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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Adolescence is a time of great change and challenge for both adolescents and their parents (Newman & Newman, 1986). For high school seniors, and their mothers and fathers, many changes have already occurred, but significant ones, including the movement of the adolescent away from home are pending. Graduation is a major accomplishment of childhood and a marker that the adolescent is moving toward adult status. What do the high school seniors feel at this time about relationships with their parents, who have been demonstrated to still be important to late adolescent outcomes (cf. Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Rice, 1990)? Using attachment theory, this study will explore a new combination of parent-adolescent variables to add further knowledge to both parent and adolescent relationship experiences at this time. These variables include, for mothers and fathers, attachment style, marital quality and parental separation anxiety from their adolescents. For adolescents, the variables of interest are cohesion, and security of attachment to each parent. Although fathers remain important to their children during adolescence (Montemayor and Brownlee, 1987), they are often not included in research inquiries. In this inquiry, both mothers' and fathers' perspectives will be considered.
In order to obtain a more complete view of relationship variables, both mothers' and fathers' and adolescents' perceptions are vital to the study of changes during adolescence. It is often the case that these multiple perspectives are significantly different (Pruchno, Burant & Peters, 1994; Tein, Roose & Michaels, 1994). Each person within a relationship has a unique perspective, contribution and experience within the relationship. Indeed, Callan and Noller (1986) noted consistent differences between adolescent and parent reports of their family's characteristics. Additionally, as Gjerde (1986) reported, the presence of mothers and fathers have different effects on their relationship interactions with their adolescents. Considering this, one purpose of this study is to obtain relationship information from each parent, along with their high school senior.

This reflects some systemic concepts, which suggest that all members of a system or family, interact in ways that effect every other member (Friedman, 1991; Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973). Here, 'family systems' ideas may be helpful in the consideration of interactions that effect more than the dyadic relationships between adolescents and each parent. In other words, the adolescent-mother and adolescent-father relationships may be affected by other relationships. A marital quality variable for parents has been included since there are suggestions by some theorists (Minuchin, 1985; Bowen, 1960) and researchers (Belsky, 1984; Belsky, Youngblade, Rovine & Volling, 1991; Callan & Noller, 1986) that parents' marital relationships may impact children in general.
Attachment, the study’s theory base

In addition to using some systemic ideas, a theoretical model that helps understanding of parent-adolescent relationships is needed. John Bowlby (1988) has proposed a theory that does this, attachment theory. According to Bowlby, attachment is a longlasting, if not lifelong, affective relationship. In attachment, the attached looks to and receives comfort and security from the attachment figure. This relationship, at least between parent and child, usually begins in infancy. It is formed over time from countless exchanges between parent and infant where the parent’s timeliness and sensitivity of response results in expectations about future availability and responsiveness of the parent. Attachment, due to ongoing exchanges over time, becomes internalized and more fixed in expectations and behaviors as a child ages (Bretherton, 1985). The parent, according to attachment theory, becomes a 'secure base' for the infant, who then begins to explore, learn and grow, coming back to obtain comfort or security whenever distressed or upset (Bowlby, 1988).

The attachment eventually becomes, as a child grows and cognitively develops, a mental image of the experiences with the parent (1988). Also included in this image is the child’s impression of him- or herself as worthy of being responded to. From this image, or mental representation, a child begins to develop expectancies about other people in relationship to the child and even beliefs about him- or herself as worthy of responsiveness (Cassidy, 1988). Two additional points are worthy of note. One, a child develops multiple attachments with caregivers and, over time builds or organizes mental representations into working models of attachments that encompass these different
relationships (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Two, attachment behaviors are not always observable in relationship interactions between parent and child since an attachment has no one set of behaviors. An attachment is an affectively based system that is activated when the child perceives danger, or is distressed and wants comfort from the aforementioned 'secure base' provided by the parent (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Thus any behavior may be an attachment behavior if it serves as a signal for the attachment figure.

Attachment theory suggests that an attachment is something that occurs not only from the adolescent to each parent but also from the parent(s) to the adolescent. Mental representations suggest that an attachment has its own entity in a person, formed from early and ongoing interactions, that encompass characteristics and behavior patterns of both the adolescent and each parent. Attachment characteristics and behaviors are those that reflect patterns of affective distress and signaling for response or comfort, along with developed expectations as to what it takes, and how another person will respond to one's need for felt security (Bretherington, 1985). Over time, mental representations, or the working models of attachment for a person, result in characteristic differences in affective regulation. Those whose experience in attachment relationships has been difficult, often either oversignal or repeatedly display feelings, or discount and minimize attachment relationships and their needs in the relationship (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

The mental representation of attachment that is accessed in day-to-day living by working models of attachment, gives a useful tool for considering affective relationships between parents and children. It also supports the suggestion that attachment theory is a lifespan perspective (Weiss, 1982), by suggesting that a person's important relationships
are encoded into these mental representations and carried into other relationships, through self expectations and expectations of others in relation to self. Adolescent dating and committed adult relationships (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987), problem-solving strategies (Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, Fleming & Gamble, 1993), defense mechanisms (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988), and parenting connections (Crowell & Feldman, 1991; Ricks, 1985), all support the ongoing presence and importance of attachment into and through adult life. Attachment theory’s focus on relationships, makes it a logical choice of theory base for this study.

**Relationship variables chosen for parent-adolescent study**

Given this study’s theoretical foundation, several constructs were selected for study. A brief overview of the two adolescent variables and the three parent variables chosen, follows.

**Security of attachment to parents**

Adolescent attachment to a parent is defined here as the specific attachment relationship to each parent perceived by the adolescent. The adolescents’ perceptions or mental representations of mothers’ and fathers’ patterns of responsiveness, along with currently perceived sensitivity and availability will be assessed. The level of security in the attachment, or the comfort that the adolescent has going to each parent when distressed or upset will be the indicator of the attachment relationship to each parent.
Cohesion in adolescent-parent relationship

Cohesion in the adolescent-parent relationship is considered for this study to encompass the perceived cohesion in typical day-to-day emotional interactions that occur between the adolescent and each parent. This variable embodies a relationship component that is compatible with attachment. In other words, cohesion is the emotional closeness that binds family members together (Bowen, 1960; Gehrings & Feldman, 1988). It also is a property of all dyads, or larger family groupings (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973; Friedman, 1991).

Parents’ attachment style

The first parent variable is attachment style. This is the mental representation that the parent has about others and self in a relationship that has evolved over a lifetime of attachment relationships, from family of origin relationships to spouse(s) to children. Working models of attachment will be assessed using characteristic response patterns associated with relationships (Collins & Read, 1990; Collins & Read, in press). Parent attachment style may relate, according to Jay Belsky (1984), to a parent’s ability to form secure parent-child attachments, and may help to further explain parent-adolescent relationships.

Parental separation anxiety

Separation anxiety from the adolescent is the second parent variable. High school seniors are entering a time where cultural expectations, if not family expectations, are
that the adolescents will be moving towards adulthood and away from their parents (Fasick, 1984; Hill & Holmbeck, 1986). Parents have been found to express fearfulness and concern, in addition to a reduced sense of control over their adolescents' increasing independence (Pasley & Gecas, 1984). At the same time, parents are often experiencing changes in their own social, cognitive and physical abilities (Steinberg, 1987). Thus, there may be considerable parental ambivalence regarding adolescent movement towards more separateness, and as a result, fear and concern for their adolescents expressed as separation anxiety.

Freud defined separation anxiety as a reaction to the danger of losing a love object (Provence, 1987). This definition appears to be compatible with possible parental experience as adolescents become more separate from their parents in day-to-day living. This possible experience of adolescents' parents has been largely unexplored, with the previous literature usually focusing on separation anxiety from a single perspective, that of a child's (Lamb, 1988). However, in attachment theory there are two participants in each relationship, and it is reasonable to consider that the attachment figure, or parent, could worry if the attached, or the adolescent was no longer coming primarily to the parent for comfort/felt security.

In this study, separation anxiety is considered from the perspective of the high school seniors' parents. Particularly, the worry of parents that their adolescents are going to others for security, will be assessed. At the same time, as adolescents move towards more separateness, parents' comfort in remaining available to their children as secure bases will also be measured.
Parent marital quality

The last variable is mothers’ and fathers’ marital experience during their child’s adolescence. Marital quality, or satisfaction has often been demonstrated to be impacted by children (Glenn & McLanahan, 1982; Hoffman & Manis, 1978; Rollins & Feldman, 1970; White, Booth & Edwards, 1986). The family systems' concept of every family member affecting every other member suggests that the parents' marital relationship, measured here as marital quality, may also impact adolescent experience (Friedman, 1991; Minuchin, 1974). There is some evidence for this viewpoint. In families with younger children, Belsky (1984) has found associations between marital support and the quality of a child’s relationship experiences with his or her mother. For adolescents, in families where marital quality is high, adolescent girls have been found to perceive other members as more friendly than in families with low marital quality (Callan & Noller, 1986). For adolescent boys, low marital quality has been found to relate to higher dominance by parents (1986). As adolescents move into adulthood, the effects of their parents' marital quality has been demonstrated to be related to how close the young adult feels to each parent (Booth & Amato, 1994). For parents, their experiences in marriage affect them in a variety of ways that then may affect their adolescent. Examples from the literature include perceptions of parenting success, stress levels, mental health (Flowers, 1991; Kosti & Steinberg, 1990; McGoldrick & Carter, 1982).

Research objectives

To conclude, attachment theory is used, in conjunction with some family systems ideas, to consider several relationship variables of high school seniors and their parents
a few months prior to graduation. Adolescent variables of attachment security and cohesion to each parent were measured. Parent variables of attachment style, parents' separation anxiety about adolescents being more distant from them and coming to parents for comfort less are considered, along with a measure of mothers' and fathers' marital quality.

General goals for the study include: 1. exploration of associations between parent attachment style, marital quality and separation anxiety variables along with expected associations of parent attachment style/dimensions to adolescent variables; 2. consideration of gender differences for mothers and fathers, in relationship to their adolescent girls and boys; and 3. consideration of a logical pattern of associations between parent variables and adolescent responses.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

A review of the relevant literature follows. First, attachment theory and its empirical support is discussed, along with parent and adolescent attachment variables. Second, a brief discussion of some family systems' ideas is presented, followed by parent marital satisfaction, parent separation anxiety, and adolescent cohesion. At the conclusion of the review, specific hypotheses developed from the research evidence are presented.

Attachment theory and research

Attachment theory, as initially proposed by John Bowlby (1973; 1982; 1988) suggests that enduring relationships form over time between parent and child. These are important initially for physical survival, later these relationships become vital for the psychological well-being of the developing child (Bowlby, 1982). The attachment model has accumulated supporting research for many of its premises, not only for the infant-parent relationship (Belsky, 1984), but also for children's relationship with parents as they develop through adolescence into adulthood (cf. Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Bretherington, 1985; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Weiss, 1982).

Several relevant premises of attachment theory follow.
Definition of an attachment, and the secure base

An attachment is a relationship that forms over time through countless interactions between an infant and each parent where the sensitivity and timeliness of the parent’s responses reflect the quality of the relationship (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). The parent’s sensitivity, responsiveness and availability interact with the child’s cuing for comfort and responses to comfort, to form an attachment (Bowlby, 1988). Attachment behaviors are not always seen in relationship behaviors; they are triggered when something occurs that is perceived as distressing, uncomfortable or threatening to the child. At this time, the child will initiate behaviors to obtain proximity/protection and comfort from a 'highly valued other' (Bowlby, 1988).

Related to this seeking of proximity/comfort is the construct of the secure base. The secure base construct suggests that the parent acts as a nurturing, supportive, or safe place from which a child can explore/develop and return to as needed for comfort (Bowlby, 1982). If the secure base is unavailable or unreliably present, separation anxiety or mourning may occur (Bowlby, 1988). This secure base acts, not as a dependency object for a developing child, but rather as a source of consistent stability from which a child may grow towards independence, in a timely manner (Bowlby, 1973). Thus, even for older children including adolescents, autonomy or independence is enhanced by secure bases to parent(s) (Bowlby, 1973).

Mary Ainsworth’s development of a test to access infant attachment, the Strange Situation (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978) demonstrated the distress of infants with distance and time separation from their mothers (secure bases). Distress and
proximity seeking were usual child behaviors, with three distinct patterns of reaction and cuing for the mothers' comfort emerging. These patterns were secure, insecure-avoidant and insecure-ambivalent, or anxious (Ainsworth et al, 1978). These particular patterns have emerged again and again in studies with children and even adults, as will be seen in the research presented below. Kenny (Rice, 1990) suggested that a naturally occurring Strange Situation scenario happens when older adolescents go away to college. With older adolescents however, proximity seeking behaviors were not necessarily physical closeness, but instead increased telephone contacts made by the adolescents. The secure base then appears to be a useful concept that has been noted behaviorally from infancy through adolescence.

**Goal-corrected partnerships**

Another valuable attachment premise, is the goal-corrected partnership. As the child grows and develops, the parent/secure base, adjusts what they respond to and provide protection/supportive behaviors for (Bowlby, 1988). Specifically, the goal-corrected partnership is the ongoing adjustment of both parent and child to one another as the relationship evolves and the child develops. The goal-corrected partnership helps explain how a child and parent can maintain an enduring, connected relationship over time and adapt to the child's need for more freedom to explore and learn, and less need for physical presence/intervention of parent(s). Thus, while behaviors for the older child or adolescent to cue attachment are different than those of infants and younger children, the meaning remains consistent to their attachment partner (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). The
parent-child attachment thus adapts to the different abilities of the child, and different needs from the parent. This goal correction component of attachment is an adaptive and important developmental mechanism in attachment.

**Working models of attachment: Mental representations**

Over time, as the child continues to activate the attachment system by cuing for comfort and the parent responds, developmental needs change. As already noted, the mechanism of the goal-corrected partnership deals with changes in how a child cues for the secure base, and how the parent, appropriately or not, responds. This mechanism can occur due to the organization of cuing and responding behaviors over time into patterns of expectancies of others and self-in-relation to others (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Through experiences with the secure base in a goal-corrected partnership, expectations of what will happen, begin to develop. These expectations become (with growing cognitive abilities) learned patterns (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985), and organize into perceptions of what one will experience in relationships, and what relationships are like in general (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). These perceptions are called the working models of attachment, or the mental representations of attachment relationships (Bretherington, 1985).

Working models then develop from experiences with one's parents, and interact with a child's interpretation of their experiences, to form an internal model of the relationship (Bretherington, 1985). There are working models for both parents, if present in the child's life, and each model may be different depending upon the interactions experienced. Furthermore, with age and more contact with others, working models
become more complex and varied. The child internalizes models for both parents, along with any other major figures in his or her life, and from these develops a general working model of strategies and behaviors to meet affective needs (Collins & Read, in press). Further, working models of relationship, once organized, tend to function beyond the consciousness of a person (Bretherton, 1985). They do change with age and development of a child and with alterations in behavioral patterns in attachment relationships; working models are however, more stable than plastic. By adolescence, mental representations of attachment are suggested to be quite firm, and difficult to directly observe. Thus characteristic patterns of behaviors that reflect the relationships (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Kobak, Cole, Ferrenz-Gilles, Fleming & Gamble, 1993) have been studied and proposed as ways to access attachment in adolescents. These patterns are noted below, along with research that underlines the apparent presence, relevance, and importance of mental representations, in general.

**Mental representations and child functioning.** Research supports the importance of mental representations, or working models of attachment in children. Various studies have found positive associations between attachment classification and positive adjustment and well-being in children and adolescents. These appear to suggest that something connects the attachment experience for a child with their subsequent functioning, both in development of self and general positive development (Cassidy, 1988; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). Mental representations of attachment provide the connection. Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985) found that infant attachment categories of secure, insecure-avoidant, and insecure-ambivalent (or anxious) related positively and strongly to
children's functioning at six years. Sroufe, Egeland & Kreutzer (1990) add to this with a study using a sample of ten-year-olds. In this study, the children had been classified into attachment groups in infancy, and observed as they developed over time. A subsample of these children, those who had demonstrated some early school/general developmental adjustment difficulties, were tested at ten-years-old. The authors found that those ten-year-olds who were classified as securely attached in infancy, were showing positive adaptation (or 'rebounding') generally, and specific improvement in school function, compared to children who were classified as insecure in infancy (1990).

**Mental representations and adolescents.** Further research with adolescents, also supports the presence and importance of mental representations. Kobak and Sceery (1988) considered behaviors of adolescents with adjustment variables, along with emotional processes of regulating distress that may be fundamental in organizing working models of relationships. After giving 53 adolescents an attachment measure, the researchers Q-sorted the responses for ego resiliency, ego under control, hostility and anxiety. Their findings suggested clusters of variables that resemble the three already discovered infant attachment categories. These categories were secure, insecure pre-occupied (anxious), and insecure dismissive (avoidant) (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). The descriptive clusters obtained from the Q-sort appeared to confirm characteristic patterns of organization of working models over time. The results also demonstrated more positive adaptation and levels of functioning for adolescents with in the secure category. Kobak and Sceery proposed from their findings that attachment provided a useful model of affective regulation. They suggested that regulation of distress is important in the
attachment relationship, and in the development of a person's mental representation of self and others in relationships.

**Mental representations and defense mechanisms.** Mental representations of attachment have also been suggested to be useful in explaining defensive processes and accessible by measuring defensive processes (Cassidy & Kobak, 1988; George, Kaplan & Main, 1984; Kobak, Cole, Ferrenz-Gilles, Fleming & Gamble, 1993). Cassidy and Kobak in their 1988 study found relationships among the use of idealization and avoidance by children and in the attachment relationships with parents. Cassidy and Kobak (1988) suggested that children used these mechanisms to protect attachments with inappropriate or inconsistently responding parents. Distress could thus be managed and the attachment relationship maintained. These authors concluded that avoidance and idealization are related to the organization of the attachment, and as such may provide ways to access and consider attachment in older children and adolescents (1988). George, Kaplan and Main (1984), using the Adult Attachment Inventory, reported finding adults with aversive attachment histories to often idealize or not even remember interactions with parent(s). Often, adults would make incongruent statements of the attachment quality as compared to actual reported experiences of availability and sensitive parent response, and not appear to see disparities.

Recently, Kobak, Cole, Ferrenz-Gilles, Fleming and Gamble (1993) found relationships between adolescents' problem-solving strategies and their working models of attachments with their mothers. These strategies reflected the same secure and insecure (insecure-dismissing/avoidant and insecure-preoccupied/anxious) patterns found
previously. Adolescents who were assessed as securely attached were open and appropriate in their disagreement with and negotiation of a problem solution with their mothers, while the insecure adolescents were not. The insecure adolescents demonstrated characteristic patterns reflective of other studies' descriptions of avoidant and anxious patterns in their dealing with a problem situation with their mothers, with avoidant adolescents not negotiating with mother directly, and anxious adolescents showing a variety of patterns in which considerable affect was apparent.

**Mental representation research and child/adolescent outcomes.** Other studies have demonstrated relationships between attachment and child outcomes, beyond infancy. In older children, attachment has been associated with positive adjustment and well-being. Greenberg and Speltz (1988) found a relationship between conduct disordered children and insecure attachments, while depression in adolescents was reported to correlate significantly and positively with attachment category, with insecurely attached adolescents the most depressed (Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke & Mitchell, 1990; Pappini, Roggman & Anderson, 1991). Attachment in adolescents has been reported as the strongest predictor of well-being, with attachment quality moderating stressful life events (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Armsden and Greenberg (1987) using the Inventory of Parent Peer Attachment found self-esteem and life satisfaction positively related to the amount of attachment security reported (1987). Rice in 1990, reviewed attachment literature on older adolescents and reported the continued importance of attachment relationships to parents for adolescents throughout college. He found consistent positive relationships between all studies reviewed for security of attachment and social
competence, self-esteem, identity status and emotional adjustment. Attachments, as mental representations of important relationships, using the concept of working models, appear to have an important impact on children and adolescents. In recent years, mental representations have been suggested to be important into adult life. Before considering this in more detail, two further points about mental representations are noteworthy.

**Development of self in mental representations.** Working models of mental representations of attachment also encompass a model of self as worthy of response in relationships with others (Cassidy, 1988). Research by Jude Cassidy provided a demonstration of the connection between mental representations of attachment and the development of self in six-year-olds (1988). Cassidy tested 52 six-year-olds to explore the relationship between self-esteem measures and attachment. A significant relationship was found, with patterns of attachment security relating to patterns of positive self development. Other findings suggested that insecurely attached six-year-olds dismissed the importance of the attachment relationship, or were found to idealize the parents (reflective of avoidant and anxious attachment coping patterns, respectively). These were suggested as possible defensive techniques used by the children to allow for the development of self in relationships to occur regardless of the feedback coming from the parent (Cassidy, 1988).

**Individual differences in mental representations of attachment.** Mental representations of attachment also explain individual differences in attachment (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). First, Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985) suggest that unique interactions with each parent, and the child's interpretation of these interactions, result in child's
unique working model of that relationship. Second, affect mediates the formation of the working model, basically through a child's felt security and management of distress levels in obtaining the parent's response (Bretherton, 1985; Sroufe & Waters, 1977). These result in unique working models for children. A child's reaction to, and feelings about the interactions with the caregiver, structure the mental representation of the attachment, with perceptions of self and others concomitantly affected (Cassidy, 1988). This individual structuring of working models thus affects the mental representations a child has of relationships throughout development (Bretherington, 1985), even continuing into his or her own parenting interactions (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985).

Mental representations in adults and parenting

As suggested above, mental representations of attachment also provide a useful way to consider a person's important and continuing relationships throughout life. George, Kaplan and Main in 1984 developed a measure, the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) that explores adults' attachment histories and is then able to categorize adults into secure or insecure (anxious and avoidant) groups. This measurement encouraged a new focus on attachment in adults, particularly parents (1984). Main, Kaplan and Cassidy studied parenting and parents' mental representation in their 1985 study with young children and their parents. They demonstrated a strong relationship between each parent's general representation of self in an attachment relationship, and their child's security of attachment, along with their child's level of functioning. A second study supported these findings and extended the exploration (Crowell and Feldman, 1991).
Crowell and Feldman investigated the general working models of attachment in mothers of two-year-olds, and the mothers' current relationships with their children. They used the AAI to tap into the mothers' mental representations of attachment (Crowell & Feldman, 1991). They then studied how these mothers' prepared and dealt with separation from their children, in addition to how the mothers interpreted their children's cues around separating. Mothers with an insecure mental representation of themselves in their own attachment relationship with parent(s), were found to behave in a significantly different manner from secure mothers during the separation tasks. Dismissive (avoidant) mothers left the room quickly and did not prepare their children at all for separations, while pre-occupied (anxious) mothers displayed considerable anxiety in both preparation and separation. Additionally, Crowell and Feldman (1991) noted that insecure mothers of both types, did not read the emotional cues of their children well, with obvious distress signals (crying, hands held toward mothers) misinterpreted or denied repeatedly. These insecure mothers also were noted for their inability to coherently describe their own childhood relationship experiences (Crowell & Feldman, 1991). This may be explained by Ricks' (1985), who suggested in her work that attachment patterns may be transmitted transgenerationally, through parenting behaviors.

**Mental representations in adult relationships**

Attachment appears to remain important to adults, at least as parents. From recent research it also appears to continue within certain committed adult relationships
(Weiss, 1982), and to continue to be of importance to a person (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The way adults tend to consider relationships via their working models has been termed an attachment style. Three general styles of mental representation have been identified, secure, anxious, and avoidant; and these have been observed, like the adolescent studies presented above, to directly relate to Ainsworth's initial attachment categories for infants (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). These categories were assigned to adults in a study, and found to consistently relate to different experiences of love/romantic relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that the "best predictors of adult attachment type were respondents' perceptions of the quality of their relationship with each parent and the parents' relationship with each other" (p. 516). Their subjects' responses consistently demonstrated the relationship between an adult's working model of self and that adult's attachment classification. Subjects also displayed characteristic ways of emotionally interpreting relationships that varied with attachment category, with secure subjects reporting comfort in trusting others, avoidant subjects dismissing the importance of others in any relationship, and anxious subjects not trusting, but overcommitting to relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Hazan and Shaver's work appears to confirm the ongoing importance of working models of attachment, with peer attachment an additional relationship available to adults.

**Mental representations and dimensions of attachment**

Hazan and Shaver provided support for the value of considering adult peer attachments, and the characteristic affective behavioral patterns of adults of different
categories. An extension of their work into adult styles by Collins and Read (1990) has broadened these categories into dimensions of attachment. Collins and Read's styles include, first the categories of secure, avoidant and anxious, and second, a broad range of individual patterns in attachment behaviors (Collins & Read, 1990). The dimensions have been found to correlate positively and significantly with Hazan and Shaver's (1987) three styles. These dimensions of Close, Depend, and Anxious describe the mental representations of attachments for adults as seen in their working models, and have been found to vary consistently and coherently with attachment style (Collins & Read, 1990). Collins and Read reported significant relationships between perceptions of the social world, and dimensions in predicting the quality of romantic relationships. Their work supported the importance of working models of oneself and others in relationships, in the quality of relationships an adult experiences with peers (1990). They additionally, through the development of a measure to assess attachment style, increased the ability to describe individual differences in attachment.

A second study of adult attachment using college students also addressed working models and individual differences (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Bartholomew and Horowitz found consistent reports of self-other mental representations for secure older adolescents, while pre-occupied (anxious) adolescents and dismissing (avoidant) adolescents reported incongruent self-other representations. The authors concluded that while there were considerable individual differences between attachment classifications, continuous ratings still were returning similar groupings as the classical categorical groupings (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). In other words, attachment representations
are very strong, and tend to fall into several predictable classifications whether the measure is continuous or categorical, and these groupings still represent the same general classifications as those for infants.

**Conclusion of mental representations of attachment**

In conclusion, once an infant develops the cognitive capacity to do so, mental representations of countless interactions with parents and important others occur and are internalized. These become the working models that are accessed as the child grows, to help them interpret and put meaning to relationships. Additionally, these working models have characteristic strategies and behaviors to affectively deal with attachment needs of comfort, felt security and distress regulation (Collins & Read, in press). Within mental representations of attachment, are explanations of individual differences and a sense of self as someone to be responded to. As such, working models of the attachment have been determined to continue into adulthood and to have ongoing impact and importance on a person's relationships with important others.

**Parent and adolescent attachment variables**

Attachment variables for adolescents and parents in the study are those that reflect the theory above. Specifically, for adolescents, their level of felt security and comfort from their secure bases, i.e. parents, gives a measure of the mental representation they have of the availability, and responsiveness of each parent to them. Armsden and Greenberg’s (1987) Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment was designed to assess this.
For parents, their general working models of relationships and subsequent style in relationships can be assessed, using the dimensions derived by Collins and Read (1990). Both parent and adolescent variables then are measurements of their working models, or mental representations of attachments. The difference is that for adolescents a specific attachment working model is assessed, while for parents the general mental representations they have of relationships are obtained. This allows for parents’ style across both their marital and parent-child relationships to be considered.

In conclusion, attachment provides a rich theory base, and a solid emerging body of supportive research into ongoing relationships with important others. It provides a meaningful way, through the working models of the mental representations of attachment, to interpret relationship variables in parent-adolescent relationships and adult relationship variables.

Family systems

The attachment model addresses the relationship between parents and children. The inclusion of some family systems’ ideas helps put the parent-adolescent relationship into a context where other members interact and have relationships that may affect the adolescent-mother and adolescent-father relationships (Kerr, 1981). Several theorists have made useful contributions to understanding families in relationships. Murray Bowen (1960; Friedman, 1991), for example, devised a model which presents a family as a system with all members responding to two human forces, one individuality, or the drive to be self-contained, and two, the drive for togetherness, or the need to be connected to others (1991). Children and parents are moving towards differentiation or fusion, two
states suggested by these forces. The movement and balance of these depends on family dynamics. According to Bowen, family members accomplish differentiation or fusion in relation to others. In particular children may be effected, or triangulated by their parents, who obtain a balance of the two forces by adding their children to the relationship. According to Bowen, some parents, while needing the closeness universal to all humans, become anxious if too close, while other parents become anxious if too distant, and some parents become anxious at both. By including the child in the relationship via a 'triangle', the parents can alleviate anxiety by having enough closeness through the child and enough distance through the child to the other parent. This allows for connection and differentiation between parents (Friedman, 1991). Bowen's work suggests the importance an adolescent may have in the relationship between parents, in addition to the importance that a parental dyadic relationship may have on the adolescent. His family systems model gives an example of the helpfulness of some family systems' views in considering parent-adolescent interactions, while underlining the impact that parents not only individually, but also as a dyad, may have on a child or adolescent.

A second well-known model is Olson's circumplex family systems model, where three dynamic dimensions are suggested to occur in all families (Olson, 1986; Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1983). The dimensions are cohesion, an affective component that relays emotional closeness to other members, adaptability or the ability to cope with change, and communication or the medium that the first two dimensions work through. The Circumplex Model suggests that a balance of dimensions describes healthy families with research supporting his model using his FACES instrument (cf. Edman, Cole &
Howard, 1990). Of primary interest for this review is the importance of cohesion. Cohesion is a basic dimension of all families, with different levels reported to relate to different levels of family functioning (Olson, Russell & Sprenkle, 1983). For adolescents and their mothers and fathers, the 'appropriate' levels of cohesion differ from the level of cohesion experienced during childhood. The family may appear less cohesive during adolescence.

A third model that has incorporated systemic concepts is one that is specific to parent-child relationships (Belsky, 1984). Belsky's parenting model encompasses the family systems perspective, yet focuses on factors that affect parent-child attachment. Belsky found, for example, that marital support by spouses was associated with maternal success in parenting (1984). Attachment ratings of infants were also found to be related to the mothers' marital relationships with more positively reported marital relationships corresponding to securely attached children (Belsky, 1984). For Belsky, the process of parenting is a systemic one that involves spouses' having impacts on not only a mother's day-to-day parenting, but also longer lasting affects on parent-child attachment. The context of parenting for mothers and fathers is suggested and supported by his research as valuable to child outcomes. This interactive perspective describes the effects of a third person on the parent-child dyad, and is helpful in considering the adolescent-mother and adolescent-father relationships in the context of the family.

In all, the three systemic models presented describe and exemplify the usefulness of including some systemic views in this study. Bowen points out that the inclusion of a child often into the parent-parent relationship allows for mother and father's necessary
connectedness and distance within that relationship. Olson gives basic dimensions, including cohesion, that all family members are subject to, while Belsky provides both a model and findings that support the importance of spouses and the marriage on the parenting process and attachment between a mother and child. Thus, for this particular study, some family systems' views may provide a helpful way to consider the interactive effects of fathers, mothers, and adolescents on each other's dyadic relationships. These concepts also underscore the complexity and difficulty in ascribing directions in interactive effects between family members.

Other study variables

In addition to attachment relationship variables for both adolescent and parent, marital quality and parental separation anxiety, as well as the adolescents' perception of cohesion to mothers and fathers are included as variables of importance.

Parent variable of marital quality, or satisfaction

Marital quality or satisfaction has been included in the study as a variable that reflects an important experience in parents' lives that has been suggested to impact children. Marital satisfaction will be briefly discussed in two parts: definition, touching on some measurement issues; and the importance of marital satisfaction to parent outcomes. The second part will consider marital satisfaction and parenting, family functioning, and child outcomes.

Definition and measurement issues. First, marital satisfaction, in this study is the "...correspondence between the actual and the expected or a comparison of the actual
relationship with the alternative, if the present relationship were terminated" (Rollins & Feldman, 1970, p. 20). This provides a clear understanding of what is intended here by the words, marital satisfaction or marital quality. This definition is grounded in social exchange theory and provides some theoretical grounding to an often atheoretical variable (Glenn, 1991). The clarity and perhaps restricted scope of this definition is in contrast to much previous work that has used marital satisfaction as a variable. Marital satisfaction has often been variously defined, with different outcomes related to these different definitions (Burnett, 1987). It has even been used without definition, leaving the researcher, participant, and reader to come to their own conclusion as to what marital satisfaction is (Eddy, Heyman & Weiss, 1991).

Concurrently, marital satisfaction measurement has been criticized, with researcher bias in definition (Sabatelli, 1984), and the lack of theoretical foundation noted as areas of concern (Glenn, 1991). These issues have led some researchers to re-conceptualize marital satisfaction as a unidimensional construct (Sabatelli, 1984). Sabatelli (1984) taps the couple's marital quality using social exchange theory as a part of his theoretical framework, and defines it in a similar manner to Rollins and Feldman (1970). Sabatelli suggests, that in measuring comparisons between expected and actual experience in the relationship, along with what might be available instead, the couple reports complaints. He thus obtains a unidimensional measure of the quality of the marriage from a couple's own perspective, without researcher bias (Sabatelli, 1984). Since Sabatelli's test uses a similar definition to the one given earlier and has minimized
some of the issues present in assessing marital satisfaction, his measure of marital quality is used in this study.

Marital satisfaction and research with adults/parents. Marital satisfaction regardless of definitional and measurement concerns has demonstrated consistent relationships with parents' functioning, parenting success, and child outcomes. It has consistently been found to be a robust variable that is pertinent to the functioning of both parents, and is stable as a predictor variable across cultures and family types (Ishii-Kuntz & Ihinger-Tallman, 1991).

Women report lower marital satisfaction than men in the first ten years of marriage (Rollins & Feldman, 1970). Women are often seen to initiate divorces at this time, i.e. when their children are young (McGoldrick & Carter, 1982). Husbands, on the other hand, appear to be affected by their wives' work status, with a wife's equal or higher work status related to low husband marital satisfaction. In general, men appear to be much more satisfied with marriage than their wives (McGoldrick & Carter, 1982), and to have more positive mental health outcomes than wives (Flowers, 1991). For women, however, the reported quality of the marriage is more important for their individual well-being than for men (Williams, 1988). It has been associated for both spouses with positive feelings and companionship (Rollins & Feldman, 1970). Marital satisfaction has consistently been associated with reports of positive marital relationships (Sabourin, Lussier & Wright, 1991). Thus marital satisfaction, however it is measured, appears to be important to those who are in the marriage.
For parents, marital satisfaction also appears to be important, as it has been associated with positive functioning in children. Rossi and Rossi (1990) reported that parents' report of marital quality was predictive of their closeness to their children. On the other hand, marital conflict and discord was shown to be associated with reduced levels of relationship to fathers for children (Amato, 1986), and generally with behavioral problems in children (Peterson & Zill, 1986). With young children (three and under), neutral and positive marital change reports have been associated with positive child behaviors, while reports of marital decline have been associated with negative parenting behaviors (by fathers), and negative child behaviors, including disobedience and negative affect (Belsky, Youngblade, Rovine & Volling, 1991). In the same study, wives who reported declining marital quality and feelings of love for her spouse, tended to demonstrate increased positive parenting. Finally, Belsky and associates found that child behaviors with their fathers were more consistently related to marital change in quality than were fathers' parenting skills.

Marital satisfaction research and adolescents. With adolescents, parents' marital satisfaction has been related to: 1) distance in the mother/son and father/daughter relationship; and 2) mothers' psychological well-being, along with other midlife evaluations of performance by mothers (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1987). These authors found mothers to be particularly affected by adolescents, with marital satisfaction a variable that mediated a mother's experience, or at least the report of the experience in parenting the adolescent. More recently, Koski and Steinberg (1990) found that marital satisfaction had a compensatory relationship on whether and how a mother experienced
midlife concerns during her child's adolescence. Women with high marital satisfaction were less likely to question parent and life roles, along with outcomes of these than women with low marital satisfaction (Koski & Steinberg, 1990). Fathers, on the other hand, report no marital satisfaction reduction as related to their adolescents, instead fathers report life satisfaction reduction in parenting adolescents (Steinberg, 1987).

For adolescents, marital satisfaction demonstrates a significant relationship with how adolescents perceive family atmosphere (Callan & Noller, 1986) and closeness with parents (Booth & Amato, 1994). While high marital quality is associated with positive adolescent reports of family atmosphere, particularly for girls, low marital quality is associated with more reports of dominance, particularly by boys (Callan & Noller, 1986). For adolescent girls, marital quality has been suggested to affect their vulnerability to problems, with low marital quality seen as associated with high vulnerability for females (1986). Longitudinally, parent marital quality has shown associations to late adolescents/young adults reports of closeness to both parents and frequency of contact with fathers, with higher quality associated with more visits, more reports of closeness and lower quality related to less visitation and more distant relationships (Booth & Amato, 1994). Additionally, marital quality reports from one spouse appeared to interact with the other parent's report of marital satisfaction, to affect the parent-child relationship. In other words, when marital quality was high, both mother-child and father-child relationships were reported to be positive. However, when marital quality was low, the adult child was reported to be closer to one parent than the other (Booth & Amato, 1994). Finally, regardless of marital quality and sex of the child, mothers were
reported to have closer relationships with their young adults. Booth and Amato (1994) conclude from their 12-year longitudinal findings, that in general, poor marital quality appears to affect the parent-child relationship in the long term by lowering the level of support children receive while young.

In conclusion, marital satisfaction or quality is a variable, albeit one with measurement and definitional problems, that continues to be important in describing relationships between spouses. It contributes to the individual functioning of the adults, along with their functioning as parents. Finally, it appears to be associated with child outcomes, and may have long lasting effects on the relationship between a child and his or her parents. As such, it is a meaningful relationship variable to explore in families with high school seniors.

Separation Anxiety

There are several ways to consider separation anxiety. Psychoanalytic tenets in particular, provide useful description, definition, and explanation of behavior using the dynamics of separation anxiety. These tenets follow. Also, attachment theory's premises, through its secure base, proximity seeking and distress that activates this, gives separation anxiety an important role and will also be discussed.

Definition. Separation anxiety, according to Freud, entails a "...reaction to the danger that...loss entails and...a reaction to the danger of the loss of the object itself" (Provence, 1987, p. 95). Separation itself, is suggested by Bloom-Feshbach and Bloom-
Feshbach (1987) as important in the psychological development of the person. Separation requires an explanation in the internal workings of a child's mind with extended separations and/or losses of important others resulting in internal models of relationships that often become related to longterm psychological organization of self. Long separations of important others, i.e. parents, are often related to less positive psychological outcomes for a child.

Separation anxiety tenets. Separation anxiety or the fear of loss of a loved one begins, according to developmentalists, as soon as an infant has object constancy (Lamb, 1988). Anxiety about interactions with others who do things differently, is a characteristic of children in their first five years of life (Provence, 1987). Next, children grow into fear/anxiety of loss of a loved parent in reality, and with further maturation, finally become able to be anxious about losing a loved one's approval and caregiving. It is further suggested that the relevant dynamic of separation anxiety becomes with development, the "...fear of object loss, loss of the person whom one loves and depends on" (Provence, 1987, p. 97). Finally, separation anxiety, for adults, becomes more conceptual and along with the fear of an actual separation from a loved one, includes the fear of losing love itself. This very powerful dynamic is seen as nearly universal in Western culture (Provence, 1987).

Attachment theory also considers separation anxiety to be important (Bowlby, 1973). Attachment theory tenets agree with the psychodynamicists in that separation anxiety serves an important role for people. Additionally, Ainsworth's Strange Situation (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978), which allows for description and
classification of attachment relationships depends, in part, on the dynamics of separation anxiety. Attachment theorists agree that separation anxiety begins as soon as the cognitive ability of object constancy occurs. For attachment, separation anxiety serves as a motivator for behavioral signalling by the infant or child of distress, with resultant parental qualitative responsiveness (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). With maturity, separation anxiety becomes a mechanism to initiate the attachment system by a child or his or her parent. Attachment theory has some of its roots in psychodynamic principals, thus its compatibility with psychodynamic tenets on separation anxiety is not surprising, nor is the focus by both on the importance of separation for both children and adults (Lamb, 1988). The difference between the two models resides in attachment theory's focus on separation anxiety as a relationship dynamic, while the psychodynamic model remains more focused on the individual experience.

Separation anxiety research and parent-child relationships. Separation anxiety has been confirmed to occur by six to eight months (Lamb, 1988) and has been found, along with parent's presence and quality of response, to relate significantly to a child's positive development (cf. Brar & Brar, 1990; Kagan, 1982). Most of this work focuses on the infant's perspective. An exception is the work of Hock, McBride and Gnezdla (1989) which considered separation anxiety from a mother's perspective. In developing an instrument to measure separation from a mother's point of view, e.g. the Maternal Separation Scale, they were able to consider the parent's point of view in separation, and begin to describe a mother's experience. Indeed, although they generally focused on mothers, fathers' experience and the need to consider his separation anxiety was also
noted. Hock, DeMeis and McBride (1988) found significant relationships between a mother’s work status and her separation anxiety. A later study also demonstrated that as a child grew older, i.e. six-year-olds, there was a relationship between child age and the number of maternal depressive behaviors (Hock & Schirtsinger, 1992). Finally, Belsky and McBride (1988) found that separation anxiety in mothers affected the development of attachment relationships, with more attachment difficulties found for highly anxious mothers.

In adolescence, separation anxiety as a relationship variable has not generally been considered. Instead, the constructs of individuation and autonomy are major focuses for research on the parent-adolescent experience (cf. Sprinthall & Collins, 1988). Separation anxiety is possibly present for both parent and child as they negotiate culturally expected autonomous behaviors in adolescence (Hill & Holmbeck, 1986). Yet it has not been generally investigated from this perspective, particularly from a parent’s point of view. For adolescents, the body of work that uses separation anxiety as a variable, tends to be clinical in nature. For example, Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke and Mitchell (1990) found relationships between depressive symptomology, adolescents’ separation anxiety and attachment. While this is useful, it has a focus on problematic issues and does not address normative separation anxiety.

In conclusion, separation anxiety may well be a universal feeling in our society (Provence, 1987), with its definition of the fear of love withdrawal. However, it has not been thoroughly considered in normative development for families, as in separation-individuation. Yet with life cycle changes (McGoldrick & Carter, 1982), and around
adolescence with separation anxiety as an activator of attachment behaviors, it would seem normative to experience separation anxiety. Some work on separation anxiety from a parent's perspective has been done, yet to date little research has been conducted that focuses on this issue as normal in the parent-child, particularly parent-adolescent relationship. To operationalize this variable directly, a parent-adolescent separation anxiety instrument still in its developmental stages was used (Hock & Eberly, 1994). Although still being revised it focuses on the separation experience from the parent's perspective, giving both a sense of anxiety in separation from the adolescent and continued comfort in being accessible as a secure base to the adolescent.

Cohesion

The last variable, adolescent cohesion is discussed in a similar manner to the preceding variables, including definition, measurement issues and research in reference to adolescents and their families.

Definition. The word cohesion is used interchangeably with the phrase emotional closeness in much of the literature. For example, Gehring and Feldman (1988) state cohesion is the emotional closeness that binds family members together, while Noller and Callan (1986) define cohesion as the emotional bonding present in families. In this study, cohesion is the sense of emotional connection between the adolescent and his or her mother and father. Cohesion also fits nicely with family systems as portrayed by Olson's and Bowen's models, as well as to Belsky's model. It adds a nearness-farness 'distance' dimension to the relationships involved (Gehring & Marti, 1993).
Bowen (1960), among others (cf. Gehring & Feldman, 1988), states that cohesion is a property of all families, and as presented earlier identifies it with the togetherness force that is present in all humans (Friedman, 1991). Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973) specify that cohesion is a property of dyads, or larger family groupings, which shows differential closeness between family members. Thus, the definition of cohesion provides a measure of relationship.

**Measurement issues.** The family systems model developed by Olson resulted in the development of a well-known measure to consider the dimensions of cohesion, adaptability and communication called the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales, or FACES (Edman, Cole & Howard, 1990). Other measurements of cohesion only, are often obtained from a spatial operationalization, and have demonstrated construct validity (Gehring & Feldman, 1988). In other words, the closeness-distance between dyads and other subsystems allows for the measurement of cohesion (Gehring & Schultheiss, 1987).

Gehring and Marti (1993) suggest that questionnaires of cohesion do not capture completely the essence of the construct and limit measurement. Instead, some alternate paper/pencil methods have been found successful in assessing cohesion. These include Madanes, Dukes and Harbin's (Madden & Harbin, 1983) picture test that uses diagrams to assess connectedness and hierarchy in families. Madden and Harbin (1983) found the technique useful and significant in helping them find associations between assaultive and non-assaultive adolescents. Pipp, Shaver, Jennings, Lamborn and Fischer (1985) used a variety of circle drawings to obtain information on cohesion, in addition to other family
atmosphere variables, as children grew. The findings provided a number of significant conclusions consistent with other literature about adolescents, including adolescents reporting increased distance and lesser cohesion between themselves and parents as they moved from childhood into adolescence. In general, researchers and clinicians have found spatial measurements, on paper with pencil or other spatial techniques to be an effective way to assess cohesion (Gehring & Schultheiss, 1987).

A second way of measuring cohesion is also useful and of interest here. Cohesion has been successfully measured spatially with the use of symbolic figure placement techniques, or SFPT's. These were originally developed by Kueth in the 1960's, and are symbolic representations of the family, arranged by members, then measured (Gehring & Schultheiss, 1987). SFPT's generally are reported to have acceptable reliability and validity, and in general are easy to administer (cf. Gehring & Schultheiss, 1987). One of these, the Family System Test, or the FAST is extremely easy to administer and reports excellent reliability and good validity, using family system measures like FACES III and the Family Environment Scale, FES to demonstrate this (cf. Gehring & Feldman, 1988). The FAST has been reported as successful in a number of studies considering cohesion in a variety of families and with a variety of other variables (cf. Gehring & Marti, 1993; Gehring, Wentzel, Feldman & Munson, 1990; Marti & Gehring, 1992). Gehring and Marti (1993) demonstrated significant differences in reports of family cohesion between clinical and non-clinical children and adolescents, with no differences in cohesion explained by mental problems. Additionally low cohesion was found in both types of children's families, where family conflict was reported as high.
Gehring and associates (Gehring, Wentzel, Feldman and Munson, 1990) demonstrated significant relationships between parental conflict and decreased adolescent reports of cohesion, while adolescent-parent conflict was not related to reduced cohesion, it was instead related to increased adolescent power. In keeping with this study's relationship focus between parent and adolescent, cohesion is a variable that can provide information about the relationship(s) between an adolescent and mothers/fathers at this important time in life. The FAST as a reliable cohesion measure provided the operationalization of cohesion for this study. The FAST was used as a SFPT method and additionally in an altered form, as a paper-pencil survey.

**Cohesion and child/adolescent outcomes.** Cohesion fits in well with the relationship focus and the attachment theory model, of this study. Cohesion's measurement of distance or closeness may complement the mechanism of signalling for comfort from one's secure base. The cohesion variable additionally, shows associations in the literature between children/adolescent outcomes and parents.

First, families of adolescents, in general report themselves to be cohesive (Gehring, Wentzel, Feldman & Munson, 1990), although this is affected situationally. For example, cohesion has been noted to vary with the amount of conflict reported in the family. Cohesion generally appears to decrease with conflict, with marital conflict shown to be related to lower cohesion in families, and higher intergenerational coalitions. Troubled families, in general, have been found to report low cohesion (Anderson & Gavazzi, 1990). Cohesion is seen to have gender differences also, with males reporting more cohesion and benefiting from this, while older adolescent girls report less cohesion,
and benefit from this (Groevant & Cooper, 1986; Moore, 1987). Some of the literature on cohesion pertains to differentiation and distance regulation in normative and problem families, often within the context of adolescent identity and autonomy development. Positive adolescent developmental outcomes were demonstrated to be related to the reported cohesion in families (cf. Anderson & Sabatelli, 1990; Groevant & Cooper, 1986).

Minuchin, another family theorist and developer of structural family therapy (1974) suggested that with development, there would be changes in cohesion between adolescents and parents, with reduced cohesion related to positive development. Although research tends to find more stability than change (Feldman & Gehring, 1988), change does occur in the direction suggested by Minuchin. These changes appear to be small, especially in comparison to the high levels of cohesion reported by different aged groups of children and adolescents (Callan & Noller, 1986). Additionally, adolescents do not appear to find the decrease in cohesion desirable, and cohesion has been suggested as important in an adolescent’s becoming autonomous (Gehring & Feldman, 1988; Groevant & Cooper, 1986). Feldman and Gehring (1988) noted that the more autonomous adolescents were also reporting higher cohesion to their parents than less autonomous adolescents. Olsen (1986) noted that, in contrast to problem families, cohesion and positive coping were reported to be high in normal families of adolescents.

There may be some differences in the stability of findings, depending on who is asked, however. Noller and Callan (1986) reported a difference in perceptions of cohesion for parents and adolescents. The adolescents, from 13- to 17-years-old, relayed
less cohesion than did their parents. The authors note that even given the lower cohesion reports of the older adolescents, the levels of cohesion reported were still high. Larson and Lowe (1990) found spatial distance increasing between parents and adolescents with age. Finally, further supporting Olson’s findings in 1986, cohesion has been found to have a linear relationship generally with positive developmental outcomes for adolescents and parents (Gehring & Marti, 1993; Marti & Gehring, 1992).

To conclude, cohesion appears to be a robust relationship variable for adolescents and their parents. It is a variable that considers perceptions of emotional distance on a continuum, and operationalized in this manner, is easily measured. Further, cohesion as a characteristic of dyads, is compatible with the attachment relationship as it taps some of the affective dimension of the relationship between parent and adolescent. It does this, however, on a day-to-day level as a dynamic, rather than in the trait-like manner of attachment’s working models.

**Introduction of Hypotheses**

In conclusion, attachment provides a meaningful theory base with supportive research to consider the variables of interest in the current study. These are parent attachment style, adolescent experience of security of attachment to each parent, parental marital quality, parental separation anxiety about adolescent, along with the adolescent’s perception of cohesion to each parent. In addition to attachment theory, some family systems’ concepts provide a context in which these variables may be considered. For example, the possible effects of a third family member on dyads, here mother, father and
adolescent, may be considered. At the same time, systems' models underline the
difficulty of ascribing causality in family interactions due to the number and complexity
of interactions. With this foundation laid, some specific predictions of associations
between the variables follow.

Hypotheses

Using attachment theory and some systems ideas, a number of associations
between parent and adolescent variables, in addition to relationships between various
parent variables are proposed. Effects of various parent variables on adolescent cohesion
are also suggested. The specific hypotheses follow.

1. The adult attachment dimensions of CLOSE, DEPEND and ANXIOUS as
measured by the Adult Attachment Scale, the AAS (Collins & Read, 1990) for mothers
and fathers will show significant associations between themselves and with each other's
attachment dimensions. In addition mothers' and fathers' dimensions will demonstrate
associations with other relationship variables, in particular other parent variables.

2. Parents who report moderate to high marital satisfaction and relay a secure
attachment style, i.e. high CLOSE, DEPEND, and low ANXIOUS scores (Collins &
Read, 1990) will express moderate adolescent separation anxiety. Parents who have an
anxious attachment style, reporting high CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIOUS scores will
display high separation anxiety, while parents with an avoidant attachment style, or low
CLOSE, DEPEND and ANXIOUS scores (1990) will report low separation anxiety.
3. Parents' reported attachment style will relate to marital satisfaction scores as measured by the Marital Comparison Level Index, the MCLI (Sabatelli, 1984), with secure style parents reporting the most positive marital satisfaction.

4. Adolescent cohesion will relate systematically to parent attachment styles, and to parent separation anxiety levels. When parents report secure styles of attachment, adolescent cohesion will be moderate. Anxious style parents, i.e. those who report concern over abandonment, will have adolescents reporting high cohesion. Avoidant style parents, or those with low comfort in closeness, interdependence, and who express little worry of abandonment, will have adolescents who report low cohesion. Adolescent cohesion will correlate with parents' separation anxiety.

5. Adolescent cohesion scores will be related to adolescent reports of attachment. Highly secure adolescents will report more cohesion than less secure adolescents, who will report a variety of scores, high and low.

6. Parents' attachment style will be related to adolescents' attachment security level, with secure style parents having adolescents who report higher security than adolescents of the other styles of parents.

7. There will be gender differences both for parents and for adolescents. Mothers' are reported as closer in daily interactions to adolescents (Youniss & Smollar, 1985) and adolescents will report themselves as higher in cohesion to mothers than fathers. Mothers will also have, as a group, higher separation anxiety scores than fathers. On the other hand, marital satisfaction scores will be higher for fathers than
mothers (Glenn, 1991). There will also be more separation anxiety expressed by the parents of adolescent girls than boys (Waterman, 1982).

8. A pattern of the relationships among the variables is suggested, using hierarchical multiple regression analyses (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) with adolescent cohesion as the outcome variable (Figure 1). Beginning with parent attachment styles, these are expected to impact parent marital quality, due to the assumption that working models serve as a way of interpreting meaningful relationships including the marital experience. Marital satisfaction, in turn, is expected to impact parental separation anxiety, since pending separation, from their adolescent, or 'loss of a love object' (Provence, 1987) may be experienced by a parent. Lower marital satisfaction and/or insecure attachment styles may make the relationship with an adolescent more important, and there may be more separation anxiety. Separation anxiety is then assumed to impact adolescent reports of cohesion. The parents' levels of separation anxiety may result in parental behaviors of overcloseness or trying to keep the adolescent from separating and this could affect how cohesive that adolescent feels towards mothers and fathers. Overall, a parent's comfort with adolescent separation, marital satisfaction and attachment style is expected to affect the adolescent's report of cohesion. Additionally, parent attachment styles will directly impact both parental separation anxiety and adolescent cohesion, since mental representations of relationships include the component of availability of others to a self. Also, a direct relationship is expected between parent attachment style and adolescent reports of their attachment relationship with each parent.
Figure 1. Proposed pattern of relationships when parent variables are regressed onto adolescent cohesion.
CHAPTER III

Methods

Procedures

Sample selection

High school seniors and their parent(s) were the targeted respondents. To identify seniors, and their families, high schools were contacted and asked to help. One suburban Columbus, OH, high school agreed to help in obtaining the study's sample, with several restrictions. These were: 1) no school time would be used in soliciting or filling out surveys; 2) the surveys had to be delivered to the families in such a manner that the anonymity of the seniors and their parents was ensured; and 3) responses had to be voluntary with anonymity of data maintained. Finally, the school reviewed all materials to be given to the families.

Data collection

A packet mailing was chosen to fulfill the school's conditions. Packets to seniors' families were assembled by the experimenter, stamped and then delivered to the school for labeling and mailing. Over 350 packets were mailed, to the reported 350 graduating seniors and their families.

Packets (Appendix A) included an introductory letter to parents and one to the adolescent inviting them to participate in the study. Separate surveys and return stamped
envelopes were included. To maintain anonymity yet allow family data to be analyzed, each packet was given a number that was present on all enclosed surveys. Two additional items were included in the packets. First, a blank raffle ticket was enclosed for each parent and the adolescent. Each parent and adolescent was encouraged to fill these out and return them with their completed surveys. On receiving the surveys, the tickets were immediately separated and placed in the appropriate drawing for thank-you prizes, one for mothers, one for fathers, and one for adolescents. This was done, in addition to thanking the families for participation, to increase the return rate. One or more members of 96 families responded to the initial mailing.

A second item included in the packet was attached to the adolescent survey. Adolescents were invited to volunteer for a five to ten minute face-to-face meeting where the cohesion measure, the Family System Test, or the FAST would be administered. Parents were apprised of this offer in their letters, while the adolescents were offered a $5 dollar gratuity for their time. Those interested signed up by enclosing their name and telephone number. All identifying information was destroyed once the adolescent's original packet number was placed on the follow-up data. The FAST procedures were usually done in the family home, away from parents, with permission obtained from those parents whose adolescents were under 18 years of age.

Approximately six weeks later, a reminder letter was sent, (Appendix B) with the school's help, anonymously, to families encouraging participation. Two additional adolescents and nine families responded. These two groups were used in the final sample.
The mailed packets of surveys were both a convenient way to obtain data and a limitation to the study. The mailing required limiting the number of questions to maximize participation from families busy with other things. An additional procedural difficulty was the school's requirement of anonymity, since this curtailed researcher followup with specific families to encourage greater participation. The one followup letter sent, was anonymous and, as such, very general (Appendix B).

Subjects

Sample size

Of the 350 high school seniors and mothers and fathers to whom surveys were mailed, 107 families had one or more members respond. This is a 30% return rate and while admittedly low, was obtained from an anonymous mailing during one of the busiest times in the year for these families. Due to the school's requirement of anonymity, no specific follow-ups could be done to complete any family's responses. Thus, the data reflects viewpoints of a number of parent-adolescent triads, dyads and individual parents or adolescents. Analyses reflect this in their N's. For the parents, mother response to the survey was N = 85, while father response was N = 74. Adolescent response to the survey was N = 78, with 35 males and 43 females. The adolescent follow-up generated participation by 17 males and 26 females.

Subject families and parent characteristics

Of the families who returned surveys, incomes ranged between under $10,000 to above $100,000, with over 50% of the parents reporting incomes between $30,000 and
$60,000. The families, by profession, were predominantly middle class, with 92% of the fathers and 76% of the mothers reporting fulltime employment outside of the home. Only 6% of the mothers identified themselves as fulltime homemakers. Ethnicity of the respondents was over 90% Caucasian, with approximately 4% African American and another 4% other ethnic groups. Educationally, over 50% of responding fathers and 33% mothers reported completion of undergraduate or higher college degrees, with at least 75% of the mothers and fathers reporting some post secondary school training. In the sample, the marital status of the adolescents' parents showed 76% of responding families were comprised of both biological parents, with another 10% reporting one biological and one stepparent in the home. The remainder of the homes were variously reported to comprise of single parents due to widowhood and divorce. The average age of the parent was 43 for mothers, and 45 for fathers.

Characteristics of adolescent subjects

Adolescents' average age was 17.5, with 80% males and 74% females living with both biological parents. In general, adolescents reported casual to moderate dating with peers, and most reported post high school plans. These plans included college for 80% of the adolescents, with 51% planning to live away from home and another 29% planning to stay at home and go to school. Adolescent plans to move out of the parental home within the next calendar year varied by both parental marital status and by adolescent birth order, with 65% of adolescents overall planning to move. Adolescent males and females living with both parents reported the intention to move 71% and 65% of the time
respectively, while adolescent males and females in other family structures planned to leave 85% and 100% of the time, respectively. By birth order, both male and female only children planned to move out 85% and 100% of the time, respectively, while 54% to 92% of first and second born adolescents also were planning to move out within the next year. Only third born children, both males and females reported a major difference in leaving home, with 66% and 75% respectively, planning to stay in the home through the next year.

**Characteristics of high school students/families in school district**

The school district from which the sample was drawn gives a similar picture for families and students in its district. Approximately 50% of families in the district report incomes between $20,000 and $60,000, while over 95% of the district is reported of Caucasian ethnicity, with 1.9% African American and the remainder in other groups. Over 78% of parents are reported to be employed outside of the home, with 7.5% of the families reporting fulltime homemakers, and the remainder giving a variety of responses. Marital status in the district is reported as 81% married, 11% single, 5% divorced or separated and about 2% widowed. (How many of the married responses are reporting second or greater marriages was not addressed.) Finally, historically many seniors in this district have gone on to post secondary education, reportedly 71% of the 1992 senior class, 79% of the 1993 senior class. Current 1994 graduates' plans to pursue further education was reported by the district of 84%.
Thus, while this sample represents only 30% of the seniors and their parents, they appear to be similar to those who attend the school district.

Several caveats are needed regarding the sample. The sample represented only 30% of all possible seniors' families, with no way to specifically discover how representative those who returned surveys were and what might be different about those who did/did not return surveys. It appeared, from demographic information, that those parents who participated were particularly well-educated. For adolescents who volunteered for the followup administration of the FAST, there was no way to determine what, if anything, was different about these adolescents and their families, from those who chose not to participate. The school district itself was located in a relatively affluent, middle class, predominantly white suburb. Thus, the study's findings are representative of only those who comprised this sample, and great care is needed before attempting to use them in consideration of any other group of adolescents and parents.

Parent Instruments

Adult Attachment Scale, the AAS

The Adult Attachment Scale, (AAS) by Collins and Read (1990) was used in this study to test attachment style. As mentioned earlier, mental representations of attachment occur as a result of a person's countless interactions with attachment figures. The expectations of relationships and self-in-relationship that result from these interactions are measured and categorized in the AAS into three styles, secure, anxious and avoidant. These styles are similar to those described in the infant literature and in the previous adult measure developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987). The AAS also provides three
attachment dimensions, CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIOUS (Collins & Read, 1990). These dimensions, found through factor analyses, allow for more individual differences to be expressed than the categories of secure, anxious and avoidant. They also provide quantitative scores. CLOSE is defined as comfort with intimacy and closeness, while DEPEND is the feeling that others can be depended and relied upon. ANXIOUS is defined as a person's concern about being abandoned or unloved.

The AAS is an 18-item measure, six items for each dimension. Each question is answered using a five point Likert-type scale ranging from "not at all characteristic of me" to "very characteristic". Dimension scores are obtained by summation, with higher scores on a dimension suggesting more characteristics of that dimension. Sample questions include: "I find it relatively easy to get close to people" (CLOSE); "I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others" (DEPEND); and "In relationships, I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me" (ANXIOUS). Cronbach's alphas are reported by the authors to range from .78 to .85.

For this study, both AAS style categories and dimensions were obtained. The styles, were obtained from the dimensional scores, using cluster analysis (cf. Collins & Read, 1990). These AAS styles have demonstrated adequate validity using Hazan and Shaver's (1987) attachment measure, suggesting that the AAS does indeed tap attachment concepts. Comparison between means obtained from the adolescents' parents in this study and Collins and Read's study 1 and 2 (1990), was favorable. Few differences were present and the directions were generally the same. Cronbach's alphas for the parents' scores ranged from .75 to .87.
Parent Adolescent Separation Anxiety Scale, the PASAS

The second instrument, the Parent Adolescent Separation Anxiety Scale, (PASAS) by Hock and Eberly (1994) was used to measure pending separation experience of the parents from their high school seniors. Cultural expectations include high school graduates assuming a more adultlike role, and this often includes separation between adolescent and parent(s) at some point (Fasick, 1984). Adolescents were asked their post graduation plans to move out of their parents' homes to consider whether the possibility of pending separation for parents was a reality for this sample. As reported earlier, the majority of adolescents, or 65%, were planning to move within the next calendar year. Additionally, even the mothers and fathers of adolescents with no plans to move out soon, have the experience of cultural expectations of eventual separation. This parental experience of pending separation was assessed using the 37-item PASAS (Hock & Eberly, 1994). The PASAS, still in its development phase, is an exploratory measure to assess mothers' and fathers' separation from adolescents, using an attachment framework as its theory base.

The PASAS has two scales that were obtained from factor analyses with items kept if they loaded .35 or higher. The first scale, called Secure Base and identified here as SECBASE is the comfort a parent has in being available (as a secure base) to their adolescent. High scores on SECBASE are seen as positive and healthful for parents. Questions that represent the first scale include, "I am happy when my teenager relies on me for advice" and "It makes me feel especially good if my teenager greets me with a hug". Cronbach's alphas for SECBASE are reported to range between .83 and .81. The
second scale, called Separation Anxiety-Other and identified here as SAOTHER is the anxiety a parent has about their adolescent distancing from them/going to others for comfort and felt security. High scores on SAOTHER are viewed as less positive or healthful parental function. Questions that reflect the second include "I feel sad because my teenager doesn't share as much anymore" and "I would feel hurt if my teenager didn't come to me for comfort". Cronbach's alphas for SAOTHER are reported to range from .87 to .88. The PASAS scales showed reasonable Cronbach alphas for this sample, and appear to relate in intuitively reasonable ways with several other parent and adolescent measures.

The PASAS uses a Likert-type scale of discrete numbers from one to five, with a range of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Scale items are summed, with larger scores reflecting more of a factor. In this study Cronbach's alphas for SECBASE were .82 and .78, for mothers and fathers respectively, while Cronbach alphas for SAOTHER were .86 for mothers and .87 for fathers.

**Marital Comparison Level Index, the MCLI**

The Marital Comparison Level Index, (MCLI; Sabatelli, 1984) was used to measure parent marital quality, or satisfaction. This is a unidimensional measure of marital expectations versus the experience of marriage. Based in the social exchange model, it involves comparison between experiences within the marriage and expectations of the marriage, along with what are perceived to be available alternatives (1984). This operationalization allows for a spouse to evaluate his or her marriage quality, without
imposed values by others, in particular researchers, as to what ought to be positive or satisfying in a particular marriage. According to Sabatelli this instrument is based on a person's own unique history and interpretation of experiences. As such, it taps their own relationship experience and perceptions of its quality.

The MCLI also uses a Likert-type scale of seven discrete choices, ranging from "worse than expected" through neutral to "better than expected" on its 32-items. Examples of items include "The amount of love you experience", "The amount of privacy you experience" and "The amount of time you spend together". It is scored by converting the seven choices to the numbers 1 through 7, and summing. Cronbach's alpha for the MCLI's total score is reported as .93, and validity was adequately demonstrated using other reports by respondents of relationship equity and commitment (Sabatelli, 1984).

Comparison between Sabatelli's sample and the current sample's scores revealed high school seniors' parents to be somewhat older and somewhat more satisfied with their marriage quality. Cronbach's alphas for the parents' scores were .95 for both fathers and mothers.

Adolescent Instruments

The Inventory of Parent Peer Attachment, the IPPA

To measure the security of attachment between adolescents and their parents, the Inventory of Parent Peer Attachment developed by Gay Arnsden and Mark Greenberg (1987) was given to adolescents. The IPPA uses the general dimensions of trust, quality of communication and extent of anger/alienation to measure adolescent attachment
relationships to both parents and peers. Validity for the measure was demonstrated using a variety of measures, including the Tennessee Self Concept Test, and the Family Environment Scale, suggesting that the IPPA does access relationship quality between adolescents and their parents and important peers. Cronbach alphas for the measure were reported to range between .86 and .91 for the original test (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). An updated version to the original, in which each parent is assessed separately by the adolescent, is now the suggested instrument for use by the authors and was used here.

The IPPA has three sections, one for each parent and one for peers, with 25 questions per section. Mother and father questions are identical. For the current study only parent sections were administered. Sample questions include "My mother accepts me as I am" and "I tell by father about my problems and troubles". Answers are given on a Likert-type scale of one to five, ranging from "almost never or never true" to "almost always or always true". A summary score is calculated, with higher scores representing higher security of attachment and lower scores representing lower security of attachment. Mean scores for adolescents in this study are somewhat higher than those reported in Armsden and Greenberg's (1987) original study, but very similar to those reported by Papini, Roggman and Anderson in their 1991 study using the revised IPPA on younger adolescents. Cronbach's alphas for the current study were .93 and .92, for mothers and fathers, respectively.
The Family System Test, the FAST

The second measure given to adolescents to measure cohesion to each parent, was the Family System Test, (FAST). The FAST, developed by Thomas Gehring (Gehring & Schultheiss, 1987) is a spatial measure that assesses both cohesion and hierarchy between family members. Only the cohesion aspect was of interest for the current study. The FAST’s psychometric qualities for cohesion include a Cronbach alpha of .80 for its various cohesion scenarios, demonstrated convergent and discriminative validity using, for example the Family Environment Scale (cf. Gehring & Feldman, 1988), and a stable test-retest reliability of \( r = .80 \) using early to middle adolescents (Gehring & Feldman, 1988). Mean scores obtained in this study were compatible with other studies using the FAST (cf. Gehring & Feldman, 1988).

The FAST is a spatial instrument that uses a 45 x 45 cm white board, divided into 81 squares, and straight or triangular wooden shapes with attached wooden balls with painted faces to represent male and female family members. These figures, once designated as particular family members, are placed within squares on the board in relationship to one another, to depict cohesion between family members.

Administration involves face-to-face contact and five to ten minutes. Instructions given include a demonstration of more and less cohesion as figures are moved across the board, along with a general description of cohesion (Gehring & Feldman, 1988). Specific instructions for this study involved asking the adolescents to depict typical cohesion between themselves and each parent using the figures on the board.
Scoring the FAST may be done in two ways, either by assigning high, medium or low cohesion from pre-determined positions and distances (cf. Gehring, Wentzel, Feldman & Munson, 1990) or by assigning a number score (Gehring & Feldman, 1988). The number scoring method for scoring the FAST (1988) was chosen for the current research to allow for maximum sensitivity in recording cohesiveness scores from adolescents. Since there was no complicating hierarchy score to consider, the use of a quantitative score appeared to provide the report of cohesion needed.

Scoring the FAST this way has two steps. The first is to obtain a distance score for each adolescent-parent dyad. Counting the number of squares that separate the figures when they are on a vertical or horizontal line results in a distance score. For example, if the figures are on adjacent vertical squares, the distance score is one. If there is a diagonal relationship between the figures, then a triangle is drawn using the diagonal distance between the dyad as the triangle’s hypotenuse. The Pythagorean formula, or the sum of the squared sides is equal to the squared diagonal distance in a right triangle, is used to calculate the dyad’s distance score. For example, the distance score for adjacent diagonal figures is 1.4 (one squared plus one squared equals 1.4 squared). The second step involves changing the distance score into a cohesion score. This is done simply by subtracting the dyad’s distance score from the board’s ultimate distance of 12 (cf. Gehring & Feldman, 1988). Cohesion scores range from .6 to 11, with higher FAST scores representing higher cohesion and lower FAST scores representing lower cohesion.
The FAST was given to 43 of the 78 adolescents who returned surveys. This administration, the follow-up procedure noted earlier was done to check the reliability of responses given on a two-dimensional facsimile, or the FFAST, which was mailed to all adolescents in the senior class. This facsimile (See Appendix A) had a 9 x 9 matrix of squares, and three different colored adhesive dots labelled MOM, DAD, YOU. Instructions indicated that adolescents were to place the dots where each adolescent felt him- or herself in relation to their mother and father on closeness, typically. These facsimiles were scored in the same manner described above. Facsimile scores obtained from the 43 adolescents who returned surveys and participated in the follow-up administration of the FAST correlated $r = .97$ for cohesion reports by adolescents to mothers, and $r = .98$ for cohesion reports by adolescents to fathers. The $n = 78$ survey facsimiles, or the FFAST's were used with relative confidence as they appeared to have assessed the same cohesion qualities measured by the actual FAST. This however, should be noted for subsequent interpretation of data obtained, and all findings should be interpreted with caution.

In closing, three parent measures, the AAS, the PASAS and the MCLI, along with a demographic survey (Appendix A) were mailed to mothers and fathers of high school seniors to test some relationship variables as adolescents approached graduation. Adolescents were also mailed a demographic survey along with the IPPA and the FFAST. Volunteer adolescents were later administered the FAST. In all, although the response was low, at 30%, the respondent family members' characteristics appear similar to the profile of seniors and their families, provided by the school system.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Findings for specific hypotheses

Analyses performed for the hypotheses included one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA’s) with mother data and then father data to consider mean differences between groups, with least means square tests (like Fisher’s Least Square difference) included to account for unequal cells. Correlations to consider the associations between various quantitative variables, and multiple linear regressions (MR’s) to regress a chosen dependent variable onto other chosen independent variables were also performed. Analyses and findings are organized by hypothesis, with some additional gender analyses presented with hypothesis seven, as it addressed gender related questions. Descriptive statistics for all measures given are reported in Table 1.

One note needs to be added prior to considering various analyses. Due to the nature of the data collection, different analyses have different n’s. While these, of course, are reported, it must also be kept in mind that the smaller n’s, usually fathers, may contribute to findings that maximize differences, or on the other hand, minimize findings, because they do not attain significance due to reduced numbers.
Table 1. Simple statistics for parents’ and adolescents’ test variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test/Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Cronbach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother SECBASE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father SECBASE</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.04</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother SAOTHER</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father SAOTHER</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother CLOSE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father CLOSE</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother DEPEND</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father DEPEND</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother ANXIOUS</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father ANXIOUS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother MCLI</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father MCLI</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother ATTACH</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father ATTACH</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother FFAST</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother FAST</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father FFAST</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father FAST</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis one

Hypothesis one made a general prediction of significant associations between parent attachment dimensions, and both parent and adolescent variables to evaluate the usefulness of the dimensions as representative of attachment working models of each parent. How these working models might relate to the report of other relationship variables was also of interest. To consider this, a correlational matrix of all variables was performed (Table 2). (See also Table 3.) Several interesting relationships were apparent between parent attachment dimensions as measured by the AAS (Collins & Read, 1990).

Mother and father AAS dimensions' associations. Mothers' attachment style dimensions were differentially associated with other variables. For instance, a mother's comfort with closeness correlated positively with her comfort in depending upon others, $r = .64$, $p = .0001$. CLOSE also correlated negatively with her level of anxiety about being left or unloved, $r = -.36$, $p = .0007$. Thus, mothers who were comfortable with closeness and depending upon others as measured by the AAS, tended not to be particularly anxious about being left.

Mothers' DEPEND dimension scores appeared to correlate moderately with many items. These scores represented a parent's comfort in and dependence on the availability and responsivity of others to the parent. Mother DEPEND scores, in addition to correlating as noted with her own CLOSE scores, also demonstrated a moderately positive correlation with fathers' report of comfort in closeness, CLOSE, $r = .25$, $p = .05$, and comfort in depending on others, DEPEND, $r = .31$, $p = .01$. Mother DEPEND
Table 2. Correlational matrix of parent/adolescent variables
(Superscript denotes level of significance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>14.</th>
<th>15.</th>
<th>16.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M SECBASE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F SECBASE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M SAOTHER</td>
<td>.17^a</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F SAOTHER</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23^a</td>
<td>.27^a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M MCLI</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.26^a</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F MCLI</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20^a</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23^a</td>
<td>.46^c</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M CLOSE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24^a</td>
<td>-.20^a</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28^b</td>
<td>.31^b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F CLOSE</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34^b</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.22^a</td>
<td>.21^a</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M DEPEND</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.40^d</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.38^a</td>
<td>.31^b</td>
<td>.64^d</td>
<td>.25^d</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F DEPEND</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29^a</td>
<td>.28^b</td>
<td>.26^b</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.56^d</td>
<td>.31^b</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M ANXIOUS</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21^a</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22^a</td>
<td>-.36^e</td>
<td>-.36^e</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.53^e</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ANXIOUS</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31^b</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29^a</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.41^e</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.47^d</td>
<td>-.34^d</td>
<td>-.49^d</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M ATTACH</td>
<td>.22^a</td>
<td>.34^b</td>
<td>-.36^e</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.25^a</td>
<td>.29^a</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21^e</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24^e</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ATTACH</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34^b</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26^a</td>
<td>.25^a</td>
<td>.32^e</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.35^b</td>
<td>.41^e</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M FFAST</td>
<td>.33^b</td>
<td>.30^e</td>
<td>-.32^e</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.24^e</td>
<td>-.25^e</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.65^d</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F FFAST</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24^a</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26^e</td>
<td>.52^d</td>
<td>.43^f</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Significant at p ≤ .05  
b. Significant at p ≤ .01  
c. Significant at p ≤ .001  
d. Significant at p ≤ .0001  
e. Approaches significance p ≤ .10
scores, furthermore, negatively correlated with both parents' ANXIOUS dimension, or fear of being left, \( r = -.53, \ p = .0001 \) for mothers, and \( r = -.34, \ p = .005 \) for fathers. In other words, mothers in this sample tended to have spouses who also were reporting comfort in depending on others, along with these couples both reporting levels of anxiety in the opposite direction to their reported comfort in depending on others. Mother ANXIOUS scores were significantly correlated with several variables as noted above.

Fathers' attachment style dimensions also resulted in some significant correlations. Fathers' CLOSE dimension scores had a pattern similar to the mothers' CLOSE correlations, with moderate to strong correlations to the other father dimensions of DEPEND and ANXIOUS, \( r = .56, \ p = .0001 \) and \( r = -.47, \ p = .0001 \), respectively. Fathers' CLOSE scores, as noted above, were also significantly and positively associated with mothers' DEPEND scores, \( r = .25, \ p = .05 \). In other words, men who were reporting comfort in closeness to others, had wives who tended to report comfort in relying on others.

Fathers' DEPEND scores showed, in addition to the positive correlation with mothers' DEPEND scores already mentioned, a strongly negative correlation to fathers' ANXIOUS dimension scores, \( r = -.49, \ p = .0001 \). Fathers who reported comfort in relying on others tended to have spouses who did so also. Additionally, fathers with comfort in relying on others tended to report lower anxiety about being left or unloved.

Parent AAS dimensions and marital satisfaction (MCLI) scores. First, attachment style dimensions appear to be significantly related to marital satisfaction as measured by the MCLI. Mothers' marital satisfaction reports linked positively to both their CLOSE,
r = .28, p = .0098 and DEPEND, r = .38, p = .0004 dimensions, and negatively to their ANXIOUS, r = -.22, p = .04 dimensions. Mothers who reported positive marital satisfaction scores on the MCLI tended also to report, in this sample, higher CLOSE and DEPEND Adult Attachment Scale dimensions and significantly lower ANXIOUS dimension scores. The father attachment dimension of DEPEND significantly related to mothers' marital satisfaction scores, with father's DEPEND dimension, r = .28, p = .02, and father CLOSE approaching significance, r = .22, p = .10. Thus, mothers with high marital satisfaction scores tended to have husbands reporting high DEPEND scores.

For fathers, all three mother attachment style dimensions were significantly related to fathers' marital satisfaction scores on the MCLI. Mothers' CLOSE, r = .31, p = .01, DEPEND, r = .31, p = .01, and ANXIOUS, r = -.36, p = .003, showed moderate correlations to fathers' report of marital satisfaction. Again, mothers' ANXIOUS dimension scores appeared to be lower and the comfort with closeness and depending upon other higher for women whose husbands were reporting positive marital satisfaction. The father attachment style dimensions that significantly correlated to his marital satisfaction were his report of comfort in depending upon others, the DEPEND dimension, r = .26, p = .05, and his anxiety about being abandoned or unloved, the ANXIOUS dimension, r = -.41, p = .001. Fathers who tended to be comfortable in depending on others and who reported little worry about being abandoned, tended to report positive marital satisfaction. Interesting to note is that while the mother CLOSE dimension was both moderately correlated, r = .28, p = .009 for mothers and r = .31, p = .01 for fathers, to each spouse's marital satisfaction scores, father scores on CLOSE
were not significant for mothers, although this correlation approached significance, \( r = .22, p = .08 \).

Overall, both parents' attachment dimensions appeared to correspond to their own and, as noted above, each other's marital satisfaction scores. Indeed, the marital satisfaction of one parent was strongly and positively correlated with the other parent's marital reports, \( r = .46, p = .001 \).

**Parent AAS dimensions and separation anxiety.** Parent AAS dimensions also were associated with separation anxiety, or their SECBASE and SAOTHER scores. Mothers' with high CLOSE dimension scores tended to report low SAOTHER scores, or anxiety about their adolescent distancing from them, \( r = -.20, p = .05 \). Also, while mothers' CLOSE scores did not correspond significantly with their own SECBASE scores, their association with fathers' SECBASE scores approached significance, \( r = .24, p = .10 \). That is, mothers who were comfortable in being close to others, appeared to worry less about their adolescents distancing or going to others for comfort, and had spouses who were reporting comfort in being available to their adolescents.

Mothers' with higher DEPEND scores were reporting lower separation anxiety from their adolescents on SAOTHER, \( r = -.40, p = .0001 \), and received higher attachment scores on the IPPA, \( r = .21, p = .09 \), along with higher cohesion scores, \( r = .24, p = .04 \). Also, the ANXIOUS dimension for mothers corresponded with the variable, SAOTHER, \( r = .21, p = .05 \). Mothers who reported high concern over abandonment or being unloved tended to report separation anxiety about their adolescents.
With separation anxiety, fathers' CLOSE scores were associated with his comfort in being available to his adolescent, $r = .34$, $p = .01$, while his DEPEND scores correlated negatively with his fear of his adolescent going to others for comfort, $r = -.29$, $p = .01$. Finally, fathers who reported high scores on ANXIOUS, like their wives, also tended to report more separation anxiety, for their adolescents, $r = .29$, $p = .01$, and lower comfort in being available as a secure base, or SECBASE for their adolescents, $r = -.31$, $p = .01$.

**Adolescent variables' associations with each other.** The adolescent variables of security of attachment, ATTACH and cohesion, FFAST, to mothers and fathers demonstrated several interesting associations (Table 2; also Table 4). First, for mothers', ATTACH and FFAST scores given by adolescents were strongly associated, $r = .65$, $p = .0001$, with mother ATTACH scores also corresponding with father ATTACH, $r = .41$, $p = .001$ and father FFAST, $r = .26$, $p = .05$, scores. For fathers of adolescents, their ATTACH and FFAST scores given by adolescents also corresponded, $r = .52$, $p = .0001$, with a further correspondence demonstrated between father FFAST scores and mother FFAST scores, $r = .43$, $p = .0001$.

**Parent variables and further points of interest with adolescent variables.** Of interest to adolescent variables, the mother dimension of DEPEND was positively related to both adolescent attachment reports and cohesion reports, with the cohesion report larger, $r = .24$, $p = .04$. Fathers' DEPEND dimension was not associated significantly with any adolescent report about him, instead it was negatively related to adolescents' reports of cohesion to mothers, $r = -.25$, $p = .09$. In other words, fathers who tended to report low DEPEND scores had adolescents who reported higher cohesion with their
mothers. The dimension of CLOSE, for both parents was not related to any adolescent variable. The ANXIOUS dimension, for fathers, was also of interest. ANXIOUS, beyond its relationships to other variables showed a moderately negative correlation to adolescents’ attachment reports on the IPPA, $r = -.35$, $p = .009$. This could be restated as, fathers who relayed higher scores on anxiety about being left or unloved, had adolescents who tended to report lower scores on their security of attachment. Additionally, the fathers’ ANXIOUS dimension was negatively associated with adolescents’ report of attachment security to their mothers, $r = -.24$, $p = .09$. Thus, for adolescents, mothers’ scores on DEPEND and fathers’ scores on ANXIOUS corresponded to adolescent attachment reports and cohesion scores.

Finally, mothers with higher MCLI scores, tended to have adolescents reporting higher attachment scores to both mothers and fathers, $r = .25$, $p = .05$ and $r = .25$, $p = .05$. For fathers also, adolescent reports of attachment security to both parents moderately and positively correlated to fathers’ marital satisfaction scores, with $r = .32$, $p = .02$ for fathers, and $r = .29$, $p = .03$ for mothers.

**Hypothesis two**

Prior to analysis using parent attachment styles, clustering of dimensions from the Adult Attachment Scale (AAS) of Collins and Read (1990) was done in the manner suggested by the authors. This clustering provided both categorical style 'scores', and continuous scores (for the dimensions). Cluster analyses resulted in the three categories, or attachment styles of secure (Style 1), avoidant (Style 2) and anxious (Style 3).
Parents' dimension scores (N=159) of CLOSE, DEPEND and ANXIOUS resulted in n=79 secure parents, n=40 avoidant parents, and n=40 anxious parents. The cluster analyses resulted overall in significant F's, with significant Scheffe's between several steps. See Table 5 for results.

The second hypothesis suggested that given parents with moderate to high marital satisfaction as measured by the MCLI, secure attachment style parents (Table 1) would report moderate separation anxiety as measured using the PASAS' scale SAOTHER. Avoidant and anxious style parents would give low and high scores, respectively. First, a subsample of parents was obtained who fit the criteria of moderate to high marital satisfaction. This criteria was determined by splitting the range of possible MCLI scores into thirds, i.e. 32 to 224 points, and using a score of 97 or higher as the moderate to high satisfaction subsample. Mean group differences between the three attachment styles and parent responses on SAOTHER were tested with ANOVA's. Parent styles were style 1 = secure parents, style 2 = avoidant parents, and style 3 = anxious parents. One-way ANOVA's for mothers or fathers revealed no significant overall model for mothers, with F(2,72)=2.3, p=.10 for mothers and F<1 for fathers. For mothers, a mean group difference did occur between secure mothers' and anxious mothers' SAOTHER scores, 54.3 and 60.7 respectively, p=.04, that supported the hypothesis' suggested direction.

Hypothesis three

Hypothesis three, one-way ANOVA's for mothers and then for fathers again tested mean group differences in considering the question of any differences in marital
Table 5. Parents' adult attachment styles and dimensions from cluster analysis of AAS: Mean scores on dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Attachment Style (Columns)</th>
<th>Secure Style 1</th>
<th>Avoidant Style 2</th>
<th>Anxious Style 3</th>
<th>F(2,156)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>23.93*</td>
<td>16.92*</td>
<td>19.20*</td>
<td>57.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPEND</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>14.40*</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIOUS</td>
<td>10.01*</td>
<td>11.45*</td>
<td>19.60*</td>
<td>135.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N's</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Denotes significantly different Scheffé at p < .05.
satisfaction and the three styles of parent attachment used above. ANOVA's resulted in significant group differences for fathers, $F(2,69)=3.91, p=.02$. Differences in marital satisfaction between secure style fathers, and anxious style fathers, 165.31 and 141.61 group means respectively, were particularly significant at $p=.006$. Marital satisfaction mean group differences for the avoidant style fathers or style 2 and the secure fathers $p=.08$, were 158.36 and 165.31, respectively. For mothers, ANOVA's demonstrated the relationship between attachment style and marital satisfaction using the MCLI, reporting $F(2,76)=2.89, p=.06$. A significant mean group difference appeared between secure style mothers and avoidant style mothers, $p=.04$, with group means 165.3 and 147.8, respectively. The mean group differences between the secure and anxious, mothers approached significance, $p=.06$, with group means 165.3 and 147.5 respectively. As can be seen from the means already given for avoidant and anxious mothers, 147.8 and 147.5 respectively, there was no significant difference in group means between the avoidant and anxious mothers on marital satisfaction scores.

**Hypothesis four**

For hypothesis four, ANOVA's again were used to test the relationship between mothers', then fathers' attachment styles, and the mean group scores of adolescent reports of cohesion to mothers and then fathers, using the FFAST (FAST survey facsimile). No significant mean group differences were found in either parent's analysis. Group means for each style were very close, such that $F$'s $<1$ for both parents. In other words, for
adolescents something other than a parent's attachment style is related to his or her reports of typical cohesion.

The second question hypothesis four considered was the association between adolescent cohesion reports and parents' SECBASE, or comfort in being available to their adolescents, and SAOTHER, or anxiety about adolescents distancing/going to others for comfort. Correlations between adolescent and parents' scores were calculated and showed no association with fathers' scores. Father SECBASE scores demonstrated $r = .24$, $p = .07$, with adolescent reports of cohesion to dads. For mothers, both SAOTHER and SECBASE demonstrated moderate associations with adolescent cohesion reports, in opposite directions, $r = -.32$, $p = .009$, and $r = .33$, $p = .006$, respectively. In other words, mothers who were reporting more anxiety about adolescents distancing tended to have adolescents who reported significantly lower cohesion scores, while mothers who reported higher comfort in being available to their adolescents tended to have adolescents who reported high cohesion scores.

**Hypothesis five**

In hypothesis five, adolescents' reports of cohesion to each parent, and their attachment security, using the IPPA, was tested. ANOVA's were used to consider the prediction that adolescents' higher scores on the IPPA would be related to high reports of cohesion to mothers, and then to fathers. Lower attachment scores were predicted to be related to varying cohesion scores, high and low. First cohesion scores were split into 3 groups, using the FAST's high, medium and low positions (cf. Gehring & Marti,
1993). These were converted to numerical scores, using the earlier mentioned methodology. Scores of 10.6 or greater comprised the high cohesion to parents group, with scores of $\geq 7.07$ and less than 10.6 defining the medium cohesion group, and scores of less than 7.07 comprising the low cohesion group. ANOVA's of mother scores, then father scores, were performed to test for mean group differences between high, medium and low cohesion groups. As predicted, findings were significant for both mother and father ANOVA's, with $F(2,75)=32.10$, $p<.001$ for mothers, and $F(2,71)=12.93$, $p<.001$ for fathers. The Least Means Squares test demonstrated significant mean differences for all three groups for each parent, with 98.54, 83.59, and 55.0, $p<.0001$ between high, medium and low cohesion groups reported for mothers, and 89.58, 81.5, and 62.6, $p<.02$ for high, medium and low cohesion groups for fathers. The standard error(s) between the high and medium groups were approximately equal for mother and father analyses, with much larger standard errors present in both sets of analyses in the low cohesion groups. The finding may reflect more variation in the low mother cohesion and low father cohesion as predicted.

**Hypothesis six**

Hypothesis six predicted adult attachment styles 1, 2 and 3 (secure, avoidant, anxious) would relate significantly to adolescent reports of attachment security on the IPPA. Secure style parents were suggested to have adolescents who were reporting significantly higher IPPA scores than adolescents of avoidant or anxious style parents. ANOVA's were performed, and demonstrated no overall significance for father styles,
nor any mean group differences. For mothers, no overall significance was reported. There was a mean group difference seen between secure style mothers and anxious style mothers on their adolescents' attachment scores, 92.2 for secure style mothers and 83.8 for anxious style mothers, $p = .09$. So for this sample, adolescents with secure style mothers tended to report more attachment security on the IPPA than adolescents with anxious style mothers.

**Hypothesis seven**

Gender differences between parents' measures and adolescent measures was the focus of predictions and analyses in question seven. Adolescents' reports of typical cohesion to each parent were tested with repeated measures' ANOVA's. Mothers' versus fathers' SECBASE and SAOTHER scores for their adolescent, along with mothers' versus fathers' marital satisfaction scores were also analyzed with repeated measures. Adolescents' cohesion scores for fathers versus mothers, was significant, $F(1,75) = 4.69$, $p = .03$. Mean cohesion to fathers was significantly lower than mean cohesion to mothers, with group means 9.3 and 9.7, respectively. This was in the predicted direction. Analyses of mothers' versus fathers' fear of their adolescents' distancing, SAOTHER, revealed no differences between parents, $F < 1$. There was a significant difference revealed for mothers versus fathers comfort in being available or secure base for their adolescents, SECBASE, $F(1,61) = 12.51$, $p = .0008$. Fathers reported significantly lower mean SECBASE scores than mothers, means 56.04 and 58.46, respectively. The third repeated measures ANOVA analyzed mothers' versus fathers' marital satisfaction using
the MCLI. Marital satisfaction experience, as reported by the parents in this sample, did not 
demonstrate any significant difference between fathers and mothers, with $F < 1$, with 
group means almost equal, 157.5 for fathers and 157.3 for mothers.

The fourth gender question in hypothesis seven considered parental differences in 
separation anxiety scores on the SECBASE and SAOTHER scales for parents of 
adolescent boys versus girls. There was no difference in SAOTHER between parents of 
adolescent boys versus girls, however there was a significant finding for SECBASE, 
$F(1,72) = 5.09, p = .02$. Fathers of adolescent girls reported significantly higher comfort 
in being available as a secure base than did fathers of adolescent boys, means 57.7 and 
54.3 respectively. There were no differences for mothers.

Adolescents, as mentioned earlier, reported on their intentions to move out or stay 
within the parental home within the coming year. This variable called MOVEOIT, was 
now used to ascertain if the previous analyses of parents' SAOTHER and SECBASE 
scores were biased by particular adolescent plans and their parents' current experiences. 
ANOVA's were done with the mothers and fathers' SECBASE and SAOTHER scores 
and the variable MOVEOIT. There were no significant mean group differences for 
fathers or mothers by MOVEOIT for either SECBASE or SAOTHER, leading to the 
conclusion that for this group, particular adolescent reports of plans did not effect mother 
or father reports of separation anxiety from their adolescent.

Two differences were revealed in analyses, and these were related to adolescent 
cohesion scores and parent attachment dimensions. First, adolescents reported significant 
mean group differences, by gender, in father cohesion scores. Adolescent girls gave their
fathers significantly lower cohesion scores than did their male counterparts, \( F(1,74)=4.03, \ p= .04 \). Group means were, for girls and boys respectively, 8.93 and 9.74. The second significant group difference was found for the parent attachment dimension of CLOSE, with mothers of adolescent girls reporting significantly higher mean scores than mothers of adolescent boys, \( F(1,83)=4.16, \ p=.04 \). There were no other significant mean group differences in this sample, giving the assurance that, in general, the adolescents in this sample had more similarities than differences in adolescent and parent responses for both males and females.

Other gender analyses were done at this time to consider any further differences in the reports of adolescents and their parents by gender. Analyses demonstrated for adolescent males and females in this sample no mean group differences in their attachment (ATTACH) to mothers or fathers, using the IPPA, \( F=1.0 \). The sex of adolescent did not describe any group differences in parents' responses to marital satisfaction as measured by the MCLI, with \( F<1 \) for boys and girls. There was a similar lack of group differences for the adult attachment style dimensions CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIOUS for both parents. Also, there were no gender differences in cohesion scores to mothers. In general, there were few mean response differences by gender.

**Hypothesis eight**

The final prediction suggested a pattern of relationships between adult attachment styles, marital satisfaction, and parental separation anxiety that would affect adolescent reports of cohesion to the parent(s). (See Figure 1.) To test this, multiple linear
regressions (MR's) were performed, regressing adolescent cohesion scores onto, in order, recoded secure, avoidant and anxious AAS attachment styles, marital satisfaction reports from the MCLI, and parental separation anxiety scales SECBASE and SAOTHER. The ordering of the variables for inclusion followed an attachment theory orientation and used hierarchical regression (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Attachment styles, as the operationalization of working models were expected to most importantly impact parents' relationships with their adolescents, and thus were entered first, followed by the MCLI as the parental relationship that could importantly affect how a parent responds to the adolescent. Lastly, the current experience of a parent's fear of separation from their adolescent was entered. The analyses when performed for fathers and mothers revealed no overall significant series of MR's, nor was any step significant for the mothers, or fathers, F's < 1. Attachment style dimensions, the raw information that the parent styles were derived from were substituted for styles, and appeared to improve the overall R-squared's, but the MR's and steps remained non-significant.

A final series of regressions were done to test any other statistical relationships between cohesion and the mother and father variables. With no a priori predictions, a stepwise approach, listing all variables, was used. Attachment styles and dimensions were put in alternately to not duplicate information. Using the stepwise technique on parent variables, two different stepwise patterns emerged for mothers and fathers (Table 6). For fathers, the stepwise MR that approached significance was one with just the variable SECBASE added. When SECBASE was regressed onto adolescent reports of cohesion to fathers, 5% of the variance in cohesion was accounted for, F(1,49)=3.07,
Table 6. Stepwise regression statistics for mother and father variables with adolescent cohesion as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Added</th>
<th>$E$ for Step</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$ of Increment</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$E$ of Full Model</th>
<th>$p$ Value of Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SECBASE</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SAOTHER</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MCLI</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers $n = 61$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SECBASE</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MCLI</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ANXIOUS</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fathers $n = 51$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( p = .08 \). Other steps included the addition of father's marital satisfaction, the MCLI at step two, with an \( R \)-squared of .07, \( F(2,48) = 1.98, p = .15 \) and father's attachment dimension of ANXIOUS put in at step three, giving a unique contribution of 2% to the \( R \)-squared, \( F(3,47) = 1.56, p = .21 \). Further steps resulted in even smaller increases in \( R \)-squared, with \( F \)'s < 1.

For mothers, a significant stepwise series of MR's occurred (Table 6). The first variable placed in the regression by the stepwise technique was also SECBASE. This was significant, \( F(1,60) = 8.68 \) at \( p = .0004 \), with 12% of the variability of adolescent cohesion to mothers' accounted for by her SECBASE score. The second and third steps in the MR's were also very significant, with the SAOTHER variable put in at step two, \( F(2,59) = 9.87, p = .0002 \), giving an \( R \)-squared of .25. The unique contributions of both SECBASE and SAOTHER in step two were both very significant, \( p = .0006 \) and \( p = .003 \), respectively. Mothers' marital satisfaction scores was entered third. Mothers' MCLI scores accounted uniquely for another 4% of the variance, with the three variable multiple linear regression series showing an \( R \)-squared of .29, and still testing as significant, \( F(3,58) = 7.91, p = .0002 \). Again, SECBASE and SAOTHER's \( \beta \)'s were significant, \( p = .0001 \) and \( p = .0008 \), with the MCLI's unique contribution almost significant, \( p = .07 \). Further steps provided no real improvement in the \( R \)-squareds. Thus, the use of a stepwise MR procedure to regress parent variables onto adolescent cohesion reports, resulted in two differently ordered MR's for fathers and mothers. For fathers, only their comfort in being available as secure bases to their adolescents contributed almost significantly to the adolescents' reports of cohesion to fathers. For
mothers, on the other hand, comfort in being available to their adolescents, along with anxiety about adolescents’ distancing/going to others for felt security, and marital satisfaction on the MCLI accounted for almost 30% of the variability of their adolescents' cohesion reports. With respect to the parent variables measured and their predicted relationship to adolescent cohesion, there appears to be different patterns for father and mother variables.

**Conclusion of Results**

To summarize, the findings indicated a variety of significant correlations and mean group differences between parent relationship variables and adolescent scores on relationship measures. Gender differences between adolescent males and females were generally few, although some were present. Parents demonstrated a few significant scores by gender. Finally, the hypothesized pattern of relationships between parents' variables and adolescent cohesion did not show any significance for mothers or fathers. Additional regression statistics identified different orderings, for fathers and mothers, of variables added in stepwise MR’s. The mothers' three step MR’s were significant, \( p = .0002 \) with variables of SECBASE, SAOTHER and MCLI scores put in respectively. The fathers’ series of regressions, however, accounted for little variability in adolescent cohesion reports, with only the first step of SECBASE approaching significance, \( p = .08 \). In sum, considerable associations between parent and adolescent variables were identified, along with some differences in associations by parent and adolescent gender.
CHAPTER V
Discussion

As adolescents and their parents prepare to deal with graduation from high school and subsequent changes, several exploratory variables of mothers, fathers, and adolescents have been considered. Attachment theory, along with some family systems views, provides a useful way to look at these variables and both parent-to-parent associations and parent-to-adolescent associations. Additionally, gender similarities and differences are of interest, along with a proposed pattern of associations between parent variables and adolescent cohesion. In sum, the findings may provide further information on parent-adolescent relationships at this important time of change for adolescents and their mothers and fathers.

The discussion of the findings will be presented in five parts. Part one will discuss measurement considerations in the study, focusing on two areas, the adult attachment style measure, and the adolescent cohesion measure, the FAST or here the FFAST. Parts two and three will examine the associations found between parent variables, and associations between parent-adolescent variables, while part four will focus briefly on significant gender differences. Finally, part five will discuss the proposed and alternate models of the contribution of parent variables to adolescent cohesion scores.
Measurement discussion

The Adult Attachment Scale, or AAS

Prior to discussing the findings on the AAS with parents, a review and consideration of the value of the instrument’s categories versus dimensions is in order.

Adults appear to have working models of attachment and these seem to be related in a consistent manner to the same categories of attachment often reported in the literature for infants and children (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). These categories are secure, insecure avoidant/dismissive, or insecure anxious/preoccupied. Also, for adults, characteristic differences have been found between the three categories and adult behaviors in relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Using the AAS, the three categories can be obtained and appear reliable. Thus, working models of attachment in adults appear to be measurable and give the same categories found for infants and children.

Lastly, the AAS provides dimensions of attachment or CLOSE, DEPEND and ANXIOUS that allow for more description of individual differences and may provide a richer picture of these than the categories. The dimensions may really be more reflective of the range of attachment behaviors and feelings that occur within each attachment category. Indeed, the AAS’ placement of adults into secure, avoidant or anxious categories, is done by clustering the three dimensions. (See Table 5.) This point is of interest for the current study. A number of correlates emerged with the parent dimension scores that appeared to often provide clearer information about significant associations than the one-way analyses of variances provided. For example, with attachment style and marital satisfaction as measured by the MCLI, hypothesis two predicted correctly that
secure style parents would report higher MCLI scores. However, the correlations between the dimensions that comprised the three styles and the MCLI scores, gave a picture of more individual differences than the ANOVA could. Thus, the dimension scores came to be of more interest than the attachment style categories, and will be a focus in the following discussions.

The Family System Test, or the FAST and the FFAST

The use of the FAST (Gehring & Marti, 1993) in the present study involved some alteration of the original. Given this, further discussion of the rationale and the reliability of the scores used for the general analyses is needed. Several additional points of interest regarding the FAST will also be noted.

In this study, the FAST measured cohesion perceived by an adolescent to each parent separately. As an instrument, the FAST provided a quick and easy way to obtain cohesion results, and one which reported reasonable reliability and validity (Gehring & Feldman, 1988).

The FAST provided a good way to measure cohesion, and obtain data, using an adjustment of its administration, or the FFAST (facsimile FAST). This became important given the data collection procedure of an anonymous mailing. Before adjusting it to a survey instrument, how the FAST measured the construct cohesion was considered. In the FAST administration with figures on a board, the cohesion part of the test is basically a 2-dimensional procedure. The primary task of the test taker is to place a representation of self and his or her parent(s) on a matrix of squares. The important result obtained and
scored from the administration, is a measurement of distance between squares on the matrix. If similar representations of adolescents and their parents within a like matrix could be maintained, resulting in measurable distances, the integrity of the test would seem intact. Thus, the facsimile was devised to maximize similarities to the original FAST. See Appendix A. Different colored dots, labelled MOM, DAD, and YOU were included with instructions to place dots within squares on a matrix that replicated the original FAST board. These dots were of a comparable size to the matrix's squares as the figures are to the FAST board’s squares.

To ensure that the facsimile or the FFAST was indeed measuring the same construct as the original, a series of face-to-face administrations of the original were given to adolescent volunteers from the survey respondents. Over half (55.5%) of the adolescent sample participated in the administration. Correlations between the original FAST, and the survey responses were quite high, \( r = .97 \) for mother cohesion reports, and \( r = .98 \) for father reports. This high level of correspondence resulted in confidence that the FFAST scores were reflecting the same cohesion measurement that the FAST obtained. The survey responses, which had a larger \( n \) than the original FAST were then used with comfort that these indeed were reliable cohesion scores.

A second consideration in the use of the FAST was the scoring. As discussed in the instrument section there are two ways to score the FAST, one by using a number score, and two by using a categorical score. The number score was chosen for its quantitative score, and for the increased sensitivity of cohesion that it might give. This was supported by the researcher's experiences in the face-to-face administrations. Many
adolescents often showed ambivalence between a diagonal and a horizontal/vertical square placement, with one or both parents. The quantitative score, as discussed in the instrument section clearly reflects this and was thus felt to impart important cohesion information. Quantitative scoring becomes difficult when the hierarchical part of the FAST is also given. However, this was not an issue here and the numerical scoring was felt to be superior.

Another point of interest, and supporting the FFAST scores obtained, is related to the FFAST means. Mother and father means for this sample of high school seniors compared favorably with means from a study reported by Gehring and Feldman in 1988. They reported early to middle adolescent mean FAST scores to parents which demonstrated a trend of lessened cohesion as adolescent age increased. This trend, suggested and supported by Olson’s circumplex family systems model (Olson, Russell & Sprenkle, 1983; Olson, 1986), was found and noted by Gehring and Feldman (1988) in support of the validity of their obtained cohesion scores. The current sample’s scores fall in line with their scores. The mean cohesion score for Gehring and Feldman’s early adolescents (mean age 11.4) to their parents was 10.32, while the mean score for middle adolescents (mean age 16.2) was reported as 10.07. There was a significant difference in scores for the 267 adolescents in their study. The 78 adolescents in this study (mean age 17.5) reported FFAST scores of 9.7 for mothers and 9.3 for fathers. This continued downward trend supports the suggestion that the current study’s FFAST scores are representative of older adolescents.
The FFAST, in summary, has evidenced good reliability and effectiveness in measuring cohesion between adolescents and their parents (Gehring & Feldman, 1988), and even adapted to a survey facsimile still reports scores that appear to reflect cohesion for adolescents. The Family System Test's facsimile is additionally quick and easy to give, with scoring available that appears to sensitively reflect an adolescent's cohesion feelings. As such, with further testing, it may prove to be a useful tool in future research where quick, reliable and easy 2-dimensional instruments are needed. One caveat needs to be noted. The cohesion part of the FAST adapted well due to its 2-dimensional aspect. However, the hierarchical component of the FAST requires a 3-dimensional manipulation that is beyond a 2-dimensional survey measure. Similarly quantitative scoring was optimal for this research, when more family members and/or hierarchy are to be considered, it may not be.

**Discussion of Parent Variables**

**Theoretical review**

The following discussion considers variables from attachment theory, and a systems perspective. An important point to remember for attachment is the organization of attachment into internal working models, or mental representations of attachment. These become useful in considering both adolescent and adult relationships (Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

In adults, working models have been suggested to include a general, or "default model", along with more specific models that develop as a person ages and experiences specific relationships (Collins & Read, in press). The organization of these is suggested
to comprise a hierarchy of interconnected working models, with the highest model, the
"default model" corresponding to "the most general representations about people and the
self, abstracted from a history of relationship experiences with caretakers and peers" (in
press, p. 7). These "default working models" include expectations of others, self-in-
relationships, beliefs (like felt security), and strategies for obtaining attachment needs.
For adults, there may also be current attachment relationship(s) that result in some
adjustment, or perhaps relationship specific changes in their working models at lower
levels in this suggested hierarchy of working models (Collins & Read, in press). More
positive or more negative life experiences are seen also to be related to adjustme nt(s) in
adult working models (Latty-Mann, 1993).

Additionally, working models are related to characteristic patterns of behaviors,
beliefs and attitudes. For example, Collins and Read (1990) found that secure adults
believed people to be generally trustworthy, reliable and helpful, while avoidant style
people reported a low opinion of human nature. Anxious style people reported that
human beings were complex and very difficult to understand, and reported that personal
relationships were usually beyond their control (1990; Collins & Read, in press). Hazan
and Shaver (1987) reported securely categorized adults perceived themselves as well-
liked, and reported fewer self-doubts than either avoidant or anxious adults.
Characteristic behaviors and strategies to meet relationship goals have been found to
include, for secure style adults, comfort with a balance between closeness and autonomy
(Collins & Read, 1990). For avoidant style adults, a general distancing form and even
discounting of relationships is reported. With anxious attachment style adults,
characteristic strategies, and behaviors are reported to include a pre-occupation with the relationship, with over-closeness often present.

Finally, working models have also been suggested to include affective patterns, with Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) reporting attachment patterns showing relationships with problems with warmth. Kobak & Sceery (1988) have additionally suggested that attachment may indeed be a model of affective regulation, with individual differences in attachment style relating to variations in affective regulation and emotional expression.

Using this picture for adults’ working models of attachment, this study’s parent variables’ association with each other and with their adolescent variables are reasonable and not unexpected within attachment theory. The associations reported in the findings also appear to support a family systems approach.

Parent attachment dimensions and marital satisfaction on the MCLI

First, dimensions as reported in the findings support the notion that they are representative of the characteristic patterns of adults’ working models of attachments. For example, generally mothers (Table 3) who reported comfort in closeness (CLOSE) and ease in relying on others (DEPEND) in relationships, along with low concern (ANXIOUS) over being abandoned were reporting high marital quality. In addition, these women tended to have spouses who were also reporting comfort in relying on others (DEPEND), and tended to feel comfortable with closeness (CLOSE). A similar and even stronger pattern is present for fathers. Fathers who were reporting positive
marital quality on the MCLI, also tended to report comfort in relying on others (DEPEND), tended to be comfortable with closeness (CLOSE), and were reporting a strong lack of concern over being abandoned (ANXIOUS).

For fathers, in particular, their wives' dimensions of CLOSE, DEPEND and ANXIOUS were all associated, some more strongly than fathers' own dimensions, to men's marital satisfaction report (Table 2 or Table 3). Fathers', with wives comfortable with closeness (CLOSE), relying upon others (DEPEND), and who were not concerned about abandonment (ANXIOUS), were reporting positive marital quality. Mothers, too, were affected by their spouses' attachment dimensions. In particular, mothers whose spouses' reported low anxiety about abandonment, tended to give high marital satisfaction scores.

Putting this into general terms, for this group of parents, their attachment dimension scores, or measured characteristics of their working models, were generally significantly associated with their reported experience of the marriage. Additionally, mothers' and fathers' individual attachment dimensions appeared to be involved with the other spouse's reported experiences of the marriage, with more secure patterns of dimensions for one spouse often reflecting more secure patterns by the other spouse. Other research suggests that secure men are often found to be in higher functioning couples (Cohn, Silver, Cowan, Cowan & Pearson, 1992).

The dimensions may additionally be reflecting differences in gender roles, with women often socialized to be more responsible for the marital relationship and its emotional well-being than men (Scott & Alwin, 1989). Also, women have been found
to have different expectations of marriage, expecting more intimacy and emotional support, than men (Williams, 1988). Perhaps, a component of women's greater involvement in men's marital quality scores and men's ANXIOUS dimension in women's marital scores represents her great responsibility in the relationship. More research in this area is needed.

Parent marital satisfaction, and the PASAS scales

Further, parents' reports of marital quality were associated with separation anxiety about their adolescents, using PASAS scales of SECBASE and SAOTHER. The SECBASE scale reports parents' comfort in remaining available as secure bases to their adolescents, while SAOTHER reflects the parents' anxiety about adolescents' distancing or going to others for comfort.

For mothers, marital quality was negatively related to anxiety about their adolescents going to others' for comfort/attachment needs (SAOTHER). When a mother's reported marital quality scores were higher, she tended to report lower SAOTHER scores. Perhaps for mothers, her perceptions of marital quality appeared to affect her worry about her adolescent separating, with higher marital quality related to lower concern about adolescent distancing (SAOTHER). For fathers, a similar picture emerged. Additionally for them, marital quality scores were positively related to their comfort in being available to their adolescents as secure bases (SECBASE). The higher a father's marital satisfaction report on the MCLI, the more comfort he tended to report in 'being there' for his adolescent.
One possible interpretation of these findings uses some attachment constructs. Parents' working models, developed from their own experiences with caretakers may provide a lens through which subsequent important relationships, both with spouses, and their adolescents would be interpreted. First, parents' characteristic comfort with closeness (CLOSE), relying on others (DEPEND) and low levels of worry over abandonment (ANXIOUS), may lead to higher marital quality. Then, perhaps when parents perceive satisfying attachment relationships with their spouses, concern for their adolescents' separating is lessened. These parents, as a result of their ability to trust others including their spouse, may have more trust that an adolescent will still be available to them, with less anxiety about that adolescent going to others for attachment needs.

The view that parental relationship experiences over time developing into characteristic patterns of expectations of others, including one's children, and characteristic patterns of responses may be further supported as the parents' ANXIOUS dimension is viewed for associations with PASAS scales of SAOTHER and SECBASE. For both parents, their worry over abandonment or being unloved (ANXIOUS), was related to separation anxiety from their adolescents. Characteristic anxious behaviors/strategies to meet attachment goals, as noted above, include over-closeness, feeling out-of-control in relationships with a sense of complexity and unpredictability of others in relationships (Collins & Read, 1990; in press). It is then not surprising that both parents' ANXIOUS scores were found to be positively associated to their anxiety about their adolescents going to others for comfort (SAOTHER). For fathers, too, the
ANXIOUS dimension was negatively associated with his comfort in being available as a secure base (SECBASE) to his adolescent. In other words, the more anxious characteristics a father reported, the less comfortable he was reporting himself as being available to his adolescent. For mothers, interestingly this was not significant although the small association present was in the same direction as fathers. Again, this may be related to her being a woman, where the importance of the role of mothering is great and may predominate in some ways over characteristic default (or general family of origin) working model patterns (Williams, 1988).

The attachment model, then, provides a useful way by using working models, to explain characteristic patterns of interactions of parents. It suggests that parents who characteristically report comfort in closeness (CLOSE) and relying on others (DEPEND), while stating little concern over abandonment (ANXIOUS), appear to perceive their relationships with spouses and adolescents in more positive ways than those who are less comfortable with closeness, and relying on others, while tending to worry about abandonment.

Parent variables with adolescent variables

The parent variables showed definite correspondence not only with each other, but also with the adolescent variables. The adolescent variables, first, also showed strong correlations with each other. Adolescents' scores of how securely attached they were to each parent (ATTACH) using the IPPA, were closely associated with how cohesive adolescents reported themselves to their parents on the FFAST (Table 4). Additionally,
as systemic interactions suggest (Gjerde, 1986), the adolescents' attachment scores for each parent were usually associated to the other parent's score. In other words, it appears that there is some relationship for each parent on the reports of cohesion and attachment security that an adolescent gives to the other parent.

Also, the very strength of the association between the FFAST and the ATTACH score, considering the differences in measures, i.e. the FFAST is a visual and spatial score, may demonstrate that some important adolescent characteristic has indeed been tapped. Attachment relationships do have an affective component in their signaling for comfort. Perhaps then, some of the typical emotional tone of the parent-adolescent relationship may also tap some of the attachment relationship's affective tone.

Several parent attachment dimensions also demonstrated associations with adolescent variables that appear to provide more knowledge about parent working models' relationships to adolescent cohesion and attachment reports. These follow.

**Adolescent cohesion and parent DEPEND dimension.** First, the DEPEND dimension for parents appeared to be the only one that correlated with adolescent cohesion reports (Table 2). For adolescents and their mothers, mothers' report of comfort in relying on others (DEPEND) was positively associated with adolescent cohesion reports, while fathers' low comfort in relying on others (DEPEND) tended to be related to higher adolescent reports of cohesion to mothers. Fathers' cohesion scores, on the other hand, appeared to be completely unrelated to their own or mothers' DEPEND dimensions. One interpretation of this is again related to gender differences. A woman's socialization to be responsible for the emotional well-being of relationships
in addition to the great importance often found in the role of motherhood for women (Scott & Alwin, 1989; Williams, 1988) may impact her DEPEND score while father's DEPEND score is not similarly affected. This interpretation may also relate to why adolescents with fathers who tend to feel low comfort in relying on others, have mothers to whom they tend to feel close.

**Adolescent attachment (ATTACH) and parent dimensions.** Once again, the parent dimension of DEPEND for mothers was positively associated with adolescent attachment reports. Once again for mothers, a father dimension, here ANXIOUS, correlated with adolescent reports of attachment to their mothers. Adolescents who reported positive attachment to their mothers, had mothers who appeared to be comfortable in relying on others, with husbands who appeared to not worry about abandonment or being unloved. It may be the case that in families with more anxious fathers, who may display overclose behaviors, mothers' may be perceived by adolescents as less available to them. This needs further study.

For fathers, the dimension of ANXIOUS corresponded to not only their wives' attachment scores from adolescents, but also their own scores. Fathers' worry about abandonment was associated with adolescents' lower reports of attachment to fathers. The characteristics of fear of abandonment for fathers, with often related behaviors of overcloseness, may be related to how comfortable an adolescent was in soliciting closeness for felt security. Mothers' ANXIOUS scores did not associate significantly with adolescent attachment security. However, a similar direction to fathers' scores was apparent. For mothers, the importance of her role as a mother, may in some manner
impact her ANXIOUS scores and an adolescent's feeling comfortable in going to her as for comfort (Scott & Alwin, 1989).

Overall, for parents', secure style working models which characteristically show behaviors of comfort in closeness to others and belief in the general trustworthiness of people, appear to be related to enhance adolescents' perceptions of parents as available and comforting.

Parent marital satisfaction and adolescent attachment

Mothers' and fathers' marital quality or satisfaction, have been seen to be significantly associated with a number of parent factors. They also appear to be important as a relationship variable to consider for adolescents.

Adolescent attachment reports to each parent were significantly and positively associated with both mothers' and fathers' reports of marital satisfaction. There were no associations however between parents' satisfaction and adolescent cohesion. Perhaps, more enduring relationship qualities were tapped here between the parents and adolescents. For adolescents, their attachment scores to each parent originated, by definition, from their mental representations, or working models of their relationships with each parent. For parents, their marital satisfaction appears to be significantly associated with their attachment styles, through the variety of significant associations present between parent dimensions and MCLI scores (Table 3). So, in this study, parents' marital satisfaction appears to importantly correspond to their adolescents'
perceptions of parental availability and attachment security, while at the same time parents' marital reports significantly relate to attachment dimensions of both parents.

**Parent separation anxiety and adolescent attachment**

Finally, parents' current perceptions of pending separation from their adolescents were significantly associated with adolescent attachment reports to fathers and mothers. This experience, as discussed previously, appears to be related to parental working models, with dimensions relaying characteristic strategies and behavior response tendencies (Collins & Read, in press). Fathers who reported high CLOSE and low ANXIOUS scores also tended to report comfort in being available to their adolescents (SECBASE). Fathers who gave low DEPEND dimension reports and had high ANXIOUS dimension scores, appeared to also worry about adolescents going to others for attachment needs (SAOTHER). These fathers had lower marital satisfaction scores and had adolescents reporting lower attachment scores. An interpretation of this, fathers with more comfort in being a secure base for their adolescents appeared to have adolescents who were reporting higher attachment scores. Moreover, fathers' comfort in being available to their adolescents, was associated with mothers' attachment scores by adolescents and adolescent reports of cohesion to their mothers. So fathers' comfort and ease in being a secure base for his adolescent and his report of marital satisfaction, appears related to both mothers and adolescents in families.

Mothers' separation anxiety scores were more straightforward, and not related to father scores. Adolescents, whose mothers who were comfortable providing
security/being available to their adolescents for attachment needs (SECBASE), reported higher cohesion with their mothers. These mothers also tended to have adolescents who had higher attachment scores. On the other hand, mothers who were worried about their adolescents going to others for comfort (SAOTHER), tended to have much lower cohesion and attachment scores from their adolescents. An interpretation of this involves mothers' attachment dimensions and their significant associations with SAOTHER. Mothers who reported high concern about adolescents' distancing-going to others for comfort, tended also to report very low comfort in relying on others (DEPEND), low comfort in being close to others (CLOSE), and greater worries about being unloved or abandoned (ANXIOUS). They tended, additionally, to report lower marital satisfaction. The patterning of the characteristics is reminiscent of an anxious working model (Collins & Read, 1990; in press), at least in relationship to pending adolescent separation. Anxious style models tend to include behaviors of overcloseness, feelings of lack of understanding and beliefs that relationships are not really controllable. Such a pattern might indeed lead to interactions with an adolescent that would result in lower cohesion and reduced comfort in going to that person for attachment needs. Also, an adolescent's normative movement/affinity towards peer relationships (Newman & Newman, 1986) might conflict with such a parent's anxious style behaviors.

In conclusion, mental representations of attachment operationalized in this study by attachment dimensions, provide a helpful way to consider and interpret relationship variables between parents and adolescents, in addition to providing insight into relationships between mothers' and fathers' attachment dimensions.
Gender differences

It became obvious that there were differences for mothers and fathers in this study. One interpretation of these differences could be socialized relationship/parental roles (Scott & Alwin, 1989; Williams, 1988; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Research repeatedly reports mothers as closer to adolescents than fathers (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Analyses of cohesion in this study resulted in a similar finding. Both adolescent boys and girls reported their mothers as closer than their fathers. Additionally, girls have often reported fathers to be less close to them than their male counterparts, and this once again occurred with this sample. At the same time and supporting previous research (Larson & Lowe, 1990), although daughter mean cohesion scores to fathers were significantly lower than mean cohesion scores to mothers, reported father cohesion was still relatively high. Mothers were found to be significantly more comfortable than fathers in being available to their adolescents, which is congruent with adolescent reports, and current literature about a woman's experience as a mother (Alwin & Scott, 1989; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Interestingly, even with daughters reporting their fathers as less cohesive than their mothers, fathers of adolescent girls were reporting themselves more comfortable being available to their daughters than their sons. This may be related to different expectations by a parent, of a daughter's than a son's pathway to adulthood, and that parent's perception of the daughter's need for parent availability (Waterman, 1982).

Finally, mothers of daughters reported significantly higher CLOSE scores than mothers of sons. In other words, mothers with female high school seniors reported
feeling more comfort in closeness in relationships. Perhaps mothers with daughters, who also probably have been socialized to consider relationships and their well-being important (Williams, 1988), have had more opportunity to experience closeness with daughters in the home. Daughters may indeed provide more opportunities for closeness than their male counterparts.

Importantly, for adolescents there were really few differences in scores by gender. This suggests that for adolescents, their relationship experiences as measured by the present variables were more similar than different.

In conclusion, for mothers and fathers, differences were apparent in several of the associations of relationship variables between each other and their adolescents. One suggested interpretation of these differences is different gender expectations and experiences for parents which suggests both different roles in relationships for women than men (Williams, 1988), and different levels of importance for mothers than fathers with their children (Scott & Alwin, 1989). For adolescents, there were a few differences present, but more similarities. Gender role socializations may also be used to explain these.

**Adolescent cohesion regressed onto parent variables**

The original predicted pattern of parent attachment style, marital satisfaction, and separation anxiety regressed onto adolescent cohesion was not significant (Figure 1). However, the associations of attachment dimensions with the other variables and each other were found to be significant. Additionally, marital satisfaction appeared to be
associated with adolescent variables along with other parental variables, including parents' separation anxiety. One possible reason for this lack of a significant pattern involves remembering first, the various associations between the attachment dimensions (sometimes different for fathers and mothers), and the other variables. Then it can be noted that while significant correlations occurred between attachment dimensions and other parent variables, often the other parent variables (MCLI and SECBASE/SAOTHER) were the ones showing significant correspondence to adolescent scores. One possible interpretation suggests that attachment dimensions may not demonstrate effects on adolescent cohesion. A working model sifts information, provides interpretation for current experiences from past experiences with important others, but itself may not be have a direct impact on certain outcomes. Instead, attachment working models, operationalized in this study as styles or the dimensions of CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIOUS, provide characteristic strategies to attain attachment goals, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors (Collins & Read, in press). As such, the effect of attachment style may not be apparent even if it is contributing to other variables. For this group it was not found related to adolescent reports of typical cohesion. So although the parents' attachment dimensions had significant associations with other study variables, they did not contribute to adolescent cohesion in the manner suggested. The pattern of relationships between variables appears instead to be more complex and needs further consideration.

Two alternate regression patterns emerged when stepwise MR’s were used to regress all parent variables onto adolescent cohesion. These MR’s (Table 6) are different
for mothers and fathers, although aspects of parental separation anxiety (SECBASE and SAOTHER) were significant along with marital satisfaction. One possible interpretation of the different stepwise regression results would be compatible with the notion that gender socialization may be involved in the differences in relationship experiences reported by mothers and fathers. They additionally seem to point to confirmation that adolescent cohesion is most directly effected by relationship variables reflective of more current experiences in the home. In other words, both parents’ experiences of pending separation from their adolescents appear to be contributing the most, and for mothers in particular, to adolescent reports of cohesion to parents, while marital satisfaction, is next. Current experiences in relationships may be contributing significantly to adolescent cohesion, while more stable relationship variables, like marital quality follow. Parent attachment working models may instead participate, at least for this sample, in other ways that affect adolescents. In all, more research is needed to determine what the relationships (or path) actually is between these variables.

**Conclusion of chapter**

The above discussion has highlighted, a number of interesting associations between parent and adolescent relationship variables. For adolescents, their parents' reports of marital satisfaction, appeared to be significantly associated with adolescents' perceptions of their attachment security to parents, confirming Belsky's findings with young children and their families (Belsky, 1984). Further, adolescent reports of attachment security and cohesion showed significant correspondence with parents' attachment dimensions, DEPEND for mothers and ANXIOUS for fathers. Also, parental
separation anxiety for their adolescents appeared to be of significance in adolescents' reports of cohesion to each parent with some differences in cohesion, depending upon the parent.

One suggested interpretation of some mother and father differences in the current data involved gender differences between parents. Adolescent reports of mother cohesion and attachment showed somewhat different associations than those for fathers, with each parent showing correspondence in their scores to the other parent's scores. In addition, regressing parent variables onto adolescent cohesion resulted again in a somewhat different statistical pattern for mothers versus fathers. Adolescents reported more cohesion in general to mothers, while mothers expressed a different pattern of separation anxiety than fathers. Differences for women from men in the responsibilities and expectations for relationships (Williams, 1988), along with the different weight and importance that women are culturally given in the mother role (Scott & Alwin, 1989), were suggested as possible explanations. More research in the area is indicated.

Attachment working models operationalized by attachment styles or dimensions appeared to be a concept strongly supported by the associations found between the adult variables. Several patterns reflective of secure, avoidant and anxious categories reported in the literature were identified and corresponded to each other as previous work and theory suggested.

Several measurement issues were also presented. One, in particular, discussed the use of a successful adaptation of the study's cohesion measure, the FAST. The adaptation or the FFAST, provided excellent reliability with the original and additionally,
was able to be included in a mailed survey, thus increasing responses and ease of administration.

Finally, various significant findings do appear to expand the current knowledge of parent and adolescent relationships at the time a high school senior is preparing to graduate.
CHAPTER VI

Summary

The general goals for the present study included explorations of associations between parent variables and parent-adolescent variables to increase knowledge about the parent-adolescent relationship at the point when adolescents are high school seniors and preparing to graduate. Also, gender differences and patterns of association between parent-adolescent variables were of interest in this exploratory research. A number of significant associations between parent and adolescent variables were identified and interpreted using attachment theory. Some family systems' ideas were used to allow a way to view the possible effects of dyadic variables on a third family member, while acknowledging the incredible complexity of family interactions and the subsequent difficulty in ascribing any direction between these. The major associations/findings are summarized below, followed by several directions for future research indicated by the current work.

Summary of findings

Parent attachment dimensions demonstrated characteristic patterns of secure, avoidant and anxious working models, with marital quality and separation anxiety demonstrating significant associations to these in directions supportive of attachment theory. Parents with secure styles (high CLOSE, DEPEND, and low ANXIOUS
dimensions) in this sample tended to report high MCLI scores, less worry over adolescent distancing, and for fathers (not important for mothers), significant associations between secure style and availability to their adolescents. This was suggested as further support for working models.

Gender differences between parents were present in attachment dimensions with the mother dimensions more significantly associated with fathers’ marital satisfaction than his for hers. Mother and father DEPEND dimensions were significant in adolescents' scores of cohesion to mother, with other gender differences apparent in the pattern of separation anxiety about adolescents, for mothers and fathers. Also, fathers were given lower cohesion scores than mothers by their adolescents, with daughters further reporting significantly less cohesion to fathers than sons. For adolescents, more similarities were present than gender differences, with parents generally showing the differences. Gender roles of women in relationships and the particular value that motherhood is given in our culture was suggested as one interpretation.

Adolescent cohesion and attachment were found to be significantly related to some parent attachment dimensions, with attachment scores (ATTACH) only consistently and positively related to both parents' marital quality. For parent separation anxiety, again, secure style parents were reporting low separation anxiety and high comfort in remaining available to their adolescents. They tended to have adolescents who were reporting high attachment security, with fathers' attachment scores showing the contribution of mothers' scores to adolescent reports of attachment to fathers.
The originally proposed pattern of parent variables' contribution to the variability of adolescent cohesion reports was not confirmed. It appeared that while parent attachment styles and dimensions were important, given the number of significant relationships reported above, the relationship to adolescent cohesion appears to be more complex and not clearly related for parent attachment styles as expected. Attachment styles instead appeared to provide contributions to variables representative of more day-to-day family interactions and situations, i.e. separation anxiety of parents about their adolescents and parental marital satisfaction. Further analyses, using stepwise MR's were done to generate any alternate statistical relationships. Two alternate MR patterns, one for mothers and one for fathers demonstrated, for mothers', explanation of almost 30% of adolescent cohesion reports, and for fathers', explanation of only 9%.

Finally, adaptation of a cohesion instrument to make it useful for a survey procedure, provided reliable scores. The adaptation of the Family System Test, or FAST, to a 2-dimensional survey instrument, or the FFAST, was found to give highly reliable scores with its original, r = .97 for mothers, and r = .98 for fathers, which allowed for more adolescent data to be analyzed.

The caveats noted in earlier chapters regarding the sample and data need to be remembered, and it needs to be remembered that the findings relate to this sample only. However, the results appear suggestive and helpful in supporting current theory and suggesting future research directions.
Indications for future research

The number of significant findings present in this study point to several directions for future inquiry. First, replication of the present study with a larger number of families, could confirm and expand current findings. The additional inclusion of the AAS for the adolescents to consider the association(s) of their working models/styles and dimensions, on their own and parent variables, would give additional helpful information. Other adolescent scales, e.g. identity formation and ego development scales, in addition to considering ethnic diversity, could broaden the information about the adolescents. Additional variables on current family interactions also appear to be needed. Giving the surveys earlier in the year was suggested by several parents in this study, as separation anxiety was reported by them to be more of a worry at the beginning of the senior year. This additionally, could possibly demonstrate some changes in adolescent-parent relationship variables over the year.

Second, a followup study of high school seniors and their parents the following year could consider and provide information about the status of the adolescent’s attachment, parental separation anxiety and marital satisfaction for families of adolescents who do indeed move out, and a comparison of these with adolescents who do not move out. Third, consideration of younger adolescents as they become seniors could be instructive in providing information about parents’ continued or changed separation anxiety.

Attachment dimensions and styles appear to provide interesting insights into adult working models, and this could add valuable information into their contribution, even if
indirect, into parenting of adolescents. Studies that consider family adaptation along with both normative and problematic development could benefit from considering how parents' relationships with their adolescents and other family members are affected by their attachment dimensions and styles. Individual differences in attachment dimensions/styles between family types, structures and ethnicities, along with adolescent attachment dimension/style individual differences, can build further knowledge into the adolescent-parent relationship across a wide range of individuals. Also, and perhaps most importantly, similarities could be confirmed that support similarity in relationships across all parent-adolescent relationships.

Further study using the more sophisticated statistics of path analyses or structural equation modelling could test variable inclusion order and indirect effects of the variables studied.

A final area of future research strongly indicated in this study, is into gender differences. For mothers and fathers there were, not surprisingly, gender differences, although for adolescents these were minimal. Mothering and fathering and the responsibility for relationships that women are often assigned may additionally affect her as an attachment figure, over and above her own family of origin attachments to parents. Studies focusing on gender differences and similarities between mothers and fathers in families with adolescents using the attachment model could provide more insight into gender and parenting for both mothers and fathers.
Concluding Comments

The current study found some significant associations present in adolescents' relationships with their parents at a time of pending change, and demonstrated some parent variables that effected adolescent reports of cohesion and attachment security to mothers and fathers at this time. Much more work in this area is needed to really understand adolescent and parent relationships as adolescents move away from home and towards adulthood. As indicated in previous research, adolescents report parents as still important to them as they move toward adulthood (Lempers & Clark-Lempers, 1992), with warm parent-adolescent relationships additionally reported as valuable to adolescents' well-being as they become adults (Rice, 1990). Thus, learning more about the parent-adolescent relationship is also important for adolescents and their families.
APPENDIX A

ITEMS ENCLOSED IN MAILED PACKETS TO FAMILIES
Dear parent(s),

My name is Pam Ellwanger and I am a doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University. I am also a longtime resident of the Hilliard community. I am doing research with my advisor, OSU professor Dr. Ellen Rock, on adolescent-parent relationships as the adolescent nears high school graduation. There are many changes in the parent-teen relationship now that research doesn’t understand, as a parent myself I have experienced this. Also, rarely more than one person is asked about this relationship, usually the adolescent, so often only one viewpoint rather than what is really happening for both adolescent and parent(s) is seen.

I invite you to participate in this study, and be a part of adding invaluable information to the understanding of parent-teen relationships at this challenging time. This survey is anonymous, and will have no name attached to it. Also, since the high school has done the mailing, I have no names whatsoever. To participate, answer the survey that applies to you. There is one enclosed for mother, father, and teen. Separate envelopes are provided for each family member, to allow each one of you privacy in answering the questions; please answer your questions individually. Also, if only one of you wishes to answer, please return the survey-any information is important to me. Finally, if there is only one parent in the home, just fill out the one addressed to you, and return it.

As a thank-you for your valuable time and effort, I am holding a raffle for those who return their surveys. Just put your name and telephone number on the ticket and return it with your survey. The tickets will be separated from your surveys and placed in the raffle; several dinners, pizzas, and sets of movie tickets, are being given away.

Finally, I will be asking adolescents to volunteer to participate in a one-half hour follow up survey at your home, or other convenient place. A five dollar thank-you will be offered the teen for this. Your permission will be obtained beforehand.

Thank-you for your time in reading this, and if you choose to fill out the surveys, thank-you for your time and thoughtfulness. If you have any questions at all regarding this study, please feel free to contact me at 876-6820. I will be happy to speak with you. If you want the results of the study, just call and I will be pleased to mail you a copy when I finish.

Sincerely,

Pam Ellwanger
Doctoral candidate
The Ohio State University
MOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I. The following statements represent matters of interest and concern to parents. Not all people feel the same way about them. Answer the statements as you are feeling now or think you will feel as your high school senior grows older. Read each statement carefully and circle the number at the right which most closely reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement. Try to answer all statements without skipping items or looking back. Please answer all items without discussing them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I really miss my teenager when I am gone for a few days.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am happy when my teenager relies on me for advice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I'm the only one who really knows how to comfort my teenager when he/she is distressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It will be a sense of relief for me when my teenager moves out of the house permanently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It hurts my feelings when my teenager takes his/her problems to a good friend instead of to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It makes me feel good when I know that my teenager is safe at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When my teenager drives, I may feel nervous because I won’t know exactly where he/she is much of the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I like knowing that my teenager will come to me when he/she is upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I worry when my teenager goes to camp or on a school trip for a few days.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I can’t wait for my teenager to leave home for good.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel most content when I know my child is sleeping under my roof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel sad because my teenager doesn’t share as much as he/she used to with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If my teenager goes away to college, I will feel depressed if he/she begins to like being at school better than home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>It doesn’t bother me if I don’t know where my teenager is in the evening as long as he/she gets home by curfew.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My teenager is a source of comfort for me when I’m upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I am relieved to know that the time will come soon when my teenager won’t need me any more.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE COMPLETE BACK OF PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. It doesn’t bother if my teenager keeps some secrets about himself/herself from me.  
18. I feel sad when I think that my teenager does not seem to enjoy being with me as much anymore.  
19. I get upset when my teenager takes the advice of another adult more seriously than my advice.  
20. I will miss seeing my teenager’s belongings around the house after he/she leaves home.  
21. Even though it’s in the future, I dread the time when my teenager gets married.  
22. I really miss holding my teenager like I did when he/she was younger.  
23. I feel resentful when my teenager goes to his/her room instead of spending time with me.  
24. I dread thinking about what my life will be like after my teenager leaves home permanently.  
25. I am naturally better at keeping my teenager safe than any other person.  
26. I feel relieved that my child is a teenager because I don’t have to be as concerned about her/him as I used to.  
27. I believe that my teenager misses me when he/she is away from me for awhile.  
28. I would feel heartbroken if my teenager no longer considered my house his/her home.  
29. I sometimes feel left out because my son/daughter has such close relationships with his/her friends.  
30. I feel lonely when my teenager spends the night at a friend’s house.  
31. It makes me feel especially good if my teenager greets me with a hug.  
32. I get really uptight if I don’t know where my teenager is.  
33. I feel sad when I realize my teenager no longer likes to do the things that we used to enjoy doing together.  
34. I get lonesome when my teenager goes away on a school trip or to camp.  
35. I feel good knowing that my teenager feels that he/she can call on me.  
36. I feel very hurt if my teenager pulls away from me when I try to give him/her a hug.  

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
37. Life will be so much better when my 
teenager leaves home for good.  1  2  3  4  5
38. I don't enjoy myself when I'm away from my 
teenager.  1  2  3  4  5
39. I feel uneasy about my teenager going to 
college because he/she won't need me as much 
anymore.  1  2  3  4  5
40. I would feel hurt if my teenager didn't 
come to me for comfort.  1  2  3  4  5
41. I often feel cool and distant from my 
teenager.  1  2  3  4  5
42. I will feel a sense of loss if my teenager 
goes away to college.  1  2  3  4  5
43. I will feel relieved when my child drives 
because I won't have to drive him/her places 
myself.  1  2  3  4  5
44. I don't feel that I need to know what my teen-
ager is doing after school because he/she is at 
an age where I shouldn't have to worry so much.  1  2  3  4  5
45. I feel empty inside when I think about my 
child leaving home for good.  1  2  3  4  5
46. I worry that my teenager won't be completely 
comfortable in an unfamiliar setting if I'm 
not with him/her.  1  2  3  4  5
47. When my teenager returns after being away, 
I feel like giving him/her a big hug.  1  2  3  4  5
48. The more involved I can be in my 
teenager's life, the happier I feel.  1  2  3  4  5
49. I would feel left out if my teenager asked 
for advice from another adult such as a teacher, 
coach, or a parent of a friend.  1  2  3  4  5
50. I resent my teenager's need for my 
help.  1  2  3  4  5

PLEASE GO ON TO OTHER SIDE
PART II

Please read the following statements and rate them on the extent to which each one describes your feelings about adult relationships. Please think about all of your relationships (past and present) and respond in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships. Please use the scale below by placing a number between 1 and 5 in the space provided to the right of each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all characteristic of me.</td>
<td>Very characteristic of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I find it relatively easy to get close to people. 
2) I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others. 
3) In relationships, I often worry that my partner does not really love me. 
4) I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. 
5) I am comfortable depending on others. 
6) I do not worry about someone getting too close to me. 
7) I find that people are never there when you need them. 
8) I am uncomfortable being close to people. 
9) In relationships, I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me. 
10) When I show my feelings for people, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me. 
11) In relationships, I often wonder whether my partner really cares about me. 
12) I am comfortable developing close relationships with others. 
13) I am nervous when anyone gets too close to me. 
14) I know that people will be there when I need them. 
15) I want to get close to people but I worry about being hurt by them. 
16) I find it difficult to trust others completely. 
17) Often, people want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being. 
18) I am not sure that I can always depend on people to be there when I need them. 

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE
PARENT SURVEY PART III

Please indicate on the 7-point scale how you think your current marital relationship experiences compare with your expectations. Please assume that the midpoint (0) on the scale represents your expectation for the relationship dimension listed. With zero representing your expectation level, please indicate to what degree your relationship currently compares favorably or unfavorably to your expectation level by circling the appropriate number. A score of -3 would indicate that your current experience is much WORSE than you expect; a score of 0 would indicate that your current experience equals your expectation level; a score of 3 would indicate that your current experience is much BETTER than you expect.

(WORSE) -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 (BETTER)

1. The amount of love you experience.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

2. The amount of compatibility that you experience.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

3. The amount of mutual respect you experience.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

4. The degree to which your needs are met.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

5. The amount of affection your partner displays.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

6. The amount of commitment you experience from your spouse.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

7. The amount your partner is willing to listen to you.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

8. The degree to which your interpersonal communications are effective.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

9. The amount of companionship you experience.
   -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

10. The amount of relationship equality you experience.
    -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

11. The amount of confiding that occurs between you and your spouse.
    -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

12. The amount your partner is trusting of you.
    -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

13. The fairness with which money is spent.
    -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

14. The amount of time you spend together.
    -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

PLEASE COMPLETE BACK OF PAGE
15. The degree of physical attractiveness of your partner.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

16. The amount of conflict over daily decisions that exists.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

17. The amount of interest in sex your partner expresses.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

18. The amount of arguing over petty issues that you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

19. The amount of sexual activity that you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

20. The amount of conflict over the use of leisure time that you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

21. The amount of criticism your partner expresses.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

22. The amount that you and your partner discuss sex.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

23. The amount to which you and your spouse agree on your lifestyle.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

24. The amount of disagreement over friends you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

25. The amount of freedom you experience in pursuing other friendships.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

26. The amount to which your spouse supports your choice of occupation.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

27. The amount that responsibility for household tasks is shared.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

28. The amount of conflict over money you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

29. The amount of jealousy your partner expresses.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

30. The amount of privacy you experience.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

31. The degree to which you and your spouse agree on the number of children to have.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

32. The amount of responsibility your partner accepts for household tasks.
-3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
Background Information (Mother)

Please read and fill in your response in the blank space provided. Thanks.

Age____  D.O.B._____

_____ Education: What is the highest grade you completed in school?
1. Less than high school (grade 12)
2. High school graduate (or passed equivalency test)
3. High school, plus business or trade school school diploma.
4. One to four years of college, but did not graduate
5. Graduated from college with an associate degree
6. Graduated from college with a bachelor's degree
7. Postgraduate and/or professional degree

_____ Employment: Are you now employed?
1. Not employed, not looking for work (retired, disabled, sick, etc.)
2. Not employed, looking for work
3. Employed, part-time (up to 29 hours/week)
4. Employed full-time (30 or more hours/week)
5. Homemaker
6. Other

_____ Occupation: Please describe your usual or main occupation, including homemaker. If you have several jobs, what is your primary occupation?____________________________

Annual income if applicable:

$ Under $10,000  $40,000 - $49,999  $80,000 - $89,999
$10,000-$19,999  $50,000 - $59,999  $90,000 - $99,999
$20,000-$29,999  $60,000 - $69,999  $100,000 and over
$30,000-$39,999  $70,000 - $79,999

_____ Ethnicity (optional):
1. Caucasian (white)
2. African American (Black)
3. Asian American
4. Native American (American Indian)
5. Hispanic
6. Other (Please specify)__________________________

_____ Marital Status:
1. Married, biological parent of the high school senior
2. Divorced, and re-married, biological parent of senior.
4. Single, never married
5. Single, divorced
6. Single, widowed

_____ If you are not married, what is your relationship status?
1. Not dating
2. Casually dating
3. Going steady
4. Engaged

PLEASE GO ON TO OTHER SIDE
If because of divorce or separation, you have a visitation agreement with your previous spouse, please indicate the amount of time your senior lives in your home.
1. All of the time
2. 80% of the time (example: lives with you during the week, but spends weekends away.
3. 50% of the time
4. 20% of the time (example: lives with previous spouse during week, is with you weekends

List of your children: Please list all of your children in the following table. Please put the first initial of all your children in order, from oldest (first born) to youngest (last born). PLEASE CIRCLE THE CHILD WHO IS CURRENTLY THE SENIOR IN HIGH SCHOOL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST INITIAL OF CHILD</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX (M/F)</th>
<th>DOES CHILD LIVE WITH YOU IN YOUR HOUSE? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oldest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONCE AGAIN, THANKS FOR YOUR TIME!
Father survey identical to mother's except for replacing the word "mother" in the title with the word "father".
February 25, 1994

Dear Senior,

My name is Pam Ellwanger, and I am a graduate student at Ohio State. I am very interested in development, and the many changes that you experience in your relationships with your parent(s) as you move to adulthood. I am studying relationships between Millard seniors and their parents, and would greatly appreciate any help you could give me. So please fill out the enclosed survey, and return to me.

I have given your parent(s) a different questionnaire to fill out; so yours will give me your special viewpoint and information. The information will be private so no one, even myself, will know which answers are yours. So please fill out the questionnaire individually, and return it in the separate envelope included for your use.

As a thank-you for spending important time doing this for me, I am holding a raffle for those who return their surveys. A $20 dinner certificate for Dacne's, 2-$10 pizza certificates from Pizza Hut, and 2 sets of movie tickets for Movies 12 will be given out. Just put your name and telephone number on the raffle ticket enclosed, and return with your questionnaire. I will remove the ticket immediately and place it in the raffle. The drawing for the prizes will be four weeks from your receiving this letter.

Finally, there is an additional opportunity for you to participate in a very brief (maximum of 1/2 hour) follow-up survey that I will give in your home, or other convenient place. There will be a five dollar thank-you that you will receive for doing this. If you are interested, just fill in your name and telephone number at the end of your questionnaire. If you fill this out, and change your mind later, that's okay. You will have my thanks for the questionnaire you've already helped me with.

Thanks for taking for your time to read this; I know you probably have more exciting things to do. And thank-you for your time and thoughtfulness if you have chosen to fill out and return your questionnaire. Your participation is purely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time you want.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire or the study in general, or would like a copy of the findings when I finish, please feel free to contact me at 876-6820. Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Pam Ellwanger
Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University
Adolescent Questionnaire

Please answer this and all questions as well as you can, after carefully reading the direction.

Part ONE - Feeling of Closeness To Each Parent

Closeness to each parent means how emotionally close, with warm feelings AND how near or far you feel you are to your mom and dad. Please place the dots for you and each parent within the squares below, to show how close you usually feel to your mom and dad. You may be closer to one than the other.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE COMPLETE BACK OF PAGE
ADOLESCENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements ask about your relationship with your mother and father. Please read the directions to each section carefully. Thanks.

Part 1
Each of the following statements asks about your feelings about your mother, or the woman who has acted as your mother. Please read each statement and circle the ONE number that tells how much the statement is for you now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost Never or Never True</th>
<th>Not Very Often True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Often True</th>
<th>Almost or Always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My mother respects my feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel my mother does a good job as my mother.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wish I had a different mother.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My mother accepts me as I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My mother expects too much from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I get upset easily around my mother.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My mother trusts my judgement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I tell my mother about my problems and troubles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel angry with my mother.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I don't get much attention from my mother.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>19. My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.</th>
<th>20. My mother understands me.</th>
<th>21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.</th>
<th>22. I trust my mother.</th>
<th>23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.</th>
<th>24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off my chest.</th>
<th>25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost Never or True</td>
<td>Not Very Often True</td>
<td>Sometimes True</td>
<td>Often True</td>
<td>Almost or Always True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2
This part asks about your feelings about your father, or the man who has acted as your father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. My father respects my feelings.</th>
<th>2. I feel my father does a good job as my father.</th>
<th>3. I wish I had a different father.</th>
<th>4. My father accepts me as I am.</th>
<th>5. I like to get my father's point of view on things I'm concerned about.</th>
<th>6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my father.</th>
<th>7. My father can tell when I'm upset about something.</th>
<th>8. Talking over my problems with my father makes my feel ashamed or foolish.</th>
<th>9. My father expects too much from me.</th>
<th>10. I get upset easily around my father.</th>
<th>11. I get upset a lot more than my father knows about.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never or True True</td>
<td>Not Very Often True True</td>
<td>Sometimes True True</td>
<td>Often True True</td>
<td>Almost or Always True True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When we discuss things, my father cares about my point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My father trusts my judgement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My father has his own problems, so I don't bother him with mine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My father helps me to understand myself better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I tell my father about my problems and troubles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I feel angry with my father.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I don't get much attention from my father.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My father helps me to talk about my difficulties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My father understands me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>When I am angry about something, my father tries to be understanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I trust my father.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My father doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can count on my father when I need to get something off my chest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If my father knows something is bothering me, he asks me about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Adolescent Questionnaire

Finally, I need to get some general information about you. Please complete the following questions by circling the answer or filling in the response.

1. Your age.______  2. Gender: Male Female

3. Dating status: a. Not dating  b. Casually dating  c. dating only one person
d. Engaged  e. Married

4. Compared to your brothers and sisters, you were: a. An only child  b. First born
c. Second born  d. Third born  e. Fourth born or greater.

5. Your parent(s)’ marital status is: a. Married  b. Separated  c. Divorced
d. Both parents’ re-married  e. Mother only re-married  f. Father only re-married
g. Mother died  h. Father died  i. Both died.

6. How would you best describe your father’s occupation?_____________________

7. How would you best describe your mother’s occupation?_____________________


9. Please check all the members of the household that you live in. Give the number of brothers and sisters, etc., in the space provided. (Example: Brothers 3)
   Mother______ Step-mother______ Brother(s)______ Step-brother(s)______ Others____________
   Father______ Step-father______ Sister(s)______ Stepsister(s)______

10. How long have you lived in this family?______

11. Consider the coming year (or the year after graduation), do you plan to move out of the family residence, or continue to live at home?_____________________

12. In the coming year, what are your plans?
a. Work and live at home with parent(s).
b. Work and move out on your own (including roommate(s)).
c. Attend college or some other educational training, living at home with parent(s).
d. Join the military and live away from parent(s)
e. Other____________________

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND ANSWERS!!! YOU HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL!!!

*****If you are interested in participating in a brief follow-up (maximum of 1/2 hour), please write your name and telephone number in the spaces below. I will be in contact with you shortly. There will be a $5 thank-you for your time.

*** Name__________________________

*** Telephone_______________________

THANKS AGAIN!!
APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO FAMILIES
Dear parents, and seniors,

I sent you a survey last month about relationships between high school seniors and their parents. As the surveys sent and returned are anonymous, I am following up with this note to all seniors' families. I would like to extend a very grateful thank-you for those of you who have already filled these out and returned them. Your information is of great importance to me, and will aid in increasing the knowledge about adolescents and parents as the seniors finish high school.

For those of you who have not already returned your survey, I am writing to assure you that it is not too late to return them. Your information is a valuable, and a unique contribution to understanding adolescent-parent relationships at this incredible time of change. Each piece of information gives more weight to (and thus makes more important) any knowledge gain, so your surveys can still help invaluably.

If you have mislaid your surveys, but are interested in filling them out, please just give me a call at 876-6820, and I will gladly provide you with another copy. Understanding that your time is valuable, the surveys generally take about ten minutes to do; this hopefully will minimize any inconvenience.

Again, thank-you for your time in reading this, and in helping me with my research into high school seniors' relationships with their mothers and fathers.

Sincerely,

Pamela B. Ellwanger
876-6820
APPENDIX C

CORRELATIONAL MATRIXES OF PARENT TO PARENT, AND ADOLESCENT TO ADOLESCENT VARIABLES
Table 3. **Correlation matrix of parent variables**  
(Superscript denotes level of significance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother SECBASE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father SECBASE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother SAOTHER3</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father SAOTHER4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother MCLI</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father MCLI</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother CLOSE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.20&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father CLOSE</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother DEPEND</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.40&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father DEPEND</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.56&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother ANXIOUS</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.36&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.53&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father ANXIOUS</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.41&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.47&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.34&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.49&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a. p \leq .05  
b. p \leq .01  
c. p \leq .001  
d. p \leq .0001  
e. p \leq .10
Table 4. **Correlational matrix of adolescent variables**  
(Superscript denotes significance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IPPA Mother ATTACH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IPPA Father ATTACH</td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facsimile Mother FFAST</td>
<td>.65&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Father FFAST</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.43&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. \( p \leq .05 \)  
b. \( p \leq .01 \)  
c. \( p \leq .001 \)  
d. \( p \leq .0001 \)
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