

5.2 Implications of the Findings and Recommendations for Further Research

As Quimby and O’Brien (2006) stated, the relationship between attachment and SWB is poorly understood. The present study intended to fill an empirical gap in the literature on both adult attachment and subjective well-being by determining whether individual differences assessed with self-report attachment scales predict cognitive and emotional components of SWB. Several implications may be drawn from the current study. Researchers have recently argued the advantage of using continuous-variable ratings of the anxiety and avoidance *dimensions* of attachment over using *categories* of attachment (Brennan, et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006). Similarly researchers have recently stated the advantage of examining the separable *components* of SWB over treating it as a unique entity. However, no study could be found investigating the relationship between avoidance and anxiety dimensions of attachment and components of SWB which are positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction. Some of the studies used attachment categories to understand the stated relationship while some others used some components as indicators of SWB and ignored others. Thereby, the present study seems to be one of the first attempts trying to capture a holistic view with respect to the stated relationship among university students in Turkey.

As might be inferred from present results different dimensions of attachment displayed unique patterns with respect to their contributions to each component of

SWB. As the results of the present study pointed out, avoidance dimension of attachment, anxiety dimension of attachment and gender predicted the life satisfaction of university student. Moreover, avoidance dimension of attachment predicted positive affect scores of students while anxiety dimension of attachment predicted negative affect scores of students. As these results imply, any exclusion regarding components of SWB would be misleading in terms of the relationship between attachment and SWB.

As counselors and psychologists try to contribute to the subjective well-being or happiness of university students, the data derived from the present study might be valuable for practical use. Researchers pointed out that, not the events themselves but the personal reactions to events are important for well-being (Eddington & Shuman, 2005). In addition, this assertion seems to further indicate that apart from temperament, attachment -which also shapes enduring reactions to relationships, others, and self- could be important for well-being. Indeed, for the present study not the actual relationship status but attachment dimensions which reflect enduring reactions that are determinative for personal and social development predicted the SWB. Hence, the present study further implies that, the counselor might give priority to the assessment of attachment dimensions rather than assessment of the actual relationship status while aiming at promoting the happiness level of university students.

Although, quality of the relationship with primary caregivers in childhood reflects itself in felt security or insecurity in adulthood by means of internal working models, individuals have more than one attachment figure in adulthood. Furthermore, even though the trait-like features of attachment are supported by research, the context-specific tendencies are also recognized (İmamoğlu & İmamoğlu, 2006). Considering these outcomes, further studies focusing on the relationship between attachment and subjective well-being should benefit from the assessment of various contexts such as parenthood, friendship, and romantic relationships. Such an approach might strengthen the perspective with respect to the relationship between attachment and subjective well-being.

In addition to life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect which are defined as the components of subjective well-being, domain-specific satisfaction is defined as the fourth component of subjective well-being (Diener, et al., 1999). However, since the aim of the present study is to assess the overall subjective well-being, assessment of domain satisfaction is not considered in the present study. Further research could utilize the assessment of domain satisfaction so as to have a more fruitful view. Moreover, performing longitudinal studies, administrating various assessment methods might minimize the limitations of the investigations compared to present study.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachment beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, 46(4), 333-341.
- 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.
- Argyle, M. (1987). *The psychology of happiness*. London: Methuen.
- Argyle, M. (1999). Causes and correlates of happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Wellbeing: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 353-373). New York: Russell Sage.
- Argyle, M., & Martin, M. (1991). The psychological causes of happiness. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 77-100). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Arikoğlu, A. P. (2003). *Attachment styles and social emotional adjustment in Turkish college students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Arthaud-Day, M. L., Rode, J. C., Mooney, C. H., & Near, J. P. (2005). The subjective well-being construct: a test of its convergent, discriminant, and factorial validity. *Social Indicators Research*, 74, 445-476.
- Ayyash-Abdo, H., & Alamuddin, R. (2007). Predictors of subjective well-being Among college youth in Lebanon. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(3), 265-284.
- 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.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books (1st ed. published in 1969).

- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Book.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, K. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bretherton, I., & Munholland, K. A. (1999). Internal working models in attachment relationships: A construct revisited. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp 89-111). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Carruthers, C., Hood, C., & Parr, M. (2005) Research Update: The power of positive psychology. *Parks & Recreation*, 40 (10), 30-37.
- Cassidy, J. (1999). The nature of child's ties. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp 3-20). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Cenkseven, F., (2004). *Examining the predictors of subjective and psychological well-being of university students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.
- Chen, S. X., Cheung, F. M., Bond, M. H., & Leung, J. (2006). Going beyond self-esteem to predict life satisfaction: The Chinese case. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 24-35.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 338, 668-678.

- Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H. M., Hale, J. M. S., & Reb, J. (2003). The Structure of Affect: Reconsidering the relationship between negative and positive affectivity. *Journal of Management*; 29(6), 831-857.
- Cummins, R. A. (2005). Caregivers as managers of subjective well-being: A homeostatic perspective. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 18, 335–344.
- DeNeve, K. M. (1999). Happy as an extraverted clam? The role of personality for subjective well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 141–144.
- Deniz, M. E. (2006). Relationships among coping with stress, life satisfaction, decision-making styles and decision self-esteem: an investigation with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(9), 1161-1170.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.
- Diener E., & Diener M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653–63.
- Diener, E. Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49 (1), 71-75.
- Diener E., & Lucas R. E. (1999). Personality and subjective well-being. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (pp. 213–229). New York: Russel Sage Found.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 403-425.
- Diener, E., Sapyta, J. J., & Suh, E. (1998). Subjective well-being is essential to well-being. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9(1), 33-37.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective Well-Being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
- Eddington, N., & Shuman, R. (2005). Subjective well-being: Happiness. *Continuing Psychology Education*. Retrieved March, 08, 2007, from <http://www.texcpe.com/cpe/PDF/tx-happiness.pdf>.

- Feeney, J. A. (1999). Adult romantic attachment and couple relationships. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver, (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp 355-377). New York: The Guildford Press.
- Geñöz, T. (2000). Pozitif ve negatif duygu ölçeđi: Geçerlik ve güvenirlilik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(46), 19-26.
- Gündođar, D., Sallan Gül, S., Uskun, E., & Demirci, S., Keçeci, D. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumunu yordayan etkenlerin incelenmesi. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 10(1), 14-27.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Heady, B., & Wearing, A. (1989). Personality, life events, and subjective well-being: Toward a dynamic equilibrium model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 731-739.
- Headey, B., & Wearing, A. (1991). Subjective well-being: A stocks and flows framework. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective Well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 49-73). England: Pergamon.
- İmamođlu, S., & İmamođlu, E. O. (2006). Relationship between general and context specific attachment orientations in a Turkish sample. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 261-274.
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz N. (1999). *Well-being: the foundations of hedonic psychology*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Karakitapođlu-Aygün, Z. (2004). Self, identity, and emotional well-being among Turkish university students. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(5), 457-478.
- Kerr, L. K., Melley, A. M., Travea, L., & Pole, M. (2003). The relationship of emotional expression and experience to adult attachment styles. *Individual Difference Research*, 1(2), 108-123.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Shmothkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 1007-1022.

- Kim-Prieto, C., Diener, E., Tamir, M., Scollon, C., & Diener, M. (2005). Integrating the diverse definitions of happiness: A time-sequential framework of subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 261-300.
- Koo, J., Rie, J., & Park, K. (2004). Age and gender differences in affect and subjective well-being. *Geriatrics and Gerontology International*, 4, 268-270.
- Köker, S. (1991). *Normal ve sorunlu ergenlerin yaşam doyumu düzeyinin karşılaştırılması*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Kuzucu, Y. (2006). *The effects of psycho-education program of emotinal awareness and expression on levels of emotional awareness, tendency to express of emotions, psychological well-being and subjective well-being*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.
- La Guardia, J. G., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., & Deci, E.L.(2000). Within-person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well-being. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 79(3), 367-384.
- Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 716-728.
- Lykken, D., & Tellegen, A. (1996). Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science*, 7, 186-189.
- Magai, C. (1999). Affect, imagery, and attachment: Working models of interpersonal affect and the socialization of emotion. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 787-802). New York: The Guildford Press.
- McCullough, G., Huebner, E. S., & Laughlin, J. E. (2000). Life events, self concept, and adolescents' positive subjective well-being. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37(3), 281-290.
- Mikulincer, M., & Orbach, I. (1995). Attachment styles and repressive defensiveness: The accessibility and architecture of affective memories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 917-925.

- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment theory and emotions in close relationships: Exploring the attachment-related dynamics of emotional reactions to relational events. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 149–168.
- Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., & Pereg, D. (2003). Attachment theory and affect regulation: The dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27(2), 77-102.
- Mikulincer, M., & Sheffi, E. (2000). Adult attachment style and cognitive reactions to positive affect: A Test of mental categorization and creative problem solving. *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3), 149-174.
- Myers, D. G. (1999). Close relationships and quality of life. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 374–391). New York: Russel Sage Found.
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10-19.
- Nalbant, N. (1993). *15-22 yaşları arasında bulunan islahevlerindeki, gözetim altındaki ve suç işlememiş gençlerin benlik saygısı ve yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Nickerson, A. B., & Nagle, R. J. (2004). The influence of parent and peer attachments on life satisfaction in middle childhood and early adolescence. *Social Indicators Research*, 66, 35-60.
- Özen, Ö. (2005). *Subjective well-being of adolescents*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Özkan, S., Ceyhan, M.N., İlhan, M.N., Aksakal, F.N., & Aygün, R.R. (2004, November). *Tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinde yaşam doyum düzeyi*. Paper presented at IX. Public Health Conference. Abstract reviewed from <http://www.halksagligi.org/halkmed>.
- Paolini, L., Yanez, A. P., & Kelly, W.E. (2006). An examination of worry and life satisfaction among college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 4(5), 331-339.

- Perlman, D. (2007). The best of times, the worst of times: The place of close relationships in psychology and our daily lives. *Canadian Psychology*, 48(1), 7-18.
- Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: The full life versus the empty life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 25-41.
- Pickover, S. (2002) Breaking the cycle: A clinical example of disrupting an insecure attachment system. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 24(4), 358-367.
- Quimby, C. L., & O'Brien, K. M. (2006). Predictors of well-being among nontraditional female students with children. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 84, 451-460.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.
- Roothman, B., Kirsten, D. K., & Wissing, M.P. (2003). Gender Differences in aspects of psychological well-being. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(4), 212-218.
- Rönnlund, M., & Karlsson, E. (2006). The relation between dimensions of attachment and internalizing or externalizing problems during adolescence. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 167(1), 47-63.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001) On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52,141-66.
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). Human health: New directions for the next millennium. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9(1), 69-85.
- Schwarz, N., & Strack, F. (1991) Evaluating one's life: A judgement model of subjective well-being. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 27-47). England: Pergamon.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1), 5-4.

- Selçukoğlu, Z. (2001). *Araştırma görevlilerinde tükenmişlik düzeyi ile yalnızlık ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin bazı değişkenlere açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Shiota, M.N., Keltner, D. & John, O. P. (2006). Positive emotion dispositions differentially associated with big five personality and attachment style. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(2), 61–71.
- Shorey, H. S., & Snyder, C. R. (2006). The role of adult attachment styles in psychopathology and psychotherapy outcomes. *Review of General Psychology*, 10(1), 1-20.
- Simonelli, L. E., Ray, W. J., & Pincus, A.L. (2004). Attachment models and their relationships with anxiety, worry, and depression. *Counseling and Clinical Psychology Journal*, 1(3), 107-118.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 971-980.
- Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1998). The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgements across cultures: Emotions versus norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 482-493.
- Suhail, K., & Chaudhry, H. R. (2004). Predictors of subjective well-being in an eastern Muslim culture. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23(3), 359-376.
- Sümer, N. (2006). Yetişkin bağlanma ölçeklerinin kategoriler ve boyutlar düzeyinde karşılaştırılması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 21(57), 1-22.
- Şimşek, Ö. F. (2005). *Paths from fear of death to subjective well-being: A study of structural equation modeling based on the terror management theory perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Torquati, J. C., & Raffaelli, M. (2004). Daily experiences of emotions and social contexts of securely and insecurely attached young adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 740-758.

- Tuzgöl-Dost, M. (2004). *Subjective well-being levels of university students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Uchida, Y., Norasakkunkit, N., & Kitayama, S. (2004). Cultural constructions of happiness: Theory and empirical evidence, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 5, 223–239.
- Ünal, S., Karlıdağ, R., & Yoloğlu, S. (2001). Hekimlerde tükenmişlik ve iş doyumunu düzeylerinin yaşam doyumunu düzeyleri ile ilişkisi. *Klinik Psikiyatri*, 4, 113-118.
- Veenhoven, R. (1991). Questions on happiness: Classical topics, modern answers, blind spots. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective Well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 7-26). England: Pergamon.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Wearden, A., Perryman, K., & Ward, V. (2006). Adult Attachment, reassurance seeking and hypochondriacal concerns in college students. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 11(6), 877-886.
- Webster, J. D., (1998). Attachment styles, reminiscence functions, and happiness in young and elderly adults. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 12(3), 315-321.
- Young, M. H., Miller, B. C., Norton, M. C., & Hill, E. J. (1995). The effect of parental supportive behaviors on life satisfaction of adolescent offspring. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57, 813-822.
- Zhang, F., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2004). Stability and fluctuation in adult attachment style over a six-year period. *Attachment and Human Development*, 6(4), 419-437.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Sevgili Öğrenci,

Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşamlarına ilişkin duygu ve düşüncelerini etkileyen bazı değişkenlerin araştırıldığı bu çalışmada, kişisel bilgi formu ve üç adet ölçek yer almaktadır. Sizden istenilen bu ölçekleri dikkatli ve içten olarak yanıtlamanızdır.

Tüm yanıtlarınız gizli tutulacak ve çalışmada sizin kimliğinizi belirten herhangi bir bilgi kesinlikle yer almayacaktır. Soruları eksiksiz ve içtenlikle yanıtlamanız araştırmanın amacına ulaşabilmesini sağlayacaktır.

Katkılarınızdan dolayı şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Zeynep Zelal Kankotan
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi
ODTÜ, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Açıklama: Aşağıdaki soruları okuyup sizin için uygun olan cevapları işaretleyiniz.

1. Yaşınız:
2. Cinsiyetiniz:
() Kadın () Erkek
3. Bölümünüz:
4. Sınıfınız:
5. Şu anda beraber olduğunuz bir kız / erkek arkadaşınız var mı?
() Var () Yok
6. Sürekli tedavi gerektiren önemli bir sağlık sorunuz var mı?
() Var () Yok
7. Fiziksel bir engeliniz var mı?
() Var () Yok

APPENDIX B

EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS INVENTORY (in Turkish)

Aşağıdaki maddeler romantik ilişkilerinizde hissettiğiniz duygularla ilintilidir. Bu araştırmada sizin ilişkinizde yalnızca şu anda değil, genel olarak neler olduğuyla ya da neler yaşadığımızla ilgilenmekteyiz. Maddelerde sözü geçen “birlikte olduğum kişi” ifadesi ile romantik ilişkide bulunduğunuz kişi kastedilmektedir. Eğer halihazırda bir romantik ilişki çerisinde değilseniz, aşağıdaki maddeleri bir ilişki içerisinde olduğunuzu varsayarak cevaplandırınız. Her bir maddenin ilişkilerinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılardaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Hiç
katılmıyorum

Kararsızım /
Fikrim yok

Tamamen
katılıyorum

1. Gerçekte ne hissettiğimi birlikte olduğum kişiye göstermemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Terk edilmekten korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere yakın olmak konusunda çok rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. İlişkilerim konusunda çok kaygılıyım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Birlikte olduğum kişi bana yakınlaşmaya başlar başlamaz kendimi geri çekiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilerin beni, benim onları umursadığım kadar umursamayacaklarından endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişi çok yakın olmak isteğinde rahatsızlık duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Birlikte olduğum kişiyi kaybedeceğim diye çok kaygılanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Birlikte olduğum kişilere açılma konusunda kendimi rahat hissetmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Genellikle, birlikte olduğum kişinin benim için hissettiklerinin, benim onun için hissettiklerim kadar güçlü olmasını arzu ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. Birlikte olduğum kişiye yakın olmak isterim, ama sürekli kendimi geri çekerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Genellikle birlikte olduğum kişiyle tamamen bütünleşmek isterim ve bu bazen onları korkutup benden uzaklaştırır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Birlikte olduğum kişilerin benimle çok yakınlaşması beni gerginleştirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Yalnız kalmaktan endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Özel duygu ve düşüncelerimi birlikte olduğum kişiyle paylaşmak konusunda oldukça rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Çok yakın olma arzumu bazen insanları korkutup uzaklaştırır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle çok yakınlaşmaktan kaçınmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Birlikte olduğum kişi tarafından sevildiğimin sürekli ifade edilmesine gereksinim duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle kolaylıkla yakınlaşabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Birlikte olduğum kişileri bazen daha fazla duygu ve bağlılık göstermeleri için zorladığımı hissedirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Birlikte olduğum kişilere güvenip dayanma konusunda kendimi rahat bırakmakta zorlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Terk edilmekten pek korkmam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Birlikte olduğum kişilere fazla yakın olmamayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Birlikte olduğum kişinin bana ilgi göstermesini sağlayamazsam üzülür ya da kızarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Birlikte olduğum kişiye hemen hemen herşeyi anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Birlikte olduğum kişinin bana istediğim kadar yakın olmadığını düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Sorunlarımı ve kaygılarımı genellikle birlikte olduğum kişiyle tartışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Bir ilişkide olmadığım zaman kendimi biraz kaygılı ve güvensiz hissedirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Birlikte olduğum kişilere güvenip dayanmakta rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Birlikte olduğum kişi istediğim kadar yakınımda olmadığında kendimi engellenmiş hissedirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

31. Birlikte olduđum kişilerden teselli, öğüt ya da yardım istemekten rahatsız olmam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. İhtiyaç duyduğumda birlikte olduđum kişiye ulaşamazsam kendimi engellenmiş hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. İhtiyacım olduğunda birlikte olduđum kişiden yardım istemek işe yarar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Birlikte olduđum kişiler beni onaylamadıkları zaman kendimi gerçekten kötü hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Rahatlama ve güvencenin yanısıra birçok şey için birlikte olduđum kişiyi ararım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. Birlikte olduđum kişi benden ayrı zaman geçirdiğinde üzülürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C

THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE (in Turkish)

Aşağıda bir takım duygu ifadeleri bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her bir duyguyu genelde yaşama sıklığınızı, yan taraftaki dereceleme ölçeğinde belirleyiniz.

	Asla	Çok Nadiren	Nadiren	Bazen	Sıkça	Çoğunlukla	Daima
1. İlgili	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Sıkıntılı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Heyecanlı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Mutsuz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Güçlü	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Suçlu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Ürkmüş	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Düşmanca	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Hevesli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Gururlu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Asabi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Uyanık	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Utanmış	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. İlhamlı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Sinirli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Kararlı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Dikkatli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Tedirgin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Aktif	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Korkmuş	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX D
SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE (in Turkish)

Aşağıda genel olarak yaşamınız ve yaşamınızın bazı alanlarındaki doyumunuz ile ilgili birtakım ifadeler verilmiştir. Lütfen söz konusu ifadeleri size uygunluğu açısından çarpı (X) işareti koyarak değerlendiriniz.

	Hiç uygun değil	Kısmen uygun	Uygun	Oldukça uygun	Tamamen uygun
1. Yaşamım idealime büyük ölçüde yaklaşıyor.					
2. Yaşam koşullarım mükemmel.					
3. Yaşamımdan memnunum.					
4. Yaşamda şu ana kadar istediğim önemli şeylere sahip oldum.					
5. Yaşamımı bir daha yaşasaydım hiçbir şeyi değiştirmek istemezdim.					