

**Title page:**

**Relationship between attachment styles with girls thinking style functions at high school in Hamadan. September 2012**

**Abolghasem Yaghobi<sup>1</sup>, Hosseyn Mohagheghy<sup>2</sup>, Nafiseh Yari Moghadam<sup>3\*</sup>, Marzieh Ghodarzi<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup> *ph.D, assistant professor in Bu Ali Sina university, Department of Psychology ,Post Office Box 65174-4161 Hamadan, Iran.*

<sup>3</sup> *M.A student of Educational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Azad University of Hamadan. Post Office Box 65168-13344. Hamadan, Iran.*

<sup>4</sup> *M.A of Educational science. Post Office Box 65168-13344. Hamadan, Iran.*

\*Corresponding author E-mail: [moghadam12@ymail.com](mailto:moghadam12@ymail.com) Fax: +98 8118223580

## **Relationship between attachment styles with girls function of thinking styles of high school girl students in Hamadan**

### **Abstract**

**Background:** In recent years, the researchers had worked on attachment style theory in studying different aspects of individual and social life of adults and announce that attachment style is related to most behavior, thought and motivational behaviors. The aim of the current study was investigating the relationship between attachment styles with function of thinking styles of high school girl students in Hamadan.

**Methods:** Participants were 340 students from the four science high schools. Some girl students were chosen randomly according clusters method and function of thinking style and attachment style were evaluated. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix, multivariable regression, and t-test analyze were used to data analysis.

**Results:** The results indicated that girls with insecure attachment styles were less use legislative and judicial than those with secure attachment styles. In addition students with executive thinking style were secure more than other students who used other styles and each of predicting styles had a contribution in predicting criterion variable.

**Conclusion:** The findings of this research are not in consistent with Sternberg's predations based on which increasing legislative and judging

thinking style in students in the U.S.A. The reason of this inconsistency refers to this fact that in our society, legislative and judging thinking styles are not encouraged while it is executive thinking style which is reinforced.

**Keywords:** *Secure and insecure attachment styles, Legislative, Judicial, Executive, Self efficacy.*

**Word:** 226

## **Introduction**

For nearly the past seven decades, scholars have been investigating the roles of intellectual styles in human performance. Intellectual styles, a general term for various labels with the root word “style” such as cognitive styles, learning styles, and thinking styles, refer to people’s preferred ways of processing information (Zhang , Sternberg 2006). Although these styles are conceptually different (Sternberg , Zhang 2001), they are similar in a fundamental way. That is, all of them are different from abilities. An ability refers to what one can do, whereas a style refers to how one prefers to use the abilities one has. It has been well established that intellectual styles matter in various domains of student life, including academic achievement (Demick , Koerber 1993), cognitive development (Zhang 2004), career development (Morgan, 1997), and personality traits (Deng, et al. 2000; Saleh 1998). However, one area that has not been widely explored is the relationship between intellectual styles and attachment styles. The present study makes such an endeavor by examining the relationships of attachment styles proposed by Bowlby`s (1969) to functional thinking styles as defined in Sternberg`s (1968) theory.

Over the past decade, one theory that has received considerable attention in educational research has been Sternberg's (1988, 1997) theory of mental self-government (MSG), which proposes that the organization of thinking parallels the organization of political government and that individuals govern themselves according to their personal thinking styles or, more accurately, their own profiles of thinking styles. Thinking style has been defined as the "interface between intelligence and personality" (Sternberg, 1994), and as ". . . a favored way of expressing or using one or more abilities" (Grigorenko , Sternberg, 1997). The construct has been operational zed by the Thinking Styles Inventory (TSI; Sternberg , Wagner, 1992). The term style, as regards human intellect, refers to "habitual patterns or preferred ways of doing something . . . that are consistent over long periods of time and across many areas of activity" (Sternberg , Grigorenko, 2001). Style is differentiated from ability, a term referring to "things one can do—a skill or skill combinations" (Zhang, 2001). MSG theory proposes that thinking styles comprise five dimensions that are analogous to facets of government: function, form, level, scope, and leaning (Sternberg, 1997; see Table 1).

The three functions of mental self-government are legislative, executive, and judicial. Briefly, legislative thinkers enjoy creating their own rules for doing things, and prefer to decide for themselves what things to do and how to do them. Executive thinkers, conversely, prefer to follow established rules and value problems that are restructured. People with a

preference for a judicial style of thinking favor analyzing and evaluating existing rules and procedures and critiquing the work of others (Sternberg, 1997). Many authors had found that there was a positive correlation between thinking styles and academic progress, creativity, self-efficacy, parents education, economic and social class of students (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1997; Sternberg, 1998; Zhang & Sternberg,

| <i>Style</i>       | <i>Characterization</i>   | <i>Sample Item</i>                                  |
|--------------------|---|---|
| <i>Functions</i>   |   |   |
| <i>Legislative</i> | Likes to create, invent, design, do things his or her own way, has little assigned structure. | I like tasks that allow me to do things my own way. |
| <i>Executive</i>   | Likes to follow directions, do what   | I like situations in which it is clear              |

2002; Zhang, 2004; Zhang, 2010; Zhu Chang & Zhang, 2011; Yu, Tak Ming & Zhu Chang, 2011).

*Table 1: thinking style functions*

|                 |  |   |
|-----------------|--|---|
|                 | he or she is told, be given structure.         | what role I must play or in what way I should participate.                          |
| <i>Judicial</i> | Likes to judge and evaluate people and things. | I like to evaluate and compare different points of view on issues that interest me. |

---

Bowlby's (1969, 1980) attachment theory is based on the relations formed and developed between an infant and his/her primary care-giver. This theory also explains the reasons of the tendencies towards strong-emotional bond with a specific person. According to the interaction between infant and the primary care-giver, a child develops working models, including judgments and evaluations of the self and other people. Based on the working models, attachment behaviors had been examined in different studies.( Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978), subsequently (Egeland , Farber, 1984; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985; Cassidy , Berlin, 1994) investigated the infants' and children's attachment behaviors. According to the results, attachment styles were classified as secure, anxious-ambivalent and avoidant. (Bowlby, 1977) asserted that attachment quality becomes stable over time. In light of this assertion, adulthood attachment styles were also investigated. Results indicate that childhood attachment is translated into a terminology suitable for adult functioning (Collins, Read, 1990; Hazan , Shaver, 1987). While examining the adult attachment (Bartholomew, Horowitz's ,1991) model is used commonly. According to this model, based on a

combination of negative and positive models of the self and others, adult attachments are classified as secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing..

Relations between attachment and emotion have been investigated by many researchers (Hazan , Shaver, 1987; Kobak , Sceery, 1988; Mikulincer , Orbach, 1995). Attachment theory assumes that the attachment figure not only provides a secure base, but also encourages exploration of the self and the environment (Ainsworth, et al, 1978; Baumeister , Leary, 1995; Bowlby, 1980). Researchers studying on the issue notified that different attachment styles are associated with distinct emotional profiles (Consedine , Magai, 2003). Generally, secure attachment is related to positive emotion, while insecure attachment is related to negative emotion. Individuals with a secure attachment style are less liable to depression, anger and hostility than insecure individuals (Hazan , Shaver, 1987; Kobak , Sceery, 1988; Mikulincer , Orbach, 1995). Like other negative social emotions, shame, guilt, and loneliness may arise from early relationships (Leary, Koch & Hechenbleikner, 2007).

In addition, psychologists consider the attachment between the youth and parents (as) an important interpersonal ground in which in dividable growth is represented and determines the main adaptability of the youth. Attachment theory provides a theoretical structure for regularly organized interference for the youth and their families. Attachment is a



specific emotional relationship which involves exchange of care giving and comfort .Bowlby describes the attachment as sustainable psychic relationship between two individuals and stated that people initial attachment styles have been shaped in early childhood (Bowlby,1969). According to Bowlby attachment has an evolving component and helps individual to survive (Bowlby,1988).

Many researcher pointed out that attachment styles has relationship with most psychic, motivation variables and adults behaviors, such as self-efficacy, violent behaviors, depression, anxiety and high risk sexual behaviors. (Berman, weems, Rodrigues & Zamora, 2006; Dereli , karakus ,2011; Deniz , Engin, 2011; Doyle, Haw ford , Markiewicz, 2009; Akbag , Imamaglu, 2010; weiss, Mac Mullin, waechter & wekerle,2011).

The basic goal of this study is to determine the relationship between attachment styles and functional thinking styles, and understand whether the attachment styles explain executive, Judicial, Legislative thinking styles or not. Since there are not enough studies targeted to determine the relationship among attachment and functional thinking styles explaining this relationship is very important in terms of contribution to the literature.

Research aims was recognizing the relationship between attachment styles with the functional thinking styles of high school girls.

## **Questions**

-Which of the predicting thinking styles are the most powerful and efficient for self-efficacy students?

- Which of the predicting attachment styles are the most powerful and efficient for self-efficacy students?

### **Hypotheses provided based on the mentioned questions:**

- There is positive meaningful correlation between students' thinking styles and their self-efficacy.

- There is positive meaningful correlation between secure attachment and self-efficacy styles.

- There is negative meaningful correlation between insecure attachment and self-efficacy styles.

## **Method**

### **Research methodology**

The current study was carried out on high school girls in Hamadan, Iran.

### **Data Analyses**

In the analysis of the obtained data Multi variable regression, t-test and correlation matrix have been used.

### **Statistical population and sampling method**

The statistical population was consisted of 12088 high school girls aged 14-18 years. Regarding the executive limitations, cluster random sampling was used. A list of all public high schools (ordinary and representative) was provided and three schools were selected randomly.

In each school, three classes were considered to be cluster and their students were studied. Simultaneously, attachment styles and functional thinking styles test on students without any time limitations for each test. Each of tow tests was performed in one session which took approximately thirty minutes. 340 students completed the questionnaires. Before collecting the data, the students had been informed about the measures.

### **Thinking styles**

Thinking styles was determined based on questionnaire of Wagner-Sternberg's (1996). This questionnaire has 104 question and examines 13 subtests. Therefore, each subtest consists of 8 questions and measures a thinking style. So in this research, researcher chosen 24 question that related to functional thinking styles.

Reliability coefficient of questionnaires was measured through its application on 75 university students. The reliability coefficient of subtests is %56 to %85 for subtests and for general style averaged at 0.78.

### **Attachment styles**

This scale, first provided by Collins and read in 1990, was revised in 1996. The theoretical basis of this test is attachment theory. RAAS which examines the individual's assessment form communication skills and rapport relationship style, has 18 items an which respondents announce agreement or disagreement level in a 5 degree liker scale. This questionnaire has three sub scales: dependency which shows the

subject's trust and reliance to others, closeness which measures the rapport and emotional closeness of subject and anxiety which assesses the individual's concern from being removed and excluded. Each of these subscales is allocated 6 specific items.

The reliability coefficient of retesting was reported to be 0.68 , 0.71 and 0.42 for closeness dependency and anxiety. Collins and read showed that subscales of closeness, dependency and anxiety were reliable in the interval of 2 month and even 8 months. As the values of chronbach  $\alpha$  are equal to or greater than 180, the level of capability is high.

## **Results**

Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to determine the relationship among attachment styles and functional thinking styles. Multivariable regression analysis was employed to determine if attachment style predict functional thinking styles. T-test is a parametric test applied to determine the significant difference of two means.

As for the data in the table No 2, usually 57 percent of statistical sampling use secure style, 21 percent anxiety, and 22 percent avoidant style. Secure students are below the closeness index and pointing dependency upper than average and below the anxiety index had lower than average grade. While bidirectional students who include 21 percent of sampling were those who have got more or less good result (their grade were below anxiety index upper than average and below closeness and dependency). Finally, the students having avoidant style include 22 percent of sampling have got lower grade in below anxiety and

dependency indexes so that they got highly lower grade regarding anxiety in high extent as for closeness and dependency.

Table 2  
Frequency & percentage of attachment styles

| <i>Attachment styles</i>                    | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>percentage</i> |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Secure attachment</i>                    | 194              | 57                |
| <i>Insecure attachment<br/>(ambivalent)</i> | 71               | 21                |
| <i>Insecure attachment<br/>(avoidant)</i>   | 75               | 22                |
| <i>Total</i>                                | 340              | 100               |

Note. N= 340 high school students

Regarding the data in the table (3) the most average is related to executive 6.44, legislative 5.99, judicial 5.97, respectively, that is, most students had executive, legislative and judicial thinking style functionally. As indicated in table 3 students had significantly higher functional thinking styles standard scores.

Table 3  
Mean and SD value of functional thinking styles

| <i>Functional thinking styles</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| <i>Legislative</i>                | 5.99        | 2.07      |
| <i>Executive</i>                  | 6.44        | 2.04      |
| <i>Judicial</i>                   | 5.97        | 2.08      |

Note: N=340

**Main hypothesis:** There is relationship between attachment styles with thinking style functions.

**H0:** There is not relationship between attachment styles with thinking style functions.

**H1:** There is relationship between attachment styles with that of thinking style functions.

For the current study of research questions, multi-variable regression analysis has been used simultaneously to examine which one of the attachment styles are the most powerful predicament for high school girl's thinking style functions. The resulting findings of the regression analysis indicate that only 19.733 percent of the observed changes at student's thinking style functions is related to the attachment style. Also, regarding the above results, it can be concluded that because the f-test statistic is equivalent to 5.30 and that of the meaningful level has 0.01, then there is meaningful difference between independent and dependent amount of variables and, in fact have meaningful relationship in the mentioned regression. Therefore, the assumed zero which showed that there is not any meaningful relationship between the attachment styles with thinking style functions, is unacceptable. And research assumed acceptable with confidently 99%. The analysis of variance showed significant difference between the relation of attachment styles with functional thinking styles. The analysis of variance showed significance difference between the relation of independent variable (attachment styles) and dependent variable (functional thinking styles). The related data are provided in table (4).

*Table 4*  
*Multivariable regression analysis the difference between the relation of attachment styles with functional thinking styles.*

| <i>Changes sources</i> | <i>Sum of squares</i> | <i>df</i>  | <i>Mean square</i> | <i>F</i>       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <i>Regression</i>      | <i>1578.249</i>       | <i>15</i>  | <i>105.217</i>     | <i>5.30***</i> |
| <i>residual</i>        | <i>6427.548</i>       | <i>324</i> | <i>19.838</i>      |                |
| <i>Total</i>           | <i>8005.797</i>       | <i>339</i> |                    |                |

*Note. N = 340 high school students..df= degrees of freedom. F=Fisher test*

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0$ .

Standardized coefficient Beta is used in order to evaluate the share of each variables in measure model in terms of standard deviant. Beta, indeed, is an index/ measure for determining the amount of on standard one; I. e, the more the rate of Beta, the greater the predicting variables with index variable. So, as for the meaningful column level based on the table, the following variables have the most relationship with the thinking style functions, respectively. They can function as predict amend variables: secure attachment style ( $p < 0.01$  &  $t = 3.87$ ), the insecure attachment style ( $p < 0.01$  &  $t = -3.54$ ), judicial thinking style ( $t = 2.812$  &  $P < 0.01$ ), legislative thinking style ( $t = 3.012$  &  $P < 0.001$ ), executive thinking style ( $3.341$  &  $P < 0.01$ ). The thinking style functions point predicament for each student follows:  $\beta = 19.733 + 0.202 = 19.935$ . This number shows the amount of student's thinking style functions having secure attachment which is at average based on the points in the table (6). The analysis of variance showed significant difference between the relation of attachment styles with thinking styles functions.

Table 5  
Different coefficient regression and T values of attachment styles and thinking styles

| Model    | Different coefficient regression (B) | Standard error | Standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) | T test  |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|---------|
| constant | 19.733                               | 2.534          |  | 7.788** |

|                            |        |       |        |          |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|--------|----------|
| <i>secure attachment</i>   | 1.363  | 0.354 | 0.202  | 3.867**  |
| <i>Insecure attachment</i> | -1.612 | 0.456 | -0.184 | -3.537** |
| <i>Executive</i>           | 0.1    | 0.293 | 0.621  | 3.341**  |
| <i>Legislative</i>         | 0.373  | 0.269 | 0.583  | 3.012**  |
| <i>Judicial</i>            | 0.488  | 0.269 | 0.408  | 2.812**  |

---

*Note. N = 340 high school students..df= degrees of freedom. F=Fisher test*

*\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01.*

**Second hypothesis:** There is positive correlation between secure attachment with thinking style functions.

**Ho:** There is not positive correlation between secure attachment with thinking style functions.

**H1:** There is positive correlation between secure attachment with thinking style functions.

There was a positive relationship between secure attachment style and executive thinking styles , Regarding the data in table (6), there is a significant relationship between attachment styles and executive (r= 0.721; sig= 0.001), implying the amount of using secure attachment style, the greater the student’s executive thinking style.

There was a positive relationship between secure attachment style and Legislative thinking style. As seen in table (6), there is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and Legislative thinking (r= 0.62; sig= 0.001), implying that the greater the secure attachment style is used, the greater the Legislative thinking will be.



There was a positive relationship between secure attachment style and Judicial thinking style. The data of table (6) show that there is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and Judicial thinking style ( $r=0.55$ ;  $sig= 0.001$ ), implying that the greater the amount of using secure attachment style, the great, the student's Judicial thinking style.

According to this results research assumption is acceptable with confidence 99% , and zero assumption unacceptable with confidence 99%. Therefore, as for these findings the grade of thinking style function increases as secure attachment style which seems, more or less, a significant amount.

**Third hypothesis:** There is negative correlation between insecure attachment (avoidant & ambivalent) with thinking style functions.

**Ho:** There is not any negative correlation between insecure attachment (avoidant & ambivalent) with thinking style functions.

**H1:** There is negative correlation between insecure attachment (avoidant & ambivalent) with thinking style functions.

There was a negative relationship between insecure attachment style (avoidant, ambivalent) and executive thinking style. The relationship between insecure attachment styles and executive thinking style ( $r= -0.054$ ;  $sig= 0.01$ ) is negatively significant, implying that the greater the insecure attachment style, the lower the student's executive thinking style. (Table 6)

There was a negative relationship between insecure attachment style (avoidant, ambivalent) and Legislative thinking style. ( $r = -0.043$ ;  $sig = 0.01$ ). Based on the data in table (6), this relationship is negatively significant, implying that the greater the insecure attachment style, the lower the student's Legislative thinking style.

There was a negative relationship between insecure attachment style (avoidant, ambivalent) and Judicial thinking style. ( $r = -0.011$ ;  $sig = 0.01$ ). Based on the data in table (6), this relationship is negatively significant, implying that the greater the insecure attachment style, the lower the student's Judicial thinking style.

According to this results research assumption is acceptable with confidence 99% , and zero assumption unacceptable with confidence 99%.

*Table 5*  
*Correlation Matrix Between attachment styles and functional Thinking styles*

| <i>Research variable</i>   | <i>Executive</i> | <i>Legislative</i> | <i>Judicial</i> | <i>Secure attachment</i> | <i>Insecure attachment</i> |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Executive</i>           | 1                |                    |                 |                          |                            |
| <i>Legislative</i>         | 0.32**           | 1                  |                 |                          |                            |
| <i>Judicial</i>            | 0.45**           | 0.40**             | 1               |                          |                            |
| <i>Secure attachment</i>   | 0.721**          | 0.62**             | 0.55**          | 1                        |                            |
| <i>Insecure attachment</i> | - 0.054**        | - 0.043**          | - 0.011**       | 0                        | 1                          |

*Note. N = 340 high school students..*

*\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ ,*

## **Discussion**

Also according to the study, a positive relationship between insecure attachment style and performance styles is available. The larger either amount of secure attachment increases the rate of students' thinking style, subsequently increases. Also there is a negative relationship between insecure attachment styles (avoidant and ambivalent) and executive thinking style. The students with insecure attachment styles are less likely to use executive style of thinking. Although numerous and diverse research which has been done in the field of thinking styles, in the realm of relationships and attachment styles of thinking, up to now, no study has been done and the present investigations are not perfectly align with this research. However, the significant relationship between attachment styles and functions of thinking styles for girls confirms that, despite that the attachment relationship in humans has a biological basis, however, secures attachment as an obtainable and developable skill and is effected by education, learning and tissue factor, and can boost the thinking level. According to Mikulincer (1997), secure attachment provides the basis for safety, through which people can discover their world and develop more adaptive responses to their environment. Under such safety, individuals are encouraged to try exploring and having cognitive openness toward new information. Also according to Funogy and Target (1997), this safe basis, gives the required self-confidence to venture out, learn and continually update the worlds, theirs and other's models .So, compatibility with new tissues facilitates. Secure

attachment, increases the ability to move back and also react to others' behavior and mental state. Mikulincer (1995) found that secure attachment leads to the development of autonomy and self-confidence and consequently, optimal use of the intellectual capacity of a person. He also stated that, secure attachment is associated with positive and coherent sense of self. Sternberg (1994) says: Unfortunately, the Department of Education and the school environment are often thought of legislative neglect. Sternberg (1994)says: Unfortunately in the training environment and to schools, law enforcement is often thought to be neglected and the executive thinking style that requires people to obey the orders is welcomed. Sternberg (1994) believes that the adoption of a proper thinking style in social life. With this stability to coordinate with it, you can beat the odds and take maximum benefit from your capabilities. Sternberg and Grigorenko (1998) believe that the study and cognition of the thinking styles is very useful and necessary for predicting success for School located training and also predicting job-choosing. Smith (2001) in an article entitled " thinking style of act-theory- in science and engineering), describes knowledge an element of the style of thought that films' collections of thought . Li Feng (2004) has reached the conclusion that social and fearless people have an external and outwork thinking style, while the artistic people have a thinking style that requires conformity with the others .Sternberg(1994) believes that the thinking style in different educational levels are

different from each other; because in different levels of education, special thinking styles are encouraged. Zhang (2001) reached the conclusion that there is positive relationship between the executive thinking style and the grades of educational progress. According to the educational system of America, the findings of this article are not consistent with Sternberg's prediction based on which increasing legislative and judging thinking style in students in the U.S.A. One of the reasons for this inconsistency refers to the fact that in our society, legislative and judging thinking styles are not encouraged while it is executive thinking style which is reinforced. Therefore, in explaining this theory, it can be said that regarding Sternberg' theory that there is no bad or good thinking style and thinking styles are preference methods of individual to use their abilities, students can perform better in environment which is consistent with thinking style. This is the case for self-efficacy. And also individuals with secure attachment style, because of being unidirectional, are likely to solve the problems systematically, these kind of people are capable of deciding and reacting to mental pressure in hard situations, have a good self-confidence, are self-satisfied, flexible and they can evaluate their progress. So the findings of the research are in some way in harmony with Mikalniser, Funagi and Target's results.

Comparative relationship between the legislative, juridical and insecure attachment thinking styles showed that there is a negative significant

relationship between them, implying that the more the use of insecure attachment thinking style, the less the students are likely to use it. Accordingly, people with insecure attachment style, preventive and bidirectional, do not protest against isolation, do not show a clear attachment behavior have less self-efficacy are not offensive to being separated, and seem to be independent, and are less likely to explore their environment and also are more nervous when they face problems. Thus they seldom have dreamy thoughts. According to the findings of researches by Yaqoubi, Mohaqqueqi and YariMoghadam (2012), these individuals have, anarchic, mixed up, stuffy and conservative thoughts, they cannot organize their goals, and usually use random solutions to deal with their problems, they avoid changes and also avoid esoteric, and unfamiliar situations, while people with juridical style of thinking, are organized, creative and evaluate their situation very well, thus they are less likely to make abysmal mistakes. Bowlby (1973, 1969, 1980) explained attachment theory is based on the relations formed and developed the interactional bond in a secure attachment with love, kindness, faith, self-confidence and decency. Waters(1978) proved that secure attachment, like to lead groups, act as entrepreneur, while insecure attachment individuals are shy, less active and do not stick to their goals, and these differences is not related to their IQ. Waters (1978) asserted that children with insecure attachment style are less liable to depression, angry and hostility than secure individuals .They easily get

angry when facing problems, it means that less active, they get disappointed easily, and cannot ask for help.

As an explanation for this theory it can be said that, if the family performs well and provides warm atmosphere, it causes secure attachment in family members and if the atmosphere is cold it causes preventive insecure attachment. And on the other side, if the behavior of the family members leads to extreme dependency (high emotional act, a great depending among the members and extreme emotions), there will be an interdependence in the family and the ambivalent attachment is shaped in family. Generally, the way parents act, their perseverance and the relationships between family members, determines the attachment type of the child, youth and adults. Based on psychoanalytic theory, insecure individuals form negative inner and mental structures/ models of themselves and others in the frame of attachment with his/her mother. Opposing to this, these weak attributes, negatively affects negative feedback. So, families which have strong relationships with their children and act well, provide the environment for their children to secure attachment, self-efficacy and thus, using creative and juridical thinking style increases and children succeed more; it means that, caring about children's needs has a great impact on secure attachment style .

According to the results of a comparison, there is a positive relationship between secure attachment style and juridical thinking one .The more a student has a secure attachment thinking style, the more the amount of

the use of its judicial thinking style increases .People, who have juridical thinking style, are inclined to analyze laws, methods and to the existing structures and they are inclined to both content and structure evaluation .They like activities like writing critical articles, evaluating their actions programs. Cassidy and Shaver (1999) believe that the importance of initial interest relations and its role in social development and the person's future thrill has been proved widely in past decades. According to the results of Elkind, Pianta and Obrin researches (1993) and Ericson and *et al* (1990), secure attachment, has the most significant relation with results of psychological test, such as self-confidence, independency, self-esteem, emotional matters, flexibility, self-organizing, consistent relationships, behaviors and social adaption skills, positive attitude, compassion, and school success and insecure attachment leads to aggressiveness, delinquency , behavioral disorder, lack of relationships, optimism toward self, anti-social behaviors. Zhang and Li Fang (2011) concluded that there is a correlation between Judgmental thinking style and creativity. Zhang (2001) and Zhang and Sternberg (2002) realized that creative thinking styles is in contraction with school success. Zhang (2004) realized that the students with judgmental and legislative thinking style have a high cognitive development and powerful and positive self-evaluative abilities, while this result is completely vice versa for children with executive thinking style. So the more the relations and attachments are safe, the more



individuals can act independently, differently and creatively. Because, positive attachment type, provides More optimistic environment for individual's personal growth, so this ....., gives the sufficient self-confidence for risking, learning, judging and criticizing and provides flexibility with environment. Secure attachment, makes it easy for the person to go back, react, and analyze his/her behavior. According to this feature, individual's judgmental thinking improves, and he/she can use his abilities in order to succeed. Research shows that, there is a positive correlation safe attachment style and judgmental thinking style. It shows that safe attachment style improves the judgmental thinking style. People who have this style, offer their own ways for doing things and prefer unpredicted problems and prefer to work in a place which satisfies their juridical desires. At the end researcher recommended: firstly because of the lack of basic research in the field of thinking styles and aspects of it in there, it is recommended that variables such as profession, marital status, type of personal, and particularly, socio-cultural and household affairs have great importance in the researches of thinking styles. In addition, training courses-related to thinking styles in the classroom helps the teachers and curriculum planners, be cognitive of training activities. Second, as for limited research done in the field of special topics of interest and work patterns, other studies in this area, especially implementation on traumatized people can clear various aspects of the field.

## Reference

- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Atkinson, L. (1997). Attachment and psychopathology : From laboratory to clinic. In L. Atkinson & K. J. Zucker (Eds), *Attachment and psychopathology*. New York: Guilford press.( pp.3-16)
- Atkinson's: (1998). Cognitive styles in context of design and technology project work: Educational psychology. *An international Journal of experimental educational psychology*\_18(2),( pp.183-194).
- Akbag, M, Imamaglu . S.E (2010). The prediction of Gender and Attachment styles on shame, Guilt, and Loneliness. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice*. Vol. (10) n (2)( pp. 669-682)
- Berman. S.L , weems. C.F, Rodrigues. E. T, Zamora. I. J (2006). The Relationship between identity status and Romantic attachment style in middle and Late adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol(29) n(5)( pp. 737-748).
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and Loss: Vol I. *attachment*. New York: *Basic Books*.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). the nature & the child's tie to mothers. *International Journal of psycho – Analysis*. XXXIX, (pp. 1-23).
- Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Vol II. *Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: *Basic books*.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Vol III. *Loss: Sadness and depression*. New York: *Basic Books*.
- Bowlby,J, (1988). A secure base: *Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York: *Basic Book*.

- Cassidy, J; & Shaver, p. R.(Eds.).(1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. New Yourk: Guilford Press.
- Collins & Read (1996),Revised Adult Attachment Scale, retrieved from: [www.psych.ohiou.edu/.../21005%20Intake%20Packet%20Part%204.doc](http://www.psych.ohiou.edu/.../21005%20Intake%20Packet%20Part%204.doc)
- Collins & Read (1990).Adult Attachment Scale, retrieved from: [www.gse.uci.edu/childcare/.../Adult%20Attachment%20Scale.pdf](http://www.gse.uci.edu/childcare/.../Adult%20Attachment%20Scale.pdf)
- Davila, J; Burge, D; & Hammen, C.(1997). why dose attachment style change? *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 73, 826-838.
- Davila, J; Karney, B. R; & Bradbury, T. N.(1999). Attachment change processes in the early years of marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76,783-802.
- Dereli. E, karakus. o.(2011). An examination of attachment styles and social skills of university students. *Electronic Journal of research in Educational psychology*. Vol.(9) n(2) (pp. 731-744)
- Demick, J., & Koerber, H. J. (1993). Relations among cognitive styles and reading readiness in preschoolers. Resources in education (RIE): #356–078. *Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*.
- Deng, Z., Li, D., & Zhang, Q. (2000). Cognitive styles, scholastic attainments with the Cattell's 16PF: A correlative approach. *Psychological Science China*, 23(2), 234–235.
- Deniz. M, Engin (2011). An investigation of Decision making styles and the five-factor personality traits with. Respect to Attachment styles. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice*, Vol.(11) n(1)( pp. 105-113).
- Doyle. A.B, haw ford. H, Markiewicz. D (2009). Attachment style with Mother, Father, Best Friend and Romantic partner-during Adolescence. *Journal of research on Adolescence*, Vol.(19) n(4)( pp. 690- 714).
- Egeland, B; Pianta, R; & O` Brien, M. A.(1993). Maternal intrusiveness in infancy and child maladaptation in early school years. *Development and psychopathology*, 5, 359-370.
- Erickson, M; Sroufe, L.A; & Egeland, B.(1985). The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool and a high-risk sample. In I. Bretherton & E. waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research. *Monographs of the Society for Research in child Development*, 50(1-2, Serial No. 209), 147-166.
- Erdman, P; & caffery, T.(Eds.).(2002). Attachment and family systems: conceptual, empirical and therapeutic relatedness. New Yourk: *Springer*.

- Fonagy, P; & Target, M.(1997). Attachment and reflective function: Their role in self-organization. *Development and psychopathology*, 9, 679-700.

- Georgion. S.N; Demetriou. A.p; staurinides. P. (2008). Attachment style and mentoring Relationships in adolescence. *Educational psychology*, Vol. (28) , (6) pp.603-614).(

- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P.R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511–524.

Johnson, S.M.(2002). Emotionally focused couple therapy with trauma survivors; *Strengthening attachment bonds*. New York: Guilford press.

- Kobak, R; & Duemmler, S.(1994). Attachment and conversation: Towards a discourse analysis of adolescent and adult security. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment process in adulthood*. London: Jessica Kingsley. (pp.121-150)

- Mikulincer, M.(1995). attachment style and the mental representation of self. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 69, 1203-1215.

-Mikulincer, M.(1997). Adult attachment style and information processing: Individual differences in curiosity and cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1217-1230.

- Oskis. A, Loveday. C, Huckle bridge. F, Thorn. L, clow. A (2011). Anxious Attachment style and salivary cortisol dis regulation in Healthy Female children and Adolescents. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry* v(52) n (2) (pp. 111-118).

- Saleh, A. I. (1998). The nexus of brain hemisphericity, personality types, temperaments, learning styles, learning strategies, gender, majors, and cultures. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 58(8-A), 3004.

- Shaffer, D.R. (2000). *Social & personality developmental*. USA: Wadsworth/ Thomson learning.

- Schmid, Hanspeter (2001). Theory and practice: Thinking styles in engineering and science. *Australian Journal of Information Systems. Special issue on Knowledge Management* ,December 2000,( pp. 106 – 115).

- Smith,S.N.& Miller,R.J.(2005). Learning approaches Examination type, discipline of study , and gender.*Educational psychology*,25(1),43-53.

- Sternberg, R.J & Grigorenko, E.L (1997), Are cognitive still in styles? *American psy chologist*, 52 (7),( pp. 700-712).

- Sternberg, R.J. (1998). Mental self government: A theory of intellectual Styles and their development. *Human Development*, Vol.( 31)( pp. 197-224).
- Yu,Tak Ming; Zhu,chang (2011). Relationship between teacher`s preferred teacher-student interpersonal behavior and intellectual styles. *Educational psychology*, 31 (3)(pp. 301-317).
- Waters, E.(1978). The reliability and stability of individual differences in infant mother attachment. *child Development*, 48, 1184-1199.
- Vaughn. L. M; Battle. J.V;Taylor. T; Dearman. L.(2009). Learning styles and the relationship to Attachment styles and psychological symptoms in college women. *College student Journal*, Vol.(43) n(3) (pp. 723-735).
- weiss. J.A, Mac Mullin. J, waechter. R, wekerle. C (2011). child maltreatment, Adolescent Attachment style, and Dating violence: considerations in Youths with Borderline to Mild intellectual Disability. *International Journal of mental Health and Addiction*. Vol.(9) n(5)( pp. 555-576).
- Zhang, L.F. and sterenberg, R.J. (2002). Are Learning Approaches and thinking styles Related? A study in two Chinese populations, *the journal of psychology. Province town*. Vol. (134)( pp.469-489).
- Zhang, L, F.(2002). Thinking styles and cognitive development. *Journal of Genetic-psychology*, 163(2), 179-195.
- Zhang, L, F.(2002). Thinking Styles and the Big Five Personality Traits. *Educational-psychology*, Volume 12, number 1 (pp. 17-31).
- Zhang, L.f. (2004). *Relation ship between thinking styles inventory and process question. Personality and individual. Differences*. Vol .(21)( pp. 840-850).
- Zhang Lifang (2010). Further investigating thinking styles and psychosocial Development in the chinese Higher Education context. *Learning and – individual Differences*, Vol.(20) n (6) (pp. 593-603).
- Zhu chang, Zhang, Li-Fang (2011). Thinking styles and conceptions & creativity among university students. *Educational psychology* Vol.(31) n(3)( pp. 361-375).
- Zakin, G., Solomon. Z. & Neri.Y. (2003). Hardiness, attachment style, and long term psychological distress among Israeli POWs and combat veterans. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 819–829.
- yaghobi, A; Mohagheghy,H; Yari Moghadam,N.(2012). Thesis for receiving " M.A" degree on educational psychology. *The Relationship between attachment*

*styles, thinking styles with girls self- efficacy at high school in Hamadan.*  
ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY Hamadan Branch.