

Attachment Dimensions and Resilience among Emerging Adults: A Cross-Sectional Study

Najath. N¹, Dr. Archana Chandran², Dr. Priyanka S. J³

¹Guest Faculty, Bethany Navajeevan College of Physiotherapy, Kerala University of Health Sciences (KUHS)

²Assistant Professor, Dept of Psychology, Govt College for Women, University of Kerala

³Guest Faculty, Dept of Psychology, University of Kerala

Abstract

Emerging adulthood is characterised by developmental transitions involving identity, autonomy, education, and interpersonal relationships. This study examined the associations between adult attachment dimensions and psychological resilience among 120 emerging adults enrolled at the University of Kerala. Adult attachment was assessed using the Experiences in Close Relationships–Revised (ECR-R) and psychological resilience was assessed using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS). Pearson product–moment correlations were used to examine the relationships between attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, and resilience, while independent-samples t tests examined selected demographic differences. Attachment anxiety demonstrated a small but statistically significant negative association with psychological resilience ($r(118) = -.245, p = .007$), whereas attachment avoidance was not significantly associated with resilience ($r(118) = -.032, p = .729$). These findings indicate that greater attachment anxiety was associated with lower psychological resilience, while no corresponding direct association was detected for attachment avoidance. Given the cross-sectional design, the findings should be interpreted as associations rather than causal relationships.

Keywords: Attachment; Attachment anxiety; Attachment avoidance; resilience; Emerging adulthood; University students

Introduction

Emerging adulthood represents a developmental period extending from the late teens through the twenties and is characterised by identity exploration, changing social roles, increasing independence, and instability in the educational, occupational, and interpersonal domains (Arnett, 2000). Contemporary applications of emerging adulthood theory also emphasise the developmental significance of the college and higher education context because students frequently encounter simultaneous transitions in identity, relationships, autonomy, career planning, and social support (Arnett, 2016).

These developmental demands do not necessarily result in psychological difficulties but may require substantial adaptive capacity. Research on college-aged emerging adults suggests that

Published: 31 August 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/SPIJSH.2026.v3.i8.45902>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

psychosocial resources, such as attachment security, social support, and resilience, are relevant to psychological well-being during developmental transitions (Lane, 2020). Understanding the factors associated with adaptive recovery from stressful experiences may therefore contribute to a more comprehensive account of psychological functioning during emerging adulthood.

Psychological resilience is a central construct in this context. Earlier perspectives sometimes treated resilience as a relatively stable personal characteristic, whereas contemporary approaches conceptualise resilience as a dynamic process of successful adaptation involving interactions among individual, relational, developmental, and environmental systems (Masten, 2001; Southwick et al., 2014). The present study operationalises resilience more narrowly as the perceived ability to recover or 'bounce back' after stress, consistent with the construct measured by the Brief Resilience Scale (Smith et al., 2008). This distinction is important because measures of resilience differ in whether they assess protective resources, personality characteristics, coping capacities, or recovery itself.

Adult Attachment

Attachment theory proposes that experiences within important caregiving relationships contribute to cognitive-affective representations concerning the availability of others and the individual's own interpersonal security (Bowlby, 1969). Subsequently, Hazan and Shaver (1987) extended attachment principles to adult romantic relationships, providing an important foundation for contemporary research on adult attachment.

Modern self-report research generally conceptualises adult attachment in terms of two continuous dimensions: attachment anxiety and avoidance (Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley et al., 2000). Attachment anxiety reflects concerns regarding rejection, abandonment, and the availability of attachment figures. Individuals higher in attachment anxiety may show heightened monitoring of relational threat, reassurance seeking, and emotional hyperactivation. Attachment avoidance reflects discomfort with emotional closeness, reluctance to depend on others, and greater reliance on interpersonal distancing or deactivating attachment strategies (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003).

These dimensions are conceptually distinct rather than being at opposite ends of a single continuum. Therefore, individuals can vary independently in anxiety and avoidance, making dimensional analysis preferable to assigning participants to categorical attachment styles for most statistical purposes (Fraley et al., 2000).

Attachment and Resilience

Attachment theory provides a plausible framework for understanding individual differences in resilience because attachment orientations are closely connected to emotion regulation and distress responses. Secure attachment-related representations may support adaptive coping by facilitating help-seeking, confidence in interpersonal support, and flexible emotion regulation. In contrast, attachment anxiety is associated with hyperactivating strategies that can involve heightened vigilance, rumination, and difficulty in downregulating negative affect (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). These processes provide a theoretical basis for expecting attachment anxiety to be negatively associated with stress recovery.

However, empirical findings indicate that attachment anxiety and avoidance may not be related to resilience in identical ways. Kural and Kovacs (2021) reported a direct negative association between attachment anxiety and resilience and found that coping processes contributed to this relationship, whereas attachment avoidance did not show the same direct pattern. Lane (2020) likewise found that attachment anxiety was negatively related to ego resilience among traditional-aged college students, although ego resilience is conceptually distinct from the stress-recovery capacity assessed by the BRS. In contrast, Tepeli Temiz and Comert (2018) found that neither anxious nor avoidant attachment significantly predicted psychological resilience when both dimensions were considered simultaneously. Parpottas et al. (2024) also demonstrated the relationships among attachment dimensions, resilience, and life satisfaction in a university sample. Taken together, the literature supports the relevance of attachment to adaptive functioning while also demonstrating variations in the strength and form of anxiety- and avoidance-related associations.

Research Gap and Rationale

Several issues warrant further investigation. First, anxiety and avoidance should be examined separately because combining them into a single undifferentiated attachment score can obscure theoretically meaningful differences (Brennan et al., 1998; Fraley et al., 2000). Second, findings concerning the direct association between attachment dimensions and resilience remain inconsistent across populations and measurement approaches (Kural & Kovacs, 2021; Lane, 2020; Tepeli Temiz & Tari Comert, 2018). Third, much of the available evidence was generated outside Indian universities. Replication across culturally and institutionally diverse samples is important before assuming the uniformity of attachment-resilience relationships. Finally, theoretical explanations frequently invoke emotion regulation, coping, and social support, but these mechanisms were not directly measured in this study. Accordingly, this study focused on associations rather than causal or mediating mechanisms.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives were as follows:

- To examine the relationship between attachment anxiety and psychological resilience among emerging adults.
- To examine the relationship between attachment avoidance and psychological resilience among emerging adults.
- To examine sex differences in attachment anxiety and psychological resilience among emerging adults
- To examine differences in attachment anxiety and psychological resilience according to educational level.

Hypotheses

H1. Attachment anxiety will be significantly and negatively associated with psychological resilience.

H2. Attachment avoidance will be significantly and negatively associated with psychological resilience.

H3a. Attachment anxiety will differ significantly according to sex.

H3b. Psychological resilience will differ significantly according to sex.

H4a. Attachment anxiety will differ significantly according to educational level.

H4b. Psychological resilience will differ significantly according to educational level.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional correlational design. This design was appropriate for examining naturally occurring relationships among attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, and psychological resilience without manipulating study variables. Because measurements were obtained at a single point in time, temporal ordering and causal direction cannot be established (Appelbaum et al., 2018; von Elm et al., 2007).

Participants

The sample comprised 120 emerging adults (60 males, 60 females) enrolled in undergraduate and postgraduate programs at the University of Kerala. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling from various departments; class announcements and notice-board invitations were used to invite volunteers who met the inclusion criteria (aged 18–29 years and currently enrolled in university studies). Of these, 50 resided in rural areas and 70 in urban areas.

Measures

Experiences in Close Relationships–Revised (ECR-R)

The ECR-R (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) is a 36-item tool measuring adult attachment across two 18-item dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. Scoring uses a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), where specific items are reverse-coded, and responses are averaged per subscale; higher scores indicate greater attachment anxiety or avoidance. It features outstanding reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values consistently between .90 and .95, alongside high test-retest stability. Its validity is confirmed by a stable two-factor structure, high convergence with other attachment measures, and strong predictive utility for romantic relationship satisfaction and conflict resolution.

Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)

The BRS (Smith et al., 2008) is a unidimensional 6-item instrument designed specifically to measure the ability to bounce back or recover from stress. Scoring uses a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), where the three even-numbered items are reverse-coded to calculate an overall mean score from 1 to 5; higher scores reflect greater resilience. The scale demonstrates strong reliability for its brief length, yielding Cronbach's alphas between .80 and .91 and excellent test-retest consistency. Its validity is supported by distinct

convergent and discriminant patterns, correlating positively with traits like optimism and negatively with psychological symptoms like anxiety, depression, and somatic complaints.

Procedure

Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and assured that participation was voluntary. Prior to questionnaire administration, informed consent was obtained, and participants were assured that all responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Demographic information was collected before administering the ECR-R and the Brief Resilience Scale. Participants completed the questionnaires individually under standardised conditions.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics were computed for demographic characteristics and study variables. Prior to inferential analyses, data were screened for missing values, univariate outliers, and violations of normality and homogeneity-of-variance assumptions; no substantial deviations were detected, and all available cases were retained. (Appelbaum et al., 2018).

Results

Pearson Correlations Between Attachment Dimensions and Psychological Resilience (N = 120)

Attachment dimension	r	p	r ²
Attachment anxiety	-.245**	.007	.060
Attachment avoidance	-.032	.729	.001

Note. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 1 presents the Pearson correlations between attachment dimensions and psychological resilience; the results indicated that attachment anxiety was significantly and negatively associated with psychological resilience, $r(118) = -.245$, $p = .007$, suggesting that individuals reporting higher levels of attachment anxiety tended to demonstrate lower levels of psychological resilience. The magnitude of this association was small, with attachment anxiety accounting for approximately 6.0% of the shared variance in psychological resilience ($r^2 = .060$). This finding suggests that although attachment anxiety is significantly related to resilience, a substantial proportion of the variability in psychological resilience is likely attributable to other individual, interpersonal, and contextual factors. In contrast, attachment avoidance was not significantly associated with psychological resilience, $r(118) = -.032$, $p = .729$, indicating that variations in attachment avoidance were not meaningfully related to participants' levels of resilience. The corresponding coefficient of determination was negligible ($r^2 = .001$), representing approximately 0.1% shared variance.

Table 2

Sex Differences in Attachment Anxiety and Psychological Resilience

Variables	Sex	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Anxiety	Male	60	2.20	0.85	-3.44	0.001
	Female	60	2.77	0.96		
Psychological resilience	Male	60	2.78	0.55	-3.98	0.001
	Female	60	3.18	0.55		

Table 2 shows sex differences in attachment anxiety and psychological resilience; a statistically significant difference was observed in attachment anxiety, with female participants ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 0.96$) reporting higher attachment anxiety than male participants ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.85$), $t(118) = -3.44$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = -0.63$. The effect size indicated a moderate difference between males and females, suggesting that female participants experienced comparatively greater attachment-related anxiety. A statistically significant sex difference was also found in psychological resilience, with females ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.55$) obtaining higher resilience scores than males ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.55$), $t(118) = -3.98$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = -0.73$. The magnitude of this effect was moderate to large, indicating a meaningful difference in psychological resilience between the two groups. Overall, female participants in the present sample demonstrated significantly higher levels of both attachment anxiety and psychological resilience than male participants.

Table 3

Differences in Attachment Anxiety and Psychological Resilience by education

Variables	Education	n	Mean	SD	t	p
Anxiety	Graduates	50	2.65	0.69	-4.39	0.001
	Post- Graduates	70	3.43	1.25		
Psychological resilience	Graduates	50	2.74	0.56	-3.37	0.001
	Post- Graduates	70	3.10	0.60		

Table 3 displays the differences in attachment anxiety and psychological resilience by education; a statistically significant difference was observed in attachment anxiety, with postgraduates ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.25$) reporting higher levels of attachment anxiety than graduates ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 0.69$), $t(111.78) = -4.39$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = -0.74$. The magnitude of this effect was moderate to large, indicating a meaningful difference in attachment anxiety between the two educational groups. A statistically significant difference was also found in psychological resilience, with postgraduates ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.60$) obtaining higher resilience

scores than graduates ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.56$), $t(109.85) = -3.37$, $p = .001$, Cohen's $d = -0.62$. This effect was moderate in magnitude, suggesting that the difference in psychological resilience between graduates and postgraduates was not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful. Overall, postgraduate participants demonstrated significantly higher levels of both attachment anxiety and psychological resilience than graduate participants, suggesting that educational level was associated with systematic differences in both variables in the present sample.

Discussion

The present study examined the associations between adult attachment dimensions and psychological resilience. In this sample, attachment anxiety, but not avoidance, was negatively associated with resilience, and females and postgraduate students reported higher levels of both attachment anxiety and resilience than their counterparts.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, attachment anxiety was significantly and negatively correlated with psychological resilience... In contrast, attachment avoidance was not significantly associated with resilience when considered alongside anxiety. Together, these findings suggest that, in this sample, anxiety represents a more salient attachment-related correlate of resilience than avoidance, providing partial support for the proposed hypotheses and aligning with previous research (Kural & Kovacs, 2021; Lane, 2020).

In contrast to Hypothesis 2, attachment avoidance was not significantly associated with psychological resilience in this study. Variations in discomfort with closeness and dependence did not correspond to meaningful differences in the ability to recover from stress. This result is consistent with studies reporting weak or nonsignificant direct relationships between avoidance and resilience when anxiety is considered simultaneously (Lane, 2020; Tepeli Temiz & Tari Comert, 2018). One possible explanation is that avoidant individuals tend to rely on deactivating strategies, such as emotional suppression and interpersonal distancing, which may buffer immediate distress in some contexts but do not necessarily translate into impaired short-term recovery, as measured by the Brief Resilience Scale. Another possibility, suggested by Kural and Kovacs (2021), is that the effects of avoidance on resilience are primarily indirect and operate through specific coping styles or social support processes, which were not assessed in this study. Thus, the absence of a significant direct association does not preclude more complex pathways linking avoidant attachment to adaptive functioning.

Therefore, the pattern of findings suggests that attachment anxiety constitutes a more salient correlate of resilience than attachment avoidance among these emerging adults. The small but significant association between anxiety and resilience indicates that internal working models characterised by fear of rejection and preoccupation with closeness may be particularly disruptive for adaptive recovery from stress, even when other protective resources are available. At the same time, the modest amount of variance explained underscores that resilience in emerging adulthood is multiply determined and shaped by a wider constellation of personal, relational, and contextual factors.

Sex differences emerged in both attachment anxiety and psychological resilience, supporting Hypothesis 3. Female participants reported significantly higher attachment anxiety than males,

indicating a greater endorsement of concerns about rejection and the availability of close others. This pattern is consistent with prior work showing that women often report somewhat higher attachment anxiety than men, potentially reflecting gendered socialisation processes related to emotional expressiveness, relational interdependence, and expectations in close relationships. Notably, females in this sample also obtained significantly higher scores for psychological resilience than males, with a large effect size. This combination—higher attachment anxiety co-occurring with higher resilience—may initially appear counterintuitive but can be understood in light of the multifaceted nature of resilience and specific operationalisation used.

Because the Brief Resilience Scale focuses on the perceived ability to bounce back from stress rather than on the absence of emotional distress, it is possible for individuals who are more emotionally expressive or reactive (as may be the case for those with higher attachment anxiety) to nonetheless perceive themselves as capable of recovering from setbacks. Female students may draw on social support, relational coping strategies, or adaptive meaning-making processes that foster recovery, even when experiencing intense interpersonal concerns. Cultural and contextual factors within the university environment, such as peer networks, family expectations, and gendered patterns of help-seeking may further shape these dynamics. These possibilities highlight the need to avoid simple assumptions that higher attachment-related insecurity uniformly corresponds to lower resilience across all subgroups.

Educational level was also significantly associated with both attachment anxiety and resilience, supporting Hypothesis 4. Postgraduate students reported higher attachment anxiety and resilience than did undergraduate students. One interpretation is that postgraduate students, who are typically older and more deeply engaged in academic and career transitions, may face more complex relational and role demands, potentially heightening their concerns regarding closeness, support, and rejection. Simultaneously, the experience of navigating prior academic transitions, coping with stressors, and successfully progressing to postgraduate studies may foster greater confidence in students' ability to recover from such difficulties. In other words, prolonged exposure to developmental and academic challenges may simultaneously intensify interpersonal insecurity and build adaptive coping capacity. However, given the cross-sectional design, it is not possible to determine whether a higher education level contributes to increased resilience and attachment anxiety or whether individuals with these characteristics are more likely to pursue postgraduate studies or both.

Taken together, the significant group differences suggest that sex and educational level are important contextual factors when examining attachment and resilience among university students. They also point to the complexity of these constructs: higher attachment anxiety does not uniformly translate into lower resilience across all subgroups, and demographic factors may moderate or mask simple bivariate relationships.

Implications

The findings have several implications for research and practice. First, the negative association between attachment anxiety and resilience indicates that attachment-related cognitions and emotion regulation strategies may be relevant targets for interventions aimed at supporting

student well-being in higher education settings. Psychoeducational programs, counselling services, and group-based interventions that address maladaptive beliefs about self and others, foster secure-base scripts, and promote flexible coping may help students with elevated attachment anxiety develop more adaptive responses to stress.

Second, the absence of a significant direct relationship between attachment avoidance and resilience suggests that resilience assessment should not rely solely on global self-report measures of recovery. Future work could incorporate behavioural indices, context-specific coping assessments, and measures of perceived social support to clarify the conditions under which avoidance may undermine or appear neutral with respect to resilience. For practitioners, it may be important to recognise that highly avoidant students may appear outwardly composed or “resilient” while relying on distancing strategies that limit deeper engagement with support resources.

Third, the observed sex and education-level differences highlight the value of tailoring preventive and support services to the needs of specific student subgroups in the future. For example, male and undergraduate students in this sample reported lower resilience, suggesting that they may benefit from targeted initiatives that normalise help-seeking, build coping skills, and enhance access to supportive peer and mentoring networks. At the same time, the higher attachment anxiety observed among female and postgraduate students underscores the importance of addressing relational stress and expectations within interventions designed for these groups of students.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations must be considered when interpreting the findings. The cross-sectional correlational design precludes conclusions about temporal ordering or causality. It remains unclear whether higher attachment anxiety leads to lower resilience, whether lower resilience contributes to anxiety about relationships, or whether both arise from shared underlying factors, such as earlier family experiences or current stress exposure. Longitudinal studies are needed to disentangle these pathways and examine how attachment and resilience co-develop during emerging adulthood.

The sample consisted of students from a single university in Kerala, which may limit the generalisability of the findings to other regions, institutional types, and non-student populations. Cultural norms regarding family relationships, gender roles, and help-seeking may shape both attachment orientations and expressions of resilience in ways that differ from those in other Indian or international contexts. Future research should include more diverse samples and explicitly examine the cultural variables that may moderate the attachment–resilience association.

Another limitation of this study is the measurement. Although the ECR-R and BRS are widely used and psychometrically sound instruments, this study relied solely on self-report questionnaires, which are susceptible to social desirability bias, response styles, and limitations in introspective access. Multi-method approaches incorporating behavioural observations, informant reports, or qualitative interviews could provide a richer understanding of how attachment patterns manifest in coping and recovery processes. In addition, the present study

did not assess potential mediators, such as emotion regulation strategies, coping styles, or perceived social support, which are central to theoretical accounts linking attachment and resilience. Including these variables in future research would allow for more rigorous testing of mediation and moderation models.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, this study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that attachment anxiety, but not avoidance, is directly and negatively associated with psychological resilience among Indian university students in emerging adulthood. The findings also reveal meaningful differences in attachment anxiety and resilience by sex and educational level, underscoring the importance of considering demographic and contextual factors when examining adaptive functioning in this developmental period. Future research that incorporates longitudinal designs, diverse samples, and assessments of underlying mechanisms will further clarify how attachment-related processes shape the capacity of emerging adults to adapt and recover in the face of stress.

References

- Appelbaum, M., Cooper, H., Kline, R. B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Nezu, A. M., & Rao, S. M. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for quantitative research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000191>
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>
- Arnett, J. J. (2016). College students as emerging adults: The developmental implications of the college context. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4(3), 219-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696815587422>
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). Guilford Press.
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 350-365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.350>
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Kural, A. I., & Kovacs, M. (2021). Attachment anxiety and resilience: The mediating role of coping. *Acta Psychologica*, 221, 103447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2021.103447>

- Lane, J. A. (2020). Attachment, ego resilience, emerging adulthood, social resources, and well-being among traditional-aged college students. *The Professional Counselor, 10*(2), 157-169. <https://doi.org/10.15241/jal.10.2.157>
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227-238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 53-152). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(03\)01002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(03)01002-5)
- Parpottas, P., Vogazianos, P., & Pezirkianidis, C. (2024). Attachment, resilience and life satisfaction of university students in Cyprus after the fourth wave of COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 21*(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21010022>
- Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2004). Short-term temporal stability and factor structure of the Revised Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR-R) measure of adult attachment. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*(4), 969-975. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00165-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00165-X)
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15*(3), 194-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972>
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 5*(1), 25338. <https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Tepeli Temiz, Z., & Tari Comert, I. (2018). The relationship between life satisfaction, attachment styles, and psychological resilience in university students. *Dusunen Adam: The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences, 31*(3), 274-283. <https://doi.org/10.5350/DAJPN2018310305>
- von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gotsche, P. C., & Vandenbroucke, J. P. (2007). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ, 335*(7624), 806-808. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD>