

Table 1. Statistics Included in the Meta-analysis for Attachment Insecurity

Study	Statistics Retrieved from the raw data of the Studies					Statistics computed with CMA	
	n	p value	r	X <sup>2</sup>	Means (SD) n	d effect sizes	CI
Boris et al. (2004)	55			14.59 <sup>a</sup>		1.20***	0.57-1.84
Bruce et al. (2009)	118		.05			0.10	-0.27-0.47
Chisholm (1998) gr 1	46		.40			0.87**	0.22-1.53
Chisholm (1998) gr 2	30	.50				0.26	-0.50-1.02
Chisholm (1998) gr 3	46	.50				0.21	-0.40-0.81
De Schipper et al. (2012)	59		.19			0.39	-0.15-0.92
Delbarre (2017)	29		.49			1.15*	0.26-2.04
Dobrova-Krol et al. (2010) gr 1	35		.36			0.77*	0.03-1.51
Dobrova-Krol et al. (2010) gr 2	29		.07			0.14	-0.63-0.91
Gleason et al. (2011)	123			7.09 <sup>a</sup>		0.50**	0.13-0.86
Kočovská et al. (2012)	65			14.13		1.05***	0.49-1.62
Lalande et al. (2012)	117			10.25 <sup>a</sup>		0.62**	0.24-1.00
Lanctôt et al. (2017)	10			0.02		0.09	-1.39-1.57
Lyons-Ruth et al. (2009)	69				Insecure: 5.17 (2.20) n = 46 Secure: 3.13 (1.79) n = 23	0.98***	0.46-1.51
Minnis et al. (2009)	70			12.75		0.94***	0.41-1.47
O'Connor et al. (2003)	129			4.02		0.36*	0.00-0.71
Pears et al. (2010)	153		.16			0.32	-0.00-0.65
Prichett, Pritchett et al. (2013)	14			0.14		0.20	-0.99-1.39
Pritchett, Rochat et al. (2013)	38	.50				0.23	-0.44-0.89
Rutter et al. (2007)	116			7.62		0.53**	0.15-0.91
Schoemaker et al. (2020)	60		.25			0.52	-0.02-1.05
Schröder et al., (2019)	135			0.07		0.05	-0.30-0.39
Van den Dries et al. (2012)	92		.03			0.06	-0.36-0.48
Zephyr et al. (2020)	67		.23			0.47	-0.03-0.98

Note. When nonsignificant findings were reported without accompanying statistical information, a *p* value of .50 was entered in CMA (Rosenthal, 1995). All *r* coefficients were retrieved from the articles and a positive *r* indicates an effect in line with study hypotheses, that is, greater symptoms of DSEB are related to a higher score of attachment insecurity. X<sup>2</sup> coefficients were computed from the raw data provided in the article or as indicated directly in the article.

\**p* < 0.05; \*\**p* < 0.01; \*\*\**p* < 0.001

Table 2. Statistics Included in the Meta-analysis for Attachment Disorganization

Study	Statistics Retrieved or Computed from the raw data of the Studies					Statistics computed with CMA	
	n	r	X <sup>2</sup>	Means (SD)	t-test		
Boris et al. (2004)	55		4.78			0.62*	0.05-1.19
De Schipper et al. (2012)	59	.25				0.52	-0.03-1.06
Delbarre (2017)	29	.52				1.23**	0.33-2.13
Dobrova-Krol et al. (2010) FR	35	.14				0.28	-0.42-0.98
Dobrova-Krol et al. (2010) IR	29	.04				0.08	-0.69-0.85
Gleason et al. (2011)	123		12.25			0.67***	0.29-1.04
Kočovská et al. (2012)	65		9.84			0.85**	0.31-1.39
Lalande et al. (2012)	117		5.00			0.42*	0.05-0.80
Lanctôt et al. (2017)	10		0.48			0.45	-1.07-1.97
Lyons-Ruth et al. (2009)	55			Disorg.: 4.56 (2.27) n = 32 Organized: 3.13 (1.79) n=23		0.69*	0.14-1.24
Minnis et al. (2009)	70		11.58			0.89***	0.37-1.42
O'Connor et al. (2003)	129		8.11			0.52**	0.16-0.88
Prichett, Pritchett et al. (2013)	14		0.12			0.19	-1.00-1.37
Pritchett, Rochat et al. (2013)	38				-2.79	0.45**	0.12-0.79
Rutter et al. (2007)	116		7.83			0.54**	0.16-0.92
Schröder et al. (2019)	135		1.00			0.17	-0.17-0.52
Van den Dries et al. (2012)	92	.12				0.24	-0.18-0.66
Zephyr et al. (2020)	67	.07				0.14	-0.35-0.63

Note. When nonsignificant findings were reported without accompanying statistical information, a *p* value of .50 was entered in CMA (Rosenthal, 1995). All *r* coefficients were retrieved directly from the articles. X<sup>2</sup> coefficients were computed from the raw data provided in the article or as indicated directly in the article.

\**p* < 0.05; \*\**p* < 0.01; \*\*\**p* < 0.001