

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

Kashish Kriplani<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Deepthi Vijayan<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to find the relationship between attachment styles, mindfulness and resilience among young adults and to understand if there was a significant difference in Resilience and Mindfulness with respect to the Attachment styles (secure, ambivalent-insecure and avoidant-insecure) among young adults. A total number of 250 young adults (18-30 years) participated in the study. The data was collected with the help of Google forms and the following questionnaires were used: Measurement of Attachment Style (MOAS), Bharathiar University Resilience Scale (BURS) and The Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS). A comprehensive statistical analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and One-Way ANOVA. According to the findings of the study, there was a positive significant relationship between secure attachment style and resilience and between mindfulness and secure attachment style. A negative significant relationship was found between ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience and between mindfulness and ambivalent-insecure attachment style. In addition, avoidant-insecure attachment style did not have a statistically significant relationship with resilience and mindfulness. The results also revealed a positive significant relationship between resilience and mindfulness among young adults. Lastly, there was a significant difference in Resilience with respect to attachment styles among young adults and resilience was higher in secure attachment style in comparison to the other attachment styles. The results however showed that there was no significant difference in Mindfulness with respect to attachment styles among young adults.

**Keywords:** Attachment Styles, Resilience, Mindfulness, Young Adults

Young Adulthood is a unique developmental period during which there are key developmental tasks that allow the young adult to participate in self-exploration and identity formation (Higley, 2019). According to Erik Erikson's Stages of Psychosocial Development, it is the period of life where the main source of conflict is the desire to develop intimate, loving relationships with others (Mcloed, 2023). Young men and women have to make decisions regarding their future aspirations, relationships, starting a family, and lifestyle during this time of adulthood. This stage of life is crucial for young adults to establish their place in society (Jadhav & J.C., 2019). Childhood events and

<sup>1</sup>M.Sc. Clinical Psychology Student, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru

\*Corresponding Author

Received: May 12, 2023; Revision Received: August 03, 2023; Accepted: August 08, 2023

experiences are believed to have an impact on adult attachment, resulting in relatively consistent attachment patterns throughout adulthood (Bowlby, 1982; Collins & Read, 1990). Young adults face a variety of challenges throughout their lives, and resilience influences their capacity to overcome these challenges (Desai & Balasubramaniam, 2021). Mindfulness can be measured as an individual quality that differs from person to person (Stevenson et al., 2017).

### *Attachment Styles*

An attachment, according to Bowlby (1969, 1988), is an emotional bond characterized by a propensity to seek out and keep close proximity to a particular attachment figure, especially through difficult circumstances. Ainsworth first defined what is known as attachment styles, ways to categorize children's behavior based on commonalities in the ways in which they respond to the presence and absence of their caregiver(s) (Ainsworth, 1967; Ainsworth et al., 1978). The basic way in which a person thinks and responds emotionally in close relationships is known as their attachment style (Halford, 2001).

According to the current view, attachment styles reflect two underlying characteristics that are continuous rather than discrete: anxiety and avoidance (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Fraley and Waller, 1998). The anxiety component conveys low self-esteem, a negative opinion of oneself, as well as a dread of rejection and abandonment. The avoidance dimension describes the level of comfort and trust (or lack thereof) in forming close bonds with people. These styles are overlapping (Baumgardner & Crothers, 2013).

People with secure attachment style have positive self-perceptions, little relationship anxiety, and little relationship avoidance. These people have faith in their capacity to meet their needs through relationships and within themselves. In their romantic and intimate relationships, those who have a secure attachment type experience greater closeness and trust as well as more positive than negative emotions. They feel comfortable asking for assistance from others when they need it (Mickelson, Kessler, & Shaver, 1997).

Preoccupied attachment style describes people who are low on avoidance because they want to enjoy intimacy but are highly anxious due to low self-esteem. Earlier classifications referred to this style as anxious/ambivalent. The preoccupied approach reveals a need for other people's love and acceptance to make up for a lack of esteem. Such persons may be labelled as "needy," "clingy," or even "greedy" due to their need for closeness and acceptance (Baumgardner & Crothers, 2013).

Fearful Avoidant attachment type defines people who exhibit high levels of anxiety and avoidance. Fear of rejection keeps people with this attachment style from getting close to others, and their low opinion of themselves appears to be the main reason. People who have this style believe that people are unreliable and likely to let them down. They are more negative about long-term relationships and think it is risky to rely on others (Baumgardner & Crothers, 2013).

High avoidance and low anxiety are the defining characteristics of Dismissing Avoidant attachment style. It defines those who are assured in their independence, confident and proud of it. Others are generally seen as irrelevant. People with this type experience less intimacy, commitment, and happiness in their relationships. Dismissive people do seem to care about what others think of them, despite what they profess (Baumgardner & Crothers, 2013).

### ***Resilience***

Resilience can be defined as “the ability to ‘bounce back’ or thrive despite being faced with difficult situations” (Connor, Davidson, 2003). It can also be defined as “the capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten system function, viability, or development” (Masten, 2014). Fundamentally, researchers studying resilience agree that resilience is concerned with individual variability in response to risk (Rutter, 1987). According to the research, resilience and thriving are characterized by a number of factors. These factors include a high tolerance for uncertainty, flexibility, risk-taking, positive self-esteem, hardiness, and strong coping mechanisms, a feeling of coherence, self-efficacy, optimism, and strong social resources (Carver, 1998; O’Leary, 1998; Patterson et al., 2002; Ungar, 2004).

Instead of being viewed as a static outcome or trait, resilience is best understood as a developmental process or dynamic capacity. Resilience may be present in varying degrees throughout many spheres of life, but in actuality it is more likely to exist on a continuum (Pietrzak & Southwick, 2011). As one develops and interacts with the environment, resilience may evolve over time (Kim-Cohen & Turkewitz, 2012). Resilience comprises of an intricate network of factors, and it can be promoted by enhancing these environmental, family or societal, and individual factors (Stock, 2022). Young adults who are resilient learn life skills that enable them to cope with and manage challenging events that are unavoidable in daily life (Murphey et al., 2013).

### ***Mindfulness***

Brown and Ryan (2003) define trait mindfulness, also known as day-to-day mindfulness or dispositional mindfulness in some literature, as “a receptive attention to and awareness of present events and experience.” The core functions of consciousness—attention and awareness—form the basis of mindfulness. Awareness is the conscious registering of stimuli, such as the five senses of the body, kinesthetic sensations, and mental processes. Our most direct and immediate contact with reality is through awareness (Brown, 2007). An initial “taking notice” or “turning towards” the object indicates that attention is engaged when a stimulus is strong enough to cause it (Nyaniponika, 1973).

A receptive state of mind where attention is restricted to only registering the facts encountered is required for a mindful mode of processing (Weinstein et al., 2009). The ability to recognize internal and external events and occurrences as phenomena, “rather than as the products of a conceptually constructed world”, is an essential aspect of mindfulness (Olendzki, 2005). Some of the characteristics of mindfulness include: clarity of awareness, non-conceptual, non-discriminatory awareness, flexibility of attention and awareness, empirical stance toward reality, present-oriented consciousness and stability or continuity of attention and awareness (Brown et al., 2007). Dispositional mindfulness is linked to increased wellbeing and more adaptable functioning, according to research (Metler et al., 2019). It has been proposed that mindfulness may operate as a protective factor against the stress that young adults encounter (Bamber & Schneider, 2016).

Desai and Balasubramaniam (2021) intended to study the relationship between attachment styles and resilience among young adults. The research found a systematic difference in resilience as a function of secure and insecure-ambivalent attachment styles in the adult population. Resilience was found to have a positive relationship with secure attachment style, but a negative relationship with insecure-ambivalent attachment style. It was also discovered that secure attachment style was a better predictor of resilience than insecure-

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

ambivalent attachment style. Stevenson et al. (2019) investigated the underlying link between adult attachment, dispositional mindfulness, and emotion regulation, and how effectively these constructs predict coping and well-being. The findings of the study revealed that there were moderate negative relationships between total mindfulness scores and attachment dimensions (anxiety, avoidance and disorganized). Zhang et al. (2023) in their meta-analysis-based study used a three-level random-effects meta-analysis model to investigate the link between trait mindfulness and resilience. The results showed a significant and positive relationship between resilience and trait mindfulness. The findings demonstrated that those with higher levels of trait mindfulness are more likely to be resilient. The research study offered important information for programs aimed at enhancing resilience.

The purpose of the current study is to find the relationship between attachment styles (secure, ambivalent-insecure and avoidant-insecure), resilience and mindfulness among young adults. It also aims to see if there exists any significant difference in Resilience and Mindfulness with respect to the Attachment styles (secure, ambivalent-insecure and avoidant-insecure) among young adults.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### *Research design*

Correlational research design with a Quantitative approach was used to fulfil the need of the study. A correlational research design is one that investigates the relationships between variables without controlling or manipulating them.

#### *Sample*

For the current study, a total sample of 250 Young Adults (N=250) were selected. The sample for the current study comprised of 250 respondents from Bangalore, Mumbai and Nagpur etc. The Young Adults aged between 18 to 30 years were chosen for the study.

#### *Objectives of the study*

- To find out if there is a relationship between secure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between ambivalent insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between avoidant insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between resilience and mindfulness among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between secure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between ambivalent insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- To find out if there is a relationship between avoidant insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- To find out if there is a significant difference in resilience with respect to the attachment styles among young adults.
- To find out if there is a significant difference in mindfulness with respect to the attachment styles among young adults.

### *Hypotheses*

- H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- H<sub>2</sub>: There is a significant relationship between ambivalent insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- H<sub>3</sub>: There is a significant relationship between avoidant insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults.
- H<sub>4</sub>: There is a significant relationship between resilience and mindfulness among young adults.
- H<sub>5</sub>: There is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- H<sub>6</sub>: There is a significant relationship between ambivalent insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- H<sub>7</sub>: There is a significant relationship between avoidant insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults.
- H<sub>8</sub>: There is a significant difference in resilience with respect to attachment styles among young adults.
- H<sub>9</sub>: There is a significant difference in mindfulness with respect to attachment styles among young adults.

### *Tools used for the study*

Three measures were used in this study,

- 1. Measurement of Attachment Style (MOAS) (Ahmad, N., Jahan, A., & Imtiaz, N., 2016):** The MOAS Scale is a 27-item inventory specially developed for the Indian population measuring the attachment style. The questionnaire followed a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) with 3 (Don't know) as the midpoint of the scale. This measure proposes 3 types of attachment styles- secure attachment, ambivalent-insecure attachment and avoidant-insecure attachment. Items are scored based on the responses given and few items have reversed scoring.  
Reliability and Validity- Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.80 for the full scale when demonstrating internal consistency reliability. The construct validity and reliability of the tool were found to be good.
- 2. Bharathiar University Resilience Scale (BURS) (Annalakshmi, 2009):** BU Resilience Scale is a self-report questionnaire that assesses psychological resilience. The scale has a total of 30 items and has been standardized in the Indian population. Items have a five-point scale ranging from “Not at all appropriate in describing you” to “Most appropriate in describing you.” The total score of the subject represents their Resilience. Greater resilience is indicated by a higher overall score. Each statement is scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1, not at all appropriate to 5, most appropriate). The responses of the participant for all the 30 statements in the scale are summed up to yield a single score on the scale representing the level of psychological resilience of the individual.  
Reliability and Validity- The Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.876. The scale's validity has been demonstrated by its correlation with the Frigborg's Resilience Scale ( $r= 0.46$ ) and the Adjustment Inventory ( $r= 0.39$ ).

**3. MAAS: The Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (Kirk Warren Brown and Richard M. Ryan, 2003):** The MAAS Scale is a single dimension measure of trait or dispositional mindfulness. The scale measures one’s tendency toward mindfulness or mindlessness. The scale has a total of 15 items. Items have a six-point scale ranging from 1 = almost always, to 6 = almost never. Scores on these statements are then combined to create an overall score of mindlessness or mindfulness. To score the scale, simply compute a mean (average) of the 15 items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of dispositional mindfulness, meaning these individuals more frequently live in a state of mindfulness.

Reliability and Validity- Internal consistency levels (Cronbach's alphas) in both healthy and psychiatric samples have been found to be greater than 0.80. The MAAS has shown excellent internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and concurrent and incremental validity.

**Procedure**

The Google form and the informed consent were prepared for the data collection. The study started by selecting participants who were between the ages of 18 and 30 years. The respondents were young adults (18-30 years) from various parts of the country. Informed consent was taken from the participants and they were allowed to withdraw from the study and an informed consent section was present before the set of questionnaires in order to obtain their consent. The purpose and criteria for the study were mentioned in the form. The completion of the form took around 10-15 minutes. The data was analyzed using the IBM SPSS software.

**RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

The results are discussed in accordance with the hypotheses. The statistical techniques used included Pearson correlation, to assess the relationship between the variables and One-Way ANOVA to see if there exists a significant difference in the dependent variables with respect to the groups of the independent variable.

*Table No. 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Attachment Styles (Secure, Ambivalent-Insecure & Avoidant-Insecure), Resilience and Mindfulness*

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Secure Attachment Style	26.964	5.023	–			0.171**	0.128*
Ambivalent-Insecure Attachment Style	29.784	5.622		–		0.294**	0.420**
Avoidant-Insecure Attachment Style	26.472	5.253			–	-0.109	0.054
Mindfulness	3.467	0.828				–	0.347**
Resilience	95.812	16.280					–

Note: \* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$

The results of the correlation for secure attachment style and resilience presented in Table 1 showed that the r value was 0.128 with the corresponding p value of 0.043 (<0.05). The r value (r= 0.128) indicated that there was a (weak or small) positive correlation between secure attachment style and resilience. Hence, the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>), “There is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and resilience among young adults”

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

was accepted. Individuals with secure attachment have a positive sense of self and others, are at ease with both intimacy and independence, and are resourceful in recruiting support when needed and being resilient (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2012).

The results of the correlation for ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $-0.420$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.001$  ( $<0.01$ ). The  $r$  value ( $r = -0.420$ ) indicated that there was a (moderate) negative correlation between ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_2$ ), “There is a significant relationship between ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults” was accepted. People with ambivalent-insecure attachment style are seen to be excessively needy and are often anxious and uncertain, lacking in self-esteem which may negatively affect how well they are able to deal with adversities and bounce back from them. Also, greater attachment anxiety interferes with resilience (Kural & Kovacs, 2021).

The above findings corresponded to a previous research showing that attachment styles and resilience are separate concepts that are interconnected in multiple ways. Resilience and secure attachment style are associated with each other and the nature of this association is positive whereas ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience were negatively associated with each other (Desai, Balasubramaniam, 2021).

The results of the correlation for avoidant-insecure attachment style and resilience presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $0.054$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.395$ . The  $p$  value was greater than  $0.05$  significance level. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_3$ ), “There is a significant relationship between avoidant-insecure attachment style and resilience among young adults” was rejected. During stressful moments, individuals with avoidant-insecure attachment style prefer to be self-reliant and minimize their distress (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2012). Similar findings have also been obtained in one of the previous researches demonstrating that resilience and avoidant-insecure attachment style were not significantly associated with each other (Pourkord et al., 2020).

The results of the correlation for resilience and mindfulness presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $0.347$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.001$  ( $<0.01$ ). The  $r$  value ( $r = 0.347$ ) indicated that there was a (moderate) positive correlation between resilience and mindfulness. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_4$ ), “There is a significant relationship between resilience and mindfulness among young adults” was accepted. Individuals with high levels of mindfulness possess the ability to respond correctly to stressful situations without reacting in instinctive and non-adaptive ways and thus be more resilient (Langer and Moldoveanu, 2000; Wallace and Shapiro, 2006; Sass et al., 2019). The findings were consistent with another study which also found a significant and positive relationship between mindfulness and resilience (Choudhary et al., 2021).

The results of the correlation for secure attachment style and mindfulness presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $0.171$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.007$  ( $<0.01$ ). The  $r$  value ( $r = 0.171$ ) indicated that there was a (small) positive correlation between secure attachment style and mindfulness. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_5$ ), “There is a significant relationship between secure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults” was accepted. In addition to more successful relationships, adaptive coping with threatening stimuli, higher self-esteem, and improved self-regulation, secure adult attachment and mindfulness have been linked to similar favorable outcomes regarding one's

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

mental and physical health (Ryan et al. 2007; Shaver et al. 2007). The obtained result was consistent with a previous research study which also found a significant positive correlation between dispositional mindfulness and secure attachment style, both for parental and romantic attachment (Fall and Shankland, 2021).

The results of the correlation for ambivalent-insecure attachment style and mindfulness presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $-0.294$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.001$  ( $<0.01$ ). The  $r$  value ( $r = -0.294$ ) indicated that there was a (moderate) negative correlation between resilience and mindfulness. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_6$ ), “There is a significant relationship between ambivalent-insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults” was accepted. Higher attachment anxiety individuals show hyperactivity of the attachment system, which could hamper the appropriate growth of mindfulness-related notions (such as acting with awareness, non-judging, and also non-reacting) and consequently lead to lower levels of mindfulness (Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007). The findings were consistent with a previous study by Lee-Winn et al. (2010) in which they also found a significant negative correlation between mindfulness and anxious-preoccupied (ambivalent-insecure) attachment style.

The results of the correlation for avoidant-insecure attachment style and mindfulness presented in Table 1 showed that the  $r$  value was  $-0.109$  with the corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.086$ . The  $p$  value was greater than  $0.05$  significance level. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_7$ ), “There is a significant relationship between avoidant-insecure attachment style and mindfulness among young adults” was rejected. The findings were not consistent with a study by Pepping et al. (2013) which revealed that attachment anxiety and avoidance were both associated with low mindfulness.

**Table No. 2: Mean, standard deviation and F-values for Resilience across the attachment styles using ANOVA**

Variable	Secure Attachment Style		Ambivalent-Insecure Attachment Style		Avoidant-Insecure Attachment Style		F(2, 247)	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
<b>Resilience</b>	100.662	16.593	91.430	13.619	98.827	18.893	9.270*	0.001

Note: \* $p < 0.05$

The results of the One-Way ANOVA presented in Table 2 showed the difference in Resilience with respect to the attachment styles among young adults. The mean and standard deviation for Secure attachment style were  $100.662$  ( $SD=16.593$ ). For, Ambivalent-insecure attachment style, the mean and standard deviation were  $91.430$  ( $SD=13.619$ ). The mean and standard deviation for Avoidant-insecure attachment style were  $98.827$  ( $SD=18.893$ ). Results indicated significant mean differences across the attachment styles for Resilience with  $F(2,247) = 9.270$  and corresponding  $p$  value of  $0.001$  ( $<0.05$ ). Findings revealed that young adults with secure attachment style exhibited higher levels of resilience ( $M=100.662$ ), in comparison to ambivalent-insecure and avoidant-insecure attachment style. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_8$ ), “There is a significant difference in Resilience with respect to attachment styles among young adults” was accepted. Secure attachment is seen as a possible resilience factor that can protect individual well-being in the face of risk and distress and thus facilitate greater resilience (Basal et al., 2020). The finding was consistent



## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

with a research by Storebo et al. (2020), whose study discovered that secure attachment is linked to the presence of resilience.

**Table No. 3: Mean, standard deviation and F-values for Mindfulness across the attachment styles using ANOVA**

Variable	Secure Attachment Style		Ambivalent-Insecure Attachment Style		Avoidant-Insecure Attachment Style		F(2, 247)	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Mindfulness	3.627	0.872	3.353	0.805	3.497	0.788	2.658	0.072

The results of the One-Way ANOVA presented in Table 3 showed the difference in Mindfulness with respect to the attachment styles among young adults. The mean and standard deviation for Secure attachment style were 3.627 (SD=0.872). For, Ambivalent-insecure attachment style, the mean and standard deviation were 3.353 (SD=0.805). The mean and standard deviation for Avoidant-insecure attachment style were 3.497 (SD=0.788). Results did not indicate significant mean differences across the attachment styles for Mindfulness with  $F(2,247) = 2.658$  and corresponding p value of 0.072, which is more than the significance level 0.05. Hence, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ), "There is a significant difference in Mindfulness with respect to attachment styles among young adults" was rejected. These findings were inconsistent with a research study done by Lee-Winn et al. (2010) which indicated that different aspects of mindfulness were related to attachment styles in varied ways. Lower mindfulness scores were closely associated with both anxious and avoidant attachment styles.

### SUMMARY

The purpose of the study was to find the relationship between attachment styles, mindfulness and resilience among young adults and to see if there existed any significant difference in Resilience and Mindfulness with respect to the Attachment styles (secure, ambivalent-insecure and avoidant-insecure) among young adults. The data was collected with the help of Google forms. The sampling technique used for the study was Non-probability sampling technique with Convenience method. A total number of 250 young adults (18-30 years) participated in the study. The following questionnaires were used: Measurement of Attachment Style (MOAS), Bharathiar University Resilience Scale (BURS) and The Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS). The data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS. The statistical techniques used included- Pearson Product Moment Correlation and One-Way ANOVA. The results showed significant positive and negative relationships between the variables and a significant difference in dependent variable with respect to groups of the independent variable.

### CONCLUSION

The aim of the study was to find the relationship between attachment styles, mindfulness and resilience among young adults and to see if there existed any significant difference in Resilience and Mindfulness with respect to the Attachment Styles among young adults. The findings showed a positive significant relationship between secure attachment style and resilience and between mindfulness and secure attachment style among young adults. A negative significant relationship was found between ambivalent-insecure attachment style and resilience and between mindfulness and ambivalent-insecure attachment style among young adults. Avoidant-insecure attachment style did not have a statistically significant

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

relationship with resilience and mindfulness among young adults. The results revealed a positive significant relationship between resilience and mindfulness among young adults. The findings also revealed that there were significant mean differences across the attachment styles for Resilience. The results did not indicate a significant mean differences across the attachment styles for Mindfulness. It can be therefore concluded that each type of attachment was linked to a certain level of mindfulness and resilience. Also, there was a significant association between young adults' resilience and mindfulness.

### ***Implications***

Understanding attachment styles, resilience, mindfulness, and their relationship in Indian society is crucial, especially for young adults who deal with many changes, problems and obstacles, particularly those pertaining to their careers and relationships. This study will be a modest step in that direction. A lucid understanding of attachment patterns or styles can be inculcated among young adults and then they can make the necessary changes in their interactions in interpersonal relationships in order to foster better mental health and restore attachment security that has been shown to increase resilience. Certain tailor made interventions targeting resilience and mindfulness can be formulated that could lead to better mental health outcomes.

### ***Limitations of the study***

The sample size was small which could affect the generalizability of the results and the sample may not be a precise representative of the population of young adults. The more number of statements in the Google form and the resultant lack of interest of the participants in answering too many questions might have led to random responding and personal bias. Also, self-report measures were used for the study which also may be prone to participant response bias. The samples were restricted predominantly to a few geographical areas like Karnataka, Maharashtra and Kerala. The sampling technique was Non-probability sampling technique with Convenience method which can also act as a potential limitation.

### ***Suggestions for future studies***

In terms of future research, the same variables can be studied in a different population like adolescents or older adults. A similar study can be conducted using a larger sample size in order to get better results. An intervention study can also be conducted using mindfulness based practices in order to see its impact on attachment styles and resilience. A longitudinal study can be carried out which would be helpful in understanding the development of resilience, attachment styles and mindfulness and the relationship between them. For future researches, a probability sampling technique can be used to provide the individuals of the population an equal opportunity to participate in the study. More sophisticated assessment techniques such as corroborating self-report with ratings from parents, teachers, or peers, or direct observation or direct behavioral assessments can be used for subsequent researches.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ahmad, N., Jahan, A., & Imtiaz, N. (2016). Measure of Attachment Style. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3:3, 60.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: infant care and the growth of love*. Johns Hopkins Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

- Annalakshmi, N. (2009). Bharathiar University Resilience Scale. In P. Harish and W. Ajay (Eds) *Research Methodology Tools and techniques* (105-121). New Delhi: Sree Publishers.
- Bamber, M., & Schneider, J. K. (2016). Mindfulness-based meditation to decrease stress and anxiety in college students: A narrative synthesis of the research. *Educational Research Review, 18*, 1–32. doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.12.004
- 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. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226
- Başal, F. B., Önür, S. T., Yamac, D., Karacin, C., Zengin, G., Bilgetekin, I., Demirci, U., & Oksuzoglu, B. (2020). Does a Secure Attachment Style Predict High Psychological Resilience in Patients with Cancer Receiving Chemotherapy? *Cureus*. doi.org/10.7759/cureus.10954
- Baumgardner, S., & Crothers, M. (2014). *Positive Psychology*. Pearson Education India.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52*(4), 664–678. doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01456.x
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822
- Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). Mindfulness: Theoretical Foundations and Evidence for its Salutary Effects. *Psychological Inquiry, 18*(4), 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701598298
- Carver, C. S. (1998). Resilience and thriving: Issues, models, and linkages. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(2), 245–266. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.641998064
- Choudhary, S., Pandey, P., & Maral, P. (2021). Role of Mindfulness and Self-efficacy in Resilience among young and older people. *Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, 32*, 3.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644–663. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety, 18*(2), 76–82. doi.org/10.1002/da.10113
- Desai, N., & Balasubramanian, G. (2021). Exploring the Relationship between Attachment Styles (Secure & Insecure–Ambivalent Type) and Resilience. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 9*(4). doi.org/10.25215/0904.212
- Fall, E. H., & Shankland, R. (2021). The Mediating Role of Dispositional Mindfulness in the Relationship Between Parental and Romantic Attachment. *Journal of Adult Development, 28*(2), 126–137. doi.org/10.1007/s10804-020-09362-0
- Fraley, R. C., & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson, & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships* (77-114). Guilford Press.
- Halford, W. K. (2001). Marriage: Psychological and Experimental Analyses. In *Elsevier eBooks* (9265–9270). Elsevier BV. doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/01341-3
- Kim-Cohen, J., & Turkewitz, R. R. (2012). Resilience and measured gene-environment interactions. *Development and Psychopathology, 24*(4), 1297–1306. doi.org/10.1017/s0954579412000715

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

- Kural, A. I., & Kovacs, M. (2021). Attachment anxiety and resilience: The mediating role of coping. *Acta Psychologica*, 221, 103447. doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2021.103447
- Langer, E. J., & Moldoveanu, M. (2000). The construct of mindfulness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(1), 1–9. doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00148
- Lee-Winn, N. a. E., Tse, N. Y. J., Holman, N. G., & Luk, N. J. (2010). A Brief Report: A Facet-Level Analysis on Relationships Between Mindfulness and Attachment Styles. *Graduate Student Journal of Psychology*, 12, 31–36. doi.org/10.52214/gsjp.v12i.10870
- Masten, A. S. (2014). Global Perspectives on Resilience in Children and Youth. *Child Development*, 85(1), 6–20. doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12205
- Mcleod, S., PhD. (2023). Erik Erikson's 8 Stages of Psychosocial Development. *Simply Psychology*.
- Mettler, J., Carsley, D., Joly, M., & Heath, N. L. (2019). Dispositional mindfulness and adjustment to university. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 21(1), 38-52.
- Mickelson, K. D., Kessler, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1997). Adult attachment in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(5), 1092–1106. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.5.1092
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. The Guilford Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2012). An attachment perspective on psychopathology. *World Psychiatry*, 11(1), 11–15. doi.org/10.1016/j.wpsyc.2012.01.003
- O'Leary, V. E. (1998). Strength in the face of adversity: Individual and social thriving. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(2), 425–446. doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.751998075
- Olendzki, A. (2005). The Roots of Mindfulness. In C. K. Germer, R. D. Siegel, & P. R. Fulton (Eds.), *Mindfulness and psychotherapy* (pp. 241–261). The Guilford Press.
- Patterson, R., Uppenkamp, S., Johnsrude, I. S., & Griffiths, T. D. (2002). The Processing of Temporal Pitch and Melody Information in Auditory Cortex. *Neuron*, 36(4), 767–776. doi.org/10.1016/s0896-6273(02)01060-7
- Pepping, C. A., Davis, P. J., & O'Donovan, A. (2013). Individual differences in attachment and dispositional mindfulness: The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(3), 453–456. doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.006
- Pietrzak, R. H., & Southwick, S. M. (2011). Psychological Resilience in OEF-OIF Veterans: Application of a Novel Classification Approach and Examination of Demographic and Psychosocial Correlates. *Journal of Affect Disorders*, 133, 560-568. doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2011.04.028
- Pourkord, M., Mirdrikvand, F., & Karami, A. (2020). Predicting Resilience in Students based on Happiness, Attachment Style, and *Religious Attitude*. *Health, Spirituality and Medical Ethics*, 7(2), 27–34. doi.org/10.29252/jhsme.7.2.27
- Rasmussen, P. D., Storebø, O. J., Løkkeholt, T., Voss, L. G., Shmueli-Goetz, Y., Bojesen, A. M., Simonsen, E., & Bilenberg, N. (2019). Attachment as a Core Feature of Resilience: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Reports*, 122(4), 1259–1296. doi.org/10.1177/0033294118785577
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316-331. doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1987.tb03541.x
- Ryan, R. M., Brown, K. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). How Integrative is Attachment Theory? Unpacking the Meaning and Significance of Felt Security. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(3), 177–182. doi.org/10.1080/10478400701512778
- Sass, S. M., Early, L. M., Long, L., Burke, A. C., Gwinn, D. E., & Miller, P. D. (2019). A brief mindfulness intervention reduces depression, increases nonjudgment, and

## Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults

- speeds processing of emotional and neutral stimuli. *Mental Health & Prevention*, 13, 58–67. doi.org/10.1016/j.mhp.2018.12.002
- Shaver, P. R., Lavy, S., Saron, C. D., & Mikulincer, M. (2007). Social Foundations of the Capacity for Mindfulness: An Attachment Perspective. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(4), 264–271. doi.org/10.1080/10478400701598389
- Smith, M. S., Giardina, T. D., Murphy, D., Laxmisan, A., & Singh, H. (2013). Resilient actions in the diagnostic process and system performance. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 22(12), 1006–1013. doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001661
- Stevenson, J. C., Emerson, L.-M., & Millings, A. (2017). The relationship between adult attachment orientation and mindfulness: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Mindfulness*, 8(6), 1438–1455. doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0733-y
- Stevenson, J. C., Millings, A., & Emerson, L.-M. (2019). Psychological well-being and coping: The predictive value of adult attachment, dispositional mindfulness, and emotion regulation. *Mindfulness*, 10(2), 256–271. doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-0970-8
- Ungar, M. (2004). A Constructionist Discourse on Resilience: Multiple Contexts, Multiple Realities Among At-Risk Children and Youth. *Youth & Society*, 35(3), 341–365. doi.org/10.1177/0044118X03257030
- Wallace, B. A., & Shapiro, S. L. (2006). Mental balance and well-being: Building bridges between Buddhism and Western psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61(7), 690–701. doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.61.7.690
- Weinstein, N., Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). A multi-method examination of the effects of mindfulness on stress attribution, coping, and emotional well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(3), 374–385. doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.008
- Zhang, J., Mao, Y., Wang, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The relationship between trait mindfulness and resilience: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Mental Health*. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmh.1581

### **Acknowledgement**

The author appreciates her guide, Dr. Deepthi Vijayan for her constant expertise and guidance, and without whom the study would not have been possible and also is indebted towards all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process. The author is also grateful towards her parents and friends for their unconditional support.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Kriplani, K. & Vijayan, D. (2023). Attachment Styles, Resilience and Mindfulness among Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3), 1692-1704. DIP:18.01.164.20231103, DOI:10.25215/1103.164