THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE EARLY ATTACHMENT EXPERIENCES ON ADULT INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of
The Ohio State University

By
Meng-Chen Shieh, M.S.

The Ohio State University
2000

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Barbara Newman, Adviser
Professor Patrick McKenry
Professor Mo-Yee Lee

Approved by
Barbara Newman, Advisor
Human Development and Family Science Graduate Program
College of Human Ecology
ABSTRACT

According to Bowlby, early attachment experiences with parents provide prototypes for later interpersonal relationships outside of family. The basic premise is that, based on early childhood experiences, people develop general expectations about relationships. Then once formalized into mental structures, these beliefs are resistant to changes and have implications for the nature of one's relationships across the life span. In the present study, interrelationships among adult perceptions of the early attachment experiences with parents, adult attachment style (AAS), self-esteem, and two types of adult interpersonal relationships (love and friendship relationships) were examined. The hypotheses were that: early attachment experience would be able to discriminate adult attachment style and are related to self-esteem; adult attachment style would predict the quality of interpersonal relationships, with individuals with a secure attachment style more likely to report satisfying relationships; adult attachment style is predictive of individual's self-esteem which in turn influences the quality of close relationships.

The sample was comprised of 116 college students (73 females and 43 males). The results supported the hypothesis that early parent-child attachment experience is significantly related to adult attachment style, self-esteem, and quality of adult interpersonal functioning. AAS predicts individual's self-esteem. AAS and
self-esteem are associated with quality of adult's interpersonal relationships. Further, the relationships are only significant for love relationships not for friendship relationships. In the domain of AAS, fathers have the predominate influence. In the domain of self-esteem, mothers play the most influential role. There is a continuous path linking early attachment experiences, AAS, self-esteem, and adult love relationships with a stronger effect for men than for women. The present study makes it possible to evaluate whether perceived mother-child or father-child attachment history is more consistently related to AAS, self-esteem, and the quality of close relationship in adulthood.
Dedicated to my family
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Dr. Barbara Newman, for intellectual support, encouragement and giving unselfishly of her time which made this dissertation possible.

I thank Dr. Mo-Yee Lee for stimulating discussions and her assistance in distributing the questionnaires used in this study.

I am grateful to Dr. Patrick McKenry for giving statistical advice.

I also wish to thank those who participated in this study, without their cooperation the study would not have been possible.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents for encouraging my pursuit of knowledge; Chi-Hsin, for his walking and sometimes struggling down this long academic path with me; and Ivan, for the daily reminders of how wonderful life is.
VITA

March 19, 1966..................Born - Changhua, Taiwan

1991..........................B.S. Child Development, Iowa State University

1992 - 1994....................M.S. Curriculum and Instruction, Iowa State University

1994 - 2000....................Ph.D. Human Development and Family Science,
                            The Ohio State University

Field of Study

Major Field: Human Ecology
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapters:

1. Introduction..............................................................................1  
   Overview of attachment theory and research.................................3  
   The continuity of attachment patterns during childhood and adolescence...8

2. Literature Review ....................................................................15  
   Attachment in adult relationships ..............................................15  
   Purpose of the study..................................................................28

3. Methodology.............................................................................35  
   Subjects..................................................................................35  
   Measures..................................................................................36  
   Demographic data.......................................................................36  
   Early attachment history..........................................................36  
   Self-esteem..............................................................................38  
   Romantic and friendship relationships........................................41  
   Adult attachment style..............................................................41  
   Procedure..................................................................................46

4. Results.....................................................................................47  
   Descriptive analyses.................................................................47
Hypothesis testing................................................................. 54
Path analysis................................................................. 77

5. Discussion................................................................................. 81
   Early attachment experiences and adult attachment style............. 82
   Early attachment experiences and self-esteem............................. 86
   Early attachment experiences and quality of close relationships.... 88
   Adult attachment style and quality of close relationships............ 90
   Working model of self or self-esteem and quality of close relationships 91
   Gender differences................................................................... 92
   Conclusion and implications..................................................... 94
   Strengths and limitations........................................................ 99
   Future direction..................................................................... 103

References............................................................................. 108

Appendix A............................................................................. 115
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stability of Hazan &amp; Shaver three-group force-choice measure of adult attachment</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demographic statistics</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Means and standard deviations as a function of gender for all measures</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intercorrelations among Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales as a function of gender</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intercorrelations among Quality of Relationship Inventory subscales as a function of gender</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The proportions of the adult attachment style classification</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intercorrelations among Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales and adult attachment style as a function of gender</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Multiple regression summary for dichotomized adult attachment style as a function of Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Means and standard deviations for Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales by attachment style and gender</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Correlation between Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales and self-Esteem Inventory as a function of gender</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intercorrelations between Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales and Quality of Relationship Inventories for women</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Multiple regression summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire for women</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intercorrelations between Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales and Quality of Relationship Inventories for men</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Multiple regression summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales for men.........................72

15. Multiple regression summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories as a function of adult attachment style for women.................................74

16. Multiple regression summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories as a function of adult attachment style for men...........................................75

17. Correlations among Self-Esteem Inventory, Adult Attachment Style Scale and Quality of Relationship Inventories....................................................76
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure                                      Page

1. Schematic model of relationship between parent-child attachment relationships and Adult interpersonal functioning..........................30

2. Path analysis for women.............................................................79

3. Path analysis for men...............................................................80
Chapter 1

Introduction

Attachment theory, as developed by Bowlby (1973, 1980, 1982), Ainsworth (Ainsworth et al, 1978), and others, is a way of conceptualizing “the propensity of human beings to make strong affectional bonds to particular others” (Bowlby, 1977, p. 201). The theory leads to two bold hypotheses: (a) attachment behavior characterizes human beings throughout life and (b) patterns established in childhood parent-child relationships tend to structure the quality for later adult interpersonal relationships (Bartholomew, 1993). Attachment theory therefore offers a promising theoretical framework for understanding why some people have difficulties in forming and maintaining satisfying bonds in their adult relationships and why some people even seem to lack the desire or capacity to become deeply involved with others.

Bowlby asserts that “attachment behavior is held to characterize human beings from the cradle to grave” (1977, p.203). Attachment processes have been investigated extensively in parent-child relationships and the social functioning of the child during preschool and elementary years, but a decade ago, relatively little attention had been paid to the role of attachment processes in adult relationships. Following up on the seminal work of Hazan and Shaver (1987), a growing body of research has applied an attachment perspective to the study of adult personal relationships. Hazan and Shaver
conceptualized adult romantic relationships as a process of being attached and argued that individual differences in adult interpersonal behavior are related in theoretically meaningful ways to memories of childhood relationships with parents.

As applied to adult relationships, attachment theory suggests there should be some degree of continuity in attachment experiences from infancy into adulthood. People who had a trusting and supportive relationship with an attachment figure as a child, should, in adulthood, expect others to respond in a similar trustworthy manner. They should seek out others who meet and confirm these expectations. In contrast, those who did not have a supportive or dependable relationship with an attachment figure during childhood should have lower expectations for others and may even avoid close relationships altogether. They may behave in such a way as to confirm and perpetuate their beliefs about others.

Attachment is unique in providing a developmental perspective on understanding the formation of relationships. The basic premise is that, based on early childhood experience, people develop general expectations about relationships. Then once formalized into mental structures, these beliefs are resistant to changes and have implications for the nature of one’s relationships across the life span.

Attachment theory may provide a useful framework for understanding adult relationships and help to explain how individual differences in interpersonal behavior may be shaped by early attachment experiences with parents and subsequent social experiences. Central to Bowlby’s theory is that through repeated social exchanges with the primary caregivers, infants learn whether caregivers can be counted on to respond kindly, promptly, and effectively to their signals of distress. These experiences
eventually form the basis of a representation of relationship or mental model that guides future attachment related behavior. More specifically, Bowlby hypothesized that mental models of attachment become integrated into the personality structure and tend toward stability, thereby provide the prototype for later social relations.

Even though Bowlby focused extensively on parent-child relations in infancy and childhood, he believed that people’s childhood experiences influence their adult personalities and their views of relationships. Bowlby emphasizes that attachment is not limited to childhood. He suggests that childhood attachment underlies the later capacity to make affectional bonds. A child’s early attachment relationships with caretakers shape important beliefs about the self and social world, which then guide relationships in adulthood. In line with Bowlby, Bartholomew (1993) suggested that extrapolating from the childhood attachment literature, it is possible to predict developmental pathways that may lead to specific patterns of problems in adult personal relationships. The theory can also guide explorations of the mechanisms that underlie continuity in relationship patterns and the potential avenues through which these patterns can be changed.

**Overview of Attachment Theory and Research**

Bowlby’s attachment theory grew out of observations of the behavior of infants and young children who were separated from their primary caregiver (usually the mother) for various lengths of time. Bowlby noticed what primate researchers had also observed: when a human or a primate infant is separated from its mother, the infant goes through a predictable series of emotional reactions. The first is *protest*, which involves crying, active searching, and resistance to others’ soothing efforts. The second is *despair*, which is a state of passivity and obvious sadness. And the third, discussed only with reference
to humans, is *detachment*, an active, seemingly defensive disregard for and avoidance of the mother as she returns. Because of the remarkable similarities between human infants and other primate infants, Bowlby was led to consider the evolutionary significant of infant-caregiver attachment and its maintenance in the face of separation.

The attachment system, as Bowlby called the complex constellation of attachment feelings and behaviors, seems to have evolved to protect infants from danger by keeping them close to the mother. Bowlby and other observers of both human and primate behavior have noticed that when an infant is healthy, alert, unafraid, and in the presence of its mothers, it seems interested in exploring and mastering the environment and in establishing affiliative contact with other family and community members. Researchers call this using the mother as a *secure base*.

In Bowlby’s initial conceptualization, the goal of the attachment system is to maintain proximity to the primary caretaker to ensure protection from danger. The system is therefore especially prone to activation under conditions of anxiety, fear, illness and fatigue. Under such conditions, infants will exhibit attachment behaviors designed to establish contact with an attachment figure and thereby to regain a sense of security. Ainsworth (1989) has broadened Bowlby’s conceptualization in viewing the attachment system as functioning continuously to provide the infant with a secure base from which to engage in exploration. Thus, the goal of the attachment system is the maintenance of *felt security*. Specifically, the defining features of attachment are: *proximity seeking* (the tendency to seek and maintain relatively close proximity); *safe haven* (the tendency to seek comfort and reassurance, especially in the face of perceived or real threat); *separation distress* (the tendency to resist and be distressed by separation); and *secure
base (the tendency to derive security from the availability of the attachment figure, which facilitates such non-attachment activities as exploration and play). A relationship in which these four components are present qualifies as an attachment bond.

Attachment theory can be summarized in three propositions:

The first proposition is that when an individual is confident that an attachment figure will be available to him whenever he desires it, that person will be much less prone to either intense or chronic fear than will an individual who for any reason has no such confidence. The second proposition concerns the sensitive period during which such confidence develops. It postulates that confidence in the availability of attachment figures, or lack of it, is built up slowly during the years of immaturity—infancy, childhood, and adolescence—and that whatever expectations are developed during those years tend to persist relatively unchanged throughout the rest of life. The third proposition concerns the role of actual experience. It postulates that the varied expectations of the accessibility and responsiveness of attachment figures that individuals develop during the years of immaturity are tolerable accurate reflections of the experiences those individuals have actually had. (Bowlby, 1973, p.235).

The quality of early attachment relationships is seen as rooted largely in the history of interactions between infants and their primary caretakers (or attachment figures). Especially crucial is the degree to which infants learn that they can rely on their attachment figures as sources of security and support. To assess individual differences in the security of attachment, Ainsworth and her colleagues (1978) developed a laboratory procedure called the “Strange Situation”. This procedure involves a series of episodes of contact, separation, and reunion with the caregiver designed to observe the infant’s behavior toward the attachment figure under conditions of increasing stress and separation. Ainsworth and her colleagues have identified three distinct patterns of infant attachment: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Secure infants appear to perceive their caretakers as reliable sources of protection and security. These infants actively seek contact with their caretakers when distressed and are readily soothed
and reassured by that contact. Secure infants also tend to explore the environment confidently under nonthreatening conditions. In contrast, infants showing an *anxious-ambivalent* attachment pattern show ambivalent behavior toward the caretaker when distressed. These infants are characterized by their mix of contact seeking with angry resistant behavior and are not easily comforted. Finally infants showing *avoidant* patterns of attachment actively avoid proximity or interaction with the caretaker when distressed. Infants in the anxious-ambivalent category frequently exhibit the behaviors Bowlby called protest, and the avoidant infants frequently exhibit the behaviors he called detachment.

Thus neither ambivalent nor avoidant infants appear to use their caretakers successfully to gain security when distressed. In addition, both groups of insecure infants show deficits in using their attachment figures as a secure base for exploration.

Bowlby argues that the child’s confidence in the availability of an attachment figure in times of need is largely determined by early experiences. The dimension of caretaking behavior that seems to be related most strongly to infant attachment patterns is *sensitivity* to the infant’s signals (Ainsworth, 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1978). Ainsworth found that (a) mothers of securely attached infants tended to be consistently responsive to their infants’ signals, (b) mothers of infants classified as ambivalent tended to be inconsistent and inept in dealing with their infants, and (c) mothers of avoidant infants tended to be relatively cold and rejecting toward their infants. These mothers are averse to physical contact, direct hostility and criticism toward their infants, show blunted affective expression, and display a general rigidity and compulsiveness in caregiving.
Bowlby posited that over time, children internalize their attachment experiences with their caretakers in such a way that early attachment relations come to form a template for later relationship outside the family. Bowlby argues that children construct “working models” or internal representations of themselves and others, and he describes the basic process through which such internal representations are formed:

Confidence that an attachment figure is, apart from being accessible, likely to be responsive can be seen to turn on at least two variables: (a) whether or not the attachment figure is judged to be the sort of person who in general responds to calls for support and protection; (b) whether or not the self is judged to be the sort of person towards whom anyone, and the attachment figure in particular, is likely to respond in a helpful way. Once adopted, moreover, and woven into the fabric of the working models, (the models of the attachment figure and the self) are apt henceforward never to be seriously questioned. (Bowlby, 1973, p.204). As a result, the model of attachment figure and the model of the self are like so as to be complementary and mutually confirming (p. 238)

For example, if the attachment figure has acknowledged the infant’s needs for comfort and protection and respected the infant’s need for independent exploration of the environment, the child is likely to develop an internal working model of self as valued and self-reliant. Conversely, if the parent has frequently rejected the infant’s bids for comfort or for exploration, the child is likely to construct an internal working model of self as unworthy or incompetent. With the aid of working models, children predict the attachment figure’s likely behavior and plan their own responses.

These working models are dynamic cognitive structures that guide expectations about relationships and interpretations of experiences in relationships. They are expected to operate largely automatically and outside of conscious awareness. They influence behavior by guiding the appraisal of social situations, as well as functioning to maintain coherent world views and self-image by guiding the assimilation of new experience (Ricks, 1985). On the assumption that the need to maintain stability and coherence of
one’s internal models of reality is a basic human motive (Epstein, 1987), people are hypothesized to process social information and to act so as to induce feedback that confirms their internal models of themselves and others (Swann, 1983). This evidence for continuity adds plausibility to the notion that a person’s adult attachment style is also affected by attachment history with parents.

The Continuity of Attachment Patterns during Childhood and Adolescence

The different patterns, or attachment styles, documented by Ainsworth in her study of infant-mother dyads, make us more aware of the temporary suffering experienced by infants whose caretakers are nonoptimally responsive. The premise of Ainsworth’s findings, however, is the possibility that early attachment experiences provide the foundation for social aspect of children’s later personalities.

In one of the earliest studies of continuity in attachment patterns during infancy, Waters (1978) found that forty eight (or 96%) of fifty infants from middle-class homes exhibited the same attachment style when assessed twice in the Strange Situation, once at twelve months of age and again at eighteen months. Studies of this kind (Crittenden, 1985; Cummings, 1990; Main et al., 1985; Waters & Deane, 1985; Thompson; 1999) have since been conducted with children of a wide variety of ages, with different subject samples (rich or poor, from majority and minority cultures, in different countries, etc.), and with different methods of assessment, which are required when children get beyond two or three years of age. Most of these studies suggest that around 80% of infants from middle class homes, whose environments tend to be fairly stable, show the same attachment pattern, or style, across time (say, up to age six).
Given that there is at least a little measurement error with almost any assessment procedure, these rates of stability in independently coded assessments are almost astonishing.

One study of a middle-class sample (Thompson, Lamb, and Estes, 1982) found only 53 percent stability in Strange Situation classifications over 6 months. That result has never been replicated. The norm for middle-class samples remains about 80% stability; that outcome has been replicated several times. Change in attachment classification in the Thompson et al. (1982) sample were associated with maternal employment and the onset of regular nonmaternal care.

Marvin and Stewart (1990) proposed that transitional periods of instability in infants’ attachment can reasonably be expected when the family undergoes a “normal crisis,” such as the birth of a new baby. The parent’s change in job status might also prompt changes in the parents’ roles, accessibility, and responsiveness. After the family situation restabilizes, infants’ attachments might revert to what they had been or might reflect substantial reorganization in response to changed patterns of interaction.

In economically less stable and more stressful homes, the figure drops to around 60 percent, which is still considerable higher than expected by chance (Shaver & Hazan, 1994). This continuity supports Bowlby’s idea that early attachment experiences help to shape children’s personalities.

Some researchers, seeing the accumulated evidence for cross-situational and cross-age continuity in attachment style, have wondered whether the continuity might be attributable primarily to inborn personality characteristics (innate temperament), rather than to interactions with attachment figures. The drop in continuity from 80 percent to 60
percent as a function of environmental stability is one sign that environment does matter: When parents are more stressed, their children tend to switch from a secure attachment style to one of the insecure styles (avoidant or anxious-ambivalent); when parents are less stressed (when single mother develops a stable relationship or gains assistance in childcare), their children tend to switch from insecure attachment styles to the secure style. An other sign that relationships matter is that a child can exhibit different attachment styles in the Strange Situation with mother and with father, especially if the parents’ attachment styles are measurably different. In other words, children seem to be able to develop any one of the three styles, depending on the treatment they receive from particular attachment figures. In an important study (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985), children’s attachment behavior at age six proved to be more predictable from Strange Situation assessments at age one involving mother than from Strange Situation assessments involving father. This difference was attributed to the fact that a typical American child spends many more hours each day with mother than with father during the first years of life. Finally, direct studies of a possible connection between infant temperament and attachment classification have so far failed to find a correlation (e.g., Belsky, 1999; Sroufe, 1985; Vaughn, Lafever, Seifer & Barglow, 1989). For the moment, it seems reasonable to conclude that persisting differences between attachment styles are due, at least in part, to social experiences, not solely to whatever temperamental differences may be between children.

Many studies (Eliciker, Englund, & Sroufe, 1992; Thompson, 1999) have examined personality and behavioral differences between children who differed in Strange Situation behavior at age one. In general, the results reveal that secure children
(at ages ranging from two to six years) are more socially responsive and competent, handle interpersonal conflict more effectively, are more competent problem solvers and explorers of their environment, perform better on age-appropriate cognitive tasks, have higher self-esteem, show more empathy and positive emotion in social situations, and have more harmonious and happier friendships. Insecure children are more likely to exhibit symptoms of childhood depression and be involved in exploitative peer relationships, especially ones in which an avoidant child victimizes an anxious-ambivalent child. Moreover, children with different attachment styles induce teachers to respond differently to them; teachers treat secure children in a matter-of-fact but warm way, become angry more often with avoidant children, and show special consideration for anxious-ambivalent children’s needy dependence.

Studies have addressed the hypothesis that children form internal representations or “working models” of the self and others that are consonant with the quality of their primary attachment relationships (Cassidy, 1988; Kaplan, 1987; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). In Cassidy’s (1988) extensive study, the concurrent relationship between quality of attachment with the mother and models of the self in six years old is investigated. Self-representations were assessed through a series of tasks including story, child interview, and self-esteem scales. As expected, children classified as securely attached showed positive conceptions of themselves, accompanied by the capacity to acknowledge vulnerabilities. Those classified as avoidant tended to insist upon unrealistic levels of personal perfection in the interviews, although this finding was not replicated on self-esteem measures. Anxious-ambivalent children showed more overly negative descriptions of themselves, as well as considerable hostility and anger in their
completion stories dealing with relations between a child and mother. It appears that by this age individual differences in the security of early attachment relationships are beginning to be translated into differing internal representations.

The farthest reaching longitudinal study to date (Eliciker et al., 1992) followed children from age twelve months to eleven years. The investigators created a summer camp program for children, each session lasting four weeks. Besides playing and making friends, as children would do at any summer camp, these children were videotaped, interviewed, and rated by their counselors. Here are some of the key findings, “overall, camp counselors without prior information about the subjects saw those with secure attachment histories as more self-assured, emotionally healthy, and competent.” “Children who had secure attachments were found to spend more time with peers and less time with adults only or in isolation. In addition, those with secure attachment histories were observed more often in groups of three of more children than those with anxious histories.” “Children with anxious-ambivalent histories were not deficient in their level of understanding of others’ internal state, but may have negative biases or anxieties with regard to peer relations. Those with avoidant histories may have both lower interpersonal understanding than children with secure histories and more negative social-evaluative biases.” “Children with secure attachment histories were more likely to form friendships than those with insecure attachment, and the secure children spent more time with their friends.” “Secure-secure friendship pairs were more likely to form than other combinations.”

There have been a few studies in which self-report attachment in adolescence has been related to social relations with peers. Attachment style is related to self-disclosure
with peers (Mikulincer and Nachson, 1991) and support seeking and giving in dating
couples (Simpson et al., 1992) and quality of daily interactions with friends (Kerns &
Stevens, 1996). Although the numbers of studies examining social interaction is small,
the results support the hypothesis that attachment influences social interaction patterns
with others.

In addition to predicting patterns of social interaction with peers, parental
attachment has been linked to the quality of adolescents’ friendships. Three studies with
late adolescents have examined these links. Self-reports of friendship closeness
(Bartolomew & Horowitz, 1991), social support from friends (Kobak and Sceery, 1988),
and friendship quality (Kerns & Stevens, 1996) have not correlated with measures of
attachment, although Bartolomew and Horowitz (1991) found moderately strong links
between how an adult discussed friendship and family relationships. Thus, studies
examining friendship and attachment in adolescence do not provide uniform support for
the hypothesis that attachment influences friendships, suggesting the need to explore
these links further.

Taken together, the vast majority of existing studies suggest that attachment
patterns assessed at age one are a useful predictor of later childhood and adolescent social
behavior and self-esteem. This led us to believe, in the mid-1980s, that it might be
worthwhile to examine attachment styles in early adulthood, where the styles might affect
the formation and maintenance of romantic relationships. Around the same time, Mary
Main (1985) and her students were developing an interview technique that could classify
parents in terms of attachment history and predict the attachment behavior of their one-
year-old children in the Strange Situation. In other words, the notion of adult attachment
style was explored in two developmental pathways, one focuses on romantic love and one on parenting behavior. These two line of research have provoked scores of fascinating studies during the past decade, and it is to the studies with focus on adult attachment styles in personal relations that we now turn.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Attachment in Adult Relationships

Bowlby strongly maintains that the attachment system continues to operate throughout the life span and that how “an individual’s attachment behavior becomes organized within his personality...(determines) the patterns of affectional bonds he makes during his life” (Bowlby, 1980, p. 41). Whereas the infant becomes attached to a parent, prototypical adult attachments are formed with an opposite-sex peer. Enduring romantic relationships generally are expected to be the most important attachment relationships in adult life. In fact, any adult relationships potentially could meet the criteria for evidence of an attachment component: (a) a desire for proximity with the attachment figure, especially under stressful conditions, (b) a sense of security derived from contact with the attachment figure, and (c) distress or protest when threatened with loss or separation from the attachment figure (Weiss, 1982). The fact that adult interpersonal relationships are typified by the defining features of attachment and seem to follow the same developmental course as attachment formation in infancy, provides additional evidence that the attachment mechanism is at work in both types of relationships. Although there are important differences between childhood and adult
attachment relationships (see Bartholomew, 1990; Hazan & Hutt, 1991), the underlying
dynamics may be surprisingly similar (Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1988).

Individual differences in forming adult interpersonal relationships are
meaningfully related to perceptions of childhood relationships with caregivers. These
perceptions, organized into internal representational models of self and other, in turn
guide behavior. Interpersonal behavior, organized around these internal models, can be
categorized into broad attachment style, creating a continuity of relationship style.

Several investigators have begun to study the existence and function of internal
working models of relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987, 1992) have examined
distinguishable representational models of relationships and their effects on the continuity
of attachment style. They report that people with different attachment styles hold
differing beliefs about the course of romantic love, the availability and trustworthiness of
others and their own love-worthiness. On the basis of the characteristics of avoidantly,
securely, and anxiously attached children provided by Ainsworth et al., Hazan and
Shaver (1987) developed a self-report measure of attachment style adapted to adult
romantic relationship. Individuals are asked to indicate which one of the three
attachment styles best characterized their general orientation toward romantic
involvement. Those with a secure attachment indicate that they find it relatively easy to
get close to others, are comfortable depending on others and having others depend on
them, and don’t worry about being abandoned or about someone becoming too
emotionally close to them. Avoidantly attached people indicate that they are
uncomfortable being close to others, find it difficult to completely trust and depend on
others, and are nervous when anyone gets too close. Anxiously attached people indicate
that they find others are reluctant to get as close as they would like, frequently worry that their romantic partners do not really love them or will not remain with them, and often want to become extremely close to their partners. Their work extends Bowlby’s theory into adulthood and offers support for the continuing impact of early family experience through internal working models of these relationships.

Taken together, the results provided preliminary support for attachment theory as applied to adults. Since this initial study, other researchers have reported similar findings based on different populations including populations outside the United State (Feeney & Nooler, 1990; Mikulincer, Florian, & Tolmacz, 1990). Research has also developed other measures of adult attachment including other self-report measures as well as the adult attachment interview (George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985).

Among the many studies with adults inspired by Hazan and Shaver’s extension of attachment theory is a series of studies reported by Collin and Read (1990). They developed a 21-item adult attachment scale based on Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) categorical measure, as well as on other characteristics described in the developmental literature on attachment. In addition to developing the scale, Collin and Read (1990, study 3) focus on the importance of experiences with the opposite-sex parent during childhood. They predict a correspondence between the attachment style dimensions of an individual’s romantic partner and the caregiving styles of the parents, especially the opposite-sex parent. This prediction was based on the idea that the opposite-sex would be particularly influential as a role model for heterosexual relationships due to the importance of existing mental models of relationships on the nature of new relationship.
To conduct this study, Collins and Read asked both members of dating couples to individually complete a number of measures including their attachment scale and questions about their parent’s caregiving style. In support of their predictions, only descriptions of the opposite-sex parent were related to the attachment style dimensions of the subjects’ romantic partners. Specifically, women who perceived their fathers as having been warm and responsive were more likely than woman who saw their fathers as cold, distant, or inconsistent to be dating men who felt they could depend on others and who felt comfortable getting close. Men who described their mothers as cold or inconsistent were more likely to be dating women who were anxious. Further, men who described their mothers as cold and distant were somewhat less likely to be dating a woman who felt she could depend on others. Interestingly, these results provide additional evidence that people do seek out others who confirm their expectations about relationships. They also suggest that the opposite-sex parent may play a central role in shaping beliefs and expectation related to heterosexual relationships.

Feeney and Nooler’s work (1990) replicated Hazan and Shaver’s work and supported the relationship between early family history and attachment style in 374 undergraduate students. Within their sample, secure subjects reported more positive early family relationships and expressed trusting attitudes toward others. Those students with an anxious-ambivalent style expressed dependence and a desire for commitment, whereas those with an avoidant style were mistrustful and maintained a distance from others.

Main (1985) has developed an Adult Attachment Interview that explores adults’ representations of their childhood relations and the influence of these early relations on
their own development. The classification system has also been used to predict individual differences in affect relation and parenting characteristics. Those labelled secure were characterized by ease in recalling childhood experiences, generally positive memories of parental treatment and a valuing of attachment relationships. The preoccupied (corresponding to the childhood ambivalent group) described a mix of closeness with parents and frustrated attempted to gain parental support. They continued to show an emotional reliance on parental acceptance and generally enmeshed attitudes toward attachment relationships. Individuals who were classified as detached or dismissing of attachment (corresponding to avoidant in childhood) tended to downplay the importance of attachment relationships. Their parents were described as cold, disinterested, or rejecting, and were especially likely to be remembered as unsupportive in time of stress. These adults also lacked coherence in their childhood accounts, often idealizing their parents in spite of conflicting specific memories.

Not only did the Adult Attachment Interview classifications correspond to Ainsworth’s secure, ambivalent, and avoidant infant patterns at a conceptual level, but adult patterns were also empirically correlated with infant patterns (e.g., a dismissing parent tended to have an avoidant infant).

Main’s methodology has proved useful in predicting the quality of mother-child interactions and the security of a child’s attachment from a mother’s representation of her own childhood experience (Benoit & Parker, 1994; Eiden, Teti & Corns, 1995; and Fox, 1995). When the classification system is used to predict individual differences in affect regulation and social support among college students (Ognibene & Collins, 1997; Wallace & Vaux, 1993 and Blain, Tompson & Whiffen, 1993), both insecure groups
were rated by peers as lower on ego-resiliency than the secure group. Peer reports further identified the preoccupied subjects as uniquely high on anxiety, while on self-report indices they reported uniquely low social competence and high levels of distress related symptoms. Peers rated the dismissing/detached group as high on hostility and moderately high on anxiety in comparison with the other two groups. On self-report measures, dismissing/detached students rated themselves as lonely and lacking in social support from their families.

However, the Adult Attachment Interview is limited by its focus on representations of childhood experiences as a means of classifying adult attachment. In adulthood, representation of friendships and love relationships would be expected to be at least as important as representations of family relationships in defining a current attachment style. An exclusive focus on child-parent relationships precludes exploring the degree of specificity found in attachment representations. For instance, adult models of parent-child attachment are related to quality of childcare, but can these adult models also predict the quality of romantic love relationships or close friendship? If, as Bowlby claims, an individual's early attachment experiences determine “the pattern of affectional bonds he makes during his life” (1980, p. 41), a general model of attachment would be expected to operate across social domains.

In contrast to Main’s focus on representation of childhood experiences, Hazan and Shaver (1987) have conceptualized romantic love as an attachment process and developed a self-report procedure to differentiate adult attachment styles. The work of Hazan and Shaver is important because it translates the childhood paradigm into terms directly relevant to adult relationship. Their attachment measure consisted of three brief
paragraphs describing adult analogues to the infant attachment styles of which subjects were asked to choose the most self-descriptive. In line with the investigators’ hypotheses, both groups of insecure adults reported more negative experiences and beliefs about love, a history of shorter romantic relationships, and less favorable descriptions of their childhood relationships with parents than did the securely attached adults. Ambivalent individuals reported especially high levels of obsessive preoccupation, desire for union, jealousy and emotional extremes in love relationships, as well as the tendency to fall in love easily. Avoidant individuals reported the most cynical beliefs about the possibility of romantic love lasting; they also scored relatively high on a scale measuring the experience of emotional extremes in love relationships. Interestingly, both insecure groups were more likely than the secure group to describe themselves as having more self-doubts and being less acceptable to others than their secure counterparts.

Collins and Read (1990) report that subjects with a secure attachment style had a more positive view of themselves than subjects with either avoidant or ambivalent attachment styles. Similarly, attachment styles covaried with measures of trust, satisfaction and quality of communication within their dating relationships. There is evidence supporting the relationship between attachment style and self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships, a prerequisite for healthy, satisfying relationships (Mikulincer and Nachslon, 1991).

The findings of Collins and Read (1990) suggest that gender moderates some of associations between attachment styles and relationship characteristics. For men, security (i.e., comfort with closeness) was more predictive of positive relationships than was their
level of anxious attachment (i.e., concern about abandonment), but for women the opposite was true: The more anxious the woman, the less satisfied and the less trusting she was.

Both Collins and Read (1990) and Simpson (1990) extended these findings further to show that one’s partner’s attachment style is also predictive of one’s own evaluation of the relationship. Collins and Read (1990) found that both partners were less satisfied with their relationships when the man was avoidant and when the woman was anxious or preoccupied. The gender-conditioned pattern was also visible in Simpson’s (1990) study, with female anxiety emerging as a particularly strong predictor of negative rating by their male partners on virtually all relationship dimensions measures.

Kirkpatrick and Davis (1994) suggest that gender differences may interact significantly with attachment styles in the prediction of relationship stability over time. For example, the traditional gender role patterns have long acknowledged that women tend to devote more effort and time than men to relationship maintenance. The traditional gender role patterns also suggest that it is the woman’s interpersonal orientation to close relationship that should be more predictive of the development of the relationship over time. These findings indicate a need to consider gender role issues for a complete understanding of how attachment style differences influence relationship functioning.

Simpson (1990) has also demonstrated the association between attachment style and interpersonal orientation. For example, a secure attachment style was associated with greater relationship interdependence, commitment, trust and satisfaction. Simpson and colleagues (Simpson et al., 1992) demonstrated that people with a secure attachment style
behave differently than those with an avoidant style, when placed in an anxiety producing situation. Those with a secure attachment style sought out more support from their partner as anxiety increased and offered more support when their partner was anxious. Those with an avoidant style sought less support and offered less support to their distressed partners.

Frazier et al (1996), suggest some relation between parental caregiving style and partner choice. For example, individuals would be attracted to partners who would respond to them as did their parents. Individuals who rated their parents as more cold would be more attracted to avoidant partners and less attracted to secure partners, presumably because such partners do not fit their mental models of relationships.

Other researchers have used attachment theory as a basis for understanding specific types of relationships. For example, Tidwell, McCarten, and Shaver (1992) focused on women who choose to stay involved in destructive, punishing heterosexual relationships. They predicted these women would be classified as having an avoidance attachment style and that this classification would be related to their relationship with their father. This prediction was based on their reasoning that avoidant women expect men to be rejecting and that this expectation is incorporated in their working models of relationships. As a result, they are likely to accept male partners who are somewhat rejecting, controlling, or nonnurturant. Tidwell and associates found support for their predictions.

Bartholomew (1990) proposed a model of adult attachment that builds upon models of the self and others derived from the literature on child attachment (theory of Bowlby) and yields a 4-group model attachment styles in adulthood: secure, preoccupied,
fearful avoidant, and dismissing avoidant. As expected, warm and responsive parenting
gives rise to positive models of both the self and other, resulting in secure and fulfilling
adult relationships—Secure attachment. Adult secure attachment indicates a sense of
worthiness and an expectation that other people are generally accepting and responsive.
This attachment style corresponds conceptually to children classified as securely
attached. Adults with preoccupied attachment style are those who experience
inconsistent and insensitive parents. Preoccupied attachment style indicates a sense of
unworthiness combined with a positive evaluation of others. This combination of
characteristics would lead the person to strive for self-acceptance by gaining the
acceptance of valued others. This pattern corresponds conceptually to Hazan and
Shaver’s ambivalent group.

Two forms of adult avoidance of intimacy are differentiated: fearful avoidance
and dismissing avoidance. Fearful avoidance is presumed to result from a history of
rejecting attachment figures. Rejected children tend to conclude that others are uncaring
and unavailable and that themselves are unlovable. The fearful attachment style is
characterized by a conscious desire for social contact which is inhibited by fears of its
consequence. By avoiding close involvement with others, this style protects a person
against anticipated rejection by others. This style may correspond to the avoidant style
described by Hazan and Shaver.

A dismissing style is characterized by a defensive denial of the need or desire for
social contact. Dismissing attachment style protects a person from disappointment by
avoiding close relationships and maintaining a sense of independence and invulnerability.
This style corresponds conceptually to the detached or dismissing of attachment attitude described by Main et al. (1985).

In both cases close relationships are avoided, although the motivations for avoidance may differ dramatically. This distinction is represented by differing models of the self. The fearful view themselves as being undeserving of the love and support of others; and the dismissing possess a positive model of self that minimizes the subjective awareness of distress of social needs which might activate the desire for close attachment.

Adult avoidance of intimacy can be understood as a disturbance in the capacity to form interpersonal attachment which stems from the internalization of early adverse experiences within the family.

In a study by Clark (1994), college students were asked to describe the interpersonal qualities they exhibit in interactions with various relationship partners—mother, father, lover, same-sex friend, and so on. These qualities were then judged by the students to be positive, negative, or neutral, and to be central or peripheral to the self. Secure and fearfully avoidant individuals differed powerfully in the extent to which negative interpersonal qualities were portrayed as central to self-structure.

It is important to identify the mechanisms by which an attachment style is maintained. The interactive role of personality disposition (self-concept, working models) and interpersonal behaviors has been examined in interpersonal approaches to personality. These approaches recognize that self-conceptions are developed and maintained within social contexts, for example, "self-verification" processes through which people induce others to verify their self-images. Selective affiliation refers to the tendency to seek out social contexts which provide self-confirmatory feedback. For
example, adults who avoid close attachment may choose partners similar to themselves in order to maintain a safe interpersonal distance. This is consistent with Bowlby’s view that individuals select and create their social environment in ways that confirm their working models and thus promote continuity in attachment patterns across the life span.

Selective affiliation in the form of avoidance of social contacts and selection of social partners with whom a safe distance can be maintained is expected to be central in maintaining adult patterns of avoidance. From the perspectives of both attachment theory and interpersonal theory, individual differences in interpersonal styles are expected to be highlighted in relationships with significant others.

In sum, there is ample evidence that infant-caregiver and adult pair-bond relationships are characterized by similar dynamics, have many features in common, and serve a similar function. Bowlby viewed pair-bond relationships as adult instantiation of attachment, and, implicit in this view is the suggestion that attachment serves a similar affect-regulatory function in adulthood as it does in infancy. In other words, the need for felt security is ageless. During all phases of development, humans will function optimally when they have a trusted figure on whom they can rely for support and reassurance. Therefore, Hazan and Zeifman (1997) postulate that both types of relationships are regulated by the same behavioral system—the attachment system. If this is the case the processes by which attachment bonds are formed would likely be similar as well.

As noted earlier, from within the early parent-child attachment history, the child actively constructs a sense of self and a sense of what to expect from others. Internal working models of self and other develop during the early attachment experiences
between children and their caregivers, and it is via internal working models that differences in attachment styles and external behavior are maintained over time.

Although much of the early attachment work was done with children, Bowlby always saw attachment in life span terms. So, despite the current focus being primarily on adult attachment process, I feel it is fitting that we draw on the childhood attachment literature as a source of inspiration. Again, while current work on adult attachment benefits from its connection with past research on childhood attachment, the work appears to have new emphases. Perhaps the most obvious difference, as explored in Hazan and Zeifman’s (1997) work, is that children form attachment bonds with parents while adults form bonds with agemates.

Taken together, the majority of the existing studies support the notion that attachment classification identified during infancy and early childhood predicts later attachment style in intimate relationships and sense of self in adulthood. This led us to believe that it might be meaningful to examine attachment styles not only in romantic love relationships but also other interpersonal relationships, such as relationship with close friends.

The research literature so far presents and reflects current developments in research and theorizing on attachment processes in adulthood. The extant attachment literature has largely focused on individual and dyadic level phenomena. There are few studies comparing various types of relationships in terms of the attachment functions they provide. Most attachment researchers have devoted little energy to examining systems of relationships. Clearly they are an important facet of our social lives and warrant more illumination from an attachment perspective. The present study will extend the
application of the attachment perspective in studying adults’ multiple relationships: love relationship and friendship relationship.

Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to answer the following questions: Do early attachment experiences affect adult interpersonal functioning across types of close relationships or is there a systematic influence specific to particular types of relationships? There is a substantial amount of evidence suggesting a relationship between early attachment experience and subsequent social functioning. The work that has been done with adult interpersonal relationships is supportive, but few systematic studies exist that compare the impact of the early attachment relationship on multiple adult relationships.

This study will examine the association between the perceptions of parent-child attachment relationships and measures of adult social emotional adjustment: a broad measure of self-esteem, a measure of adult attachment style and two specific adult interpersonal relationships: friendship and love relationship. A schematic model is presented in Figure 1.

These four constructs are chosen because they represent distinct aspects of adult social emotional adjustment. The first measure mentioned above is the broad measure of self-esteem. This measure is important to address the question whether early attachment experiences influence an adult’s overall sense of self worth, and thereby influences individual social relationship in a similar way. More specifically, according to Bowlby, the attachment relationship between a child and his or her primary caregiver is central to the
individual’s emerging sense of self and to the sense of what to expect in relationships with other. This internal representation of self and other becomes part of the individual’s mental structure and provides the foundation for later interpersonal relationships.

Including a measure of adult attachment style allows examination of a parallel question. Are perceptions of family experiences related to an individual’s adult attachment style in a meaningful way? If this is the case, does attachment style influence only certain adult relationship or is the influence constant regardless of the relationship in question?

As mentioned earlier, romantic relationships generally are expected to be the most important attachment relationships in adult life. In fact, any adult relationships, such as friendship, potentially could meet the criteria of an attachment component. The friendship and romantic love relationships are chosen to represent two distinct aspects of interpersonal functioning. They encompass discrete underlying relationship bonds (Weiss, 1986) and represent two different life tasks (Simpson & Rholes, 1998). A romantic love relationship shares more similar characteristics with child-parent attachment than a friendship relationship. The relationship satisfaction between dating couples relies on emotional and behavioral compatibility and a feeling of shared trust and commitment to each other (Weiss, 1986). This bond relationship is based on feelings of enhanced security linked to the presence of the person to whom there is attachment. Naming this bond “attachment” expresses a belief that the bond is based on a development of the emotional system Bowlby identified as linking children to parents.

Friendships are equally important as love relationship to overall well being and proved to be of critical emotional significance. This bond of relationship is based on
Figure 1: Schematic Model of Relationship between Parent-Child Attachment Relationships and Adult Interpersonal Functioning
recognition of shared interests and outlooks. From this sharedness can develop a sense of
mutuality, feelings of affection, respect, and loyalty. There is reason to believe that some
close friendships have an attachment component. A relationship with a best friend may
contain many of the same elements of the love relationship. The partners seek proximity
to each other; they give care and protection to each other; each feels more secure when
with the other; separation or threat of separation occasions anxiety, and lose would
certainly cause grief. But the difference in intensity (e.g., more love will be expressed for
a romantic partner than for a friend) and commitment make these two relationships
distinct. “Affiliation”, based on recognition of shared interests, respect and loyalty, best
describes a friendship relationship (Weiss, 1986).

In fact, Kirkpatrick (1998) contends that romantic and peer relationships provide
unique information about an individual’s attachment history in different kinds of
relationships experienced at different points of development. In all likelihood, the two
relationships assess different components of working models that are embedded in large,
complex, and interrelated mental networks (Collins & Read, 1994). Different
components may represent different types of relationships (e.g., parent-child, romantic,
friendship), with components formed earlier in development (i.e., those concerning one’s
parents and caregiving) possibly affecting components formed later (i.e., those relevant to
peers or romantic partners). Within each type of relationship, components are likely to
have different beliefs, assumptions, and expectancies about what certain types of
relationships are like (or should like), and specific beliefs, assumptions, or expectancies
about how certain people are likely to think, feel, and behave in specific situations.

Based on the evidence presented above, I propose the following hypotheses:
1. Given the description of Ainsworth’s secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant styles, I expect roughly 60% of adults to classify themselves as secure and the remainder to split fairly evenly between the two insecure types (AAS), with perhaps a few more in the avoidant than in the anxious-ambivalent category. In a summary of American studies of the three types of infants, Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, and Stenberg (1983) concluded that 62% are secure, 23% are avoidant, and 15% are anxious-ambivalent. Given a diverse sample of American college students, I think it is reasonable to expect approximately the same proportions.

2. Because attachment style is thought to develop in infancy and childhood, I expect respondents of the three adult attachment styles (AAS) to report different attachment histories (PAQ). According to the theory, secure respondents should remember their parents as dependably responsive, caring, and supportive; anxious-ambivalent respondents should remember a mixture of positive and negative experiences with their parents; avoidant respondents should report that their parents were generally cold and rejecting.

3. Because Bowlby emphasized the role of mother in the formation of a child-caregiver attachment relationship, I expect early attachment experiences with mothers (PAQ-Mother) will be more strongly related to adult attachment style (AAS) than experiences with fathers.

4. An individual’s early attachment experiences (PAQ) will be influential in the construction of the mental representation of self. I expect that supportive and sensitive parenting will increase the likelihood of a positive self-esteem (SEI).
5. Individual’s perceptions of early attachment experiences (PAQ) are related to the quality of his/her interpersonal relationships (QRI) (e.g., satisfying friendship and relationships).

5a. In addition, based on Hazan and Shaver’s conceptualization that love relationships share important characteristics with child-parent attachment relationships, it was further hypothesized that the relationships would be stronger for the love relationship, less strong for the friendship subscales.

6. I predict that adult attachment style (AAS) will be significantly related to adult’s interpersonal functioning (QRI) and adult attachment style will have more influence on adult romantic love relationship than on friendship relationship.

7. Respondents’ measure of self-esteem (SEI) will be expected to differ according to their attachment style (AAS). Secure respondents should have a more positive view about themselves and others than insecure respondents.

8. I predict adult self-esteem (SEI) will be related to the quality of adult interpersonal relationships (QRI).

9. Empirical evidence suggests gender differences in friendship and social interaction. Females report higher levels of disclosure to friends and sexual partners and greater satisfaction with them, and place more emphasis on mutual support and on relationships generally. Therefore, attachment style and gender role expectations jointly influence interpersonal behavior in close relationship. This reasoning suggests the hypothesis that gender differences may interact significantly with attachment style in the prediction of relationship quality with women’s orientation to the relationship be more predictive of the quality of close relationship.
A model will be tested which suggests a path (Figure 1) from parent-child attachment to two indicators of adult representations of self (adult attachment style and self-esteem). These two indicators are predictive of the quality of friendship and love relationship. The direct association between the early attachment experiences with parents and the individual’s quality of close relationship will also be analyzed.
Chapter 3
Methodology

The literature cited thus far suggests that early attachment experience, particularly how nurturing, supportive, and sensitive the parent is to the child’s needs for security, comfort, and autonomy, influences the individual’s ability to be part of a healthy, satisfying relationship. Nine hypotheses were developed to determine how perceptions of early attachment experience influence the adult’s attachment, self-esteem, and two distinct interpersonal relationships. To analyze these relationships, information was collected about (a) the adult’s perceptions of the degree to which his or her mother and father were caring and sensitive to his or her needs for security and autonomy, (b) the individual’s self-esteem, (c) the level of support and conflict in the romantic love relationship, (d) the level of support and conflict in friendship relationship, and (e) the adult’s attachment style.

Subjects

The questionnaire packet was distributed to a sample of college students at the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. A moderately gender balanced sample was sought. The desired sample size was 120. The sample size was based on the statistical assumption that in order to obtain statistically significant results, the minimum number of subjects for each sample group should be thirty. Because the effect of gender difference was taken into account in the relationship between early attachment experiences and adult
interpersonal functioning and each gender group was comprised of two AAS categories, therefore the desired sample size of 120 was determined.

Three hundred and sixty-four questionnaire packets were distributed and 116 of them were returned to the investigator. The response rate was 32%. The final sample was comprised of 73 females and 43 males.

Measures

Demographic data: A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain subjects’ demographic data, such as sex, age, race, marital status, parental marital status.

Early attachment history. The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) (Kenny, 1985), a self-report, 30-item Likert scale was used to assess the subject’s perceptions about their parents’ attitude towards them and their relationships with their fathers (PAQ-father) and mothers (PAQ-mother). Subjects provided a single rating for each parent. If the parents are separated, divorced, remarried, or widowed, the subjects answer in relation to the living parent or the parent with whom they feel closer.

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) was designed to assess perceived parental availability, understanding, acceptance, respect for autonomy, and facilitation of autonomy. The PAQ contains two scales: Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support and Parental Fostering of Autonomy, which were derived from factor analysis. Subjects were asked to respond to each of the 30-items by choosing the number on a 5-point Likert scale (1, not at all; 2, somewhat; 3, a moderate amount; 4, quite a bit; 5, very much) that best described their parents, their relationship with their parents, and their feelings or experiences. In this study, difference between ratings of mother and father were
evaluated. Based on these analyses, the PAQ scores may be combined to test most hypotheses.

The reliability of the attachment measure was assessed by Kenny (1987) through test-retest and internal consistency methods. Test-retest reliability over a 2-week interval was .92 for the measure as a whole and ranged from .82 to .91 for the two scales derived from factor analysis. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was calculated for each of the scales, yielding coefficients of .88 and .88 respectively. Internal consistency for the entire measure is Cronbach alpha of .93 for male college students and .95 female college students. Evidence of construct validity was obtained by correlating each of the factor scales with the subscales of the Moos Family Environment scale (Moos, 1985). The attachment scales were significantly correlated with the Moos scales for which correlations were expected and were not correlated with the scales for which correlations were unexpected. More specifically, significant correlations were obtained between Parental Fostering of Autonomy on the PAQ and Expressiveness (r=.33, p<.01), Independence (r=.35, p<.01) and Control (r=.40, p<.01) on the FES and between parental Role in Providing Emotional Support on the PAQ and Cohesion (r=.45, p<.001) and Expressiveness (r=.33, p<.01) on the FES (Kenny, 1988). Further evidence of construct validity is derived from the factor structure of the PAQ (Kenny, 1990). The two factor scales are theoretically consistent with Ainsworth et al.’s (1978) conceptualization of attachment as a secure base in providing emotional support and in fostering autonomy and mastery of the environment. The relationship of the PAQ to social desirability was evaluated by Kenny (1990) for a group of college students. Correlations were not significant between scores for the Marlowe Crowne Social desirability Scale and the
PAQ Scales, Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support. A small, but statistically significant correlation, \((r = .22, \rho < .04)\) was found between Social Desirability and PAQ Parental Fostering of Autonomy scale.

A related problem of the PAQ in relationship to its validity as a measure of early attachment history is that of reliance on retrospective accounts of early parent-child relationships. The retrospective data may not be an accurate assessment of childhood experience. Main argued that people's notion of their past experiences with parents may be seen as a function of reconstructed and reinterpreted sense of self and memories of days past, having more to do with current psychological status than the way in which their caregivers really treated them or even their "working through" of such experiences. However, this does not take away from the potential power of self-report in measuring something important in the adult. Indeed, the meta-analytic data in the Van Ijzendoorn (1995) review shows that whatever self-report procedure measures, it is related to the infant's behavior in the Strange Situation some 12 to 18 months later.

Therefore, perceptions of childhood experiences may be influential in guiding internal working models and interpersonal behavior. It is encouraging that individual responses to the questions about relationship history did discriminate among different aspects of their interpersonal functioning. This discriminative responding adds to the validity of the measure. Future studies examining internal representational models will help elucidate this question.

**Self-esteem.** The "broad" view of attachment is one that may be thought of as something akin to an Eriksonian view of attachment. That is, the feeling of security or insecurity generated by this initial attachment relationship between mother and infant
permeates the psychological being of the individual and provides a sense of basic trust or mistrust about the way in which the environment will react. The primary relationship between mother and infant forms the essence through which all subsequent relationships and, indeed, individual self-esteem and self-effectance are interpreted.

Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI): Adult Form (Coopersmith, 1981) was used to assess the subject’s attitudes toward self in social and personal contexts.

Since its development, the SEI has been administered to tens of thousands of children and adults participating in research studies or in special educational or clinical programs to enhance self-esteem. All socioeconomic ranges and many ethnic and cultural groups are represented. Well over 100 studies have been conducted, and those included here are meant to be representative.

*Internal Consistency:* Bedeian, Geagud, and Zmud (1977) administered the SEI Adult Form to 103 college students in one study and reported Kuder-Richardson reliability estimates (KR20s) of .74 for males and .71 for females.

*Stability:* Bedeian, Geagud, and Zmud (1977) computed test-retest reliability estimates for 103 college students who are administered the Adult Form. Coefficients are .80 for males and .82 for females.

*Construct Validity:* A study of SEI construct validity was reported by Kokenes (1974, 1978). Her investigations were designed to observe the comparative importance of the home, peers, and school to the global self-esteem of adolescents. Her study “confirmed the construct validity of the subscales proposed by Coopersmith as measuring sources of self-esteem.”
On the basis of studies conducted or reviewed by Coopersmith, it was found that SEI scores are significantly related to resistance to group pressures, willingness to express unpopular opinions (Coopersmith, 1967); perceived reciprocal liking (Simon and Bernstein, 1967); perceived popularity (Simon, 1967); effective communication between parents and youth (Matteson, 1974); and family adjustment (Matteson, 1974).

**Factor analyses:** Kokenes (1973) performed a factor analysis on the SEI (School Form) responses of 7600 children (grades 4 through 8). The sample included students from all socioeconomic ranges. Four pairs of bipolar factors emerged; each pair seemed to be highly congruent with the subscales of the SEI. There were factors related to the School-Academic subscale (Success and Failure); Factors related to the Social Self-Peers subscale (Success and Failure); factors related to the Home-Parents subscale (Good-Poor); and factors related to the General Self subscale (Perceived adequacy of Self, Perceived Inadequacy of Self, and Rejection of Self).

Several other factor analyses support the multidimensionality of the SEI. Crandall (Shaver and Robinson, 1973) reported four factors emerging in two factor analyses of college students' scores. These factors were labeled Self-Derogation, Leadership-Popularity, Family-Parents, and Assertiveness-Anxiety. The Family-Parents factor was the most stable and unambiguous.

**Multitrait-Multimethod Validity:** Taylor and Reits (1968) reported a correlation of .45 between the SEI and the California Psychological Inventory Self-Acceptance scale and correlations of .42 and .66 with other scales. Divergent validity was examined by correlating SEI scores with scores on the Edwards and Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scales. Obtained coefficients were .75 and .44 respectively.
In another study addressed validity, Crandall (Shaver and Roovinson, 1973) found correlations of .59 and .60 between the SEI Adult Form and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for college students.

**Romantic and friendship relationships.** The Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI) (Pierce, Sarason and Sarason, 1991) was chosen to measure perceptions of the love (QRI-love) and friendship (QRI-friendship) relationships for each subject. Subjects were asked to respond to 25 questions using a 4 point scale indicating whether each statement was not at all like, somewhat unlike, somewhat like or very much like their love and friendship relationships. Support, the first dimension, of the scale measures the extent to which the individual can rely on the other person to do whatever he or she can to be of assistance. Depth, the second dimension, assesses the extent to which the relationship is important in the subject’s life. Conflict, the third dimension measures the extent to which the individual experiences angry or ambivalent feelings toward the other person. Pierce, and colleagues (Pierce, et al., 1991) reported stable test-retest reliability estimates ranging from .67 to .82 (mean = .758). They reported adequate internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha across the scales generally in the .80s and .90s.

**Adult attachment style.** The Adult attachment Style scale (AAS) (Hazan and Shaver, 1987; 1992) is a single trichotomous item designed to assess the adult’s predominant attachment style. The adult selects one of three descriptions of interpersonal style which is best self-descriptive. These descriptions correspond to “secure”, “anxious-ambivalent”, and “avoidant” attachment styles. The components of each description were translated from Ainsworth et al.’s descriptions of infant attachment styles to their parents.
In a self-report study of 840 college students, Brennan, Shaver, and Tobey (1991) included both Hazan and Shaver’s (1987, 1990) romantic attachment questionnaire and Bartholomew’s (1991) relationship questionnaire. Participants placed themselves into one of Hazan and Shaver’s three categories (secure, anxious, and avoidant) and rated how self-descriptive each of the three prototypes was. They also placed themselves into one of Bartholomew’s four categories (secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing) and rated how self-descriptive each of the four prototypes was.

A chi-square analysis indicated that the classifications obtained from the two system were significantly related $\chi^2 (6)=370.31, p<.001$. Of the people who classified themselves as secure on Bartholomew’s measure, 82% were secure on the Hazan-Shaver measure. Of those who classified themselves as preoccupied on Bartholomew’s measure, 57% were anxious-ambivalent (the conceptually parallel category) on the Hazan-Shaver measure. Of those who classified themselves as fearful on Bartholomew’s measure, 61% called themselves avoidant on the Hazan-Shaver measure. Of those who classified themselves as dismissing on Bartholomew’s measure, 43% called themselves avoidant on the Hazan-Shaver measure and 45% called themselves secure. As suggested earlier, there is no category on the Hazan-Shaver measure that is strongly parallel to dismissing, so most dismissing subjects are forced to choose fearful, which acknowledges their avoidant tendencies, or secure, which emphasizes their autonomy and self-esteem.

Participants in the Brennan et al. (1991) study rated all seven prototypes from the two self-report measures, so it was possible to conduct correlational as well as categorical analysis by Bartholomew and Shaver. The correlations for the parallel ratings (secure with secure, etc.) were all highly significant and ranged from .46 (for fearful with
avoidant) to .55 (for the two secure ratings). In each case, these correlations were higher than any of the correlations among nonparallel ratings. The dismissing rating was not strongly correlated with any of the Hazan-Shaver ratings, but its correlation with the avoidant rating—the most logical quasi-parallel category—was significant, .23. When the seven ratings were submitted to factor analysis, two clear factors emerged. On the first factor, the two secure ratings loaded positively (.78 and .79), the avoidant and fearful ratings loaded negatively (-.77 and -.68), and the other ratings loaded below .35. On the second factor, the anxious-ambivalent and preoccupied ratings loaded positively (.84 and .77), and dismissing rating loaded negatively (-.52), and the other ratings loaded below .20. These factors confirm the convergence between the two measures, and they correspond clearly to the Bartholomew’s two dimensional classification.

Research into the stability of Hazan and Shaver’s three group measure is summarized in Table 1. The most comprehensive report is provided by Baldwin and Fehr (1995). These researchers report six studies involving mass testing of college students, with the time lag between testing sessions varying from 12 to 16 weeks. Combined, the samples show an overall stability rate of 67.4%; that is, just over two thirds of subjects chose the same attachment description on each occasion. When the level of agreement across the two occasions is adjusted for chance (using Cohen’s Kappa), the result indicates fair agreement. Note that stability rates differ according to attachment type, as defined by Time 1 classification; rates range from 80.5% (secure) to 32% (anxious-ambivalent). This pattern is not unexpected, given the high base rate for secure attachment and the low base rate for anxious-ambivalence.
Baldwin and Fehr (1995) also report stability data supplied to them by other researchers (Keelan, Dion, & Dion, 1994; Pistole, 1989; Senchak & Leonard, 1992; Shaver & Brennan, 1992) and based on time interval from 1 week to 1 year. Overall stability rates are slightly higher than for Baldwin and Fehr’s samples, varying from 71% to 80%. Although Senchak and Leonard’s (1992) sample is unique, involving couples undergoing the transition to marriage, it yields similar rates of stability to other samples; also, in all cases, stability is greatest for secure subjects and least for anxious-ambivalent subjects.

Finally, other researchers whose data are not included in Baldwin and Fehr’s (1995) analyses report similar stability rates for the three-group measure (see Table 1; lower portion). Most notably, in the longest prospective study to date, Kirkpatrick and Hazan (1994) report a 4-year follow up of a sample of newspaper respondents (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Despite the long time interval, 70% of subjects endorsed the same attachment description on both occasions.

Hazan and Shaver report that the subjects in their sample were able to meaningfully classify themselves. The frequency of each style was similar to that reported in the infancy attachment literature (i.e., approximately 60% secure, 20% avoidant and 20% anxious-ambivalent). As further validation of the difference between attachment styles, subjects responded predictably in the way they experience romantic love.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Timelag</th>
<th>Time 1 Secure</th>
<th>Time 2 Avoidant</th>
<th>Time 3 Anx.-Amb.</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin &amp; Fehr (1995)</td>
<td>12-16 weeks</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistole, 1989</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keelan, Dion, &amp; Dion, 1994</td>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaver &amp; Brennan, 1992</td>
<td>40 weeks</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senchak &amp; Leonard, 1992</td>
<td>52 weeks</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeney &amp; Nooler, 1992</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick &amp; Hazan, 1994</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Stability of Hazan & Shaver Three-Group Force-Choice Measure of Adult Attachment
Procedures

The proposed research was reviewed and approved by Human Subjects IRB. The faculty in the Departments of Human Development and Family Sciences, Chemical Engineering, and Social Work were contacted to ask permission to present the study in their classes during Fall Quarter, 1999. No incentive was offered to participants who chose to complete the questionnaire packet. Potential participants were informed that they were not obliged to participate and they could quit anytime if they felt uncomfortable in answering any of the questions in the questionnaires.

The script was read in class or placed in mail boxes. Participants were asked to participate in a voluntary research project investigating the relationship between early attachment relationship with parents and later interpersonal relationships in adulthood. The subjects completed the questionnaire packet anonymously.

Participants who chose to participate were given a packet containing the 4 questionnaires described above that take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Subjects completed the packets at home and returned them in a self-addressed, stamped envelopes to the investigator. Each subject was assigned an identification number which was used to insure confidentiality.

The questionnaire packet (Appendix A) contains the following items: (a) a demographic questionnaire; (b) two Parental Attachment Questionnaires—one targeting mothers, the other fathers; (c) Self-Esteem Inventory: Adult Form; (d) two Quality of Relationship Inventories—one targeting the romantic love relationship and one targeting the friendship relationship; (e) Hazan and Shaver’s Adult Attachment Style scale (AAS).
Chapter 4

Results

In the previous chapter, the psychometric analyses used to determine the quality of the instruments included in this study were described. To begin the chapter, the results of the descriptive analyses will be discussed. Next, associations among perceptions of the early attachment experiences with parents, self-esteem, adult attachment style, and the quality of the love and friendship relationships as a function of gender will be presented for each hypothesis outlined in Chapter 2. Finally, path analysis, examining the overall model, will be reported.

Descriptive Analyses

The descriptive analyses were performed for each of the instruments used in this study. This section will begin with the demographic characteristics of the sample, followed by descriptive statistics for the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ), the Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI), Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI), and Adult Attachment Style (AAS) scale.

The sample was comprised of 73 female and 43 male students at the Ohio State University who ranged in age from 19-56 years and 21-49 years respectively. The mean age for women was 25.58 with a standard deviation of 8.12. The mean age for men was 28.63 with standard deviation of 5.22. The majority of the subjects were European Americans (67%), while minorities were African Americans (11%), Asian Americans
(4%), Native American (1%), and others (17%). The majority of the female subjects were single (67%) and the majority of the male subjects were single (51%). The majority of the subjects’ parents were married (69%). Sample demographics are summarized in Table 2.

The Parental Attachment Questionnaire was used to measure the subject’s perceptions of his or her attachment relationships with both mother and father. Subjects provided information about the degree to which mother and father were supportive (Mother-Support; Father-Support) and facilitators of independence (Mother-Independence; Father-Independence). Scores were calculated for each of the subscales. High scores on the support subscale indicate greater parental support, whereas low support scores suggest emotional coldness or rejection. High scores on the independence subscale suggest parental encouragement for and sensitivity to the child’s needs for independence, whereas low scores reflect overprotection and insensitivity to the child’s autonomy needs. The higher the score, the more positive the relationship between the subjects and their parents. Means and standard deviations for each of the Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales are shown in Table 3. All items were subjected to analysis to determine internal reliability. Cronbach alpha coefficients, also presented in Table 3, are consistent with those reported in the literature and indicate the presence of internally consistent subscales.

As part of the preliminary analyses, the intercorrelations among the Parental Attachment Questionnaire subscales were performed and are presented in Table 4. Because high scores on support subscale are indicative of a supportive and nurturing parent-child relationship and high independence scores are indicative of sensitive
parenting, we would expect these two subscales to be positively correlated. The correlation coefficients indicate a moderate degree of association for both women and men. The strongest associations for women were between Father-Support and Father-Independence ($r=.61$, $p<.01$), Father-Independence and Mother-Independence ($r=.57$, $p<.01$), and Mother-Support and Mother-Independence ($r=.55$, $p=.01$). These correlations suggest that the more supportive the parents were, the more likely they were to be sensitive to their daughters’ need for independence. In addition, the parents of the daughters tended to be coordinated in the supportive and sensitive aspects of their parenting. The strongest associations for men were between Father-Support and Father-Independence ($r=.49$, $p<.01$), Father-Independence and Mother-Independence ($r=.44$, $p<.01$), and Mother-Support and Mother-Independence ($r=.34$, $p<.05$). This suggested that if the parents were supportive and nurturing, they were more likely to provide encouragement for and be sensitive to their sons’ need for autonomy. The high correlation between mother and father support and as facilitators of independence scores suggests a problem of multicollinearity. To exam the multicollinearity between the Support and Independence subscales, a $R^2$ was computed. The $R^2$ value was 68% which indicated that the scores on Support and Independence subscales were intercorrelated. Consequently, it will be difficult to determine in subsequent analyses whether mother or father variable is more influential, since they are perceived as acting in a highly coordinated manner in this regard.

The Self-Esteem Inventory: Adult Form was used to measure the subject’s overall sense of self-worth. High scores reflect positive overall sense of self worth, while low scores correspond to low self-esteem (according to Coopersmith, the means have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (N=73)</th>
<th>Men (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>28.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>19-56</td>
<td>21-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-habitant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Standard Deviation

Table 2: Demographic Statistics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (N=73)</th>
<th>Men (N=43)</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Attachment Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>61.33 (10.08)</td>
<td>53.14 (10.94)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>55.07 (9.98)</td>
<td>50.95 (9.76)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>52.99 (16.42)</td>
<td>50.98 (14.25)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>53.52 (12.12)</td>
<td>50.37 (11.68)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Relationship Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Support</td>
<td>21.60 (5.06)</td>
<td>20.00 (3.17)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Depth</td>
<td>26.32 (4.60)</td>
<td>25.12 (4.62)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Conflict</td>
<td>21.41 (6.50)</td>
<td>24.54 (5.95)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Support</td>
<td>20.95 (3.37)</td>
<td>18.86 (3.93)</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Depth</td>
<td>24.64 (4.23)</td>
<td>21.95 (4.04)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td>17.19 (10.15)</td>
<td>16.07 (5.05)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem Inventory</strong></td>
<td>75.89 (18.10)</td>
<td>76.33 (17.50)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses*

*Table3: Means and Standard Deviations as a Function for All Measures*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother Support</th>
<th>Mother Independence</th>
<th>Father Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher Support scores reflect more support and care while high Independence scores reflect more encouragement and sensitivity to the child’s independence needs.

*p < .01

**p < .05

Table 4: Intercorrelations among Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales as a Function of Gender
generally been in the range of from 70 to 80 with a standard deviation of from 13 to 15). The mean score for the female subjects is 75.89 with a standard deviation of 18.10. The mean self-esteem score for the male subjects is 76.33 with a standard deviation of 17.50. The information is summarized in Table 3.

The Quality of Relationship Inventory was used to measure aspects of the romantic love and friendship relationships. Specifically, information was obtained about the levels of support (Love and Friend-Support), depth (Love and Friend-Depth) and conflict (Love and Friend-Conflict) in each relationship. The advantage of using the same instrument for both relationships was direct comparison between the love and friendship relationships. Means and standard deviations for each of the subscales are summarized in Table 3.

To analyze the internal structure of the instrument, correlation coefficients were analyzed for both the QRI-Love and QRI-Friend subscales and are presented in Table 5. Analyses indicated that the QRI-Love Support and Depth subscales are intercorrelated for women ($r=.22$) and significantly correlated for men ($r=.67$, $p<.01$); and QRI-Friend Support and QRI-Friend Depth subscales are also highly intercorrelated for women ($r=.74$, $p<.01$) and men ($r=.74$, $p<.01$). When the QRI subscales were submitted to factor analysis, two clear factors emerged. On the first factor, the QRI-Love Support and Depth subscales loaded positively (.76 and .77), the QRI-Love Conflict subscale loaded negatively (-.69). On the second factor, the QRI-Friend Support and Depth subscales loaded positively (.81 and .74), and QRI-Friend Conflict subscale loaded negatively (-.56). These factors confirm the convergence between the QRI-Support and Depth
subscales. Because it is likely that these subscales are measuring a single positive aspect of the love and friendship relationships, these subscales were collapsed into one subscale (Love-Positive and Friend-Positive) for use in subsequent analyses.

Adult attachment style was assessed using the Adult Attachment Style single trichotomous item questionnaire. Descriptive statistics for the adult attachment style were examined to ensure that each style was adequately represented. Eighty percent of the women endorsed the secure attachment style, 8% endorsed the anxious-ambivalent style and 12% endorsed the avoidant style. Sixty-one% of the men classified themselves as secure, 2% as anxious-ambivalent and 37% as avoidant. Although the percentages are comparable to those reported in the literature, the low number of subjects in either of the two insecure attachment groups alone was a concern. Therefore the two insecure categories were collapsed into one insecure dimension.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis was that according to American studies of the three types of infants, Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, and Stenberg (1983) concluded that 62% are secure, 15% are anxious-ambivalent, and 23% are avoidant. Given the description of Ainsworth’s secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles, the proportions of the adult attachment classifications would be comparable to those reported in the infant attachment literature. The percentages of the adult attachment styles were presented in Table 6.

The descriptive statistics show that 72% of the subjects classified themselves as secure attachment style, 6% as anxious-ambivalent and 22% as avoidant. To examine the representativeness of the sample, a chi-square value is computed. The percentages of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QRI Subscales</th>
<th>Women (N=73)</th>
<th>Men (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
*p<.01
**p<.05

Table 5: Intercorrelations among Quality of Relationship Inventory Subscales as a Function of Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (N=73)</th>
<th>Men (N=43)</th>
<th>Total (N=116)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>58 (80%)</td>
<td>26 (61%)</td>
<td>84 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious-Ambivalent</td>
<td>6 (08%)</td>
<td>1 (02%)</td>
<td>7 (07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>16 (37%)</td>
<td>25 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The Proportions of the Adult Attachment Style Classification
three types of infants in the studies of Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, and Stenberg (1983) were used as the "true proportions" and the percentages obtained in the current study were the hypothesized proportions for the AAS classification in computing the chi-square value. According to the chi-square \( X^2 (5)=5.3, p<.01 \), it does not suggest that the sample in the study is over-represented or under-represented. Therefore the proportions are comparable to those reported in the infant attachment studies. However, the percentage of the anxious-ambivalent style is low as compared to the literature. The result may be attributable to the nature of the sample. There is potentially a selection bias inherent in the motivation to complete the questionnaire. As a result, the sample is potentially weighted toward those with greater motivation and interest in this research as well as those who are more sensitive to the needs of others. Those interested and willing to take the time to complete the questionnaire are more likely to have sensitivity, motivation and interest in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, this selection bias inherent in the sample may affect the frequency distribution of the three attachment styles of the subjects.

**Hypothesis 2.** The second hypothesis was that the adult attachment styles would be associated with different parental attachment histories. To test this notion, correlations were obtained between the two PAQ subscales and the adult attachment styles. As mentioned earlier, the two insecure categories were condensed into one insecure dimension because of the low number of the subjects in either of the anxious-ambivalent or the avoidant group and the two-group dimensions will be used for all the subsequent analyses.
The correlation coefficients presented in Table 7 suggest some support for the hypothesis that the perceptions of early attachment experiences with parents are related to adult attachment style.

The patterns of correlations are different for women and men. For women, only the PAQ subscale, Father-Independence ($r=.26$, $p<.05$) was significantly correlated with adult attachment style.

For men, Father-Support ($r=.42$, $p<.01$) was the only subscale that was significantly correlated with their adult attachment style. The directionality in both cases was as expected; parental support and high facilitator of independence scores were associated with secure attachment. The results are summarized in Table 7.

Because correlations are limited in their ability to explain the relationship among several variables, regression analyses were performed to measure the ability of the four PAQ subscales to explain variation in adult attachment styles. These results are summarized in Table 8. The test of the overall model was not significant ($F=1.29$; df=4,69) for women, however, the variable that contributed significantly to the overall effect was Father-Independence ($F=4.97$; df=4,69; $p<.05$).

The test of the overall model was significant ($F=2.85$; df=4.39; $P<.05$) for men. The sole variable that contributed to the main effect was Father-Support ($F=9.00$; df=4.39; $p<.01$).

Based on the theory in Chapter 2, it should be possible to differentiate attachment style using information about the individual’s early attachment relationship history with parents. To measure the ability of the PAQ to discriminate between the two adult attachment styles, a discriminate function analysis was performed. The discriminant
analysis is presented in Table 8. As mentioned at the end of the descriptive analysis, adult attachment style was reduced to two groups. The two-group discriminant function analysis involving the four PAQ subscales yielded an index of discrimination of 7.1% for women and 23.1% for men. This index, tested for significance, yielded a significant F-ratio (F=2.85; df=4,39; p<.01) for men. Father-Support carried the most discriminating power for men (18%). Table 9 presents the PAQ subscale means and standard deviations by attachment group and gender.

**Hypothesis 3.** The third hypothesis was that the perceptions of early attachment experiences with mothers would be more strongly related to adult attachment style than experiences with fathers. According to the intercorrelations among PAQ subscales and the Adult Attachment Style presented in Table 7, higher scores on PAQ are correlated with individuals’ secure AAS and lower scores on PAQ are correlated with individuals’ insecure AAS. The perceptions of the early attachment relationships with fathers are more highly correlated with both women and men’s adult attachment style. For women, Father-Independence (r=.26, p<.05) subscales and adult attachment style are correlated. For men, Father-Support is the best predictor of adult attachment style(r=.42, p<.01). The results show that Father variables are the only significant predictors.

**Hypothesis 4.** The fourth hypothesis was that individual’s early attachment experiences, would be important in the construction of an individual's mental representation of self. In other words, supportive and sensitive parenting will be associated with the individual’s positive self-esteem. To test the hypothesis, the correlation coefficients were computed between the subjects’ scores on the PAQ subscales and on the Self-Esteem Inventory. The results are summarized in Table 10. As
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores on PAQ are correlated with individuals’ secure AAS; lower scores on PAQ are correlated with individuals’ insecure AAS

*P<.01

**p<.05

Table 7: Intercorrelations among Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales and Adult Attachment Style as a Function of Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Multiple Regression Summary for Dichotomized Adult Attachment Style as a Function of Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAQ Subscale</th>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>60.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.77)</td>
<td>(11.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.04)</td>
<td>(13.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.77)</td>
<td>(18.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>55.09</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.99)</td>
<td>(14.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.22)</td>
<td>(10.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.68)</td>
<td>(11.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>55.81</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.58)</td>
<td>(13.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.22)</td>
<td>(11.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses

Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations for Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales by Attachment Style and Gender
expected, individual’s attachment relationship with parents during childhood increases the likelihood of positive self-esteem in their adulthood. The subjects’ perceptions of their attachment experiences in their childhood are associated with their overall sense of self worth, or working model of self. According to Table 10, women’s scores on self-esteem are associated with Mother-Support (r=.28, p<.05), Mother Independence(r=.36, p<.01), and Father-Independence (r=.27, p<.05) subscales. For men, the best predictors for their positive self-esteem are their scores on Mother-Support (r=.32, p<.05) and Mother-Independence (r=.39, p<.01) subscales. Therefore, the more positive their attachment memories with their mothers, the higher their self-esteem in adulthood. Specifically, the mothers’ being supportive, caring, and as facilitators for their children’s autonomy needs are predictive for their children’s positive self-esteem in adulthood.

**Hypothesis 5.5a.** The fifth hypothesis was that individual’s perception of early attachment experiences is related to the quality of his/her interpersonal functioning in adulthood (e.g., satisfying love and friendship relationships). It was further hypothesized (hypothesis 5a) that the relationships would be stronger for the love relationship, less strong for the friendship relationship. To test this hypothesis in a preliminary way, correlations were obtained between the four PAQ subscales and the four dependent relationship measures; (a) Love-Positive; (b) Love-Conflict; (c) Friendship-Positive; (d) Friendship-Conflict. The correlations, summarized in Table 11, 12 provided mixed support for the hypotheses.

For women, the correlations between the PAQ subscales and Love-Positive scale (Table 11) were significant and supported hypothesis 5. Mother-Support (r=.27 p<.05),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=73)</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Attachment Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01  
**p<.05

Table 10: Correlations between Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales and Self-Esteem Inventory as a Function of Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Love-Positive</th>
<th>Love-Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend-Support</th>
<th>Friend-Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
**p<.05

Table 11: Intercorrelations between Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales and Quality of Relationship Inventories for Women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love-Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love-Conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend-Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire for Women (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire for Women
Mother-Independence ($r=.28$, $p<.05$), Father-Support ($r=.24$, $p<.05$), and Father-Independence ($r=.26$, $p<.05$) were all positively related to Love-Positive. The only PAQ subscale which was significantly correlated with Love-Conflict scale was Mother-Independence ($r=-.24$, $p<.05$). Unexpectedly, PAQ subscales were not significantly correlated with either Friend-Positive or Friend-Conflict scores. For all significant correlations, the direction was as expected. Higher support and independence scores were positively correlated with the positive aspects and negatively correlated with the conflict aspects of love relationships, but not with friendship relationship.

The pattern of correlations was different for men. In examining the relationship between the four PAQ subscales and the QRI-Love scores (Table 13), Father-Support ($r=.33$, $p<.05$) was positively correlated with Love-Positive; and was negatively correlated with Love-Conflict ($r=-.44$, $p<.01$). As was true for women, directionality for all significant correlations was in the expected direction.

To measure the ability of the PAQ subscales to explain variance in each of the dependent relationship measures, multiple regression analyses were performed. The results are summarized in Table 12 for women and Table 14 for men.

For women, the degree of association between the PAQ subscale and the Love-Positive scores was significant. In this case, Mother-Independence explained the most variance in the Love-Positive ($R^2=8.0\%$, $p<.05$). In examining the relationship between PAQ subscales and Love-Conflict score, the Mother-Independence subscale contributed most of the variance (5.9\%, $p<.05$) to the Love-Conflict dependent variable.

For men, the degree of association between the PAQ subscales and the QRI-Love scores was significant only for the Father-Support subscale. Father-Support subscale
accounted for 10.7% (p<.05) variance in Love-Positive scores and 19% (p<.01) in the Love-Conflict scores. The variables contributing to this relationship are different for men and for women, with Father-Support carrying the largest percentage of explained variance for men and Mother-Independence for women.

Analyzing the degree of association between PAQ scores and QRI-Friend scores revealed no significant relationships for women or for men. Although for men PAQ scores taken together accounted for 9.1 % of the explained variance in Friend-Positive scores, the overall model did not reach significance (F=0.95; df=4,39).

**Hypothesis 6.** The sixth hypothesis was that adult attachment style (AAS) would be significantly related to adult’s interpersonal functioning (QRI) and adult attachment style would have more influence on adult romantic love relationship than on friendship relationship. Regression analyses were performed to determine the degree to which attachment style can predict the two measures of adult relationships (Table 15, 16).

Analysis suggested that for men, attachment style was able to predict Love-Positive (F=10.76; df=4,39); p<.01), Love-Conflict (F=11.55; df=4,39; p<.01). For women, only one model was significant: Love-Conflict (F=4.16;df=4,69; p<.05) and Adult Attachment Style. However, for both women and men, individual’s adult attachment style is not associated with his/her quality of friendship relationship. For the significant relationships, the direction was as expected. Secure AAS is positively related to the positive aspect of love relationships and is negatively related to the conflict aspect of love relationships.
Hypothesis 7. Hypothesis seven was that respondents’ measure of self-esteem would be expected to differ according to their attachment style. Secure respondents should have a more positive view about themselves and others than insecure respondents.

To test this hypothesis, correlation coefficients were performed between the subjects’ scores on Self-Esteem Inventory and their Adult Attachment Style. The correlations between the two variables are presented in Table 17.

For both women and men, measure of self-esteem and adult attachment style were significantly correlated (r=.48 and .38, p<.01 respectively). This result supports the conceptualization that supportive and sensitive parenting increase the likelihood of the child’s development of an internal working model of self as valued, worthy and competent.

Hypothesis 8. The eighth hypothesis was that individual’s self-esteem would be related to the quality of his/her adult interpersonal relationships. Correlation coefficients were computed to analyze the association between the individual’s self-esteem and his/her quality of love and friendship relationships. According to Table 17, for women the correlations between self-esteem scores and the four QRI subscales were significant for Love-Positive (r=.31, p<.01) and Love-Conflict (r=-.38, p<.01) subscales. For men, the measure of self-esteem was significantly related to their Love-Conflict (r=-.42, p<.05) scores. None of the QRI-Friend subscales was correlated with the measure of individual’s self-esteem. Specifically, the subjects’ overall self-esteem is associated with their quality of love relationship, but not with their friendship relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Love-Positive</th>
<th>Love-Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend-Support</th>
<th>Friend-Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
*p<.01
**p<.05

Table 13: Intercorrelations between Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales and Quality of Relationship Inventories for Men
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love-Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Love-Conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend-Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales for Men (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Independence</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Support</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Independence</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories by Parental Attachment Questionnaire Subscales for Men
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love-Positive</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Conflict</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Positive</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories as a Function of Adult Attachment Style for Women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love-Positive</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Conflict</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Positive</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Multiple Regression Summary for Quality of Relationship Inventories as a Function of Adult Attachment Style for Men
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (N=73)</th>
<th>Men (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Attachment Style</strong></td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Positive</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Conflict</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Positive</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-Conflict</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Secure AAS is correlated with positive self-esteem; whereas insecure AAS is correlated with lower self-esteem.

*p<.01

**p<.05

Table 17: Correlations among Self-Esteem Inventory, Adult Attachment Style Scale and Quality of Relationship Inventories
Hypothesis 9. The ninth hypothesis was that women’s attachment styles would be more predictive of the quality of close relationship than men’s attachment styles. Based on the multiple regression analyses in Table 15 and 16, it indicated that women’s attachment style accounted for the 8.9% explained variance in their scores on the QRI. In contrast, men’s attachment style explained 29.0% variance in the quality of their close relationships. The results did not support the hypothesis that women’s interpersonal orientation to close relationship is more related to the quality of their social functioning than men’s interpersonal orientation.

Path Analysis. To test the schematic model (Figure 1) of relationships between PAQ, adult attachment style, self-esteem and the four relationship measures, several path analyses were conducted. To determine the direct effect of the perceived attachment experiences with mother and father on AAS, the two PAQ subscales, Support and Independence, were merged to create one total score for mother and one for father. Attachment Style was regressed on these two parental variables. The same is true for Self-Esteem. To determine the path coefficients leading to the adult close relationship measures, each dependent variable (Love-Positive, Love-Conflict, Friend-Positive and Friend-Conflict) was regressed on Attachment Style. Correlational analyses between Self-Esteem and the four relationship measures were conducted to examine the relationship between Self-Esteem and individual’s interpersonal functional. To analyze the association between the individual’s early attachment experiences with parents and the individual’s quality of close relationship, each relationship variable was regressed on the two parental variables.
Path analysis results for women suggest that early attachment experience with parents is not directly associated with their AAS when the two parental variables (PAQ-Mother, PAQ-Father) are used, but women’s AAS does influence the quality of their love relationships, especially conflict aspect of the love relationships (Figure 2). It should be noted that when PAQ is separated into Support and Independence scores, the Father-Independence scores do have influence on women’s AAS. Individual’s attachment style is not significantly related to the friendship relationship. The path linking early attachment history and women’s interpersonal functioning suggests an direct effect for attachment experience with both mother and father on women’s love relationship.

With regard to the self-esteem, attachment experiences with mother and father are predictive for women’s self-esteem, which in turn is correlated with Adult Attachment Style and is related to the quality of love relationship.

Path analyses results for men suggest a different pattern (Figure 3). In contrast to women, early attachment experience with fathers is the predominant influence on their adult attachment style which in turn has influence on their interpersonal relationship. Early attachment relationship with mothers is the predominant influence on men’s self-esteem. For men, adult attachment style is associated with their self-esteem and is predictive of their quality of love relationships, especially the conflict component of their love relationships. The path linking early attachment history and men’s love relationship is significant with experience with father carrying the most influence on the love relationship, especially the Love-Conflict subscale.
Note: Only significant relationships are presented (p<.05)

The Support and Independence subscales are combined as the Attachment Experience with Mother and Father measures

Figure 2: Path Analysis for Women
Note: Only significant relationships are presented (p<.05).
The Support and Independence subscales are combined as the Attachment Experience with Mother and Father measures.

Figure 3: Path Analysis for Men
Chapter 5

Discussion

To explore the relationships among perceptions of early attachment experiences and subsequent adult interpersonal functioning, relevant literature was reviewed and nine hypotheses were proposed and tested. It was predicted that the individual’s attachment relationship with parents would be related to her/his adult attachment style and self-esteem, such that perceptions of parental support and sensitivity to autonomy needs would be associated with secure attachment style and positive self-esteem whereas perceptions of cold, neglecting or insensitive parenting would be predictive of insecure attachment style and low self-esteem. It was also predicted that individual’s perceived attachment experience with mother would have more influence than perceived attachment experience with father on the adult attachment style.

It was argued that the individual’s adult attachment style would be related to the quality of his/her close relationships, such as love and friendship relationships. Specifically, those with a secure attachment style would be more inclined to have satisfying interpersonal relationships. It was further proposed that adult attachment style would be associated with positive self-esteem which, in turn, would influence the quality of adult interpersonal relationships.

The association between early attachment history and the quality of two adult interpersonal relationships: love and friendship relationships, was also explored. It was
proposed that supportive, caring and sensitive parenting would be differentially related to the two distinct adult interpersonal relationships. It was hypothesized that the influence would be greater for love relationships than friendship relationships. Lastly, path analyses were performed to explore the unique contribution of each variable in predicting love and friendship relationships as a function of gender.

**Early Attachment Experiences and Adult Attachment Style**

The present study partially supported the hypothesis that early attachment experience is related to adult attachment style. The directionality of correlations is consistent with those reported in the literature (Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Shaver and Hazan, 1992; Collins and Read, 1990; Feeney and Noller, 1990). Individuals who receive supportive and sensitive care as children are more likely to approach later interpersonal relationships in a positive way, reflected in this study by secure attachment style.

While it was expected that parental support and sensitivity to the child’s independence needs would be influential for the development of a secure adult attachment style for both female and male, this was not the case in this sample. Unexpectedly, the degree of support women reported receiving from both parents was not significantly related to their attachment style. Rather, the parental component most related to adult attachment style for women was how sensitive the fathers were to their autonomy needs. If a father supported and facilitated his daughter’s independence needs as a child, she was more likely to have internal representational models of herself as competent, significant, and self-reliant. These were reflected in a secure attachment style.
as an adult. With these representational models guiding her interpersonal behavior, she finds it relatively easy to get close to and trust others without a fear of being abandoned.

However, when the two PAQ-Father subscales, Father-Support and Father-Independence, were merged as a total PAQ-Father score, it is surprising to see that the perceived early attachment relationship with father was not predictive of the women's adult attachment style. One possible explanation for this result is that there is not much variation in the AAS for women. The majority of the women in the sample classified themselves as secure (80%) group. The small numbers in the two insecure groups limited the ability of the PAQ-Father score in predicting the women’s AAS.

In contrast, for men the most salient early attachment experience related to their adult attachment style was how caring and supportive the fathers were. If a man received warm, nurturing, and supportive parenting as a child, he was more likely to incorporate internal representational models of himself as worthy and others as supportive. He was then more likely to be comfortable with himself and others, and able to feel secure in close relationship.

When the two PAQ-Father subscales were condensed as a total PAQ-Father score, it had direct effect on the men’s AAS. It means that father support as well as sensitivity to their sons’ autonomy needs are associated with secure AAS.

The developmental implications from these findings are interesting. It is possible that these finding are a reflection of a gender difference in the effect of certain parenting patterns. In other words, high parental responsiveness and support accentuate sex-normed competence in women, because women are expected to be nurturing and supportive in relationships. On the other hand, parents being facilitators
for men’s early independence needs accentuates sex-normed competence in boys, because males are expected to be autonomous and self-reliant. However, this study indicates that in order for women to be competent in close relationship, they rely strongly on how well their fathers facilitated their early independence needs. In contrast, in order for men to be optimally competent in interpersonal functioning, they rely strongly on how much care and support they received as children. Therefore, this study suggests that a given parental pattern may have different impact on girls and boys. For example, fathers’ warmth, caring, responsiveness, and support seem to promote boys’ competence in their later close relationships. On the other hand, fathers’ fostering for independence and self-reliance seem to be especially important for girls; these factors seem to help girls to move away from the protected family environment and to be self-reliant and capable in close relationships.

The findings of Kerns and Stevens (1996) support the results of this study in which adults’ attachments to mother and father and their associations with personality and social relations were examined. Their study is consistent with the hypothesis that parental attachments influence the quality of social relations outside attachment relationships and indicates that father-child attachment was related to reported quality of daily social interactions. Secure attachment to father was associated with healthier personality development for men, not for women.

The association between father-child attachment and personality development for men was particularly strong and is generally consistent with the early childhood literature, though several studies (Cohn, 1990; Lewis et al., 1984; Renken et al., 1989) have found that associations between mother-child attachment and personality
development are stronger for boys than for girls. An important question is why attachment and personality are correlated. Kobak et al (1993) suggest that parents of insecurely attached children may try to restrain rather than cope with their children’s displays of negative affect. As a result, insecurely attached children may not learn how to regulate affect. Given the nature of the sample in this study (39% of the male subjects classified themselves as insecure as compared to 20% of female subjects who classified themselves as insecure), it is reasonable to expect that adult attachment style carries more effect on men’s interpersonal relationships since emotion regulation may operate as a mediator of links between men’s adult attachment style and their interpersonal behaviors. The different results for men and women suggest it may be fruitful to examine adults’ attachment to specific attachment figures and emotion regulation as a mediator of links between attachment and social relations, particularly for males.

Although Bowlby emphasized the mother’s role in the formation of individual’s early attachment relationship and the majority of attachment studies have focused on mothers because mothers tend to most often fill this role, this study provides evidence that the father’s role is also central to an individual’s healthy development.

Although the association between the perception of early attachment experience and adult attachment style was stronger for relationships with fathers than for mothers, it is important to interpret this finding cautiously. The high correlation between mother and father support and independence subscales suggests that the respondents perceived their parents as acting in a similar manner with respect to their parenting. This combined influence may be the salient factor. Working together they send a stronger message that
their children are worthy (or unworthy) and competent (or incompetent) to make
decisions and function independently than either could send separately.

It should be noted that although the discriminant function analyses were
statistically significant, the accuracy of the overall model was not strong for women. It
would be interesting to see if these gender effects replicate in future studies.

**Early Attachment Experiences and Self-Esteem**

The findings of this study, in general, support the hypothesis that perceptions of
early attachment experience are related to individual’s measure of self-esteem which is
significantly associated with adult attachment style. Supportive and sensitive parenting
results in a secure and fulfilling adult interpersonal relationship which is reflected by
positive overall sense of self-worth, or positive self-esteem. As attachment style is
represented by internal working models of self, reflected in this study by self-esteem, this
current study lends support to the notion that perceptions of childhood attachment
relationships with parents are organized into internal representational models which
continue to have impact on interpersonal relations in adulthood.

The relationship between the perception of early attachment experiences and
adult’s self-esteem shows that the most salient component of women’s early attachment
experiences was the degree to which they perceived both fathers and mothers as being
supportive and sensitive to their autonomy needs. For men, the most influential early
attachment relationship was how well the mothers supported and fostered their
independence needs.

The relationship pattern is different than those between early attachment
experiences and adult attachment style with mothers playing the greater role in self-
esteem for both men and women. Based on Bowlby’s conceptualization, if the attachment figure has acknowledged the infant’s needs for comfort and protection and respected the infant’s need for independent exploration of the environment, the child is likely to develop an internal working model of self as valued and self-reliant. Conversely, if the parent has frequently rejected the infant’s bids for comfort or for exploration, the child is likely to construct an internal working model of self as unworthy or incompetent. With the aid of working models, an individual constructs overall sense of self as being worthy (or unworthy) and competent (or incompetent).

Since Bowlby emphasizes mother’s role in the formation of early attachment relationships and mothers also tend to fit the role as primary caregivers, it is not surprising to find that early attachment experiences with mothers play an important role in the construction of an individual’s internal working model of self, or self-esteem.

It should be noted, however, that because of the high intercorrelation between mother and father support and independence subscales discussed earlier, this finding must be interpreted with caution. So, we can conclude that the degree to which both women and men perceived their early attachment experiences with parents as supportive and sensitive is important in determining the extent to which they feel confident about their own worth.

**Early Attachment Experiences and Quality of Close Relationships**

The hypothesis that early attachment experiences predict the quality of adult interpersonal relationships received mixed support from the present analyses. The pattern of influential early attachment experiences was different across relationships and for women and men.
Early relationship history was significantly related to women’s quality of love relationships but not to their friendship relationships. The results of this study support the work by Hazan and Shaver (1987), Ainsworth (1991), Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; and Hazan and Zeifman (1997) confirming that attachment is a component of only some relationships. The perception of early parental attachment experience does not appear to have an influence across relationships. These findings contradict those reported by Lewis and Feiring (1994) and Youngblade and Belsky (1992) that early attachment experience has a more pervasive influence on interpersonal functioning. The path linking developmental history to interpersonal functioning is consistent with those reported by Weiss (1986, 1994), who suggested that bonds of attachment are found in some but not all adult relationships. In contrast to the sample of women in this study, the association between early attachment experiences and the quality of adult interpersonal relationships was different men. For men, father’s support was the most important variable in predicting the level of the conflictual love interactions. This lends further support to the notion discussed earlier that father support is a crucial element to their sons’ healthy development. For women, the level of parental support and fostering of autonomy needs were significant variables in predicting women's level of positive as well as conflictual love interactions. The overall effect was only significant for the love relationships, not for the friendship relationships.

It is clear from these analyses that the perceived level of parental support accounts for the majority of the variance in the two love relationship measures, and is a vital aspect in the development of intimate relationship formation for both women and men.
Of note in these analysis is the fact that the quality of the friendship relationship appears to be unrelated to early attachment history (Weiss, 1986, 1994). These findings support the notion that it is the attachment component of relationships that is most strongly related to early attachment experiences and enduring romantic relationships generally are expected to be the most important attachment relationships in adult life. As mentioned earlier in the literature review that a romantic love relationship could meet the criteria for evidence of an attachment component: (a) a desire for proximity with the attachment figure, especially under stressful conditions, (b) a sense of security derived from contact with the attachment figure, and (c) distress or protest when threatened with loss or separation from the attachment figure (Weiss, 1982). The fact that adult romantic love relationships are typified by the defining features of attachment and seem to follow the same developmental course as attachment formation in infancy, provides additional evidence that the attachment mechanism is at work in adult romantic love relationships.

**Adult Attachment Style and Quality of Close Relationships**

The Quality of Relationships Inventory (QRI) was used to assess the perceptions of the quality of romantic love and friendship relationships for each subject. Support, the first dimension of the scale, measures the extent to which the individual perceives how supportive the other person is in the relationship. Depth, the second dimension, assesses the extent to which the relationship is significant to the subject. Conflict, the third dimension, measures the extent to which the individual experiences negative feelings (such as angry or ambivalent) toward the other person. As mentioned earlier, the Support and Depth dimensions are merged into one subscale, Positive, since these two dimensions tend to measure a single positive aspect of love and friendship relationships.
Results of this study suggest that adult attachment style is significantly related to individual’s quality of some but not all relationships. Attachment style was able to effectively predict the degree of conflictual aspect of love relationship for women and both positive and conflictual aspects of love relationship for men. The effects were stronger for men than for women. Adult attachment style did not predict the quality of the friendship relationships for either women or men.

There are several possibilities for why attachment style and friendship relationships were not related. First, the demands of friendship may be less likely to tax attachment-related capacities (e.g., the ability to use others as a secure base as well as serve as a secure base for others). A second possibility is that links between attachment and friendship will be more predictable if information about each individual’s attachment history is available. In studies of children’s peer relationships (Kerns, 1994; Kerns, 1996), peer dyads were observed and investigators had information about the quality of each child’s attachment to parents, and it was the dyadic combination (two securely attached children, or one securely and one insecurely attached child) that was predictive of relationship quality. In adulthood, it may be that particular attachment pairings will be found to have distinct relationship patterns.

**Working Model of Self or Self-Esteem and Quality of Close Relationships**

By definition, adult attachment style is designed to measure an adult’s internal working model of his or her internalized attachment experiences. However, previous studies did not tell us what internal working models are exactly? Are they mostly conscious or mostly unconscious? How do they determine a person’s attachment-related feelings and behaviors?
Once we entertain the possibility that adult attachment styles are definable in terms of working models of self and others, it becomes important to figure out what those working models are. It seems unlikely that they will prove to be completely distinct from all the other dimensions that personality researchers have measured over the years. In fact, the self-model dimension, as we might expect, is highly similar to existing measures of self-esteem or negative affectivity.

By measuring the self-model dimension with a general measure of self-esteem (Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory), it will be easier to say what the self-model corresponds to (such as, self judgment as competent, successful, significant, and worthy as defined by Coopersmith).

However, even though the association between working model of self and self-esteem has proved to be significant in the study, the limitation of using the Self-Esteem Inventory in measuring the internal working model needs to be specified. Studies in the field of attachment research do not tell us what internal working models are exactly. Are they measurable or only definable? Future research needs to be done on internal working models to find ways to assess it consistently and reliably.

The findings of this study, in general, supported the hypothesis that supportive and sensitive parenting is associated with positive overall sense of self worth which in turn is predictive of individual’s interpersonal functioning. The results show that for women, self-esteem is related to both positive and conflictual aspects of love relationships. For men, self-esteem predicts only the conflictual aspect of their love relationships. Self-esteem is not able to predict either women or men’s friendship relationships.
The results of this study support the previous studies (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1988) that the degree to which a parent is caring and appropriately supportive of the child’s needs for autonomy are incorporated into a child’s internal mental representation of self which in turn is critical in determining how confident, valued, and worthy the child will feel about him/herself. An individual’s overall sense of self (self-esteem) which is established in the early attachment experiences with parents continues to influence interpersonal relationships outside of the family.

**Gender Differences**

Although the distribution of attachment styles, as measured by the Hazan-Shaver AAS, appears to be independent of gender (Brennan, Shaver, & Tobey, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Levy & Davis, 1988), the results of this study suggest that it may not be the case in this sample. So, the way in which attachment style relates to other variables may very well be conditioned by gender role patterns.

The results of this study support the notion that gender moderates some of associations between attachment styles and relationship characteristics (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990). However, the findings of this study contradict the traditional gender role patterns which suggest that it is the woman’s interpersonal orientation to close relationship that should be more predictive of the development of the relationship over time.

The results of the current study suggest that it is the men’s attachment style which is more significantly related to the quality of love relationships. These gender differences lead to questions about possible moderators and mediators of relationship satisfaction. Perhaps the different effects of relationship satisfaction for men and women are
moderated by the way they see themselves and others. Some theorists (e.g., Davis & Kirkpatrick, 1994; Kobak, 1994) proposed that instead of consisting of personality descriptors relatively independent of others, self-concept is more likely to implicate others with whom they have relationships. The sample of this study is comprised of a relatively high percentage of men in the avoidant group. According to Bartholomew (1991), two forms of adult avoidance are differentiated: fearful avoidance and dismissing avoidance. The fearful style is characterized by a conscious desire for social contact which is inhibited by fears of its consequence. A dismissing style is characterized by a defensive denial of the need or desire for social contact. This distinction is represented by differing models of the self. The fearful avoidants view themselves as being undeserving of the love and support of others. Those with a fearful style possess a negative view of themselves and others, whereas the dismissing possess a positive model of self that minimizes the subjective awareness of distress of social needs which might activate the desire for close attachment.

Given that self-esteem is related to the quality of close relationships, the results of the study may be implicated by the nature of the sample with the men who possess positive working models of self. As discussed earlier, an individual’s overall sense of self worth, or self-esteem, is positively associated with the adult’s social functioning.

Another possible explanation for the different effect of relationship satisfaction for men and women is that there might be a delayed contribution of father's role to an individual's personality development. The emotional support an individual received from his father as a child might be especially important for him to function independently and competently in close relationships as an adult. The finding of this study led to the
question of whether there is a relative shift in the influence of mother-child and father-child attachment on an individual’s AAS across the developmental period.

**Conclusion and Implications**

This present study suggests that for women the single most important early attachment variable related to the adult attachment style was the level of father’s fostering of independence. Fathers’ facilitating of independence predicted women’s adult attachment style, which in turn predicted the conflictual components of the love relationship. As stated earlier, a sensitive parenting operates as a secure base from which the child feel comfortable and interested in exploring and mastering the environment and in establishing affiliative contact with others.

It should be noted that when the two PAQ-Father subscales, Father-Support and Father-Independence, were merged in analyzing the relationship between the perception of early attachment experience and women’s AAS, it turns out that the perceived early attachment relationship with father is not significant in predicting women’s AAS. The expected associations between early attachment with parents and AAS ran counter to prediction. There are several possible explanations for the result. First, as mentioned earlier, the majority of the female subjects in the sample is in the secure group. It lacks a widespread variation in the women’s adult attachment classification (see Table 5). Therefore it becomes difficult for the early attachment variable to explain the variance in the women’s AAS. Second, although early attachment experience with parents is important in determining an individual’s AAS, in adulthood, representations of contemporary friendships and love relationships would be expected to be at least as important as representations of early family relationships in defining a current attachment
style. It is possible that experiences with several love and friendship relationships provide opportunities to revise the working model of self and others which were established in the early attachment experience with parent. A study by Hazan and her students (1997) suggested that adult attachment styles are generally stable but not incapable of changing. An exclusive focus on child-parent relationship precludes exploring the degree of specificity found in adult attachment representations.

The implication for intervention is that the findings of the current study help to explain why some people have difficulties in forming and maintaining satisfying adult intimate relationships and why some people even seem to lack the desire or capacity to become deeply involved with others. When it comes to the practical implication of the results, the findings suggest that even though early parent-child attachment is essential in the construction of an adult’s attachment-related behaviors and feeling in close relationships, any given intimate relationship experience with a specific romantic partner provides an opportunity to reconstruct or work through the attachment memory established during infancy and childhood. Although Bowlby’s conceptualization emphasizes certain degree of continuity of attachment patterns between childhood and adulthood, attachment patterns found in adulthood are not incapable of changing. Change toward attachment security is always possible if an adult has the opportunities to repeatedly engage in model-disconfirming relationship experiences and partners.

For men, fathers’ support predicted men’s adult attachment style, which in turn predicted the positive as well as the conflictual component of the love relationship. As stated earlier, the care and support a men receives as a child appears to set the stage for
positive mental representation about the self and about what to expect in close relationships with others.

The possible explanation for the relationship between reported fathers’ support and men’s AAS may be that a supportive father not only sends a message to his son that he is worthy of love; a same-sex parent who is warm and caring also provides a role model for the boy which is important in constructing his internal working model of self, and therefore promotes positive later attachment-related behaviors in close relationship.

Another possible explanation for the significant relationship between father-child attachment and the individuals' AAS is that the parental role is more shared and coordinated today than the 1930s during which Bowlby's attachment conceptualization was initiated. In the 1930s, mother and father's roles were relatively differentiated. Given that mother and father's roles are not as differentiated as before, it is not surprising to find that father might carry more influence on a child's personality development than as expected.

The present study makes it possible to evaluate whether reported mother-child or father-child attachment experience was more consistently related to AAS and the quality of close relationship in adulthood. Many of the studies of attachment in children have examined mother-child relationships only, and therefore we have relatively little information about the importance of children’s attachment to fathers.

In the domain of adult attachment style, only the perceived early attachment experiences with fathers were related to adult attachment style, with stronger effect for men. The pattern of results for AAS suggests that it may be important to examine specific perceived attachments to parents in early adulthood, but it also raises several
questions. First, it raises the issue of whether there is a shift in the relative influence of mother-child and father-child attachment on AAS across developmental periods. Studies of mother-child and father-child attachment that make explicit cross-age comparisons would provide a more direct test of this hypothesis. Second, the findings suggest that, for AAS, attachment to father may carry more significance. Future studies which pursue and replicate the current study to elucidate the different patterns of male and female relationship satisfaction will be helpful in the explanation of the father's role in the formation of adult intimate relationships, especially for men.

There was a continuous path linking early attachment experiences, self-esteem, and adult love relationships. For women, attachment experiences with both mother and father are related to their self-esteem, which in turn is predictive of positive and conflictual aspects of love relationships. However, perceived attachment experience with mother plays a greater role in women's self-esteem. For men, attachment experience with mothers has the predominant influence on their self-esteem, which in turn is associated with the conflictual aspect of their love relationships.

In contrast to the relationship direction between reported early attachment experiences and AAS, the reported perception of attachment with mother has the predominant influence on individual's self-esteem.

In Bowlby's writings, a child who is consistently well-treated by attachment figure with love, support, and sensitivity to autonomy needs can grow up feeling that the self is worthy, or a positive model of self, and other as trustworthy, or a positive model of others. Given that in American society, a typical child spends more time with mother than with father, it means that mothers tend to play the roles as primary attachment
figures. Hence, it’s not surprising to find that mothers are more significant in influencing children’s self-esteem.

The path linking early attachment experience and adult’s interpersonal relationships suggests a direct effect. For women, early attachment experience with mother is related to both positive and conflictual aspects of love relationships. Early attachment experience with father is only correlated with the positive component of love relationships. For men, in contrast, only early attachment experience with father is influential to the conflictual component of their love relationships.

Taken together, the findings of the current study support the overall hypothesis that perception of early attachment experiences with parents does indeed influence adult attachment style, self-esteem, and the quality of adult interpersonal functioning. Further, the love relationship appears to be more strongly related to attachment history than does the quality of friendship relationship. This finding is consistent with Weiss’s finding (1994) that bonds of attachment are found only in some but not all adult relationships. A child’s early attachment experiences with parents appear to be fundamental in establishing the internal working model of self or self-esteem that guide subsequent attachment relationships. Early attachment relationships with parents have greater impact on those adult interpersonal relationships that share more attachment characteristics with the childhood attachment relationships.

Across relationships, it is interesting that the most salient feature for women is the degree to which the parents are sensitive in fostering the independence needs while for men the most salient feature is parental support. From these results it appears that women’s relationships as adults are hindered if, as children, they were overly protected
and not allowed to function independently by their parents. In contrast, men’s social functioning is hindered if they did not feel loved and supported by their parents as children. Within the context of balancing closeness and separateness, it will be interesting in future studies to examine whether it is healthier for parents to place a greater emphasis on autonomy for girls and a greater emphasis on nurturance and support for boys.

Early attachment with father is significant in determining the individual’s adult attachment style, whereas early attachment with mother is critical in predicting the individual’s self-esteem in adulthood. Given the high correlation between the mothers and fathers support and independence scores, it is difficult to determine whether attachment experiences with mother or father is more influential, since they are often perceived as acting in concert in their parenting.

The question remains to be answered: Do these findings suggest that females and males differ in their prerequisites for healthy social and emotional development? Perhaps the results suggest that sex-normed expectations jeopardize individual’s social functioning. It seems that high support and low overprotection are optimal environments for both girls and boys and that perhaps within this framework cultural views dictate that parents place a greater emphasis on care and support for women and on autonomy for men. However, when it comes to the formation of intimate romantic relationships, the traditional approach of fostering dependence for females and independence for males does not appear to be effective. Increased knowledge of the bounds within which healthy development occurs will help clarify these questions.
Strengths and Limitations

A major feature of the attachment perspective on close relationships is the breadth of its application: it highlights the universal nature of attachment behavior, but also helps explain how individual differences in relationship behavior are shaped by both early and subsequent social experiences.

The great strength of attachment theory in guiding research is that it focuses on a basic system of behavior—the attachment behavioral system—that is biologically rooted and species-characteristic. This implies a search for basic processes for functioning that are universal in human nature, despite differences attributable to genetic constitution, cultural influences, and individual experience.

This present study is designed to answer the following questions: Do early attachment experiences affect adult interpersonal functioning across types of close relationships or is there a systematic influence specific to particular types of relationships? There is a substantial amount of evidence suggesting a relationship between early attachment experience and subsequent social functioning. The work that has been done with adult interpersonal relationships is supportive, but few systematic studies exist that compare the impact of the early attachment relationship on multiple adult relationships. The present study extends the concept and employs this perspective in studying adults’ multiple relationships: love and friendship relationships.

Taken together, the findings of the study help to support the overall hypothesis that early family experiences indeed influence individual’s perceptions of self and the social world, and adult attachment styles, which in turn influences the quality of adult interpersonal relationships. An individual’s early attachment history with parents appears
to be fundamental in establishing the internal working models that guide subsequent adult attachment relationships.

The limitations of the present study can be grouped into two categories: those concerning the measurement and those concerning the sample. With respect to the concerns of the measurement, one limiting aspect of this study is its sole reliance on self-report. Self-report assessment of attachment is limited in terms of number of items and simplicity of answer alternatives. Some of the complexities of the interpersonal relationships are lost using self-report techniques. There are certainly some problems with the forced choice, self-classification method (AAS) used in this study. Important information about the degree to which the chosen attachment style fits the individual is lost. In addition, inner working models of the self and others are not necessarily conscious and, even if conscious, may be susceptible to various response sets (e.g., social desirability). First of all, subjects may be unable to articulate exactly how they feel in love relationships. Second, subjects are unlikely to have anything like perfect memory for their love experiences or for the nature of their attachment relationships with parents. Third, subjects are likely to be defensive and self-serving in their recall and description of some of the events we wish to inquire about.

Another potential problem of the retrospective attachment measure used in this study is that individuals' retrospective account of early attachment experiences may have more to do with their current state of mind, or a function of reconstructed and reinterpreted memory of early parent-child attachment than the actual reflection of the early attachment experiences in their childhood. Therefore, the degree to which the
retrospective attachment assessment is meaningfully related to the early parent-child
attachment needs to be specified in the future studies.

Future research should utilize additional assessment such as interview,
observation, and peer ratings. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine patterns of
partner choices over time and the development of relationships over time. For example,
there is a need to study longitudinally those individuals who move from relationship to
relationship. In this way, we can begin to assess the link between stability of attachment
style and specific relationship events.

Different factors may be important at different phases in relationship. It also
seems necessary to assess the importance of attachment style relative to other factors
(e.g., social desirability) that may influence attraction and partner choice.

Another limitation of the present study concerns the nature of the sample.
Some characteristics of the sample may limit generalizability of the findings. For
example, the results of this study were obtained with a predominantly white, well-
educated, cooperative, young sample and most of the participants were in an early phase
of romantic relationship formation. It is possible that a broader range of background (e.g,
ethnic/racial and SES diversity) of subjects and interpersonal functioning will serve to
further elucidate the patterns found in this study.

The present study was intended to explore the relationship between early
attachment with parents and individuals’ social functioning in their early adulthood. The
age ranges of both females and males subjects suggested a selection bias inherent in the
sample. A small number of the subjects were in their middle or late adulthood. This
selection bias may also affect the association patterns found in this study.
The majority of the female subjects in the study endorsed secure AAS such that the lack of variations in the AAS classification limited the ability of the reported attachment experiences in the discrimination of women’s AAS. The small number of male subjects in this study made it difficult to detect the degree of association between perceived early attachment experiences and adult social functioning measures. Therefore there is a potential risk of Type I error in the path analyses linking perceptions of early attachment and men’s AAS, self-esteem, and adult interpersonal relationship measures.

Research suggested that in addition to general models of self and others, people develop working models of specific partners and relationships (Collin and Read, 1990). The average person participates in several important love and friendships relationships, each of which provides an opportunity to revise mental models of self and others. Given the characteristics of the sample (all college students and many are young), they are less likely to be involved with a steady partner and are relatively inexperienced in relationships. Then the question arises; is the relationship found between their attachment history and their interpersonal orientation an artifact of the relationship they are currently in, or a reflection of a stable, cross-relationship consistent attachment style?

**Future Direction**

The purpose of this study has been to evaluate the utility of an attachment-theoretical framework for understanding interpersonal functioning across the life course. Throughout the study we have shown that the perception of the early attachment experiences with parents, maintain measurable and cross-age continuity and are associated with theory-consistent psychological and interpersonal correlates in early
adulthood. So, what can we conclude about the attachment-theoretical perspective on adult interpersonal relationship?

Despite the success of attachment theory and research, certain aspects of attachment-theoretical approach to interpersonal social functioning need further work. One problem is self-report measurement. A potential problem for self-report methods of assessment is that they may mistake idealization and defensive depictions of attachment figures for security. Also, clarification of the conceptual validity of the self-report, forced-choice measurement (AAS) is needed in the future studies. In light of these limitations, a major challenge for future research is to explore the associations between various, currently used measurement approaches, such as questionnaire and observational methods of data collection, and cross-sectional as well as longitudinal designs. Besides asking the respondents about their everyday lives, subjects’ behavior in more controlled laboratory situations also warrant study.

Observational research in the natural environment is also essential in the study of attachment and other affectional bonds beyond infancy. From it, we could infer how the attachment system is internally organized. It should be possible to examine not only self reports about relationship qualities but also observable features of couple interaction in the laboratory. Indeed, individual differences in overt behavior, both at home and in lab, could be viewed as signifying different patterns of internal organization.

However, one shortcoming of many of these currently employed techniques is that they are limited to the aspects of working models that individuals can consciously observe and articulate. Thus additional strategies are required to uncover unconscious or nonlinguistic component of working models (such as interview).
Most of the attachment research to date has focused on either parent-child or romantic relationships. These are two types of relationships in which the dynamics of attachment are likely to be prominent. The current study suggests that the early attachment relationship is helpful in understanding the love relationship but not the friendship relationship. It is possible that replication with more heterogeneous sample will further elucidate theses patterns.

Another important issue is change in attachment styles. As mentioned earlier, attachment styles are fairly, but by no means perfectly stable in childhood. A study by Hazan and her students (1997) suggested that adult attachment styles are also generally stable but not incapable of changing. Of adults who said they had changed, most attributed the change to important close relationship that violated expectations (in attachment terms, that altered internal working models of self and others). These findings are consistent with examinations of attachment styles discontinuity in childhood (e.g., Lewis & Feiring, 1991; Sroufe et al., 1990); they suggest that changes in environment and/or repeated interactions with model-disconfirming relationship partners force the individual to accommodate working models to current experiences instead of assimilating these experiences to existing representational structure. Hazan (1994) also studied the ways in which existing attachment figures (e.g., parents) are slowly relinquished in favor of new ones (e.g., close friends or romantic partners).

As related to the change in attachment style, another target for future research should consist of factors that influence stability and instability of attachment styles, particularly in adulthood. Are members of the insecure attachment groups in adulthood largely doomed to lives of negative interpersonal expectations and unfulfilling
relationships? Although research suggests that change toward attachment security is possible, the factors underlying this change need to be specified. To what extent and in what manner do current attachment relationships influence attachment styles? What proportion of the variance in adult attachment can be accounted for by experiences occurring subsequent to the relationship between young children and their primary caregivers (e.g., during adolescent and early adult friendships and romantic relationships)? Do these experiences also influence the manner in which individuals represent early attachment experiences? That is, can a person’s memories of early relationships be revised? An examination of naturally occurring change may be useful not only for evaluating the attachment-theoretical perspective on adult interpersonal functioning and for understanding life-span attachment process, but for developing therapeutic intervention strategies. There is obviously a need for life-span longitudinal studies of attachment-related phenomena.

As the research evidence indicates that gender differences in interpersonal behavior stem from differences in the way that men and women view themselves, one clear direction for further research is studies that directly test these postulated associations between self-concept, attachment styles, and interaction patterns in relationships. Studying gender differences in relationships will provide one way of furthering our understanding of the development of mental models that represent a general type of relationship based on societal norms and the development of specific mental models of particular relationship.

Finally, further research needs to be done on internal working models, what are they exactly? Are they mostly conscious or mostly unconscious? How do they
determine a person’s attachment-related feelings and behaviors? Among the biggest
current challenges in the field of attachment research are clarifying the construct of
working models and finding ways to assess it reliably. Moreover, how do models
relevant to different types of relationships (e.g., parents, friends, romantic partners)
influence and interact with one another in guiding social perceptions and behavior? For
example, if an individual has insecure working models about parents but secure models
about close adolescent friends, how do these contrasting models impact the individual’s
views of romantic partners? To answer these questions, we must discover what kinds of
childhood and adolescent experiences generate different romantic attachment styles in
adulthood.

It would not be surprising to find that adult love is more complex than infant-
caretaker attachment, despite fundamental similarities. Although people may bring stable
patterns into relationship, these patterns are likely to be adapted in responses to their
partner’s behavioral style. In adulthood, representations of friendships and love
relationships would be expected to be at least as important as representations of family
relationships in defining a current attachment style. An exclusive focus on child-parent
relationship precludes exploring the degree of specificity found in attachment
representations. Thus, a challenge for future research is to explore empirically how
attachment patterns are externalized, maintained, and revised in interaction with the
social environment.
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Appendix A

Questionnaires
Dear participant:

This survey is designed to examine the association between your parent-child attachment relationships and measures of your social adjustment in early adulthood, such as your attitudes towards self in social and personal contexts, your attachment style in intimate relationships, and your perceptions of the quality of your love and friendship relationship. This research project is being conducted by Meng-Chen Shieh, a doctoral candidate from the Department of Human Development and Family Sciences at OSU, under the supervision of Dr. Newman, a faculty member in the Department.

This research project is important because attachment processes have been investigated extensively in parent-child relationships and the social functioning of the child during preschool and elementary years, but relatively little attention has been paid to the role of attachment processes in early adult relationships. Therefore, the results of this study will offer a promising theoretical framework for understanding why some people have difficulties in forming and maintaining satisfying bonds in their early adult relationships.

If you choose to participate, you will complete the questionnaire packet anonymously. You can take the packet with you and return it in a stamped envelope provided by the investigator. The packet contains 4 questionnaires and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your packet is assigned an identification number, which is used to insure confidentiality.

Your participation is voluntary. You are not obliged to participate and you can quit anytime if you feel uncomfortable in answering any of the questions in the questionnaires.

The questionnaire packet contains the following items: (1) a demographic questionnaire; (2) two Parental Attachment Questionnaires—one targeting mothers, the other fathers; (3) two Quality of Relationship Inventories—one targeting the love relationship and one targeting the friendship relationship; (4) Self-Esteem Inventory; (5) Adult Attachment Style scale (AAS).

If you want to receive feedback from this study, please complete the attached card. Information about the results will be mailed to the address you provide in Spring, 2000. Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Meng-Chen Shieh

Barbara Newman, Ph.D.
Learning More about Close Relationships

Demographic Data

Age______ Sex: Race/Ethnicity:
M______ European American_____
F______ African American_____
Hispanic/Latino_____
Asian American_____
Native American_____
Other_____

Marital Status:
Single______ Parental Marital status:
Married______ Single_____
Divorced______ Married_____
Separated______ Divorced_____
Co-habitant______ Separated_____
Widowed______ Co-habitant_____
Other ________ Widowed_____
                      Other ________

Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) – Mother

This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your MOTHER in the past, please respond to each item by circling the number on a scale of 1 to 5 that best describes your mother, your relationship with your mother, and your experiences and feelings during your childhood. Please provide a single rating to describe your mother and your relationship with her. If your mother is deceased, or if your parents are divorced, respond with reference to the person who is most like a mother to you.

In general, my mother...

1. is a person I can count on to provide emotional support when I feel troubled
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Quite A Bit Very Much
   Amount

2. supports my goals and interests.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Quite A Bit Very Much
   Amount

3. is available to give me advice or guidance when I want it
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Quite A Bit Very Much
   Amount
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4. has given me as much attention as I have wanted
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

5. has no idea what I am feeling or thinking
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

6. is too busy or otherwise involved to help me
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

7. protects me from danger and difficulty
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

8. ignores what I have to say
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

9. is sensitive to my feelings and needs
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

10. I feel more confident in my ability to handle the problems on my own
    1 2 3 4 5
    Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

11. towards whom I felt cool and distant
    1 2 3 4 5
    Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much

12. for whom I felt feeling of love
    1 2 3 4 5
    Not at All Somewhat A Moderate Amount Quite A Bit Very Much
13. I avoided telling about my experiences
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

14. I look to my mother for support, encouragement, and guidance
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

15. I work it out on my own, without help or discussion with my mother
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

16. to whom I confided my most personal thoughts and feelings
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

17. respects my privacy
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

18. restricts my freedom or independence
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

19. takes my opinions seriously
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

20. encourages me to make my own decisions
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much

21. is critical of what I can do
   1  Not at All
   2  Somewhat
   3  A Moderate Amount
   4  Quite A Bit
   5  Very Much
22. imposes her ideas and values on me
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

23. is a person to whom I can express differences of opinion on important matters
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

24. has provided me with the freedom to experiment and learn things on my own
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

25. has trust and confidence in me
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

26. tries to control my life
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

27. gives me advice whether or not I want it
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

28. respects my judgment and decision, even if different from what she would want
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

29. does things for me, which I could do for myself
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much

30. treats me like a younger child
1 Not at All 2 Somewhat 3 A Moderate Amount 4 Quite A Bit 5 Very Much
Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ) – Father

This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behavior of parents. As you remember your FATHER in the past, please respond to each item by circling the number on a scale of 1 to 5 that best describes your father, your relationship with your father, and your experiences and feelings during your childhood. Please provide a single rating to describe your father and your relationship with him. If your father is deceased, or if your parents are divorced, respond with reference to the person who is most like a father to you.

In general, my father...

1. is a person I can count on to provide emotional support when I feel troubled
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

2. supports my goals and interests.
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

3. is available to give me advice or guidance when I want it
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

4. has given me as much attention as I have wanted
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

5. has no idea what I am feeling or thinking
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

6. is too busy or otherwise involved to help me
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much

7. protects me from danger and difficulty
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite a Bit  5 Very Much
8. ignores what I have to say
   1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

9. is sensitive to my feelings and needs
   1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

10. I feel more confident in my ability to handle the problems on my own
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

11. towards whom I felt cool and distant
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

12. for whom I felt feelings of love
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

13. I avoided telling about my experiences
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

14. I look to my father for support, encouragement, and guidance
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

15. I work it out on my own, without help or discussion with my father
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much

16. to whom I confided my most personal thoughts and feelings
    1  Not at All  2  Somewhat  3  A Moderate Amount  4  Quite A Bit  5  Very Much
17. respects my privacy
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

18. restricts my freedom or independence
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

19. takes my opinions seriously
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

20. encourages me to make my own decisions
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

21. is critical of what I can do
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

22. imposes his ideas and values on me
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

23. is a person to whom I can express differences of opinion on important matters
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

24. has provided me with the freedom to experiment and learn things on my own
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much

25. has trust and confidence in me
   1 Not at All  2 Somewhat  3 A Moderate Amount  4 Quite A Bit  5 Very Much
26. tries to control my life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. gives me advice whether or not I want it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. respects my judgment and decision, even if different from what he would want

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. does things for me, which I could do for myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. treats me like a younger child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Quite A Bit</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI)—Romantic Partner

Please use the scale below to answer the following questions regarding your relationship with your romantic partner. If you are not currently in a romantic relationship, please answer for the most recent romantic relationship you have been involved in. If you have never been in a serious romantic relationship, please go to the next section on page 12.

1. To what extent could you turn to this person for advice about your problem?

2. How often do you need to work hard to avoid conflict with this person?

3. To what extent could you count on this person for help with a problem?

4. How upset does this person sometimes make you feel?

5. To what extent can you count on this person to give you honest feedback, even if you might not want to hear it?

6. How much does this person make you feel guilty?

7. How much do you have to “give in” in this relationship?

8. To what extent could you count on this person to help you if a family member very close to you died?

9. How much does this person want you to change?
10. How positive a role does this person play in your life?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

11. How significant is this relationship in your life?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

12. How close will your relationship be with this person in 10 years?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

13. How much would you miss this person if the two of you could not see or talk with each other for a month?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

14. How critical of you is this person?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

15. If you want to go out and do something this evening, how confident are you that this person would be willing to do something with you?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

16. How responsible do you feel for this person’s well being?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

17. How much do you depend on this person?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

18. To what extent can you count on this person to listen to you when you are very angry at someone else?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

19. How much would you like this person to change?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

20. How angry does this person make you feel?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much
21. How much do you argue with this person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. To what extent can you really count on this person to distract you from your worries when you feel under stress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. How often does this person make you feel angry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How often does this person try to control or influence your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How much more do you give than you get from this relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Relationship Inventory (QRI)—Friend

Please use the scale below to answer the following questions regarding your relationship with your closest friend with whom you have frequent and regular contact.

1. To what extent could you turn to this person for advice about your problem?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

2. How often do you need to work hard to avoid conflict with this person?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

3. To what extent could you count on this person for help with a problem?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

4. How upset does this person sometimes make you feel?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

5. To what extent can you count on this person to give you honest feedback, even if you might not want to hear it?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

6. How much does this person make you feel guilty?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

7. How much do you have to “give in” in this relationship?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

8. To what extent could you count on this person to help you if a family member very close to you died?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

9. How much does this person want you to change?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

10. How positive a role does this person play in your life?
    1  2  3  4
    Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much
11. How significant is this relationship in your life?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

12. How close will your relationship be with this person in 10 years?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

13. How much would you miss this person if the two of you could not see or talk with each other for a month?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

14. How critical of you is this person?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

15. If you want to go out and do something this evening, how confident are you that this person would be willing to do something with you?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

16. How responsible do you feel for this person’s well being?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

17. How much do you depend on this person?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

18. To what extent can you count on this person to listen to you when you are very angry at someone else?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

19. How much would you like this person to change?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much

20. How angry does this person make you feel?
   1  2  3  4
   Not at all  A little  Quite a bit  Very much
21. How much do you argue with this person?

1 2 3 4
Not at all A little Quite a bit Very much

22. To what extent can you really count on this person to distract you from your worries when you feel under stress?

1 2 3 4
Not at all A little Quite a bit Very much

23. How often does this person make you feel angry?

1 2 3 4
Not at all A little Quite a bit Very much

24. How often does this person try to control or influence your life?

1 2 3 4
Not at all A little Quite a bit Very much

25. How much more do you give than you get from this relationship?

1 2 3 4
Not at all A little Quite a bit Very much
### Self-Esteem Inventory

On this form, you will find a list of statements about feelings. If a statement describes how you usually feel, put an X in the column “Like Me.” If a statement does not describe how you usually feel, put an X in the column “Unlike Me.” There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like Me</th>
<th>Unlike Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Things usually don’t bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I find it very hard to talk in front of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There are lots of things about myself I’d change if I could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I’m a lot of fun to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I get upset easily at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I’m popular with persons my own ages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My family usually considers my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I give in very easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My family expects too much of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It’s pretty tough to be me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Things are all mixed up in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People usually follow my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have a low opinion of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There are many times when I would like to leave home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I often feel upset with my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I’m not as nice looking as most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If I have something to say, I usually say it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My family understands me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Most people are better liked than I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I usually feel as if my family is pushing me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I often get discouraged with what I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I often wish I were someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can’t be depended on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Adult Attachment Style (AAS)**

Put an X next to one of the statements that best describes your feelings.

___ I find it relatively easy to get close to others and I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.

___ I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me or won’t stay with me. I want to merge completely with another person, and this desire sometimes scares people away.

___ I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

---

**Thank you for your participation!**