



Examination of The Relationship Between Dyadic Trust and Father Involvement Among Young Adults

Genç Yetişkin Bireylerin İkili İlişkilerinde Güven ile Baba Katılımı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Leyla YARAR¹, Pervin NEDİM BAL²

Abstract

In this study it was aimed to investigate the relationship between father involvement that is perceived by individuals in their childhood and adolescence and the feeling of trust in their current romantic relationships. In addition, it was aimed to investigate both father involvement and trust in romantic relationships according to some demographic variables. The sample of this study consisted of 201 participants (154 females, 47 males) between the age of 18 and 35. In this particular study, it was used Father Involvement Scale, Dyadic Trust Scale, and a Demographic Information Form was prepared by the researchers. According to the results, there is no significant relationship between father involvement and feeling of trust in romantic relationships. In terms of demographic variables, first of all, father involvement differs significantly according to whether the relationship with the father continues or not in favor of does. Secondly, father involvement differs significantly according to how the individuals define the relationship between their parents while they grow up in favor of individuals who define their parent's relationship as "good". Finally, father involvement differs significantly according to the place the individuals grow up, in other words, individuals growing up with both parents perceive more father involvement than the others. Father involvement and feeling of trust in the romantic relationship do not differ significantly according to other demographic variables. Future researchers could use longitudinal research design to eliminate the limitation of retrospective measurement of father involvement.

Keywords: Father involvement, trust in romantic relationships, the relationship of parents

Öz

Bu çalışmada genç yetişkinlerin çocukluk ve ergenlik dönemlerinde hissettikleri baba katılımı ile ikili ilişkilerinde hissettikleri güven arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek amaçlanmıştır. Ayrıca hem baba katılımı hem de ikili ilişkilerde güven bazı demografik değişkenler açısından da incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemini 18-35 yaş arasında 154 kadın ve 47 erkek olmak üzere toplam 201 katılımcı oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada; Baba Katılım Ölçeği, İkili İlişkilerde Güven Ölçeği ve araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan bir Demografik Form kullanılmıştır. Bulgulara göre baba katılımı ile ikili ilişkilerde güven arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Demografik değişkenler açısından bakıldığında, öncelikle baba katılımı kişinin babasıyla ilişkisinin hala devam edip etmemesine göre ilişkinin devam etmesi lehine anlamlı bir farklılık göstermiştir. İkinci olarak, baba katılımı kişinin büyürken anne babası arasındaki ilişkiyi iyi olarak tanımlaması lehine anlamlı bir farklılık göstermiştir. Son olarak, baba katılımı büyüdüğü ortama göre anlamlı bir farklılık göstermekte olup her iki ebeveynle de beraber büyüyen bireylerin daha fazla baba katılımı algıladıkları anlaşılmıştır. Baba katılımı ve ikili ilişkilerde güven diğer demografik değişkenlere göre anlamlı bir farklılık göstermemiştir. Gelecek çalışmalara baba katılımının geriye dönük ölçülmesinin yarattığı kısıtı engelleyebilmek için boylamsal bir araştırma deseni kullanmaları önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Baba katılımı, ikili ilişkilerde güven, ebeveyn ilişkileri

Atıf (to cite): Yazar, L. & Nedim Bal, P. (2023). Examination of the relationship between dyadic trust and father involvement among young adults. *International Journal of Behavior, Sustainability, and Management*, 10(18), 25-41. DOI: 10.54709/iisbf.1238152

Makale Geliş Tarihi (Received Date): 17.01.2023

Makale Kabul Tarihi (Accepted Date): 04.04.2023

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License



¹ Arş. Gör., Beykent Üniversitesi, leylayarar@beykent.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9521-6028

² Prof. Dr., Beykent Üniversitesi, pervinbal@beykent.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3090-6634

1. INTRODUCTION

It is seen that majority of research on raising children mostly focused on the mother-child relationship (Brown et.al, 2007). Despite the fact that father involvement became more popular in European literature, researchers still mostly focus on the mother-child relationship with the Turkish sample. In Turkey, it is understood the reason for this tendency is the role of raising a child is associated with the mother rather than the father. Fathers mostly are of secondary importance in this context (Çelik & Bulut, 2019). Researches showed that even if fathers see their children every day, they still connect less with them in comparison to mothers (Lugaila, 2003).

With the beginning of the 21st century, family structure and of course its function of it in human life show some differences. These differences occur based on four main domains; increase in women's employment, raising a child without the father, increased attention to father involvement, and increased cultural diversity. Changes in these areas cause the occurrence of respectively new forms of family structure and accordingly change the expectation and beliefs about the role of the father in the family (Cabrera et.al, 2000). In recent years, there are attempts to integrate the fathers' role in the family system. With these attempts, fathers are tried to be seen as distinct members of the family who contribute to system not only with physical manner but also with emotional support and bonding with children like the mothers (Cabrera, 2019).

Perception of father involvement comes from how people see their relationship with their father. It can be examined in two dimensions; the first one is the expressive dimension, latter is the instrumental dimension. The expressive dimension mostly focuses on the extent of accessibility of the father emotionally on the other hand instrumental dimension focuses on the involvement of the father in the development of the child (Krampe, 2009). In this sense father's being easy to access can provide a sense of security and emotional support (Cabrera et.al, 2000). Physical proximity is one of the most important components of father involvement nevertheless it is not the only necessary one (Thomas et.al., 2007). The physical being of the father does not fulfill all of the requirements of father involvement, fathers should be role models who are emotionally stable and trustworthy and also willing to support the child in terms of her/his social life and development (Harris, 2002). However, even if physical closeness is not enough for father involvement, children feel most close to their father when they live together. This fact should not be interpreted as those children who do not live with their father cannot build any relationship with them, but still, the most favorable environment for raising children is them living with both parents in a healthy concept (Thomas et.al, 2007). Researches indicate that

people who lived in this kind of family arrangement state more positive father involvement retrospectively, tend to be more self-confident, get more pleasure out of life, and have more expectation from the future compared with the people who came from divorced families (Finley & Schwartz, 2007). Children who live with both parents have the opportunity to access easily both financial sources and also the opportunity to spend time with their father. Therefore, they have more supervision over their daily activities and get a more regular social life (Fields, 2003).

The effect of parents' feelings about children and the relationship between parent and child on the children's future is now a well-known fact (Lugaila, 2003). Adults who have caring parents are found more capable of carrying out more long and happy marriages compared to adults who have not caring parents, especially father involvement is found associated with the adult's success in social life (Franz et.al, 1991). Similarly, in other research, it was stated that people who did not have a regular relationship with their parents in their childhood are more prone to unhappiness in their adulthood (An & Cooney, 2006). While these findings highlight the importance of building a relationship with parents, in other research was found the type of communication with parents differs in accordance with whom is connected. While communication with the mother occurs around emotional sharing and mostly talking, communication with the father is mostly based on attending to some physical activities (Way & Gillman, 2000). In conclusion, regardless of the type of relationship, father involvement was found associated with people's emotional coping strategies with daily stressors (Mallers et.al, 2010).

Romantic relationships are seen as the most complicated and significant relationships among different kinds of relationships. Most research about it is based on either attachment theory or interdependence theory. Attachment theory focused on whether people attach to other people securely or insecurely throughout their development from infancy while interdependence theory is interested in dynamics occurred in every individual relationship (Campbell & Stanton, 2019). Trust is one of the most important factors that affect the dynamics of relationships from the beginning and make the relationships continue healthily. In one source trust is defined as hoping someone will behave in a certain way in the future with regard to past actions of that person. In other words, trust is accepting being vulnerable and taking risks with the faith that a certain person's behavior will lead the positive consequences in the future depending on the commitment between individuals (Borum, 2010).

Many research show that individuals who trust their romantic partners, experience less conflict in their relationships. Even if they experienced it, they can end the conflict more constructively and therefore feel more satisfied (Şensoy et.al, 2019). Çetinkaya et.al highlighted the importance of trust in marital relationships in terms of mental health in their research (2008). Such that feeling trust in the relationship is important both for the person herself/himself and the relationship itself when people experience relationship problems they are prone to show prorelationship behaviors to restore the trust, for example, sexual intercourse, spending more time together or giving a gift to their romantic partners (Matson et.al, 2021). In other research, it was found that trust in the romantic partner is related to how people remember past mistakes of their partner. For example, if a person trusts her/his partner, s/he tends to remember bad memories related to her/his partner with a more positive vibe (Luchies et.al, 2013). The traditional view tends to see trust as a concept that develops with time the relationship continues (Borum, 2010). On the contrary, in research about trust and misremembering bad memories, even if the relationship is fairly new, trust and positively misremembering memories were found associated (Luchies et.al, 2013).

It is well-accepted fact that with many other things early childhood experiences have also an effect on shaping relationships in adulthood. In a study, it was found that intimacy with parents in adolescence is positively associated with the quality of romantic relationships in adulthood (Flouri & Buchanan, 2002). In literature, there are many pieces of research about the link between the parent-child relationship in adolescence and romantic relationships in adulthood. For instance, Orina et.al found the fact that a person is a weak chain in a romantic relationship as the one who invests less in the relationship is positively related to the absence of healthy bonding with the parents in childhood (2011). As the extent of a healthy relationship with parents throughout childhood and adolescence will lead to building a healthy relationship in adulthood. For example, adults who grew up in divorced families are less self-confident in a relationship compared to adults who grew up with both parents (Johnston & Thomas, 1996).

Especially, trust is one of the main issues in child development. Erik Erikson's well-known personality theory starts with trust and mistrust in the infancy (Erikson, 1950). Babies are totally depend on others in early years of their life. So, according to Erikson's theory their first challenge to cope with is feeling of trust based on whether their needs will be met or not. Considering that babies are usually spend lots of time with their parents in those years, the shape of connection with parent becomes critical. If the needs of a baby are met properly, s/he

develops a basic sense of trust. This sense of trust is reflected on other relations later in life as well (Burger, 2006).

The relationship with the parent in childhood basically sets the expectations and shapes the schemas about how to feel, what is proper behavior etc. for their adult relationships. (Walper & Wendt, 2015). It can be seen that in the literature there is a tendency to focus on mother-child relationships when it comes to this issue. Whereas there are also lots of studies that suggested that the effect of the father should not be underestimated. In a qualitative study run by Way and Gillman, girls especially said that their father has a critical role in their life (2000). Fathers shape the children's ideas about themselves, relationships, and in general about the world (Way & Gillman, 2000). In consistence with these findings, if a father shows intimacy to his child while growing up, praises her/his actions and supports, that child learns the fact that s/he is valuable and builds trust about when the time of need people will support her/him in adulthood. On contrary, if the father does not behave like the listed above or is not consistent with them, that child will believe that s/he is not worthy of love and support and are not able to build trust in the willingness of people to help in adulthood (Karre, 2015).

When it is taken into consideration, the present study has three main purposes. First of all, it is aimed to study the relationship between perceived father involvement and the trust in their current romantic relationships among young adults. The second goal is to study the differences in father involvement according to participant's gender, family arrangement, description of the father-mother relationship in childhood, whether the father is alive or dead, and whether the relationship with the father continues. The last goal is to study differences in dyadic trust according to participant's gender, family arrangement, description of the father-mother relationship in childhood, whether the father is alive or dead, and whether the relationship with the father continues. Thus it is hypothesized that there is significant relationship between perceived father involvement and the trust people feel in their current relationships, and also both variables differ significantly in accordance with socio-demographic variables specified above.

2. METHOD

2.1. Model of the study

In this research to study the relationship between dyadic trust and father involvement, the correlational survey model was used. In the correlational survey model, it is studied whether

there is a relationship between two variables and if there is whether they differ respectively (Karasar, 2012).

2.2. Sample and population

The population of this study consisted of young adults living in Turkey and the sample consisted of 201 participants, 154 females and 47 males, who are selected by using convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is one of the sampling types that mostly used participants primarily convenient for the researchers and agree the participate voluntarily (Erkuş, 2009). As the population of the study were young adults, participants had chosen between 18-and 35 years old people. In Table1 sample distribution according to demographic information form.

2.3. Data collection instruments

For this research Father Involvement Scale, Dyadic Trust Scale, and a Demographic Information Form which is prepared by the researcher, were used. The questionnaire battery was approved by Beykent University Ethics Committee. One survey was prepared by collecting all the scales via the application of Google Forms. This survey was sent out to participants by using social media applications such as Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, and Whatsapp. Before using scales, required permissions were gotten from each scale's author. Participants signed the informed consent before they started answering questions to state they participated voluntarily. To complete the survey took approximately 10 minutes.

2.3.1. Demographic information form

This form, which contains socio-demographic information about participants, was prepared by the researcher in light of the related literature to investigate the hypothesis of this study. The Demographic Information Form includes variables about the hypothesis of the study such as gender, whether the relationship with the father continues or not, family arrangement, and description of the relationship between mother and father.

2.3.2. Father involvement scale (FIS)

The original Father Involvement Scale was developed by Finley in 1998, to measure father involvement perceived throughout childhood (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). In 2013, the scale was adapted to the Turkish language and studied reliability and validity by Kuzucu and Özdemir. FIS consisted of 9 items. Participants were asked to choose the most suitable answer for the 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. Answers differ according to the questions. In regard to the reliability of the scale, Cronbach alpha was found .88 (Kuzucu & Özdemir, 2013).

2.3.3. Dyadic trust scale (DTS)

The original Dyadic Trust Scale was developed by Lazerlere and Huston in 1980, to measure interpersonal trust in romantic relationships (Larzelere and Huston, 1980). In 2008, the scale was adapted to the Turkish language and studied its reliability and validity by Çetinaya, Kemer, Bulgan, and Tezer. The original scale consisted of 8 items but one item was excluded in the Turkish version of the scale because of the low factor load. So Turkish version of DTS consisted of 7 7-point Likert items ranging from (1) "Never" to (7) "Always". Item 1 and 2 are revised items. Cronbach alpha for Turkish version of DTS was .89 (Çetinkaya et.al, 2008).

2.4. Statistical analyses

In this study, IBM SPSS Statistics 25 was used to analyze data. First of all, normality statistics were run and reached the results that the data distributed normally. Pearson Correlation analyses were run in order to measure the relationship between father involvement and dyadic trust in accordance with the normality tests. To measure whether the data acquired from scales differ according to socio-demographic information, independent samples t-test and ANOVA were run. Lastly, it was decided between which groups there are significant differences via Hochberg's GT2 and Games Howell post hoc tests relatively whether the data was homogeny or not.

Table 1. *Socio-demographic distributions of sample*

		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Female	154	76,6
	Male	47	23,4
Relationship Status	Married	85	42,3
	Engaged	13	6,5
	Girl/Boyfriend	103	51,2
Is Your Father Alive?	Alive	186	92,5
	Not Alive	15	7,5
If alive, are your relationships continuing?	Yes	175	87,1
	No	26	12,9
Description of mother-father relationship during childhood	Good	79	39,3

	Medium	76	37,8
	Bad	46	22,9
With whom did you grow up?	Both Parent	174	86,6
	One of The Parent	21	10,4
	Relatives	6	3,0

3. RESULTS

First of all, it was investigated the skewness and kurtosis of the data obtained. Values between -1.5 and +1.5 can be interpreted as the indication of normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In Table 2 there are the results about concerned values. It is seen that both Dyadic Trust and Father Involvement Scales' skewness and kurtosis values are between -1.5 and +1.5. According to these results, it can be said that data distributes normally. After it was understood data has normal distribution Pearson Correlation test was run to measure the relationship between father involvement and dyadic trust.

Table 2. Mean, standard deviation, minimum-maximum and kurtosis-skewness values

Variable	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Skew.	Kurt.
Dyadic Trust	201	39	.618	7	49	-1.244	1.402
Father Involvement	201	31.17	.681	9	45	-.489	-.608

Table 3. *The correlation between dyadic trust and father involvement*

		Dyadic Trust	Father Involvement
Dyadic Trust	Pearson Correlation	1	0,093
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,19
	<i>n</i>	201	201
Father Involvement	Pearson Correlation	0,093	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,19	
	<i>n</i>	201	201

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that Pearson Correlation was run to measure dyadic trust and father involvement and the p value is greater than .05. So the relationship between father involvement and dyadic trust is not statistically significant.

In Table 4 both dyadic trust and father involvement do not differ significantly according to gender. p values for both scales are greater than .05, (respectively) $p=.128$, $p=.264$.

Table 4. *t-Test analysis of dyadic trust and father involvement according to gender*

	<i>f</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.(2-tailed)
Dyadic Trust	1.923	0.167	-1.530	199	.128
Father Involvement	.016	0,899	-1.120	199	.264

Table 5. *t-Test analysis of dyadic trust and father involvement according to continuance of relationship with father*

	<i>f</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.(2-tailed)
Dyadic Trust	3.217	.074	-.530	199	.597
Father Involvement	15.244	.000	3.817	28.458	.001

In Table 5, while dyadic trust does not significantly differ according to the continuance of the relationship with the father ($p=.597$), perceived father involvement, as expected, differs significantly in accordance with the continuance of the relationship with the father. ($p<.05$)

Table 6. ANOVA table for the differences according to family arrangement

		SS	df	Mean Square	f	Sig.
Dyadic Trust	Between Groups	.444	2	.222	.003	.997
	Within Groups	15374.551	198	77.649		
	Total	15374.995	200			
Father Involvement	Between Groups	2962.716	2	1481.358	18.734	.000
	Within Groups	15656.190	198	79.072		
	Total	18618.905	200			

In Table 6 it can be understood that dyadic trust does not significantly differ according to where the child grows up, $p=.997$. However, perceived father involvement shows a significant difference in accordance with the family arrangement, $p<.001$. To understand between which groups, among "with both parents", "with only one parent", and "relatives" groups, this difference take place, post hoc tests were run. Because of the imbalance between-group sample size (respectively $N=174$, $N=21$, $N=6$), Hochberg's GT2 post hoc test was preferred, results are given in Table 7.

As can be seen from Table 7, the results of the post hoc tests indicated that father involvement shows a significant difference in favor of the "both parents" group. When Table 8 is examined, it is understood that dyadic trust does not differ significantly according to the description of the mother-father relationship during childhood. $p=.083$. However, perceived father involvement differs significantly in accordance with the description of the mother-father relationship during childhood. $p<.001$. In order to understand between which groups, among "good", "moderate", and "bad" groups, this difference takes place, post hoc tests were run. In regard to homogeneity results, it was understood that data did not distribute homogeny ($p=.043$) Games-Howell post hoc test was preferred, results were given in Table9.

Table 7. *Post hoc results of father involvement differences according to family arrangement*

(I) With whom did you grow up?	(J) With whom did you grow up?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Both Parents	Only One Parent	12,305*	2,054	.000	7,36	17,25
	Relatives	5,971	3,692	.288	-2,92	14,86
Only One Parent	Both Parents	-12,305*	2,054	.000	-17,25	-7,36
	Relatives	-6,333	4,116	.330	-16,24	3,58
Relatives	Both Parents	-5,971	3,692	.288	-14,86	2,92
	Only One Parent	6,333	4,116	.330	-3,58	16,24

Note: *p<.05

Table 8. *ANOVA table for the differences according to description of mother-father relationship during childhood*

		SS	df	Mean Square	f	Sig.
Dyadic Trust	Between Groups	381.808	2	190.904	2.521	.083
	Within Groups	14993.187	198	75.723		
	Total	15374.995	200			
Father Involvement	Between Groups	7393.807	2	3696.904	65.210	.000
	Within Groups	11225.098	198	56.692		
	Total	18618.905	200			

Table 9 shows that people who describe the relationship between their mother and father as good differ significantly from people who describe the relationship as medium and also people who describe the relationship as medium differ significantly from people who describe it as bad. For each group, p<.05. In other words, people who describe the relationship between their mother and father as good perceive more father involvement than people who describe it as the medium. Similarly, people who describe the relationship as medium perceive more father involvement than the people who describe the certain relationship as bad.

Table 9. *Post hoc results of father involvement differences according to description of mother-father relationship during childhood*

(I) Description of mother-father relationship during childhood	(J) Description of mother-father relationship during childhood	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Good	Medium	7.748*	1.168	.000	4.98	10.52
	Bad	15.752*	1.433	.000	12.32	19.18
Medium	Good	-7.748*	1.168	.000	-10.52	-4.98
	Bad	8.004*	1.555	.000	4.30	11.71
Bad	Good	-15.752*	1.433	.000	-19.18	-12.32
	Medium	-8.004*	1.555	.000	-11.71	-4.30

Note: *p<.05

Table 10 indicated that dyadic trust does not differ significantly according to the fact whether the father is dead or alive. p value is greater than .05, $p=.762$.

Table 10. *t-Test analysis of dyadic trust according to father dead or alive*

	<i>f</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.(2-tailed)
Dyadic Trust	3.309	.070	.303	199	.762

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Findings

In this present study, it was investigated the relationship between perceived father involvement retrospectively and the trust people feel in their current relationships, and also differences of both variables in accordance with some socio-demographic variables. At the end of the investigation, the main hypothesis which is there is a relationship between perceived father involvement and dyadic trust, cannot be proven. In regard to the current study's results, it can be stated that there is no significant relationship between perceived father involvement and dyadic trust. In addition, in comparisons regarding socio-demographic variables father

involvement differs significantly according to only three variables. First of all, perceived father involvement is higher among people who continue the relationship with their father. Secondly, perceived father involvement shows a significant difference depending on which family arrangement the person grows up in. To make more clear, people who grow up with both parents perceive more father involvement than people who grow up with only one parent or relatives. Lastly, father involvement shows a difference in the description of the relationship between mother and father. The results of this study show that people who describe their parent's relationship in their childhood as good perceive more father involvement than people who describe it as medium or bad. And also, people describe the relationship as a medium state more father involvement than people describe it as bad.

4.2. Discussion

At the end of the current study, contrary to expectations, there was no significant relationship between father involvement and dyadic trust. These results are shocking because according to the commonly accepted theory of Erik Erikson's psychosocial development, the acquisition of feeling of trust takes place in the first stage and it can be achieved with a stable relationship with parents. In the present study, only the father was taken into account as a parent because of the changes in parental roles along with many other things throughout the time changes. Findings can be interpreted as with the changing rule of the world even though fathers became equal parents with mothers and not the secondary caregiver, the effect of the mother on a child's life cannot be substituted even with the father.

There are also many research supporting this particular interpretation. For example, research by Çelik & Bulut run in 2019 stated that father involvement perceived by child increases as the mother's support for the father-child relationship increase. This result can be interpreted, at least in Turkey, that mothers are still primary caregivers and have an undeniable effect on a child's way of thinking. In addition, another research in America indicated that mothers' view of traditional gender roles, dyadic trust, and hostility towards men is one of the predictors of their support for father involvement (Hoffman & Moon, 1999). In England, in a longitudinal research, it was found that intimacy with the mother predicts the child's intimate feelings for the father (Flouri & Buchanan, 2002). Not only the perceived father involvement effected by mothers', effects of the actual father involvement is also mediated by maternal acceptance. In a research, it was found that in the relationship with father involvement and externalizing behaviors in children maternal acceptance placed as mediator (Rodríguez Ruíz et al., 2016). These culturally diverse researches show that the role of the mother in the relationship between

father and child cannot be underestimated. Thus, the present study has also shown that individuals who describe their mother-father relationships as good stated more father involvement than others. However, the dyadic trust did not differ accordingly from the description of the mother-father relationship.

In the current study, neither father involvement nor dyadic trust did not differ according to gender. Gender can shape the dynamics of the relationship between father and children but results show that perceived father involvement develops regardless of the shape of the relationship. In Way and Gillman's study, different kinds of father-child relationships were highlighted. In interviews done with adolescent girls, they defined their relationships with their father mostly based on "doing things and physical activities" on the other hand defined their relationship with their mother mostly based on "talking and sharing emotions" (2000). In another study, it was stated that a healthy bonding with father in childhood affects decreasing negative behaviors in adolescence for both girls and boys equally (Gold et al., 2020). The present study's result can also be interpreted as regardless of gender and the shape of the relationship with the father, it is important to have a healthy interaction between child and father.

Last, of all, the results that individuals who grow up with both parents perceive more father involvement show parallelism with the literature suggesting that the most ideal place for a child to grow up with both parents (Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Thomas et.al., 2007). However, individuals who grow up with both parents perceive more father involvement than others, they do not differ in terms of dyadic trust from individuals who grow up with only one parent or relatives. These results do not sort together with the results of Johnston and Thomas's research which stated individuals who come from divorced families have less trust for their romantic partners than individuals who grow up with both parents (1996). These results can be interpreted with the fact that individuals observed their parent's relationship during childhood and take them as role models therefore they expect a similar cycle of the relationship. The fact that the present study's results do not overlap with the literature can let the opinion, that in today's world relationships became more diverse and create more sources of relationship schemas for individuals to look up beside their parent's relationship, is emerged yet most effective one is still parent's relationship. In addition, some of the research showed that even though there is a relationship between growing up in divorced families and less dyadic trust, it can be mostly compensated with a healthy relationship with parents during especially adolescence (King, 2002). As well as, there are researches define the trust as a developing

manner within every specific relationship not specially in childhood. While Campell and Stanton explaining different approaches to trust in romantic relations, they stated a conceptualization of trust that develop within every different relationship (2019). So, more the partners in that specific relationship shows the pro-relationship behaviors they will prone to develop more trust regardless of the childhood relations in that manner.

Besides in the current study, father involvement was measured retrospectively. Individuals' memories of their relationship with their father during childhood can be affected by later life experiences. In one research, it was found that individuals may remember biasedly or completely wrong because of many reasons, such as inconsistency between the real incident and their thoughts/beliefs about themselves, desire for the incident to occur in a particular way, or social pressure (Kopelman, 1999). Consistent with this memory research, individuals who continue the relationship with their father stated more father involvement than others. An ongoing relationship with the father could provide more positive atmosphere while they were trying to remember memories from their childhood.

Future researchers could use longitudinal research design for investigating the perceived father involvement adolescents and children feel today and the level of dyadic trust of the same individuals in their adulthood. Thanks to this method it can be eliminated the limitation retrospective measurement. Although in current study, it was not focused on the birth order of the participants, it may be related to perceived father involvement for both boys and girls so future researchers can take that into account. In addition, the present study could not provide equality for male-female participants, female participants were the majority. Future research could be tried the equalize the groups in terms of gender. Like many research was done during the times of the Covid-19 pandemic, for the present study data were collected via the Internet. It must be taken into consideration that collecting data in person may affect the results.

REFERENCES

- An, J. S., & Cooney, T. M. (2006). Psychological well-being in mid to late life: The role of generativity development and parent-child relationships across the lifespan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*(5), 410-421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025406071489>
- Borum, R. (2010). *The science of interpersonal trust*. Mental Health Law and Policy Faculty Publications.
- Brown, G., McBride, B., Shin, N., & Bost, K. (2007). Parenting predictors of father-child attachment security: Interactive effects of father involvement and fathering quality. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers, 5*(3), 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.3149/fth.0503.197>
- Burger, J. M. (2006). *Kişilik* (I. D. Erguvan Sarioğlu, Trans.) (1st ed.). Kaknüs Yayıncılık.
- Cabrera, N. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development, 71*, 127-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00126>
- Cabrera, N. J. (2019). Father involvement, father-child relationship, and attachment in the early years. *Attachment & Human Development, 22*(1), 134-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2019.1589070>
- Campbell, L., & Stanton, S. C. (2019). Adult attachment and trust in romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 25*, 148-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2018.08.004>
- Çelik, H., & Bulut, O. (2019). Examining Turkish adults' recalled experiences of their father's presence. *Journal of Family Issues, 40*(9), 1224-1251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x19835879>
- Çetinkaya, E., Kemer, G., Bulgan, G., & Tezer, E. (2008). İkili İlişkilerde Güven Ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmaları. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 3*(29), 65-77.
- Erkuş, A. (2009). *Davranış bilimleri için bilimsel araştırma süreci* (7. Basım). Seçkin.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Fields, J. (2003). *Children's living arrangements and characteristics*: March 2002. Current population reports.
- Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2004). The father involvement and nurturant fathering scales: Retrospective measures for adolescent and adult children. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 143-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258453>
- Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2007). Father involvement and long-term young adult outcomes: The differential contributions of divorce and gender. *Family Court Review, 45*(4), 573-587. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2007.00172.x>
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2002). What predicts good relationships with parents in adolescence and partners in adult life: Findings from the 1958 British birth cohort. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*(2), 186-198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.16.2.186>
- Franz, C. E., McClelland, D. C., & Weinberger, J. (1991). Childhood antecedents of conventional social accomplishment in midlife adults: A 36-year prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(4), 586-595. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.586>
- Gold, S., Edin, K. J., & Nelson, T. J. (2020). Does time with dad in childhood pay off in adolescence? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 82*(5), 1587-1605. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12676>
- Harris, S. M. (2002). Father absence in the African American community: Towards a new paradigm. *Race, Gender and Class, 9*(4), 111-133.

- Hoffman, C. D., & Moon, M. (1999). Women's characteristics and gender role attitudes: Support for father involvement with children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 160*(4), 411-418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221329909595554>
- Johnston, S. G., & Thomas, A. M. (1996). Divorce versus intact parental marriage and perceived risk and dyadic trust in present heterosexual relationships. *Psychological Reports, 78*(2), 387-390. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1996.78.2.387>
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler* (34. Basım). Atalay Matbaacılık.
- Karre, J. K. (2015). Fathering behavior and emerging adult romantic relationship quality: Individual and constellations of behavior. *Journal of Adult Development, 22*(3), 148-158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-015-9208-3>
- King, V. (2002). Parental divorce and interpersonal trust in adult offspring. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(3), 642-656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00642.x>
- Kopelman, M. D. (1999). Varieties of false memory. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 16*(3-5), 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026432999380762>
- Krampe, E. M. (2009). When is the father really there? *Journal of Family Issues, 30*(7), 875-897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x08331008>
- Kuzucu, Y., & Özdemir, Y. (2013). Ergen ruh sağlığının anne ve baba katılımı açısından yordanması. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 38*(168).
- Larzelere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*(3), 595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351903>
- Luchies, L. B., Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., Eastwick, P. W., Coolsen, M. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Trust and biased memory of transgressions in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(4), 673-694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031054>
- Lugaila, T. A. (2003). *A child's day: 2000* (selected indicators of child well-being).
- Mallers, M. H., Charles, S. T., Neupert, S. D., & Almeida, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of childhood relationships with mother and father: Daily emotional and stressor experiences in adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(6), 1651-1661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021020>
- Matson, P. A., Chung, S., Fortenberry, J. D., Lich, K. H., & Ellen, J. M. (2021). The impact of relationship stressors on trust and prorelationship behavior within adolescent romantic relationships: A systems approach. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 68*(3), 558-564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.06.043>
- Oriña, M. M., Collins, W. A., Simpson, J. A., Salvatore, J. E., Haydon, K. C., & Kim, J. S. (2011). Developmental and dyadic perspectives on commitment in adult romantic relationships. *Psychological Science, 22*(7), 908-915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611410573>
- Rodríguez Ruíz, M. M., Carrasco, M. Á., & Holgado-Tello, F. P. (2016). Father involvement and children's psychological adjustment: Maternal and paternal acceptance as mediators. *Journal of Family Studies, 25*(2), 151-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2016.1211549>
- Şensoy, G., Asıcı, E., & İkiz, F. E. (2019). İlişki doyumunun mükemmeliyetçilik ve güven aracılığıyla yordanması. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 46*(46), 230-249. <https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.454315>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6. Basım). Pearson.

- Thomas, P. A., Krampe, E. M., & Newton, R. R. (2007). Father presence, family structure, and feelings of closeness to the father among adult African American children. *Journal of Black Studies*, 38(4), 529-546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934705286101>
- Walper, S., & Wendt, E. (2015). Adolescents' relationships with mother and father and their links to the quality of romantic relationships: A classification approach. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12(5), 516-532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2015.1065727>
- Way, N., & Gillman, D. A. (2000). Early adolescent girls' perceptions of their relationships with their fathers. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 20(3), 309-331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431600020003003>