



Attachment Style in University Students and Its Importance for Their Professional Work

Simona Prosen*

Helena Smrtnik Vitulić**

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to explore the attachment styles in university students, future primary school teachers, preschool teachers and social pedagogues. The study sample consisted of 619 students from the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana. The Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) was used to analyze the attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissing. Results showed a relatively high level of secure attachment style among primary education and social pedagogy students, whereas in preschool education students the level was moderate and significantly lower. Cluster analysis confirmed two configurations of attachment styles: predominantly secure (including 71.7% primary education, 66.1% social pedagogy and 59.3% preschool education students), and a cluster of predominantly fearful-preoccupied attachments. Detailed analysis of insecure attachment indicated that about one half of the students in each group reported at least one “risky” attachment style.

Keywords: Attachment, university students, relationship, education.

* PhD., University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Ljubljana, Slovenia. E-mail: simona.prosen@pef.uni-lj.si

** PhD., University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
E-mail: helena.smrtnik-vitulic@guest.arnes.si

INTRODUCTION

Attachment Styles and Interpersonal Relationships

Attachment represents an individual's long-term emotional relationship with a person who is close to him/her, who provides security and whose absence causes stress (Bowlby, 1969/1997). In close relationships individuals develop patterns or styles of attachment that differ in their qualitative characteristics. Attachment styles include beliefs about the degree of security, trust, intimacy, autonomy etc., to be expected in close relationships (Baldwin, Keelan, Fehr, Enns & Koh-Rangarajoo, 1996).

Research on attachment primarily focused on early childhood – on the characteristics of relationships between a child and the primary care-giver (Bowlby, 1969/1997; Bowlby & Ainsworth, 1965). The pioneer study of Ainsworth included observations of a child's reaction upon separation from and reunion with his/her primary care-giver. Patterns of behaviour in such situations were named as, secure and insecure attachment styles. Results of various other studies (e.g., Cugmas, 2003; van IJzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg & Sagi-Schwartz, 2006) showed that all children attach to at least one person. An attachment is formed regardless of the genetic bond between a child and a care-giver, although the primary care-giver across cultures is predominantly the biological mother (Grossmann, Grossmann & Keppler, 2005). A secure attachment style usually prevails cross-culturally (Ainsworth, 1979, in Grossmann et al., 2005). The quality of a child's attachment depends on the care-giver's sensitivity for the child's needs regarding proximity or independence and her/his adequate response to these signals (Stern, 1985/2000).

Later, the research into attachment styles expanded to include different age groups (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Main, 1996; Mikulincer, 1995, Zimmermann, 2004) and different contexts such as attachment to teachers in preschool/school or to a school community in general (e.g., Cugmas, 2003; Cugmas, 1998; Kirkpatrick Johnson, Crosnoe & Thaden, 2006). The results of these studies confirmed that the quality of an individual's early experiences in close relationships has an impact on the quality of his/her close relationships in the future (Sroufe, 2005, in Masten & O'Dougherty Wright, 2010; Wallin, 2007).

There are several classifications of attachment styles in adolescence/adulthood. One of the more influential classifications was proposed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). They defined attachment styles as positive or negative mental representations of one-self and others within relationships, which also influence a number of other relationship characteristics. Positive evaluations of self and others represent a *secure* attachment style. Securely attached individuals form close relationships easily and maintain a high level of intimacy, inclusion, balanced control, warmth and self-confidence. Positive self-evaluations but negative evaluations of others represent a *dismissing* attachment style. Individuals with a dismissing attachment style feel good without having close relationships, don't like disclosing personal information, are more controlling and less caring. If they experience rejection they devalue the person that rejected them and thus maintain their self-worth. Individuals with a *preoccupied* attachment style evaluate themselves

negatively and others positively. They are prepared to share personal information, are emotionally expressive and less controlling, seek support from others and often worry about relationships. They blame themselves for possible rejections by others and consequently maintain a positive opinion of them. Negative evaluation of self and others is found in individuals with a *fearful* attachment style. They have lower self-esteem and are not relaxed when entering new relationships. They long for close relationships but are very scared of being refused and hurt because of that. The last three described styles represent in-secure attachment styles.

The aforementioned four attachment styles can also differ in two other dimensions of behaviour in relationships, namely avoidance and anxiety. For fearful and dismissing attachment styles a higher degree of avoidance within relationships and for fearful and preoccupied attachment styles a higher degree of anxiety in relationships is found (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994).

The secure attachment style is predominant in the majority of adult persons (Žvelc & Žvelc, 2006). Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) reported on some gender differences: in men a dismissing style is more frequent than in women, whereas in women a preoccupied style is more frequent than in men.

Attachment security has several psychological correlates in different domains such as adequate emotion regulation, higher self-esteem and cognitive functioning (e.g., Gross & Thompson, 2009; Jacobsen, Edelstein & Hofmann, 1994; Siegel, 1999). Insecure attachment styles appear more frequently in persons with mental health problems (e.g., Broberg, Hjalmer & Nevenon, 2001; Fonagy, 2001; Werner & Gross, 2010).

An individual's attachment style usually remains unchanged throughout different life periods and is transmitted also trans-generationally (e.g., Bowlby, 1969/1997; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2010; Ross, Stein, Trabasso, Woody & Ross, 2005). However, Thompson (1999) reported that attachment styles can also be modified if important changes occur in an individual's close relationships. Positive experiences with attachment to persons outside the family (i.e., preschool and school teachers, trainers, counsellors) can play a compensatory role for individuals who have otherwise negative attachment experiences with their primary care-givers. In light of these findings Pajnič and Praper (1995) talked about the importance of emotional warmth and empathy in teachers, especially when they work with children.

Students' Attachment Style and Their Future Professional Work with People

In our study the attachment styles in various groups of students were explored, as they are important to the quality of their current relationship with colleagues, friends, parents and romantic partners. However, since the students in our sample (future preschool and primary school teachers and social pedagogues) are future human-relations professionals, the issue of attachment is particularly relevant to them as they will be working with various groups of people.

The period of adolescence brings on a number of developmental tasks that include important shifts in relationships of adolescents with their parents and peers. Parental relationships tend to grow weaker while peer relationships become more important (Noller, 1995). Attachment styles significantly influence the characteristics

of relationships in adolescence also. In late adolescence, Mattanah, Hancock and Brand (2004) found a positive correlation between secure attachment style and students' good adjustment to college. Kobak Rogers and Sceery (1988) reported that students with secure attachment are perceived as stronger and less anxious by their colleagues and they themselves reported lower degree of stress and a higher degree of social support. Students with dismissing attachment style were perceived as less strong and more hostile by their colleagues, whereas they themselves reported more feelings of loneliness and lower social support. It is interesting to note that those students described themselves similarly to the secure attachment group, on the social competency scale and stress degree scale. The differences however were noted in the description by their colleagues. This indicates possible poor self-perception in these students. The group of students with the preoccupied attachment style was described by their colleagues as less strong and more anxious, whereas they themselves reported a higher stress level even though they perceived their families as more supportive than the group of students with a dismissing attachment style.

The students in our sample are future human-relations professionals and the issue of attachment is relevant to them because of their future work. The characteristics of human-relations professional should include sensitivity to others, cooperation, and trust in interpersonal relationships (Dekleva, Kobolt & Klemenčič, 2006; Predstavitveni zbornik študijskega programa Predšolska vzgoja, 2011; Razdevšek Pučko & Rugelj, 2006). These characteristics are prevalent in individuals with a secure attachment style.

The selection criterion for the majority of study programmes in Slovenia includes academic achievement in secondary school. That is also the case in primary education, preschool education and social pedagogy programmes. Such selection criterion does not give the information whether the selected students have all the characteristics, important for their future professions that involve work with people. In our preliminary study (Prosen & Smrtnik Vitulić, 2010) we found that students of primary education and social pedagogy mostly feel secure in close relationships but there were a number of students with predominantly insecure attachment styles, also. However, these results were not analysed in detail.

In the present study we wanted to explore the attachment styles of the future human-relations professionals, namely students of primary education, preschool education and social pedagogy. The collected data is important because attachment styles are significant in their present relationships and especially because of their future work orientation.

METHOD

Participants

The study sample consisted of 619 students from the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana; students of primary education, enrolled in the first year of the study programme in 2008, 2009 and 2010 and in the second year of study programme in 2008 ($N=411$), students of social pedagogy, enrolled in 2008, 2009 and 2010 ($N=127$) and students of preschool education, enrolled in 2010 ($N=81$). The age of

students ranged among 18 and 24 years. The majority were females (95.6% for primary education, 94.5% for social pedagogy and all for preschool education).

Instruments

The *Relationships Questionnaire* (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) was used to assess attachment styles. There are four attachment styles included in the questionnaire: secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing. There are descriptions for each attachment style – behaviours and emotional states – given in the questionnaire. Individuals mark to what degree the given four descriptions of attachment styles apply to them on the 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 – *almost never*, 2 – *very rarely*, 3 – *sometimes*, 4 – *moderately*, 5 – *quite often*, 6 – *very often*, 7 – *almost always*.

Procedure

Students of primary education, social pedagogy and preschool education completed the questionnaire during the lecture on developmental psychology. Their participation was based on their informed consent, was anonymous and voluntary. At all times one of the authors of this article was present during completion of the questionnaire to ensure proper administration. Upon completing the questionnaire, there was a lecture and a discussion about attachment and its importance to their future work.

RESULTS

The results of the research on attachment styles in the three groups of students (primary education, preschool education and social pedagogy) include: (1) differences in attachment styles among student groups, (2) configuration of attachment styles and (3) a detailed analysis on insecure attachment styles. Our sample consisted of different generations of students from primary education and social pedagogy and one generation of preschool education students. Possible differences in attachment styles among the different generations of primary education and social pedagogy students were excluded by analysis of variance procedure (intergenerational differences were not significant). Consequently, the data were explored for the three study programmes separately.

Differences in Attachment Styles Among Student Groups

Statistical data on attachment styles and the differences among student groups are reported in Table 1 (one-way *ANOVA*).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of attachment styles and differences among students of primary education, social pedagogy and preschool education

Attachment style	Primary Education Students		Social Pedagogy Students		Preschool Education Students		<i>ANOVA</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Secure</i>	5.35	1.49	5.14	1.52	4.63	1.76	7.51	.00
<i>Fearful</i>	3.39	1.82	3.75	1.80	3.68	2.03	2.31	.10
<i>Preoccupied</i>	3.10	1.71	3.33	1.75	3.36	1.85	1.33	.27
<i>Dismissing</i>	2.07	1.36	2.16	1.41	2.11	1.36	0.23	.80

The results of *ANOVA* showed a significant difference between the three groups of students in their level of secure attachment style ($p < .01$). Tukey's post-hoc test showed that there were some significant differences between primary and preschool education students ($p < .01$) and between social pedagogy and preschool education students ($p < .05$). The highest mean of secure attachment style was found in primary education students ($M = 5.35$), followed by social pedagogy students ($M = 5.14$) and preschool education students ($M = 4.63$). The level of secure attachment for primary education and social pedagogy students was relatively high, since students indicated this style as quite characteristic for them on a 7-point Likert-scale (more than 5). The level of secure attachment in preschool education students was significantly lower since students indicated this style as moderately characteristic for them on a 7-point Likert-scale (more than 4).

Configuration of Attachment Styles

The configuration of all four attachment styles for all student groups together was explored using the two-step cluster analysis. The results are presented in Table 2, together with the number and percentage of students included in each cluster.

Table 2. Mean values of four attachment styles, number and percentage of students in two clusters

	Cluster 1	Cluster2
Attachment style		
<i>Secure</i>	5.96	3.53
<i>Fearful</i>	2.55	5.61
<i>Preoccupied</i>	2.83	3.95
<i>Dismissing</i>	2.08	2.12
<i>N (%)</i>	423 (68.9)	191 (31.1)

The results of cluster analysis for all students together, confirmed the existence of two clusters in the attachment styles configuration. In Cluster 1, the secure attachment style was predominant whereas insecure attachment styles (fearful, preoccupied and dismissing) were only weakly presented.

In Cluster 2, the fearful attachment style was predominant, followed by the preoccupied style. There were 68.9% of all students categorised in Cluster 1 and 31.1% in Cluster 2. For each of the three study programmes the number and percentage of students in each cluster are shown in the next table.

Table 3. Number and percentage of primary education, social pedagogy and preschool education students in two clusters

	Primary Education Students		Social Pedagogy Students		Preschool Education Students	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Cluster 1	291	71.7	84	66.1	48	59.3
Cluster2	115	28.3	43	33.9	33	40.7
<i>N</i>	406		127		81	

Results showed that the majority of primary school (71.7%), social pedagogy (66.1%) and preschool education students (59.3%) were included in Cluster 1, where secure attachment was predominant.

However, 28.3% of primary education students, 33.9% of social pedagogy students and 40.7% of preschool education students were included in Cluster 2, where fearful and preoccupied attachment styles were predominant.

Detailed Analysis of Insecure Attachment Styles

We concluded our data exploration by thorough analysis of insecure attachment styles in each student group separately. We introduced the term “risky” attachment, defined by the following criteria: (1) for low level of secure attachment style (non-secure) the first three degrees, which include the answers “almost never”, “very rarely” and “sometimes” indicative for me, and (2) for high level of fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachments, the last three degrees on a 7-point Likert-scale which include the answers “quite often”, “very often” and “almost always” indicative for me. On the basis of these criteria each individual from the three student groups was included in one of the four categories, namely “without risky attachment style”, “with one risky attachment style”, “with two risky attachment styles” or “with three risky attachment styles”. There were 226 (55% of all students) students of primary education, 54 (42.5% of all students) students of social pedagogy and 37 (45.7% of all students) students of preschool education who reported no risky attachment styles. The number and percentage of individuals in each category of risky attachment styles for three student groups are presented in the Table 4.

Table 4. Number and percentage of primary education, social pedagogy and preschool education students in the categories of risky attachment styles

	Primary Education Students		Social Pedagogy Students		Preschool Education Students		Σn
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
One answer indicating risky attachment							
<i>Non-secure</i>	6	3.2	0	0	2	4.5	8
<i>Fearful</i>	55	29.7	21	28.8	10	22.7	86
<i>Preoccupied</i>	39	21.1	19	26.0	5	11.4	63
<i>Dismissing</i>	17	9.2	5	6.8	3	6.8	25
Together	117	63.2	45	61.6	20	45.5	182
Two answers indicating risky attachment							
<i>Non-secure-fearful</i>	19	10.3	12	16.4	8	18.2	39
<i>Non-secure-preoccupied</i>	10	5.4	3	4.1	2	4.5	15
<i>Non-secure-dismissing</i>	1	0.5	1	1.4	2	4.5	4
<i>Fearful- preoccupied</i>	15	8.1	5	6.8	5	11.4	25
<i>Fearful-dismissing</i>	2	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2
<i>Preoccupied -dismissing</i>	0	0.0	2	2.7	1	2.3	3
Together	47	25.4	23	31.5	18	40.9	88
Three answers indicating risky attachment							
<i>Non-secure-fearful- preoccupied</i>	16	8.7	2	2.7	5	11.4	23
<i>Non-secure-fearful-dismissing</i>	3	1.6	2	2.7	0	0.0	5
<i>Non-secure-preoccupied-dismissing</i>	1	0.5	1	1.4	0	0.0	2
<i>Fearful- preoccupied-dismissing</i>	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	2.3	2
Together	21	11.4	5	6.9	6	13.6	32
All	185	/	73	/	44	/	302

In the category of students with one risky attachment style there were 117 (63.2%) students of primary education, 45 (61.6%) students of social pedagogy and 20 (45.5%) students of preschool education. For primary education and social pedagogy students the most frequent attachment styles were fearful and preoccupied, and for preschool education students a fearful style was predominant.

Among students who had two risky attachment styles there were 47 (25.4%) students of primary education: mostly with risky attachment styles non-secure-fearful, non-secure-preoccupied or fearful-preoccupied. There were 23 (31.5%) students of social pedagogy with two risky attachment styles, mostly with risky attachment styles non-secure-fearful or fearful-preoccupied. In the group of preschool education students there were 18 of them (40.9%) with two risky attachment styles, majority of which were non-secure-fearful or fearful-preoccupied attachments.

Students with three risky attachment styles were: 21 (11.4%) primary education students and 6 (13.6%) preschool education students, mostly with non-secure-fearful-preoccupied attachment styles in both groups, and 5 (6.9%) social pedagogy students with no predominant category.

Chi-square test showed significant differences ($\chi^2=9.40$, $df=4$, $p<.05$) among the percentage of students from the three study programmes who reported one, two or three risky attachment styles. The chi-square tests between the three pairs of student groups (namely primary education – social pedagogy, social pedagogy – preschool education and primary – preschool education) were performed. The significant difference appeared between the percentages of primary and preschool education students in the category with two risky attachment styles – the percentage was higher in preschool education students ($\chi^2=3.62$, $df=1$, $p<.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our study explored the attachment styles in primary education, preschool education and social pedagogy students. The students' secure attachment is important for the quality of their personal relationships in general but also for their future profession that involves work with different groups of people, especially children. Our results focused on attachment styles, the differences among students' groups, the configuration of their attachment styles, with special attention to those students who reported insecure attachment style(s).

Attachment styles differed in the level of secure attachment style among the three student groups. Primary education and social pedagogy students reported a relatively high level of secure attachment whereas the level of secure attachment of the preschool education students was moderate and significantly lower in comparison with the other two groups of students.

There is usually one prevailing attachment style that an individual has in personal relationships but a certain level of other attachment styles may also be found (Broberg et al., 2001). Because of that we performed a cluster analysis that confirmed the existence of two different attachment style configurations in students. The majority of primary education (71.7%), social pedagogy (66.1%) and preschool

education students (59.3%) were included in a cluster with a predominantly secure attachment style. Individuals with a secure attachment style value themselves and others positively and maintain intimate, warm and trusting relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The prevalence of secure attachment is also reported in other studies involving different age groups (e.g., Ainsworth, 1979, in Grossmann et al., 2005; Žvelc & Žvelc, 2006).

In the cluster with predominantly fearful and preoccupied attachment styles there were 28.3% of primary education, 33.9% of social pedagogy and 40.7% of preschool education students included. Higher level of anxiety in relationships is found in fearful and preoccupied attachment styles (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Individuals with fearful attachment style value themselves and others negatively, tend to be anxious when establishing relationships and have a great fear of rejection (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The aforementioned authors described individuals with preoccupied attachment style as those who value themselves negatively and other people positively; they are emotionally expressive, seek support in others and often worry about relationships. Preoccupied attachment is more frequent in women who also represented the majority of our sample.

We were not only interested in the average scores of attachment styles in the three student groups but we also wanted to take a closer look at those students who reported insecure attachment styles and might be considered “at risk” in their present relationships and for their future professions, that will rest upon their interpersonal skills (Dekleva, Kobolt & Klemenčič, 2006; Predstavitevni zbornik študijskega programa Predšolska vzgoja, 2011; Razdevšek Pučko & Rugelj, 2006). The “at risk” students were defined as those who reported risky attachment styles, meaning they had either low level of secure attachment or high levels of fearful, preoccupied or dismissing attachment styles. They were divided into three categories based on the number (one, two or three) of risky attachment styles. There were 45% of primary education, 57.5% of social pedagogy and 54.3% of preschool education students who reported at least one risky attachment style. There were significant differences among the percentage of students from the three study programmes who reported one, two or three risky attachment styles. The percentage of preschool education students was significantly higher in the category with two risky attachment styles in comparison with the percentage of primary education students in this category.

The number of students who reported an insecure attachment styles (determined through the fearful/preoccupied attachment cluster or through the “at risk” categories) was quite high considering the students’ work orientation. Primary education students will work with children, to whom a teacher represents an important figure. They will also have numerous interactions with the parents of these children. Students of social pedagogy will work as counsellors with different groups of people including children, adolescents and other vulnerable individuals. Preschool education students will work with younger children and their parents. School teachers, preschool teachers and social pedagogues represent one of the possible, important attachment-figures who can influence the quality of attachment in an individual. This is the reason for focusing on the high percentage of insecurely attached students’ in all three study programmes. In particular special attention should be paid to preschool education students, where the highest percentage of

insecure attachments was observed. Moreover, during the preschool period especially, attachment style undergoes intensive development and because of that, those who work with children of this age-group, need to be more sensitive. When children enter their preschool education they need a secure and warm acceptance by their preschool teacher to help them overcome their separation fears and adapt to their new environment (Pajnič & Praper, 1995).

Attachment styles stay relatively stable during the individual's development; however they can change at important life-events or in long-term relationships – becoming more or less secure. Within the university context, altering the students' insecure attachment styles is a difficult task. What teachers at the faculty of education could do, to influence the types of attachments that their students' form, is to inform them of the importance of the various attachment styles on their relationships and their future professions that involve working with people. This information may encourage students with insecure attachment styles to start transforming their mental representations and behaviours regarding relationships.

In conclusion, paying attention to attachment can contribute to improving the quality of relationships in a students' life and their adjustment to the student community during their studies (Mattanah et al., 2004). This is especially important for those who will work with people in the future.

The main advantage of our study is the exploration of attachment styles of several generations of primary education, social pedagogy and preschool education students based on their average and individual results. As a result we have information on attachment styles for different student groups in general and individual differences within these groups. However, the attachment styles could be assessed by other attachment measures, such as interviews providing more detailed information on attachment, or by observations, providing external information on individual's attachment-related behaviour. A future study could assess students' attachment styles at the end of the study programme, to determine if and how the study programme influenced the quality of attachment. Future research could also include studies on attachment styles in relation to other measures, such as personality traits, personal well-being, emotion regulation, with a view to the students' success and satisfaction in their future professions.

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, M. W., Keelan, J. P. R., Fehr, B., Enns, V. & Koh-Rangarajoo, E. (1996). Social-cognitive conceptualization of attachment working models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 94–109.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1997). *Attachment and Loss*. Vol. 1. Great Britain: Pimlico.
- Bowlby, J. & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1965). *Child Care and the Growth of Love*. Great Britain: Penguin books.
- Broberg, A. G., Hjalms, I. & Nevenon, L. (2001). Eating disorders, attachment and interpersonal difficulties: a comparison between 18- to 24-year-old patients and normal controls. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 9(6), 381–396.
- Cugmas, Z. (2003). *Narisal sem sonce zate - izbrana poglavja o razvoju otrokove navezanosti in samozaznave* [I drew a sun for you – selected chapters on child's attachment development]. Ljubljana: Center za psihodiagnostična sredstva, d.o.o.
- Cugmas, Z. (1998). *Bodi z menoj, mami - razvoj otrokove navezanosti* [Mummy, be with me – development of child's attachment]. Ljubljana: Center za psihodiagnostična sredstva, d.o.o.
- Dekleva, B., Kobolt, A. & Klemenčič, M. M. (2006). *Analiza doseženih in zaželenih kompetenc študijskega programa Socialna pedagogika na Pedagoški fakulteti v Ljubljani* [The analysis of achieved and desired competencies in the Social Pedagogy programme at the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana]. In S. Tancig & T. Devjak (Eds.), *Prispevki k posodobitvi pedagoških študijskih programov* (p. 150–169). Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Fonagy, P. (2001). *Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Griffin, D. & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and the other: fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(3), 430–445.
- Gross, J. J. & Thompson, R.A. (2009). Emotion regulation: conceptual foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (p. 3–24). New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K. & Keppler, A. (2005). Universal and culture-specific aspects of human behavior: The case of attachment. In W. Friedlmeier, P. Chakkarath & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and Human Development: The Importance of Cross-cultural Research for the Social Sciences* (p. 75–97). New York: Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Predstavitveni zbornik študijskega programa Predšolska vzgoja [The presentation of the Preschool Education programme] (2011). Retrieved July 4, 2011 from: http://www.pef.uni-lj.si/fileadmin/Datoteke/Studijski_programi/Predstavitveni_zborniki/pv-zbornik.pdf
- Jacobsen, T., Edelstein, W. & Hofmann, V. (1994). A longitudinal study of the relation between representations of attachment in childhood and cognitive

- functioning in childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(1), 112–124.
- Kirkpatrick Johnson, M., Crosnoe, R. & Thaden, L. L. (2006). Gendered patterns in adolescents' school attachment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(3), 284–295.
- Kobak Rogers, R. & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. *Child Development*, 59(1), 135–146.
- Main, M. (1996). Introduction to the special section on attachment and psychopathology: 2. overview of the field of attachment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64(2), 237–243.
- Masten, A. S. & O'Dougherty Wright, M. (2010). Resilience over the lifespan. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra & J. Stuart Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of Adult Resilience* (p. 213–237). New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Mattanah, J. F., Hancock, G. R. & Brand, B. L. (2004). Parental attachment, separation - individuation, and college student adjustment: a structural equation analysis of mediational effects. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 51(2), 213–225.
- Mikulincer, M. (1995). Attachment style and mental representations of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(6), 1203–1215.
- Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2010). *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change*. New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Noller, P. (1995). Parent - adolescent relationships. In M. A. Fitzpatrick & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Explaining Family Interactions* (p. 77–111). London: SAGE Publications.
- Pajnič, R. L. & Praper, P. (1995). Vpliv različnih oblik zgodnjega varstva otrok na njihov razvojni proces [The impact of early placement of children to children's nurseries to their developmental process]. *Psihološka obzorja*, 4(3), 37–49.
- Prosen, S. & Smrtnik Vitulić, H. (2010). Značilnosti študentov razrednega pouka in socialne pedagogike [Characteristics of students of Primary teacher education and Social pedagogy]. *Socialna pedagogika*, 14(3), 327–346.
- Razdevšek Pučko, C. & Rugelj, J. (2006). *Kompetence v izobraževanju učiteljev* [Competencies in teacher's education]. In S. Tancig & T. Devjak (Eds.), *Prispevki k posodobitvi pedagoških študijskih programov* (p. 30–44). Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Ross, H., Stein, N., Trabasso, T, Woody, E. & Ross, M. (2005). The quality of family relationships within and across generations: a social relations analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* (special issue), 29(2), 110–119.
- Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The Developing Mind*. New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Stern, D. N. (1985/2000). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. USA: Basic Books.
- Thompson, R. A. (1999). Early socio-personality development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Social, Emotional, and Personality Development* (p. 25–104), vol. 3, *Handbook of Child Psychology*, 5th ed. USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. & Sagi-Schwartz, A. (2006). Attachment across diverse socio-cultural contexts: The limits of universality. In K. H. Rubin & O. B. Chung (Eds.), *Parenting Beliefs, Behaviors, and Parent-*

- Child relations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (p. 107–142). New York, Hove: Psychology Press.
- Wallin, D. J. (2007). *Attachment in Psychotherapy*. New York, London: Guilford Press.
- Werner, K. & Gross, J. J. (2010). Emotion regulation and psychopathology. In A. M. Kring & D. M. Sloan (Eds.), *Emotion Regulation and Psychopathology: A Transdiagnostic Approach to Etiology and Treatment* (p. 13–37). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Zimmermann, P. (2004). Attachment representations and characteristics of friendship relations during adolescence. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 88(1), 83–101.
- Žvelc, M. & Žvelc, G. (2006). Stili navezanosti v odraslosti [Attachment styles in adulthood]. *Psihološka obzorja*, 15(3), 51–64.

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Bağlanma Stilleri ve Mesleklerindeki Önemi

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, geleceğin okul öncesi, sınıf öğretmenleri ve sosyal pedagogları olacak üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stillerini araştırmaktır. Araştırmanın örneklemini, Slovenya’da bulunan Ljubljana Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi’nde öğrenim görmekte olan 639 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Bartholomew & Horowitz (1991) tarafından geliştirilen ilişki ölçeği kullanılarak; güvenli, saplantılı, korkulu ve kayıtsız bağlanma stilleri analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre; okul öncesi eğitim öğrencilerinin bağlanma stili arasında orta düzeyde ve anlamlı derecede düşük bir ilişki görülürken ilköğretim ve sosyal pedagoji öğrencilerinin güvenli bağlanma stiline nispeten yüksek olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Küme analizi de her iki bağlanma stilleri yapılandırmalarını doğrulamıştır: ağırlıklı olarak güvenli (ilköğretim öğrencileri %71.7, sosyal pedagoji öğrencileri %66.1 ve okul öncesi eğitimi öğrencileri %59.3). Güvensiz bağlanma stiline ayrıntılı analizi ise her gruptaki öğrencilerin yaklaşık yarısının en az bir “riskli” bağlanma stili ifade ettiklerini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Bağlanma stili, üniversite öğrencileri, ilişki, eğitim.