

AN INVESTIGATION INTO ATTACHMENT STYLES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE OF ADOLESCENTS FROM INTACT AND NON-INTACT FAMILIES¹

² Zülal ERKAN

³ Esra ÇETİNKAYA

⁴ Müzeyyen SOYER

Geliş Tarihi/Received: 27.09.2023

Elektronik Yayın / Online Published: 15.12.2023

DOI: 10.48166/ejaes.1367332

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine whether the attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from intact and non-intact families differed by gender, age, parents' survival status, parents' togetherness status, parents' separate living arrangements, reasons for family breakdown, age during family breakdown, and cohabitants. The study sample consists of 1355 high school students studying in the Mamak district of Ankara Province. The data were collected through the Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale, the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale, and the Personal Information Form prepared by the researchers. According to the analysis, adolescents from non-intact families exhibited a higher level of anxious-ambivalent attachment than those from intact families. The psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families were lower than those from intact families. While secure and avoidant attachment levels showed no gender difference in both family structures, anxious-ambivalent attachment levels differed. The psychological resilience levels of adolescents from intact families indicated a significant gender difference, whereas there was no significant difference in adolescents from non-intact families. The attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families did not differ by parents' separate living arrangements and the reason for family breakdown. There was no difference in attachment styles by cohabitants, parents' survival status, and age during family breakdown. However, there was a statistically significant difference between their psychological resilience levels, except for their age during family breakdown.

Keywords: Intact family, non-intact family, attachment styles, psychological resilience, adolescent

¹This article was prepared by the second author under the supervision of Assoc.Prof.Dr.Zülal ERKAN. Produced from MA thesis. Lecturer Dr Müzeyyen Soyer contributed to the writing of the article.

²Assoc. Prof. Dr., Mersin University, Department of Psychological Counselling, zulaler@yahoo.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-5134-9673

³Exp., Mersin University, Department of Psychological Counselling, cetinkayaesra66@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7200-421X

⁴Lecturer Assist. Prof. Dr., Mersin University, Department of Psychological Counselling, mkarslan@mersin.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4596-4116

PARÇALANMIŞ VE PARÇALANMAMIŞ AİLEYE SAHİP ERGENLERİN BAĞLANMA STİLLERİNİN VE PSİKOLOJİK SAĞLAMLIKLARININ İNCELENMESİ

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin bağlanma stillerinin ve psikolojik sağlamlıklarının cinsiyet, yaş, ebeveynlerin hayatta olma durumu, ebeveynlerin birliktelik durumu, ebeveynlerin ayrı yaşama şekli, ailenin parçalanma sebebi, parçalanmanın yaşandığı yaş ve birlikte yaşadığı kişi değişkenlerine göre farklılaşp farklılaşmadığını incelemektir. Araştırmanın örneklemini, Ankara İli Mamak ilçesinde halen öğrenim gören 1355 lise öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmanın verileri, Üç Boyutlu Bağlanma Stilleri Ölçeği, Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği ve araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan Kişisel Bilgiler Formu aracılığıyla elde edilmiştir. Yapılan analizler sonucunda; parçalanmış ailelerdeki ergenlerin kaygılı-kararsız bağlanma düzeyi, parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerden daha yüksek çıkmıştır. Parçalanmış aileye sahip ergenlerin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyleri, parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerden daha düşük çıkmıştır. Güvenli ve kaçınan bağlanma düzeyi her iki aile yapısında da cinsiyete göre farklılaşmazken, kaygılı-kararsız bağlanma düzeyleri farklılaşmaktadır. Parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyleri cinsiyete göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterirken, parçalanmış aileye sahip ergenlerde anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmamaktadır. Parçalanmış aileye sahip ergenlerin bağlanma stili ile psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyleri ebeveynlerin ayrı yaşama şekline ve parçalanma sebebine göre farklılaşmamaktadır. Birlikte yaşadığı kişi, ebeveyn hayatta olma durumu ve parçalanmanın yaşandığı yaş değişkenlerine göre bağlanma stillerinde bir farklılaşma olmazken, parçalanmanın yaşandığı yaş hariç, psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir fark vardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Parçalanmış aile, parçalanmamış aile, bağlanma stilleri, psikolojik sağlamlık, ergen

1. INTRODUCTION

Every individual comes into the world opening their eyes within a family and is born within a family, whereby the foundation of many traits that make up an individual is laid within the family. Family breakdown for any reason is like a dynamite detonating at its foundation, dispersing individuals. The existence of a family influences the mental health, self-identity, and self-esteem of family members. Children growing up within a family develop a significant sense of value and belonging when they perceive themselves as part of the family (Cüceloğlu, 2002). On the other hand, family breakdown leads children to distance themselves from parental control and culture, getting controlled by external factors beyond the family (Şentürk, 2006).

Family breakdown is a change in the overall and normal structure of the family. This change may occur in the family due to various situations such as a parent's death, their long-term journeys, living separately without divorce, or divorce leading to children moving away from the family (Özgüven, 2001). The breakdown of a family due to divorce can have a worse impact on children compared to the death of a parent. Thus, children often take a longer time to adapt to divorce compared to a parent's death (Özgüven, 2000). When one of the parents dies, the children know that they will not come back and accept this situation, for they understand they cannot bring the lost person back.

However, the situation is different in cases of divorce. Children know that their fathers or mothers are alive and that they can see them, but their parents experience problems to keep together. This situation is often more difficult for children to accept. In case of their parents' divorce, adolescents may often feel abandoned, distance themselves from home, feel like they have lost their parents, experience anger towards their parents, or face academic difficulties (Weyburne, 2000). In addition, children whose families have fragmented due to divorce or the loss of a parent may be more prone to resorting to aggression and violence compared to children from intact families (Şentürk, 2006).

According to Bowlby, attachment is a strong emotional bond that an individual develops towards someone significant to them (attachment figure). Being close to the attached person and maintaining this closeness is a fundamental building block of the attachment system. Newborn babies increase their chances of survival and development in life by establishing closeness with those who care for them. Upon examining the attachment system, individuals seem to have secure, avoidant, and anxious attachment styles (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Individuals with a *secure attachment* style describe their relationship experiences as happy, sincere, and trustable. They accept the people they are with and support them despite their mistakes. In addition, individuals with a secure attachment tend to have long-lasting relationships. On the other hand, individuals with an *anxious-ambivalent attachment* style are constantly anxious, experience more emotional ups and downs, are more jealous, and place more emphasis on sexuality in their relationships. Individuals with an *avoidant attachment* style are described as individuals with fears related to intimacy (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Psychological resilience refers to an individual's ability to adapt to changes in their life in the dynamic process resulting from the interaction between protective and risk factors when facing adverse situations (e.g., divorce, disrupted family dynamics, natural disasters, changing cities, terrorism, and poverty). Therefore, when defining psychological resilience, two critical points are emphasized: (a) exposure to a significant threat or adversity, and (b) the successful adaptation process despite these adversities (Luthar et al., 2000). Individuals with high psychological resilience can cope with problems more easily and adapt to changes more readily. In their study, Dumont and Provost (1999) found that adolescents exhibiting psychological resilience traits had higher self-esteem scores compared to adolescents with lower psychological resilience. Additionally, adolescents with high psychological resilience also scored higher in the problem-solving sub-dimension. The psychological resilience exhibited by adolescents against stress and adversity varies depending on innate (e.g., personality traits) and environmental factors (e.g., family, school, and social environment). Therefore, when explaining the concept of psychological resilience, one should consider the impact of multiple risk factors that can coexist in an individual's life, such as poverty, life-threatening illness of parents, exposure to natural disasters, and more (Karairmak, 2007).

Considering the literature, several research studies have been conducted on family breakdown due to divorce, but there have not been enough studies on all forms of family breakdown (e.g., death,

living apart, and going on long trips). An examination of existing studies indicated there were numerous studies related to the age variable. However, there were insufficient studies regarding the variable of age during family breakdown. Furthermore, there was insufficient research on whether children who witness family breakdown at a young age experience any differences in their attachment style and psychological resilience compared to someone who experiences this at an older age. Likewise, the variable of who the adolescents live with after the family breakdown has not been adequately investigated. Therefore, this study may make important contributions to the literature in this context. This study examined the attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from intact and non-intact families in terms of variables such as age, gender, separate living arrangements, reasons for family breakdown, cohabitants, age during family breakdown, and parents' survival status. The research hypotheses are formulated as follows:

- There is a significant difference between the attachment styles and psychological resilience mean scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families.
- There is a significant difference between the attachment styles and psychological resilience mean scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families by gender, age, separate living arrangements, reasons for family breakdown, cohabitants, parents' survival status, and parents' togetherness status.
- There is a significant difference between the attachment styles and psychological resilience mean scores of adolescents from non-intact families based on the age when the breakdown occurred.

2. METHOD

This descriptive research examines the attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from intact and non-intact families according to various variables (Karasar, 2011). The dependent variables of the study are attachment styles and psychological resilience levels, while the independent variables include gender, age, parents' survival status, parents' togetherness status, parents' separate living arrangements, reasons for family breakdown, age during family breakdown, and cohabitants.

2.1. Study Group

The research population consisted of grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 students enrolled in public high schools in the Mamak district of Ankara during the 2021-2022 academic year. The study sample consisted of 1355 students attending four high schools selected through a convenient sampling method. Since the study focused on reaching out to children from intact and non-intact families and assessing family structures through children, the qualities of the schools were not taken into consideration.

The distribution of participants in the study group based on gender, age, parents' survival status, parents' togetherness status, parents' separate living arrangements, reasons for family breakdown, age during family breakdown, and cohabitants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Participants' personal information

Variable	Levels	<i>N</i>	%
Gender	Male	623	46.0
	Female	732	54.0
Age	13	39	2.9
	14	259	19.1
	15	239	17.6
	16	397	29.3
	17	363	26.8
	18	53	3.9
	19	5	0.4
Parents' Survival Status	Both are alive	1299	95.9
	Mother passed away	22	1.6
	Father passed away	34	2.5
Parents' Togetherness Status	Together	1114	82.2
	Separated	241	17.8
Parents' Separate Living Arrangements	Divorced	164	68.0
	Not divorced but separated and deceased	77	32.0
Reason for Family Breakdown	Divorce	164	68.0
	Death	56	23.2
	Separation	21	8.7
Reason for Living Apart	Marital conflict	2	9.5
	Work	13	61.9
	Other	6	28.6
Cohabitant	Family	1110	81.9
	Mother	158	11.7
	Father	45	3.3
	Grandparents	13	1.0
	A Relative	8	0.6
	Grandparents and mother	16	1.2
	Grandparents and father	5	0.4

As seen in Table 1, 1355 students participated in the study, with 623 (46%) being male and 732 (54%) being female. Their ages range between 13 and 19, where 29.3% of them are 16 years old, 26.8% are 17 years old, and 19.1% are 14 years old. Of these participants, 1299 have both parents alive, 22 have lost their mothers, and 34 have lost their fathers. In addition, 1114 (82.2%) students' parents live together, while 241(17.8%) students' parents have separated. As per the distribution of 241 students whose parents live separately considering the separate living arrangement of parents, 164 (68%) students' parents have divorced, and 77 (32%) students' parents have not divorced but separated or deceased. Upon examining the distribution of the 241 students with separated parents based on the reasons for family breakdown, we observed that 164 (68%) students' parents have divorced, 56 (23.2%) students' mothers and/or fathers have passed away, and 21 (8.7%) students' parents have separated. Considering the distribution of 21 students whose parents lived apart without being divorced in terms of the reason for their family's breakdown, 2 (9.5%) students' parents have separated due to marital

conflict, 13 (61.9%) students' mother and/or father have separated due to work, and 6 (28.6%) students' parents lived separately. The distribution of students based on their cohabitants indicated that 1110 (81.9%) students lived with their families, 158 (11.7%) lived with their mothers, 45 (3.3%) lived with their fathers, 13 (1.0%) lived with their grandparents, 8 (0.6%) lived with one of their relatives, 16 (1.2%) lived with their grandparents and mothers, 5 (0.4%) lived with their grandparents and fathers, and 6 (28.6%) had parents who separated for other reasons. Table 2 presents the distribution of 241 students from non-intact families considering their ages when the family breakdown occurred.

Table 2. Distribution of students based on their age when family breakdown occurred

Age	<i>N</i>	%
0	4	1.66
1	17	7.05
2	13	5.39
3	14	5.81
4	10	4.15
5	12	4.98
6	11	4.56
7	17	7.05
8	16	6.64
9	13	5.39
10	30	12.45
11	15	6.22
12	21	8.71
13	12	4.98
14	13	5.39
15	10	4.15
16	10	4.15
17	3	1.24
Total	241	100

As seen in Table 2, the students are between the ages of 1 and 17, and either their parents have passed away or have separated.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

In the research, the Personal Information Form prepared by the researcher, the Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale for Adolescents, and the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale (CYPRS-12) were employed. The Personal Information Form included questions about adolescents' gender, age, parents' survival status, parents' togetherness status, age during family breakdown, and cohabitants.

The Three-Dimensional Attachment Styles Scale, developed by Erzen (2016), was designed to determine attachment styles. The scale was developed to identify three different attachment styles: secure attachment, anxious-ambivalent attachment, and avoidant attachment. It consisted of 18 Likert-type items, with response categories of 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Five items identified the secure attachment style, seven items identified the avoidant attachment style, and six items identified the anxious-ambivalent attachment style. There were no reverse-coded items in the scale.

Since the scale had two negative and one positive sub-dimension, obtaining a single Cronbach's Alpha value for the entire scale was not possible. Therefore, separate values for each sub-dimension were determined. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.80 for the Avoidant Attachment Style, 0.69 for the Secure Attachment Style, and 0.71 for the Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style. In the validity and reliability study conducted, the exploratory factor analysis revealed that the 18 items in the scale consistently clustered under three dimensions. The item-total correlation values of the scale ranged between 0.49 and 0.75 (Erzen, 2016). In this study, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.497 for the Secure Attachment Style, 0.731 for the Avoidant Attachment Style, and 0.728 for the Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style.

The Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale (CYPRS-12) was used to measure psychological resilience in adolescents. The original form of the scale, developed based on data collected from eleven different countries, consisted of 28 items, three subscales, and eight sub-dimensions. The measurement tool was developed using a socio-ecological perspective, employing both quantitative and qualitative methods (Liebenberg, Ungar, & Van de Vijver, 2012). A short-form study of the scale was conducted by Liebenberg, Ungar, and LeBlanc (2013), and a 12-item structure was obtained through two different studies. The Turkish adaptation of the scale, conducted by Arslan (2015), yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.39 to 0.88, with an internal consistency coefficient of 0.84. The measurement tool, which is in a five-point Likert format, is rated on a scale of "Completely Describes Me (5)" to "Does Not Describe Me at All (1)." In this study, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.815.

2.3. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and normality test results for the scores obtained from the Attachment Style sub-dimensions and the Psychological Resilience scales are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for the scores obtained from the attachment style sub-dimensions and the psychological resilience scale

	Attachment Styles Scale			Psychological Resilience
	SAS	AAS	AAAS	Scale
<i>N</i>	1355	1355	1355	1355
Mean	18.6959	17.8804	17.8266	44.5173
Median	19.0000	17.0000	18.0000	45.0000
Mode	20.00	19.00	16.00	44.00
Standard Deviation	3.49538	5.74769	5.37172	8.35071
Variance	12.218	33.036	28.855	69.734
Skewness Coefficient	-0.324	0.341	0.082	-0.392
Kurtosis Coefficient	-0.349	-0.438	-0.545	-0.376
Range	16.00	27.00	24.00	39.00
Minimum	9.00	7.00	6.00	21.00
Maximum	25.00	34.00	30.00	60.00
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	K-S = 0.094 <i>p</i> = 0.000*	K-S = 0.068 <i>p</i> = 0.000*	K-S = 0.057 <i>p</i> = 0.000*	K-S = 0.059 <i>p</i> = 0.000*

* $p < 0.05$, N = Number of participants, SAS= Secure Attachment Style, AAS = Avoidant Attachment Style, AAAS = Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style

As seen in Table 3, the scores obtained for the attachment style sub-dimensions and psychological resilience scale did not have a normal distribution ($p < 0.05$). Based on this finding, the research hypotheses were tested using the Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests.

3. FINDINGS

The findings regarding whether there are significant differences in mean attachment style scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by family type

Attachment Style	Family	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
SAS	Intact	1114	683.53	761452	128077	0.26
	Non-intact	241	652.44	157238		
AAS	Intact	1114	669.45	745769	124714	0.08
	Non-intact	241	717.51	172921		
AAAS	Intact	1114	666.71	742713	121658	0.02*
	Non-intact	241	730.20	175977		

* $p < 0.05$, N = Number of Adolescents, U = Mann-Whitney U value, p = Significance Level, SAS= Secure Attachment Style, AAS = Avoidant Attachment Style, AAAS = Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style

As seen in Table 4, the Mann-Whitney U analysis results indicated no statistically significant differences in the mean scores for secure ($p = 0.26$) and avoidant attachment styles between adolescents from intact and non-intact families ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for anxious-ambivalent attachment style between adolescents from intact and non-intact families ($U = 121658, p < 0.05$). Considering the mean ranks, adolescents from non-intact families had higher mean scores for anxious-ambivalent attachment style compared to adolescents from intact families. The findings regarding whether there is a significant difference between the mean psychological resilience scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Mann-Whitney U-Test results for scores on psychological resilience by family type

Family	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Intact	1114	708.10	788824	100705	0.00*
Non-Intact	241	538.86	129866		

* $p < 0.05$

As seen in Table 5, the Mann-Whitney U test yielded a statistically significant difference between the psychological resilience mean scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families ($U = 100705, p < 0.5$). Considering the mean ranks, adolescents from non-intact families had lower psychological resilience mean scores compared to adolescents from intact families.

Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant gender differences in attachment style scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families. The test results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Mann-Whitney U test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by gender

Family Type	Attachment Style	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Intact	SAS	Female	602	560.09	337175	152552	0.07
		Male	512	554.45	283880		
	AAS	Female	602	562.57	338668	151059	0.56
		Male	512	551.54	282387		
	AAAS	Female	602	622.00	374445	115282	0.00*
		Male	512	481.66	246610		
Non-Intact	SAS	Female	130	120.16	15620.50	7105.5	0.83
		Male	111	121.99	13540.50		
	AAS	Female	130	121.07	15738.50	7206.5	0.98
		Male	111	120.92	13422.50		
	AAAS	Female	130	133.93	17410.50	5534.5	0.00*
		Male	111	105.86	11750.50		

* $p < 0.05$, N = Number of Adolescents, U = Mann-Whitney U value, p = Significance Level, SAS= Secure Attachment Style, AAS = Avoidant Attachment Style, AAAS = Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style

As shown in Table 6, the mean scores for secure and avoidant attachment styles of adolescents from intact families did not significantly differ by gender ($p > 0.05$). However, their mean scores for anxious-ambivalent attachment style indicated significant gender differences ($U = 115282$, $p < 0.05$). Accordingly, the mean rank scores of female adolescents for anxious-ambivalent attachment style were higher than those of male students. Adolescents from non-intact families showed no significant gender difference in mean scores for secure and avoidant attachment styles ($p > 0.05$). At the same time, adolescents from non-intact families demonstrated significant gender differences in mean scores for anxious-ambivalent attachment style ($U = 5534.5$, $p < 0.05$). Accordingly, the mean rank scores of female adolescents for anxious-ambivalent attachment style were higher than those of male students.

A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in psychological resilience scores of adolescents from intact and non-intact families according to their parents' separate living arrangements. The test results are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Mann-Whitney U test results for scores on psychological resilience by parents' separate living arrangements

Separate Living Arrangements	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Divorced	164	121.90	19992	6166	0.76
Not divorced but separated	77	119.08	9169		

N = Number of adolescents, U = Mann-Whitney U values, p = Significance level

Table 7 shows that the mean psychological resilience scores of adolescents from non-intact families did not significantly differ by their parents' separate living arrangements ($p > 0.05$). The mean

rank for psychological resilience scores of adolescents whose parents had divorced was 121.9, while the mean rank for adolescents whose parents had not divorced but separated was 119.08.

A Kruskal-Wallis H Test was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the attachment style scores of adolescents from non-intact families according to the reasons for family breakdown. The test results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by reasons for family breakdown

Attachment Styles	Reasons	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	p
SAS	Divorce	164	123.92	2	4.883	0.08
	Death	56	124.42			
	Separation	21	89.05			
AAS	Divorce	164	118.32	2	3.936	0.14
	Death	56	118.06			
	Separation	21	149.79			
AAAS	Divorce	164	120.20	2	0.201	0.90
	Death	56	120.95			
	Separation	21	127.43			

* $p < 0.05$, N = Number of Adolescents, p = Significance Level, SAS= Secure Attachment Style, AAS = Avoidant Attachment Style, AAAS = Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment Style

The Kruskal-Wallis H test yielded no significant differences in attachment style sub-dimensions considering the reasons for family breakdown ($p > 0.05$). In other words, the scores obtained from the secure attachment style did not significantly differ in terms of different reasons for family breakdown ($X^2 = 4.883$, $p > 0.05$). The scores obtained from the avoidant attachment style did not significantly differ based on the reasons for family breakdown ($X^2 = 3.936$, $p > 0.05$). Likewise, the scores obtained from the anxious-avoidant attachment style showed no significant differences based on various reasons for family breakdown ($X^2 = 0.201$, $p > 0.05$). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to determine whether the psychological resilience scores of adolescents from non-intact families significantly differed by reasons for family breakdown. Table 9 presents the Kruskal Wallis H test results.

Table 9. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on psychological resilience by reasons for family breakdown

Reasons	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	p
Divorce	164	121.90	2	1.750	0.41
Death	56	125.35			
Separation	21	102.36			

The Kruskal-Wallis H test yielded no significant difference in psychological resilience scores considering the reasons for family breakdown ($p > 0.05$). A Kruskal-Wallis H Test was also conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in attachment style scores of adolescents according to their cohabitants. The test results are given in Table 10.

The Kruskal-Wallis H test yielded no significant difference in attachment style sub-dimensions considering the cohabitants of adolescents ($p > 0.05$). Simply put, the scores obtained from secure attachment styles did not significantly differ by their cohabitants ($X^2 = 5.074, p > 0.05$). The scores obtained from the avoidant attachment style did not differ significantly considering the cohabitants of adolescents ($X^2 = 6.752, p > 0.05$). Similarly, the scores obtained from the anxious-avoidant attachment style indicated no significant difference considering the cohabitants of adolescents ($X^2 = 10.551, p > 0.05$).

Table 10. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by cohabitants

Attachment Styles	Cohabitants	<i>N</i>	Mean Rank	<i>df</i>	Chi-Square	<i>p</i>
SAS	Family	1110	684.05	6	5.074	0.53
	Mother	158	653.72			
	Father	45	663.99			
	Grandparents	13	669.15			
	A relative	8	504.13			
	Grandparents and mother	16	716.00			
	Grandparents and father	5	408.70			
AAS	Family	1110	669.60	6	6.752	0.34
	Mother	158	699.24			
	Father	45	722.66			
	Grandparents	13	727.15			
	A relative	8	615.00			
	Grandparents and mother	16	881.53			
	Grandparents and father	5	792.60			
AAAS	Family	1110	667.22	6	10.551	0.10
	Mother	158	758.59			
	Father	45	643.78			
	Grandparents	13	565.38			
	A relative	8	679.50			
	Grandparents and mother	16	776.91			
	Grandparents and father	5	805.60			

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to determine whether the psychological resilience scores of adolescents significantly differed considering their cohabitants. The test results are provided in Table 11.

Table 11. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on psychological resilience levels by cohabitants

	Cohabitants	<i>N</i>	Mean Rank	<i>df</i>	Chi-Square	<i>p</i>
Psychological Resilience	Family	1110	707.22	6	40.462	0.00*
	Mother	158	536.89			
	Father	45	545.99			
	Grandparents	13	546.08			
	A relative	8	740.44			
	Grandparents and mother	16	632.31			
	Grandparents and father	5	226.80			

* $p < 0.05$

The Kruskal-Wallis H test yielded a significant difference in adolescents' psychological resilience scores considering their cohabitants ($X^2 = 40.462, p < 0.05$). A pairwise comparison between

the scores indicated that this differentiation was between adolescents living with their mothers and adolescents living with their families ($p < 0.05$). Accordingly, the mean rank for psychological resilience scores of adolescents living with their families (707.22) was higher than the mean rank for psychological resilience scores of adolescents living with their mothers (536.89). A Kruskal-Wallis H Test was also conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the psychological resilience scores of adolescents based on their age when they experienced family breakdown. The test results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by age during family breakdown

Attachment Styles	Parents' Survival Status	<i>N</i>	Mean Rank	<i>df</i>	Chi-Square	<i>p</i>
SAS	Both are alive	1299	678.44	2	1.749	0.41
	Mother passed away	22	583.16			
	Father passed away	34	722.60			
AAS	Both are alive	1299	677.00	2	2.562	0.27
	Mother passed away	22	800.89			
	Father passed away	34	636.79			
AAAS	Both are alive	1299	675.75	2	1.047	0.59
	Mother passed away	22	733.14			
	Father passed away	34	728.41			

Adolescents' scores on secure attachment styles indicated no significant differences based on their age when they experienced family breakdown ($X^2 = 3.124, p > 0.05$). Likewise, adolescents' scores on the avoidant attachment style showed no significant differences based on the age when they experienced family breakdown ($X^2 = 1.466, p > 0.05$). Similarly, their scores on the anxious-avoidant attachment style indicated no significant difference considering their age during family breakdown ($X^2 = 1.592, p > 0.05$).

A Kruskal Wallis H test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in psychological resilience scores of adolescents based on their age during family breakdown. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on psychological resilience levels by age during family breakdown

	Age	<i>N</i>	Mean Rank	<i>df</i>	Chi-Square	<i>p</i>
Psychological Resilience	0 – 6	81	125.79	2	1.590	0.45
	7 – 13	124	115.59			
	14 – 19	36	128.86			

According to the Kruskal-Wallis H test results, there was no significant difference in adolescents' psychological resilience scores based on their age when their parents separated or passed away ($p > 0.05$). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was also conducted to determine whether there were significant

differences in adolescents' scores on attachment styles based on their parents' survival status. The test results are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on attachment style sub-dimensions by parents' survival status

Attachment Styles	Parents' Survival Status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	p
SAS	Both are alive	1299	678.44	2	1.749	0.41
	Mother passed away	22	583.16			
	Father passed away	34	722.60			
AAS	Both are alive	1299	677.00	2	2.562	0.27
	Mother passed away	22	800.89			
	Father passed away	34	636.79			
AAAS	Both are alive	1299	675.75	2	1.047	0.59
	Mother passed away	22	733.14			
	Father passed away	34	728.41			

Adolescents' scores on secure attachment styles indicated no significant differences based on whether their parents were alive or not ($X^2 = 1.749, p > 0.05$). The scores obtained from the avoidant attachment style did not significantly differ based on whether the adolescents' parents were alive ($X^2 = 2.562, p > 0.05$). Similarly, the scores obtained from the anxious-avoidant attachment style demonstrated no significant difference based on whether the adolescents' parents were alive or not ($X^2 = 1,047, p > 0.05$).

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in adolescents' psychological resilience scores based on their parents' survival status. The test results are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Kruskal Wallis H Test results for scores on psychological resilience by parents' survival status

	Survival Status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	p
Psychological Resilience	Both are alive	1299	682.76	2	6.344	0.04*
	Mother passed away	22	483.25			
	Father passed away	34	622.12			

* $p < 0.05$

The Kruskal-Wallis H test yielded a statistically significant difference in adolescents' psychological resilience scores according to their parents' survival status ($p < 0.05$). A pairwise comparison of the scores indicated that this difference was between the adolescents whose parents were alive and those whose mothers had passed away ($p < 0.05$). Further, the mean rank psychological resilience scores of adolescents with both parents alive (682.76) were higher than the mean rank psychological resilience scores of adolescents whose mothers had passed away (483.25).

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the research results, there were no significant differences in secure and avoidant attachment levels of adolescents from intact and non-intact families. However, adolescents from non-intact families exhibited higher anxiety-ambivalent attachment levels than those from intact families. Supporting this result, Sardoğan et al. (2007) found that children whose parents have separated or divorced exhibit lower levels of attachment to their parents and develop insecure attachment compared to children whose parents are married. Brennan and Shaver (1998) stated that parental loss can result in developing an insecure attachment style. In another study, Aral and Başar (1998) found significant differences in trait anxiety levels of children from divorced families compared to those from non-divorced families. Similarly, Richardson and McCabe (2001) report that adolescents whose parents have divorced exhibit higher levels of anxiety, depression, and stress compared to adolescents whose parents have not divorced. These studies suggest that family breakdown due to divorce or death is a factor that can influence attachment.

Another research finding indicated that the psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families were lower than those from intact families. In line with this result, Hand and Antramian (2003), Huebner and Valois (2008), and Sipahioğlu (2008) found in their studies that adolescents living in non-intact families experienced negative and risky experiences, which in turn reduced the psychological resilience levels of adolescents. Similarly, Özcan (2005) determined that high school students whose parents were together had higher levels of psychological resilience characteristics and protective factors compared to those whose parents had divorced. Adolescents from nuclear and extended family structures have more family members and support to rely on compared to those from non-intact family structures (Barton & Coley 2007; Trawick-Swith 2013). These research findings support that adolescents from non-intact have lower levels of psychological resilience and endurance. Inconsistent with this study, Aktaş (2016) reported that there was no significant difference in psychological resilience and future expectations between adolescents with divorced parents and those with married parents. Additionally, Saka and Ceylan (2018) and Ergün (2016) found no relationship between family structure and psychological resilience.

An examination of gender differences in attachment styles indicated that there was no difference in secure and avoidant attachment levels in both intact and non-intact families. However, females had higher anxious-ambivalent attachment levels compared to males in both family structures. Taşkaya (2019) found that female adolescents in institutional care had higher anxious-ambivalent attachment levels compared to males. In another study, Çıkrıkçıoğlu (2017) concluded that female university students who did not live with their families had higher fearful attachment levels. Morsünbül (2005) and Sümer and Güngör (1999) stated in their studies that female adolescents had higher levels of fearful attachment compared to male adolescents. These studies indicate that females generally have a higher prevalence of anxious-ambivalent attachment levels than males. Therefore, these results identified in

both family structures among females seem meaningful. On the other hand, many studies report no gender differences in attachment styles (Ammaniti et al., 2000; Atabay, 2019; Atik, 2013; Damarlı, 2006; Erözkan, 2004).

Considering the study findings regarding gender differences in psychological resilience levels, male adolescents living in intact families had higher psychological resilience levels compared to female adolescents. However, no significant difference was found in psychological resilience levels between males and females in non-intact families. Bahadır (2009) and Li et al. (2012) revealed that boys had higher psychological resilience levels compared to girls. Similarly, Erdogan (2015) found that males had higher levels of psychological resilience compared to females. Supporting our research findings, these studies suggest that psychological resilience differs by gender and that males are psychologically more resilient. As an example of studies conducted with adolescents from non-intact families, Altundağ (2013) found no gender differences in psychological resilience among adolescents whose parents had divorced. This finding also parallels the results of the present study. On the other hand, Guo (2019) examined the differences between Chinese adolescents from single-parent families and adolescents living with both parents. Guo found that female adolescents exhibited significantly lower levels of resilience than male adolescents, regardless of their parents' marital status. Therefore, when investigating psychological resilience according to gender in both family structures, examining social and cultural influences could also be meaningful.

Another result obtained from the research indicated that the attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families did not significantly differ by their *parents' separate living arrangements*. An examination of the literature indicated that there was no study on whether the reasons for living separately caused any difference in attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families. Studies were mainly conducted by categorizing individuals as divorced or non-divorced and bereaved or non-bereaved. As an example of these studies, Dalahmetoğlu (2018) found that adolescents who experienced parental loss had more mental health problems than those who did not. In another study, Eren (2017) determined that adolescents who experienced parental loss were weaker in terms of psychological resilience compared to those who did not. As such, the conclusion that “parents' separate living arrangements do not cause any difference in psychological resilience and attachment styles of adolescents from non-intact families” may contribute to the literature.

Considering *the reasons for family breakdown*, no significant differences were found in psychological resilience levels and attachment style sub-dimensions. Upon reviewing the literature, no study investigating whether attachment style and psychological resilience differed based on the reasons for family breakdown was found. Numerous studies have examined various variables in adolescents from non-intact families, reporting on whether being from a non-intact family differentiated these variables. However, the reasons for family breakdown (e.g., divorce, death, and separation) have not

been explored among them. Only Amato's (2001) research focused specifically on divorce as one of the reasons for family breakdown and found differences in psychosocial adjustment, self-confidence, and social relationship success among children with divorced parents compared to children whose parents had not separated. Therefore, the result obtained in our study, indicating that "the reasons for family breakdown do not cause any significant difference in attachment styles and psychological resilience levels of adolescents from non-intact families," may make significant contributions to the existing literature.

Upon examining the study results in terms of adolescents' cohabitants, no significant differences were found in attachment style sub-dimensions in intact and non-intact families. Similarly, Ünlü (2015) found no statistically significant differences in avoidant and anxiety sub-dimensions among individuals with divorced parents based on who they lived with after the divorce. In another study, Ünal (2017) found no significant difference between the attachment styles of adolescents living in dormitories and those living with their families. Çağatay (2014) reported no difference between the attachment styles of caregivers and adolescents. Supporting our study findings, these studies concluded that individuals' cohabitants do not influence their attachment styles. In this study, most adolescents either live with their families or, even if their family breaks up, most adolescents from non-intact families live with their mothers. Therefore, the fact that adolescents' cohabitants do not significantly differentiate their attachment style appears to be an important determinant. According to Bowlby, the mother plays a key role in attachment relationships. Attachment is established through the warmth reflected by the mother.

Another finding of this study indicated that the psychological resilience levels of adolescents living with their families were higher than those living with their mothers. At the same time, many studies indicate that family support increases psychological resilience levels and is among the protective factors (Kabasakal & Arslan, 2014; Tahmasbipour & Taheri, 2012). A study conducted by Akduman and Cantürk (2007) suggests that children whose parents have separated may feel unloved and lonely because they cannot see the parent who is living away from home, and this situation can lead to feelings of depression in them. Therefore, it is assumed that their psychological resilience will be affected.

Upon examining the research findings considering adolescents' age during family breakdown in non-intact families, no significant differences were found in their psychological resilience levels and attachment styles. However, Caruso and Morwit (1998) note that two types of losses have been emphasized in the literature over the past twenty years: death and divorce. Both of these events result in significant life changes, regardless of age, gender, race, or education level. Caruso and Morwit (1998) state that research studies are generally conducted on losses in early childhood and emphasize that parental loss during adolescence is also of great importance. This is because when adolescents are in the process of separating from their parents and becoming independent, this loss occurs right at that time, posing significant challenges to their struggle for individualization. Additionally, Harris and Bifulco (1991) conducted a study with a group of women who had lost their mothers during childhood. They

examined sociological and psychological variables and found that the depression rates were higher in women who experienced this loss compared to those who did not. These studies contradict our findings, in that they directly or indirectly emphasize the age when family breakdown occurred and suggest that this circumstance affects attachment.

One of the research findings was that there were no significant differences in attachment styles across all sub-dimensions between adolescents from intact and non-intact families based on whether their parents were alive or not. Studies contradicting our findings were encountered when the literature was reviewed. On the other hand, the results showed significant differences in adolescents' psychological resilience levels depending on whether their parents were alive or not. As a result of pairwise examinations, it was found that this difference was between the cases where both parents were living and the cases where the mother had passed away. Aydın (2018) concluded that the psychological resilience levels of those whose mothers were living were higher than those whose mothers were not living. In another study, Eren (2017) determined that adolescents who experienced parental loss were weaker in terms of psychological resilience compared to those who did not. Similarly, Şahin (2018) found that adolescents with healthy parents have higher psychological resilience levels compared to those with unhealthy or deceased parents.

4.1. Recommendations

- As mentioned above, the research was conducted in a remote and less urban area. It is possible to conduct similar studies in more central areas, different school levels, and types of schools.
- When entering the data into the computer, it was noticed that nearly all participants gave low scores to the item "I feel a sense of belonging to school" in the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale. Therefore, projects that promote children's sense of belonging to school could be supported.
- A qualitative study could be conducted by including both intact and non-intact families.
- It is recommended to examine intact and non-intact families separately, considering different variables.

REFERENCES

- Akduman, G., Akduman, B., & Cantürk, G. (2007). Ergen suçluluğunda bazı kişisel ve ailesel özelliklerin incelenmesi, *Türk Pediatri Arşivi*, 42(4), 156–161.
- Aktaş, E. (2016). *Ergenlerin psikolojik dayanıklılıkları ile gelecek beklentileri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). On Dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Altundağ, Y. (2013). *Anne-babası boşanmış ergenlerin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinde yordayıcı değişkenler olarak yaşam doyumu ve yalnızlık* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

- Amato, P. R. (2001). Children of divorce in the 1990s: An update of the Amato and Keith (1991) meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.15.3.355>
- Ammaniti, M., Ijzendoorn, M. H., Speranza, A. M., & Tambelli, R. (2000). Internal working models of attachment during late childhood and early adolescence: An exploration of stability and change. *Human Development*, 2(3), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730010001587>
- Antaramian, S. P., Huebner, E. S., & Valois, R. F. (2008). Adolescent life satisfaction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57, 112–126. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.694183>
- Aral, N., & Başar F. (1998, 9-11 Eylül). Boşanmış Aileye Sahip Olan ve Olmayan Çocukların Kaygı Düzeylerinin incelenmesi. VII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi (20 Şubat 2009).
- Arslan, G. (2015). Çocuk ve genç psikolojik sağlık ölçeğinin (ÇGPSÖ-12) psikometrik özellikleri: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(1), 1–12.
- Atabay, E. (2019). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Mizah ve İletişim Becerilerinin Bağlanma Stilleriyle İlişkisi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Aydın, E. (2018). *Çocukluk çağı travmatik yaşantılarının psikolojik sağlık ve depresyon belirtileri üzerine etkisi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Bahadır, E. (2009). *Sağlıkla ilgili fakültelerde eğitime başlayan öğrencilerin psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Barton, P. E. & Coley, R J. (2007). *The family: America's smallest school. Policy Information Report*. Educational Testing Service, Princeton.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Volume 1 attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. 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). The Guilford Press.
- Çağatay, E.S. (2014). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin çocukluk çağı travmatik yaşantı düzeyi ile bağlanma stilleri ve savunma mekanizmaları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Arel University, İstanbul.
- Çıkrıkçıoğlu, F. (2017). *Ailesiyle birlikte yaşamayan kız üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stillerinin benlik kavramı, yeme tutumu ve davranışları üzerindeki ilişkisi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (2002). *İnsan ve davranışı*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Dalahmetoğlu, B. (2018). *Ebeveyn kaybı yaşamış ergenlerin yaşamamış ergenlere göre öz saygı ve ruh sağlığı değişkenlerinin incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Işık Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Damarlı, Ö. (2006). *Ergenlerde toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri, bağlanma stilleri ve benlik kavramı*

- arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Dumont, M., & Provost, M. A. (1999). Resilience in adolescents: Protective role of social support, coping strategies, self-esteem, and social activities on experience of stress and depression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28(3), 343–363. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021637011732>
- Erdoğan, E. (2015). Tanrı algısı, dini yönelim biçimleri ve öznel dindarlığın psikolojik dayanıklılıkla ilişkisi: Üniversite örnekleme. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(29), 223–246.
- Eren, G. (2017). *Ebeveyn kaybı yaşamış ergenlerin psikolojik sağlamlıklarının incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Ergün, O. (2016). *Ergenlerde duygusal zekâ özellikleri ile psikolojik sağlamlık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Erözkan, A. (2004). Lise öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri ve yalnızlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4(2), 155–175.
- Erzen, E. (2016). Üç boyutlu bağlanma stilleri ölçeği. *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(3), 01–21.
- Guo, X. (2019). Coping as a mediator between parental attachment and resilience: An examination of differential effects between Chinese adolescents from single parent families versus those from intact families. *Psychol Rep.* 122(2), 50–524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294118765418>
- Hand, M. (2003). *Psychological resilience. The influence of positive and negative life events upon optimism, hope, and perceived focus of control* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Waldon University: United States.
- Harris, T., & Bifulco, A. (1991). *Loss of parent in childhood, attachment style and deprivation in adulthood, in attachment across the life cycle*. London: Routledge.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0501_1
- Kabasakal, Z. & Arslan, G. (2014). Ergenlikte görülen anti-sosyal davranışlar, psikolojik sağlamlık ve aile sorunları arasındaki ilişki. *ACED*, 3(2), 76–88.
- Kararımak, Ö. (2007). *Deprem Yaşamış Bireylerde Psikolojik Sağlamlığa Etki Eden Faktörlerin İncelenmesi: Bir Model Test Etme Çalışması* (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Li, M., Xu, J., He, Y., & Wu, Z. (2012). The analysis of the resilience of adults one year after the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 40(7), 860–870. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21496>

- Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & LeBlanc, J. C. (2013). The CYRM-12: A brief measure of resilience. *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 104*(2), 131–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03405676>
- Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & Van de Vijver, F. (2012). Validation of the Child and Youth Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-28) among Canadian youth. *Research on Social Work Practice, 22*(2), 219–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731511428619>
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164>
- Morsünbül, Ü. (2005). *Ergenlikte kimlik statülerinin bağlanma stilleri, cinsiyet veeğitim düzeyi açısından incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Özcan, B. (2005). *Anne-babaları boşanmış ve anne-babaları birlikte olan lise öğrencilerinin yılmazlık özellikleri ve koruyucu faktörler açısından karşılaştırılması* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (2000). *Evlilik ve aile terapisi*. Ankara: Pdrem Yayınları.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (2001). *Ailede iletişim ve yaşam*. Ankara: Pdrem Yayınları.
- Richardson, S. & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Parental divorce during adolescences and adjustment in early adulthood. *Adolescence, 36*(143), 467–489.
- Şahin, H. (2018). *Ergenlerin psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri ve hayat amaçları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Haliç Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Saka, A. & Ceylan, Ş. (2018). Ergenlerin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin aile yapılarına göre incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(1), 68–86.
- Sardoğan, M. E., Karahan, T. F., Dicle, A., & Menteş, Ö. (2007). Ebeveyne bağlanma düzeyine ve anne-babanın boşanma/birliktelik durumuna göre çocuklarda evlilik çatışmasını algılama biçimleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23*, 12–27.
- Şentürk, Ü. (2006). *Parçalanmış aile çocuk ilişkisinin sebep olduğu sosyal problemler* (Malatya Uygulaması) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İnönü University, Malatya.
- Sipahioğlu, Ö. (2008). *Farklı risk gruplarındaki ergenlerin psikolojik sağlıklarının incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örnekleme üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14*(43), 71–109.
- Tahmasbipour, N., & Taheri, A. (2012). A survey on the relation between a social support and mental health in students Shahid Rajae University. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 47*, 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.603>
- Taşkaya, R. (2019). *Ergenlerin bağlanma stilleri sorumluluk duygu ve davranışı ile kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Karabük Üniversitesi, Karabük.

Trawick Smith, J. (2013). *Early childhood development* (5nd ed.), (Çev. Ed. B. Akman). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Ünlü, F. (2015). *Ebeveyni boşanmış bireylerde benlik saygısı, yalnızlık ve bağlanma stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Haliç Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Weyburne, D. (2000). *Ben şimdi ne olacağım?* (Çev. H. Koşar). İstanbul: Kuraldışı Yayıncılık.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu araştırmada, parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin bağlanma stillerinin ve psikolojik sağlıklarının cinsiyet, yaş, ebeveynlerin hayatta olma durumu, ebeveynlerin birliktelik durumu, ebeveynlerin ayrı yaşama şekli, ailenin parçalanma sebebi, parçalanmanın yaşandığı yaş ve birlikte yaşadığı kişi değişkenlerine göre farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını incelenmiştir. Ailede parçalanma, ailenin genel ve normal yapısındaki bir değişimdir. Ailedeki bu değişim anne veya babanın; ölümü, uzun seyahate çıkması, boşanma olmadan birbirinden ayrı yaşaması ya da boşanmaları ile çocukların aileden uzağa gitmesi gibi durumlardır (Özgüven, 2001).

Bağlanma, Bowlby'ye göre bireyin kendisi için önemli olan bir başkasına (bağlanma figürü) karşı geliştirdiği güçlü duygusal bağıdır. Bağlanılan kişiye yakın olmak ve bu yakınlığı korumak bağlanma sisteminin en temel yapı taşıdır. Bağlanma sistemi incelendiğinde; bireylerin güvenli, kaçınan ve kaygılı bağlanma stillerini gerçekleştirmiş olduğu görülmektedir (Hazan ve Shaver, 1994). *Güvenli bağlanma* stilindeki bireyler ilişkilerine ait deneyimlerini mutlu, samimi ve güven verici olarak tanımlamışlar; birlikte oldukları kişilerin hatalarına rağmen onları kabul etmişler ve onlar için destekleyici olmuşlardır. Ayrıca güvenli bağlanan bireylerin ilişkileri daha uzun süre devam etme eğilimindedir. Diğer taraftan *kaygılı/kararsız bağlanma* stilindeki bireylerin ilişkilerinde, sürekli endişe halinde oldukları, daha çok duygusal iniş çıkışlar yaşadıkları, daha kıskanç oldukları ve cinselliğe daha fazla önem verdikleri gözlenmiştir. *Kaçınan bağlanma* stilindeki bireyler ise yakınlığa ilişkin korkulara sahip bireyler olarak tanımlanmıştır (Hazan ve Shaver, 1987).

Psikolojik sağlık, olumsuz bir durum (boşanma, bozuk aile düzeni, doğal afetler, şehir değiştirme, taşınma, terör, yoksulluk vb.) ile karşı karşıya kalındığında koruyucu faktörler ile risk faktörlerinin etkileşimi sonucu ortaya çıkan dinamik süreçte, bireyin hayatındaki değişikliğe uyum gösterme becerisini ifade etmektedir (Luthar ve ark. 2000). Psikolojik sağlığı yüksek olan bireyler, sorunlarla daha rahat baş edebilmekte ve yeniliklere daha kolay uyum sağlayabilmektedir. Ergenlerin stres ve olumsuzluklar karşısındaki gösterdikleri psikolojik sağlık, doğuştan gelen (kişilik özellikleri gibi) ve çevreden kaynaklanan faktörlere (aile, okul ve sosyal çevre gibi) bağlı olarak değişmektedir (Kararımak, 2007). Bu çalışmada ele alınan çalışma grubu lise öğrencilerinden oluşturmaktadır. Alanyazın incelendiğinde ailedeki parçalanma şekillerinden boşanmayla ilgili araştırmaların yapıldığı; ancak parçalanma şekillerinin tamamıyla (ölüm, ayrı yaşama, seyahate gitme gibi) ilgili yeterince çalışma yapılmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın alan yazınına önemli katkılar sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın evrenini 2021-2022 eğitim-öğretim yılında Ankara'nın Mamak ilçesine bağlı devlet liselerinde halen öğrenim gören 9, 10, 11 ve 12. Sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini ise ulaşılabileni örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen dört lisede öğrenim gören 1355 öğrenci oluşturmuştur. Araştırmada, araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan Kişisel Bilgiler Formu, Ergenlerde Üç

Boyutlu Bağlanma Stilleri Ölçeği Erzen (2016), Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği(ÇGPSÖ-12) Arslan (2015) kullanılmıştır. Kişisel bilgi formunda; cinsiyet, yaş, anne ve babanın hayatta olup olmaması, anne ve babanın birlikteliği, parçalanma yaşı, ergenin kiminle yaşadığı gibi sorular yer almaktadır. Verilerin analizi SPSS 21 programı kullanılarak yapılmıştır.

Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin güvenli ve kaçınan *bağlanma* düzeylerinde anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı görülmezken, parçalanmış ailelerdeki ergenlerin kaygılı-kararsız bağlanma düzeyleri parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerden daha yüksek çıkmıştır. Araştırmanın bir diğer sonucuna göre, parçalanmış ailelerdeki ergenlerin *psikolojik sağlık* düzeyleri parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerden daha düşük olduğu bulunmuştur. Bağlanma stilleri ve *Cinsiyet* arasındaki farklılaşma incelendiğinde; hem parçalanmış hem de parçalanmamış ailelerde güvenli ve kaçınan bağlanma düzeylerinde bir farklılaşma görülmezken, her iki aile şeklinde de kadınların kaygılı-kararsız bağlanma düzeyleri erkeklerden yüksek çıkmıştır. Araştırma sonuçları psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri ve cinsiyet arasında farklılaşma açısından incelendiğinde, parçalanmamış ailelerde erkek ergenlerin psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri kadın ergenlerden yüksek olurken, parçalanmış ailelerde kadın ve erkekler arasında psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri açısından anlamlı bir farklılık belirlenmemiştir. Araştırmadan elde edilen diğer bir sonuç, parçalanmış aileye sahip ergenlerin bağlanma stilleri ile psikolojik sağlık düzeylerinin, *anne-babanın ayrı yaşama şekli* açısından anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmadığıdır. *Ailenin parçalanma sebebi* açısından incelendiğinde; psikolojik sağlık düzeyinde ve bağlanma stillerinin tüm alt boyutlarında anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmamıştır. Araştırmadan elde edilen sonuçlar ergenlerin *birlikte yaşadığı kişilere* göre incelendiğinde; parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış ailelerde bağlanma stillerinin tüm alt boyutlarında anlamlı bir farklılığa rastlanmamıştır. Çalışmadaki bir diğer bulgu; aile ile yaşayan ergenlerin psikolojik sağlık düzeylerinin, anne ile yaşayan ergenlerden daha yüksek olduğudur. Araştırma sonuçları, parçalanmış ailelerde parçalanmanın yaşandığı *yaş* açısından ve incelendiğinde; psikolojik sağlık düzeyi ve bağlanma stillerinin tüm alt boyutlarında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarından biri de; parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin *ebeveynlerinin hayatta olup olmasına* göre bağlanma stillerinin tüm alt boyutlarında anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmediğidir.

Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulardan hareketle, bu araştırma farklı örneklem gruplarında; merkezi bir bölgede, farklı okul kademelerinde ve okul türlerinde çalışılabilir. Veriler bilgisayar ortamına girilirken, katılımcıların neredeyse tamamına yakınının; Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeğindeki “Kendimi okula ait hissediyorum” maddesine düşük puan verdiği fark edildiğinden, MEB bünyesinde çocukların okula ait hissetmelerini sağlayacak projeler desteklenebilir. Farklı çalışmalarda aileler de sürece katılarak nitel bir araştırma yapılabilir. Son olarak, parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış ailelerin farklı değişkenlerle ele alınarak incelenmesi sağlanabilir.