This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

PERSONAL ATTACHMENT
AND
ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AND OTHERS

presented by

Betty Feintuch

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

_____M.A._____ degree in __Psychology__

Major professor
John R. Hurley, Ph.D.

Date 3/27/95

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

PERSONAL ATTACHMENT
AND
ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AND OTHERS

By

Betty Feintuch

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1994

ABSTRACT

PERSONAL ATTACHMENT AND ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AND OTHERS

By

Betty Feintuch

Derived from Bowlby's (1988) attachment theory, the hypothesis was addressed that security of attachment is associated with greater acceptance of both self and of others. Before starting a course requiring extensive small group participation, 56 college seniors (39 women, 17 men) completed an Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden, 1986; Greenberg, 1982) that separately assessed one's attachment to mother, father, and peers. Weeks later, after more than 20 hours in one group, each rated the within-group conduct of all same-group members for self-acceptance and acceptance of others, yielding self-ratings, one's average rating of group peers, and how these peers' rated the individual on each scale. As hypothesized, the three attachment and six acceptance indicators generally correlated positively (17 of 18; 4ps < .05) and, especially for attachment to peers, sometimes significantly. Developmental and/or ecological variables seemed strongly involved in these findings. This study's limitations and implications were discussed.

This manuscript is dedicated to
my mother, Gladys Curtis
my father, Marvin Kelley
and
my late dear friend, Myrtle Yoshinaga Grey

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is has been made possible through the combined interest and dedication of people who are very important to me and who have given generously of their time and expertise. I especially appreciate the understanding and guidance of my committee, including Dr. John Hurley, Dr. Ellen Strommen, and Dr. Bertram Karon.

First, I thank Dr. Hurley, my chairman and advisor, without whom this all would not have been possible. It is his interpersonal sensitivity, intellectual quality, academic integrity, and dedication to what he believes in that has been a continual inspiration to me. His generosity in allowing me access to his interpersonal groups provided a meaningful setting that otherwise would not have been available for this research. The appreciation I feel goes deeper than words can express.

I thank Dr. Strommen for early and important discussions on relationships, attachment theory, and women's issues. Her encouragement and support has been greatly appreciated. Her perceptive comments and timely and constructive feedback were most helpful.

I especially express my appreciation to Dr. Karon for his warm support and genuine interest, which has been more

iv

important to me than he can ever know. His constant
encouragement and enthusiasm never fails to motivate and has
been invaluable to me.

Lastly, I wish to recognize all the individual and
anonymous group members who took time to completed
questionnaires and the ratings without which this research
could not have been done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PERSONAL ATTACHMENT

AND

ACCEPTANCE OF SELF AND OTHERS

"Relationship is a mirror in which you can see yourself, not as you would wish to be, but as you are." (Krishnamurti, 1964, p. 122)

"The bird a nest, the spider a web, man friendship." (William Blake, 1915, p. 251)

INTRODUCTION

The quality of interpersonal relationships is widely recognized as a central factor in the general well-being and overall mental health of individuals (Horney, 1950; Sullivan, 1953). It is also generally accepted that the quality of adult relationships is greatly influenced by early experience in infancy and childhood experiences in the relationship with the parent/care-giver (Erikson, 1963; Stern, 1985). A broad range of theories and psychological measures too numerous to list here have been formulated to assist in understanding the precursors, processes, and correlates of the development of competence in interpersonal relationships.

One such theory that has received considerable attention is Bowlby's theory of attachment, which was

1

initially developed to help better understand the infant's tie to its mother (Bowlby, 1958), but which has been extended to encompass various psychological issues and relationships into adolescence and adulthood (Bowlby, 1969, 1979). For example, Ryan and Lynch (1989) found attachment status to be important in understanding the vicissitudes of adolescent and early adulthood issues of separation and autonomy. Fenney and Noller (1990), Shaver, Hazan, and Bradshaw (1988), and Collins and Read (1990) have studied various aspects of romantic love in relation to levels of attachment. Hazan and Shaver (1990) examined the relationship of attachment theory to love and work, while Collins and Read (1990) conducted three studies examining the relationship of adult attachment to internal working models and relationship quality in dating couples. From a more theoretical perspective, Franz and White (1985) revisited Erikson's (1963) developmental theory related to individuation, and proposed a dual path in the development of both men and women that accounts for the importance of intimacy and attachment in relationships.

To extend further the utility of this theory of attachment and to better understand the correlates of interpersonal style, it would be of interest to examine how a person's level of attachment might relate to their interpersonal style in communicating with peers. The purpose of this study is to examine correlations between levels of attachment to father, mother, and peers and the

various dimensions of interpersonal style, as indicated from ratings given by peers, ratings given to peers, and ratings of self. It is hypothesized that, in general, the more secure a person's level of attachment, the more positive will be her or his ability to relate to peers.

BACKGROUND AND THEORY

Interpersonal Style and Theories of Measurement

Since theories of the central importance of
interpersonal relations in human development and well-being
were articulated and extended by Sullivan (1953), Horney
(1950), and others, researchers and writers have attempted
to make ordered sense of interpersonal transactions.
Theorists and researchers attempting to provide a systematic
coherent description of interpersonal transactions have used
various theoretical paradigms and statistical methodologies.
In efforts to develop a meaningful model, these theorists
have approached the measurement of interpersonal behavior
from a number of perspectives. Following the early work of
Leary (1957) and his associates, one of the more useful,
explanatory, and predictive models that has been developed
in a number of versions over the last thirty years by
several authors is commonly known as the circumplex model of
interpersonal behavior (Gifford & O'Connor, 1987; Humphrey &
Benjamin, 1986; Merenda, 1987; Wiggins, 1982).

All circumplex models attempt to describe interpersonal
behaviors using descriptive adjectives or action verbs that
provide a dual bipolar correlational arrangement in an

4

orthogonal circular configuration when analyzed statistically using multivariate methodologies. These models order behaviors in terms of descriptive categories that are mutually exclusive, complementary, or opposites, with ordering in a circular fashion, where bipolar attributes fall on opposite ends of the vertical and horizontal axes of the circumplex. These orthogonal axes have consistently been found to represent attributes along the lines of affiliation versus power or love versus hate and dominance versus submission. The circumplex model has been found useful as a tool for the understanding and integration of theories of interpersonal behavior and style (Merenda, 1987; Wiggins, 1982).

It was from these research findings and related theory that Hurley (1976, 1978, 1989b) developed measures of interpersonal functioning for use in small groups. Parallel to the dominance-submission axis are Hurley's measures of acceptance versus rejection of self (ARS). This ARS measure of interpersonal style consists of four bipolar subscales representing the rater's view of how the target person shows feelings versus hides feelings, is expressive versus guarded, is active versus passive, and is dominant versus submissive. Similarly, Hurley's measures of acceptance versus rejection of others (ARO) parallels the affiliation-disaffiliation or love-hate dimensions of circumplex models. Hurley's ARO measures of interpersonal style represent the rater's view of how the targeted individual is warm versus

cold, helps others versus harms others, is gentle versus harsh, and accepts others versus rejects others.

These measures of interpersonal style have been used in a number of studies in recent decades (Hurley, 1976, 1978, 1986a, 1986b, 1990; Hurley, Feintuch, & Mandell, 1991). They have repeatedly yielded statistically significant linkages with a variety of behaviors, including group members' interpersonal gains (Hurley, 1986b), member growth associated with leader behaviors (Hurley, 1989a; Hurley & Rosenberg, 1990), mutual eye contact (Hurley & Bennett, 1988; Hurley & Marsh, 1986), and with the range of ratings used by the individual in ratings of others (Hurley, 1986a).

These ARS and ARO measures have also demonstrated both convergent and discriminant validity when compared with corresponding and divergent measures from conceptually related scales, including Lorr and McNair's (1963) Interpersonal Behavior Inventory (Hurley, 1989b), Epstein's and Meier's (1989) Constructive Thinking Inventory (Hurley, 1990), and Bales' and Cohen's (1979) Systematic Multiple Level Observation of Groups (Hurley, 1991). Additionally, May (1991) found the internal consistency of these group measures to be .86 (Cronbach's alpha) for ARS and .81 for ARO for small group peers' mean ratings of the individual. Thus these ARS and ARO measures apparently provide valid and useful indicators of an individual's interpersonal style. The measures are included in Appendix A.

Attachment Theory and Background

Attachment theory was originally formulated by Bowlby (1958) to provide a framework for better understanding the infant's needs and behaviors in seeking and maintaining his security in proximity to the mother. Subsequently, theoretical concepts related to attachment issues and attachment behaviors have received much attention by a wide range of researchers with diverse orientations (Ainsworth, 1967; Ainsworth & Bell, 1970; Blehar, Lieberman, & Ainsworth, 1977; Bornstein, 1989; Bretherton, 1985; Cassidy, 1988; Cohn, 1990; Main, 1990; Oppenheim, Sagi, & Lamb, 1988). For example, attachment theory was soon extended to account for more socially sophisticated behaviors in toddlers and early school age children, such as higher levels of social participation and dominance observed in the more securely attached child (LaFeniere & Stoufe, 1985). Similarly, Arend, Gove and Sroufe (1979) found that the level of early attachment was related to various dimensions of ego-control and ego-resilience in 4-5 year-old children. The tendency toward a remarkable level of stability of early patterns of attachment has been confirmed in numerous studies (Ainsworth, 1989; Arend et al., 1979; Bowlby, 1988; Bus & Van Ijzendoorn, 1988; Cassidy, 1988; Emde & Harmon, 1982; George & Main, 1979; LaFeniere & Sroufe, 1985; Sroufe & Waters, 1977).

As noted earlier, more recently attachment theory has been extended and is being widely used as a framework within

which to examine various adolescent and adult issues and concerns. Such topics of study include separation and the development of autonomy in adolescents (Greenberg, Siegel, & Leitch, 1983; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Ryan & Lynch, 1989; Steinberg & Steinberg, 1986), the function of parental attachment among college students (Berzoff, 1989; Kenny, 1987a, 1987b, 1990), love as attachment (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987, 1990; Shaver & Hazan, 1987, 1988; Shaver et al., 1988), and attachment quality as a predictor of the quality of romantic love relationships (Fenney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Others have discussed attachment failures as etiology in adult mental illness (Bowlby, 1953, 1973a, 1980; Frances & Dunn, 1975; Kestenbaum, 1984; Melges & Swartz, 1989; Munro, 1969) and the intergenerational transmission of certain attachment behavioral characteristics (Ricks, 1985).

In Bowlby's schema, attachment is the representational model and attachment behavior is the working model whereby the infant attempts to maintain proximity to the mother/care-giver who will be accessible and responsive in meeting his needs, providing comfort and security, and thus insuring his survival. This mother/care-giver provides the securely attached child with a `secure base' from which the child will explore and develop well-founded self-reliance (Bowlby, 1973b, 1988). Later, in adolescence and adulthood, friends and peers may provide the `secure base' (Bowlby, 1979, 1988).

Bowlby viewed insecure attachment resulting from situations such as the trauma of separation and loss of the mother-figure, or inadequate mothering, before six years of age, as having many significant sequelae including psychopathology and personality disturbances (Bowlby , 1969, p. 3-35; 1979, chap. 1). The latter include detachment, separation anxiety, ambivalence, disorganization, anger, guilt, and/or hopelessness, all likely to have far-reaching effects both on the individual's intra-psychic state and on his interpersonal relationships.

While attachment provides the more or less secure base from which the individual explores and takes the risk of entering new relationships, attachment behaviors are activated when the individual comes under stress, engages in exploratory activities, or is at risk of loss or rejection. The response of an insecurely attached individual to a strange or stressful situation may lead to clinging or over-dependent, detached or withdrawn, or hostile and aggressive behaviors. Such tendencies would likely be revealed in an individual's interpersonal style and be discernable by others in any meaningful relationship or repeated interactions with them over an extended period of time.

The psychological dynamics operating in attachment behaviors can be understood theoretically. Since Bowlby, himself an analyst, developed the theory of attachment to help bring psychoanalytic principles more into the realm of empirical and observational requirements of modern science,

the close correspondence with psychoanalytic principles remains. According to Bowlby, the concept of the working model as the self- and other-representation of interpersonal relationships is roughly equivalent to, and interchangeable with, the psychoanalytic concept of the `internal object' (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1988, p. 120).

Closely related to both object relations theory and attachment theory is the concept of internalization as discussed by Behrends and Blatt (1985), Blatt and Behrends (1987), and Blatt and Blass (1990). They define internalization as "...those processes whereby individuals recover lost or disrupted, regulatory, gratifying interactions with others, which may have been either real or fantasied, by appropriating those interactions, transforming them into their own enduring, self-generated functions and characteristics" (Behrends & Blatt, 1985, p. 22).

Loewald (1970) believed that it is relationships that are internalized rather than objects. This process may be seen as approximately equivalent of Bowlby's concept of self representation and other representation, which provides the internal model for expectations of external relationships. Blatt and Blass (1990) stated, "Psychological development is a process in which an individual, through interaction with significant others, internalizes aspects of both the quality of attachment (or relatedness) and conscious and unconscious attitudes and feelings toward the self..."

Behrends and Blatt (1985) explicitly assumed that the

"...mechanisms which instigate growth at one level of personality functioning are precisely those which insure it at any other level--from birth through senescence, even though individuals grow in their complexity and change with regard to their social-psychological context" (pp. 12-13). This theoretical position may be seen as an ongoing dynamic model that is consistent with, and perhaps supportive of, the findings discussed earlier relative to the degree of stability of attachment status researchers have found, lending further support to the psychological significance and importance of level of attachment in relation to interpersonal style over the entire life span.

Behrends and Blatt (1985) also stated that the first prerequisite for internalization was unity of the infant-mother matrix and, with later development, the presence of a need-satisfying or gratifying involvement of another human being. The next requirement for internalization to take place involves the minute and manageable disruption of the near-perfect union with mother or, later in development, the manageable `experienced incompatibility' with another person in a relationship. Finally, this manageable loss or disruption is recovered from through internalization of the function provided by the other person, leading to new levels of differentiation and individuation. They also stated that, "The adolescent can separate from familial objects, seek new relationships and redefine old ones, only because significant aspects of these familial relationships have

been internalized. Once again, in these new relationships, the adolescent seeks more mature and refined forms of gratifying involvement through attachments to peers, ideologies, and idealized other." (Behrends & Blatt, 1985, p. 33).

Blatt and Blass (1990, p. 120) described the result of development as a "gestalt of internalizations" which includes both "...the quality of the interpersonal relationships and the feelings toward the self acquired in these relationships. Thus the quality of the internalized familial relationships, which seems roughly parallel to attachment status, are refined and transferred from family to peers, parallel to the way in which attachment level might be reasonably seen as reflected in the interpersonal style of adolescents and young adults.

Conceptualizing this process of the development of capacities for interpersonal relationships in terms of attachment theory, behavioral observations may be categorized according to various types or qualities of attachment labelled secure attachment, ambivalent attachment, and avoidant attachment (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1969). These categories are roughly descriptive of the predominant behavioral mode through which the individual exhibits attachment behaviors when under stress or in need of support, but may also be observed in ongoing behavior patterns, such as tendencies toward either clinging or detached attitudes toward others.

It is through the use of attachment theory as a reference base that Greenberg (1982) and Armsden (1986) developed their Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA). The IPPA is a self-report instrument which assesses attachment status through questions addressing such issues as the degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and the extent of anger and alienation toward mother, father, and peers, with the same or similar questions asked about each category of persons.

Armsden (1986) assessed the internal reliability of the IPPA items for mother, father, and peers using Cronbach's alpha. She reported coefficient alphas of .87 for attachment to mother, .89 for attachment to father, and .92 for attachment to peers.

Armsden (1986) also examined the validity of the IPPA. She found significant correlations between measures of self-esteem and more secure attachment. Her findings show secure attachment negatively correlated with the symptoms and experience of anxiety, depression, anger, and loneliness. Armsden also studied the correlates of attachment measures on the IPPA with the stress and coping measures developed by Lazarus and Folkman (Folkman, 1984; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In general, she found a significant correlation between greater security of attachment and strength of coping, levels of well-being, and stability in the sense of self. The IPPA assessment items are included in Appendix B.

Attachment and Interpersonal Style

Based on theories of attachment and interpersonal style it might be expected that individuals with more secure levels of attachment would rate others and be rated by others more favorably on measures of interpersonal functioning than would those less securely attached. Operating from a more adequate base, securely attached individuals would tend to be more realistic in their expectations and demands of others, leading to more open and accepting behaviors. For example, from a position of greater security, they would be more willing to express their feelings and treat others as more valued and warm and offer them more acceptance than would less securely attached individuals. Because of their history of experiencing significant others as accessible and responsive, these more securely attached persons would most likely view and rate others as more open, accepting, and responsive than would those less securely attached. Thus expecting acceptance and responsiveness from others, those who are more securely attached would also tend to behave less defensively, as manifested by interpersonal behaviors and ratings indicating expectations of love and status. Correspondingly, persons of a more insecure attachment status would more likely see and rate others as more closed, unaccepting, unresponsive, and cold. Operating from a less secure base of ambivalent or avoidant attachment, they would tend to be more clinging and dependent, or more disaffiliative and detached,

respectively, leading to less generous ratings of their
peers' conduct on interpersonal affiliativeness and status.

Correspondingly, it might be expected that individuals
with more secure levels of attachment would be rated more
positively by others for both similar and parallel reasons.
For, as noted above, it is the relationship that is
considered internalized. Thus the attributes of the more
securely attached individual, including a tendency toward
more realistic expectations and demands on others, a
willingness to express their own feelings and to treat
others warmly, a more open and accepting manner, and
expectations that others will be accessible and responsive,
would likely result in others rating the securely attached
person higher on interpersonal measures related to
acceptance versus rejection of self (ARS).

Consistent with other findings (Hurley, 1986a, 1986b),
it might be expected that persons who are more securely
attached would tend to use a wider range of ratings.
Individuals showing a greater security in their attachment
would be more likely to accurately identify a wide range of
interpersonal skills in their peers since, coupled with a
more secure representation of themselves, they would tend to
have a less defensive style and hold more realistic
perceptions of others' behaviors in relationships. Their
stronger sense of adequacy or security would tend to allow
them to take greater risks in arousing the ire of peers when
giving lower ratings when they perceived such ratings as

accurate. Their less defensive stance would result in less idealization indicated by consistently high scores, or conversely, less negative projections or transferences indicated by consistently low scores on measures of ARS and ARO. The prediction that secure attachment is associated with giving a wider range of interpersonal ratings would also be consistent with research on the role of both self-schematas (Fong, 1982; Markus, 1977) and cognitive complexity (Aronoff & Wilson, 1985; McNeil, 1974; Schneier, 1979; Woike & Aronoff, 1992) in social situations.

Because attachment status appears to be a valid indication of the internal representation of both an individual's model of relationships and feelings about self in relationship, attachment measures are expected to be positively and significantly correlated with corresponding measures of interpersonal styles relative to the degree of acceptance of self and of others. Mindful of these theories of attachment and interpersonal functioning, the following hypotheses were formulated concerning the relationship between these measures of attachment to family and peers and the measures of acceptance versus rejection of self and others.

Hypotheses

A. More secure levels of attachment, as assessed by higher scores on the IPPA, will be associated with more accepting conduct toward both self and others, as measured by both higher self-ratings on ARS and ARO and by the higher

ratings received from their pooled group peers on measures of ARS and ARO.

B. More secure levels of attachment, as assessed by higher scores on the IPPA, will be associated with more accepting conduct toward others, as measured by the individual's higher ratings given others on measures of ARS and ARO.

C. More secure levels of attachment, as assessed by higher scores on the IPPA, will be associated with assigning a wider range of scores to others on measures of both ARS and ARO.

METHOD

Participants and Setting

Participants in this research project were 56 students
enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course over three
terms at Michigan State University. The subjects were late
adolescent college students ranging in age from
approximately 20 to 24 years of age and included 17 men and
39 women. This class met for a one hour lecture weekly in
addition to 90-minute small group (5-10 students) sessions
twice each week, and extended 12-hour small group sessions
near the third and seventh weekends of ten week academic
terms.

The stated purpose of the class is to provide a
supportive learning environment in which students can
explore their interpersonal style and obtain feedback from
peers. The textbook, <u>Interpersonal Living: A</u>
<u>Skills/Contract Approach to Human-Relations Training in</u>
<u>Groups</u>, by Egan (1976), helped set group norms in relation
to such concerns as focusing on the here-and-now, self-
disclosure and expression of feelings, empathic listening,
communication of understanding, constructive confrontation,
and ongoing immediacy of interaction. The core of this
course is the experiential involvement in the small groups.

18

These small groups are formed during the initial class meeting. They were led by trained small group facilitators who are students who have taken this class in the past, shown promise in terms of relatively high ratings on the self-acceptance and other-acceptance measures by peers in their initial group, and received a term of further training through participation in a didactic class and experience in an advanced group. Occasionally a group was led by a psychology graduate student or the class professor.

Attempts were made to assure gender balance within groups and to avoid having previously well-acquainted persons in the same group. The focus was on providing empathy and mutual support in order to promote understanding and growth in interpersonal relating. To ensure confidentially, much emphasis was placed on keeping information and concerns within each group. This also encouraged the focusing of attention on within-group events rather than siphoning energies out of the group. These efforts were based on beliefs that individual group members are more likely to feel free to express themselves openly with diminished concern for the perceptions and expectations of friends, and lessened worry about confidentiality.

Relatively high degrees of trust and related feelings of security and support sometimes develop within these groups as early as in the first 12-hour session, which normally occurred after about six 90-minute sessions or about three weeks into the term. This trust often continues

to grow throughout the term. Superficial topics of conversation such as college major, living arrangements, dating status, and so forth, are discouraged, thus directing the focus to the individual's experiences, thoughts, feelings, and conduct within their small group. Relatively high levels of intimacy and cohesiveness commonly ensue, partially due to norms about relating positively and constructively, but perhaps more importantly because of the atmosphere of immediacy in empathic and sensitive mutual disclosure of feelings, perceptions, and reactions relative to other small group members. Trust, cohesiveness, and intimacy are further enhanced through honest and often immediate feedback provided in a caring and sensitive manner by other group members and/or insightful facilitators.

This high level of group functioning is important to the individual and to the current study because it contributes to a setting in which one person may become acquainted with several others on a level of intimacy and understanding that is uncommon even in situations or relationships of much longer duration. Thus, these interpersonal learning group members' evaluations of interpersonal functioning, while somewhat situation-specific, may be more veridical and more deeply meaningful than similar evaluations from close friends, roommates, parents, and other meaningful relationships.

Measures and Procedures

Two basic measures of attachment and one multi-dimensional measure of interpersonal style were used. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) addressed the individual's degree or level of attachment to each parent and to peers outside the group. A single-item global measure of attachment was also administered. Measures of Acceptance versus Rejection of Self (ARS) and Acceptance versus Rejection of Others (ARO) were used to address the individual's current style of interpersonal functioning within their small groups.

Interpersonal Measures

The ARS and ARO measures were completed twice each term by each group member following the first regular 90-minute group meeting after each 12-hour sessions, thus providing both early and late ratings. These ten-point semantic differential scales were completed by each member for self and each other group member on four bipolar ARS subscales and four bipolar ARO subscales (see Appendix A).

Attachment Measures

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) was given at the beginning of the term. This attachment measure is a self-report inventory containing a total of 75 items on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "Almost Never or Never True" to "Almost Always or Always True" (Armsden, 1986; Greenberg, 1982). Sets of 25 items relate separately to feelings about mother, about father, and about

relationships with peers (see Appendix B). To discourage using stereotypical response sets, IPPA questions are randomly staggered in scoring direction.

The IPPA assesses the degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and the extent of anger and alienation toward mother, father, and peers, yielding a numerical score that represents the degree or level of attachment felt towards important others in the individual's life (Armsden, 1986; Greenberg, 1982; Greenberg et al., 1983). Both the combined and individual attachment scores derived from the mother, father, and peer items were the primary measures of attachment status.

The single item attachment item was given to assess the relative frequency of secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles in the current sample compared to other studies. This measure is included in Appendix B.

Statistical Analyses

The hypotheses A, B, and C proposed in this study (p. 17), as measured with the IPPA and interpersonal scales, were tested using the Pearson product-moment correlations. These data were also analyzed for gender effects as well as possible differences between group facilitators and regular group members. Analyses included comparing separate attachment scores identifying any differences in the correlations involving only mothers; only fathers; mothers plus fathers; only peers; and overall attachment level to

mothers plus fathers plus peers. The single-item attachment measure was used to assess whether the current sample's attachment pattern was similar to those reported by other researchers.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations for attachment scores and both early and late ARS and ARO measures are shown in Table 1. Overall the scores found in the current study were most often similar to those reported by other researchers for both attachment and interpersonal measures. It is noteworthy that women had higher scores than men on all attachment measures, and also on all interpersonal measures except early self-rated acceptance of self.

The present students' mean IPPA scores were compared to those reported for Armsden's (1986) sample which included 401 late adolescent college students. The present sample's mean attachment scores generally differed less than .4 standard deviation (sd) units from those reported by Armsden (1986, p. 49), with the exception that the mean for males' attachment to father in the current study was about .9 sd units lower than Armsden's and the males' mean attachment to peers was about .8 sd units higher. Males in the current study were only slightly more attached to their mothers (.1 sd units), than males in Armsden's study. All female attachment scores in this study were higher than Armsden's, but by less than .4 sd units. When compared using the

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Attachment and Interpersonal Conduct

Measure	All		Gender				Status			
			Women		Men		Members		Facilitators	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Attachment										
Peers (P)	107.2	(9.8)	108.4	(8.9)	104.5	(11.3)	106.1	(10.0)	112.4	(6.5)
Mother (M)	93.0	(22.5)	94.9	(23.6)	88.6	(19.6)	92.8	(24.4)	93.9	(11.2)
Father (F)	80.2	(25.1)	85.0	(24.7)	69.2	(23.0)	79.3	(26.3)	84.4	(18.9)
M + F	173.2	(38.1)	179.8	(36.9)	157.9	(37.2)	172.1	(40.9)	178.3	(21.6)
M + F + P	280.3	(41.6)	288.2	(40.0)	262.2	(40.5)	278.0	(44.4)	290.7	(23.7)
Acceptance-Rejection of Self (ARS)										
SELF, early	25.2	(5.9)	25.1	(6.5)	25.5	(4.6)	24.0	(5.6)	30.7	(3.9)
SELF, late	27.3	(4.8)	27.5	(5.1)	26.9	(4.1)	26.4	(4.6)	31.4	(3.3)
RECEIVED, early	23.6	(6.3)	24.2	(6.3)	22.1	(6.2)	22.5	(6.2)	28.8	(3.4)
RECEIVED, late	26.7	(4.5)	26.9	(4.7)	26.2	(4.0)	25.8	(4.4)	30.7	(2.3)
GIVEN peers, early	24.1	(3.6)	24.7	(3.4)	22.7	(3.7)	24.1	(3.8)	24.1	(2.2)
GIVEN peers, late	26.7	(2.9)	26.9	(2.7)	26.2	(3.5)	26.8	(3.0)	26.5	(3.0)
Acceptance-Rejection of Others (ARO)										
SELF, early	26.8	(4.3)	27.5	(4.3)	25.2	(3.9)	26.8	(4.5)	26.5	(2.9)
SELF, late	28.6	(3.5)	29.1	(3.1)	27.5	(4.0)	28.5	(3.4)	29.1	(3.8)
RECEIVED, early	27.2	(3.7)	28.2	(2.6)	24.9	(4.6)	27.1	(3.9)	27.6	(2.6)
RECEIVED, late	28.7	(3.0)	29.2	(2.8)	27.6	(3.1)	28.7	(3.1)	28.7	(2.3)
GIVEN peers, early	27.3	(3.4)	27.8	(3.6)	26.3	(2.9)	28.3	(3.5)	27.3	(3.3)
GIVEN peers, late	28.7	(2.9)	29.0	(2.7)	28.0	(3.3)	28.8	(2.9)	28.3	(3.0)

Note: Total $\underline{N}$=56, including 39 women and 17 men, also 46 group members and 10 facilitators. Underscored values significantly ($p \leq .05$) exceeded their cross gender or cross-status counterparts.

standard t-test (two-tailed), the present sample's IPPA scores did not differ significantly from those found in Armsden's much larger sample of similar age college students. However, women's attachment scores consistently exceeded men's, and facilitators' scores consistently exceeded members', although the only statistically significant difference (p < .05) involved attachment to fathers and was stronger for women than for men.

The Table 1 means and standard deviations for acceptance versus rejection of self- and other-ratings are similar to previously reported findings (Hurley, 1989b, 1994). Women received higher acceptance ratings than men in 11 of 12 instances, although these differences were statistically significant only for early self-acceptance ratings given to peers and for early other-acceptance ratings received from group peers. Facilitator's ratings were significantly higher than those for members by four of the six self-acceptance ratings, but did not differ significantly for acceptance of others. Thus, facilitators were rated significantly above members for acceptance of self (ARS) by both self and their group members.

The relationships among attachment measures for mother, father, and peers are shown in Table 2. The present correlation of -.02 between attachment to mothers and peers was significantly weaker than the .38 correlation between attachment to fathers and peers. However, Armsden reported parallel values of .31 and .18, respectively (1986, p. 63).

Table 2
Product-Moment Correlations Among Attachment Measures

	Peers	Mother	Father	M + F	M + F + P
Peers (P)		-.02	.38**	.24†	.46**
Mother (M)	.31**		.28*	.78**	.70**
Father (F)	.18**	.45**		.82**	.84**
M + F	†	†	†		.97**
M + F + P	†	†	†	†	

Note: Present values above the diagonal, N = 56; Armsden's
   (1986) values below, N = 401. † Data not available.

** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .10, two-tailed test.

While the interstudy father-peer correlations (.38 vs. .18)
did not differ significantly (Fisher's z = 1.49), the two
mother-peer correlations (-.02 vs. .31) did (z = 2.34).
Also, the present .28 correlation between attachment to
mothers and fathers was significantly (p < .01) weaker than
Armsden's .45 correlation (z = 3.13). Interestingly, in the
present study attachment to fathers and peers correlated
more highly than attachment to mothers and peers.

On the single item attachment measure, 48% of these
students classified themselves as secure, 32% as ambivalent,
and 20% as avoidant. These findings are consistent with
prior studies, except that the latter works have commonly
found avoidant attachment to be slightly more prevalent than
ambivalent attachment, and secure attachment characterizes
approximately 9% more. For example, various studies have

found about 57% securely attached, about 24% avoidantly attached, and about 19% ambivalently attached (Hazan & Shaver, 1987, 1990; Pistole, 1989; Shaver & Hazan, 1987).

The interpersonal measures evidenced considerable interoccasion stability in correlations (Table 3) ranging from .48 to .85. The highest values were associated with self- and peer-rated acceptance of self and with peer-rated acceptance of others. Appreciable agreement between self- and peer-ratings of individuals existed although this was stronger for self-acceptance than for acceptance of others. Raters' leniency, as assessed by the individual's mean ratings assigned to other group members, also showed moderate stability (.48 and .54) as well as cross-dimensional generality (mdn r = .58).

Study Findings

Presented in Table 4, the attachment measures' correlations with the interpersonal conduct ratings showed the latter more strongly associated with attachment to peers than with attachment to either mothers or fathers. Peer attachment correlated positively and significantly (p < .05) with acceptance of self, as rated early by self and later by peers, and also with late ratings assigned to others for acceptance of others. Each parallel other-occasion correlation also attained or closely approached the .10 level of statistical significance. Additionally, attachment to fathers was correlated (p < .01) with late other-acceptance, and closely approached significance (p < .10) on

Table 3

Product-Moment Correlations Between Measures of Self- and Other-Accepting Conduct (N=56)

	Acceptance vs. Rejection of Self (ARS)						Acceptance vs. Rejection of Others (ARO)					
	Self		Received		Gave		Self		Received		Gave	
	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L
Self-Acceptance												
Self												
Early (E)		71**										
Late (L)												
Received												
Early (E)	69**	71**										
Late (L)	60**	68***	85**									
Gave												
Early (E)	27*	62***	-06	-16								
Late (L)	12	38***	00	00	48**							
Acceptance of Others												
Self												
Early (E)	27*	12	15	10	48**	18		48**				
Late (L)	19	37**	28*	28*	13	41**						
Received												
Early (E)	-02	09	28*	23†	18	12	39**	51**				
Late (L)	-07	05	08	19	23†	14	39**	43***	71**			
Gave												
Early (E)	31*	19	17	08	67**	49**	61**	36***	21	27*		
Late (L)	16	41**	18	17	23†	70**	18	55***	17	21	54**	

Note: All decimals omitted. Divide entry by 100 for r.
** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed test.

Table 4

Product-Moment Correlations of Attachment with Interpersonal Measures (N=56)

Attachment	Acceptance vs. Rejection of Self (ARS)						Acceptance vs. Rejection of Others (ARO)					
	Self		Received		Gave		Self		Received		Gave	
	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L
Peers (P)	27*	24†	23†	33*	07	17	05	19	12	02	21	32*
Mothers (M)	-24†	-11	-02	05	05	06	10	18	11	20	16	16
Fathers (F)	00	19	21	18	02	23†	15	21	16	07	20	35**
M + F	-15	06	12	15	04	19	16	25†	17	16	22†	32*
M + F + P	-07	11	16	21	06	21	16	27*	18	15	26†	37**

Note: All decimals omitted. Divide entry by 100 for r.
** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed test.

late self-acceptance.

Other notable features of Table 4 include the attachment measures' consistently positive associations with how favorably one rated others as well as their consistently more positive correlations with acceptance of others than with self-acceptance. Also, 10 of the 30 self-acceptance (ARS) correlations were below $\pm$.10 versus only 3 of 30 parallel other-acceptance (ARO) correlations. Self-acceptance also contributed to all five of Table 4's negative correlations, including the three surprising negative associations with attachment to mothers.

Thus, hypothesis A, which predicted association of more secure levels of attachment with higher self-ratings and higher ratings from peers on both ARS and ARO, received substantial support for both peer- and self-rated acceptance of self (ARS), but less support for one's other-acceptance (ARO) ratings from self and peers. Hypothesis B, which predicted association of more secure levels of attachment with more favorable ratings of others, was broadly supported in that all 20 related correlations were positive, with four of these statistically significant (p < .05) and three others approaching significance (p < .10). Of these seven largest correlations, two associated attachment to fathers with a more favorable rating of group peers versus a single similar association with attachment to peers and none with attachment to mothers.

Curiously, attachment to mother had a nearly significant negative correlation with early self-acceptance ratings given to self (r = -.24, p < .10). The associations of composite attachment ratings (mother + father and mother + father + peer) with these interpersonal measures, even when statistically significant, seem artifacts of the noted correlations between the interpersonal ratings and attachment to peers and fathers. Perhaps one reason for this might be that the concordance or discordance between attachment to mother, father, and peers would relate more closely to interpersonal functioning than the total attachment score. Obviously a much larger sample would be necessary to meaningfully explore this and related hypotheses.

Gender-based correlations of attachment and interpersonal ratings, presented in Table 5, identified significant positive correlations between women's attachment to peers and self-acceptance ratings from peers and self on each occasion. Women's attachment to their fathers also associated positively with how generously they rated others for other-acceptance early and late (p < .10). Women's early other-acceptance ratings were also correlated positively with both composite attachment measures (p < .05). Six of the 60 women's correlations statistically significant (p < .05) and 2 others approaching significance (p < .10).

Table 5

Product-Moment Correlations of Attachment with Early (E) and Late (L) Ratings
of Self- and Other-Accepting Conduct by Gender

| | 39 Women | | | | | | 17 Men | | | | | |
| | Self | | Received | | Gave | | Self | | Received | | Gave | |
	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L
Self-Acceptance												
Peers (P)	42*	35*	40*	42*	11	10	-06	-01	-14	12	-12	23
Mothers (M)	-21	-21	-02	06	12	-08	-35	24	-11	-02	-23	31
Fathers (F)	08	15	19	16	05	22	-28	29	11	17	-34	20
M + F	-08	-04	12	15	11	10	-36	30	01	09	-33	29
M + F + P	02	04	20	23	13	11	-35	28	-04	11	-33	34
Acceptance of Others												
Peers (P)	20	19	11	-04	25	18	-38	12	-02	00	04	48†
Mothers (M)	15	09	10	23	24	07	-18	34	01	03	-23	31
Fathers (F)	20	21	14	11	27†	28†	-25	08	-09	-27	-25	42
M + F	23	19	16	22	34*	24	-25	23	-05	15	-28	42
M + F + P	25	22	18	19	37*	26	-34	25	-06	-15	-24	52*

Note: All decimals omitted. Divide entry by 100 for r.
** p < .01, * p < .05, † p < .10, two-tailed test.

The attachment and interpersonal measures had notably
less reliable associations for the small male subsample ($\underline{n}$
=17), as merely 2 of these 60 correlations reached the .10
level of confidence. Surprisingly, however, 30 of the 60
correlations based upon the men's data were negative (versus
merely 7 for women). Most (26 of 30) of the men's negative
correlations involved early ratings of acceptance.

Parallel correlations of attachment with participant's
group status (member versus facilitator), presented in Table
6, showed stronger associations with acceptance of others
than with acceptance of self. Only 1 of 60 self-acceptance
correlations attained statistical significance ($\underline{p} < .05$)
versus 7 of the 60 other-acceptance values with six more of
the latter correlations approaching statistical significance
($\underline{p} < .10$).

Members' attachment to fathers and peers associated
significantly only with late ratings of others for other-
acceptance. Members' attachment to fathers also had a
nearly-significant association with late self-rated
acceptance of others. Surprisingly, members' attachment to
mothers showed a significant negative correlation with early
self-acceptance ratings given to self. Facilitators' peer
attachment was positively correlated with the other-
acceptance ratings they received from, and gave to, others
on each occasion.

For hypothesis C, the anticipated associations between
more secure levels of attachment and use of a wide range in

Table 6

Product-Moment Correlations of Attachment with Early (E) and Late (L) Ratings of Self- and Other-Accepting Conduct by Status

| | 46 Members | | | | | | 10 Facilitators | | | | | |
| | Self | | Received | | Gave | | Self | | Received | | Gave | |
	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L	E	L
Self-Acceptance												
Peers (P)	17	14	14	25	06	15	30	43	36	39	22	45
Mothers (M)	-31*	-12	-02	06	03	06	17	-18	-38	22	49	06
Fathers (F)	-08	18	16	15	-01	23	29	14	54	35	34	27
M + F	-23	04	09	13	01	19	34	03	28	20	55	27
M + F + P	-18	07	12	17	03	21	39	14	35	28	56	37
Acceptance of Others												
Peers	06	15	05	-06	17	30*	16	44	73*	82*	63†	73*
Mothers (M)	10	17	12	20	17	17	14	39	-10	18	10	14
Fathers (F)	18	26†	14	06	25	43**	-17	-07	31	10	-15	-06
M + F	17	27†	17	16	26†	37*	-08	14	22	18	-08	02
M + F + P	17	28†	16	13	28†	41**	-03	25	40	39	10	22

Note: All decimals omitted. Divide entry by 100 for r.
** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed test.

Table 7
Correlations Between Attachment and Range of Interpersonal
Ratings GIVEN

	ARS		ARO	
	Early	Late	Early	Late
Peers	.08	.14	-.16	.16
Mother	-.19	-.06	-.11	.05
Father	.11	-.16	-.20	.25†
M + F	-.04	-.14	-.20	.14
M + F + P	-.02	-.16	-.22†	.17

† $p \leq .10$

these interpersonal ratings given others were not found, as shown in Table 7. Merely 2 of these 20 correlations even approached statistical significance ($p < .10$), one positive and one negative.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to test hypotheses about ways in which an individual's attachment status related to his/her interpersonal style as revealed by peer and self-evaluations of conduct within a small informal group. Because attachment status was conceptualized as the individual's internal representation of the self in relationship with others, it was hypothesized that greater attachment to parents and peers would be positively correlated with more favorable ratings of one's interpersonal conduct by both self and others, as well as rating peers' interpersonal conduct more generously.

The present sample of late adolescent college students was similar to that in related studies by Armsden (1986) and Hurley (1986a, 1989a, 1989b). However, because of the limited sample size ($\underline{N}$ = 56), a large effect size (Cohen, 1977, 1992) would have been necessary to refute the null hypotheses at the .05 level of confidence with an .80 power level. Keeping the limitations in mind, several interesting findings and patterns emerged.

While the overall set of correlations found between the measures of interpersonal conduct and attachment were largely in the direction predicted, fewer than expected

37

reached statistical significance. For the total sample, correlations between peer attachment and interpersonal conduct reached ($\underline{p}$ < .05) or approached statistical significance ($\underline{p}$ < .10) in five (of 12) instances, versus merely two parallel associations with attachment to fathers and only one significant negative association with attachment to mothers. While peer attachment was largely associated with favorable ratings from self and peers for acceptance of self, it also correlated positively and significantly with one's late ratings assigned to peers for other-acceptance. The remaining statistically significant associations with attachment were largely with one's average ratings of group peers for their acceptance of others. The third hypothesis that more secure levels of attachment would be associated with giving other a wider range of scores on interpersonal measures did not receive support.

The IPPA attachment measure, which was accorded substantial validity by Armsden's study of 401 late adolescent college students, was selected for the present study. The present men and women's self-reports of attachment to parents and peers were similar to Armsden's (1986). However, these MSU women consistently scored higher on attachment to mothers, fathers, and peers than the MSU men, whereas Armsden's men were slightly more attached to their fathers than were her women, although no present mean attachment rating differed significantly from Armsden's parallel data.

Correlations between present reports of attachment to fathers and peers were also similar to Armsden's. However, the present correlations between attachment to mothers and peers, and between attachment to mothers and fathers, varied significantly from Armsden's parallel values. In the current study, attachment to fathers and peers correlated more closely than did attachment to mothers and peers, the reverse of Armsden's findings.

The present sample's ratings on the single-item attachment measure, used to assess overall attachment patterns, suggested general congruence with other studies in the distribution of attachment styles. Thus, the patterns of attachment noted in this sample appear broadly representative of larger populations. The sources of the observed differences are unclear, but may be due to imprecise measurements, self-selection into this college group learning course because of relationship concerns different than a random sample would exhibit, or chance.

The interpersonal ratings showed substantial agreement between ratings by self and by pooled small group peers for both self-acceptance (mdn r = .68) and other-acceptance (mdn r = .41), suggesting convergent validity. Conversely, sharply lower correlations between individual self-acceptance and other-acceptance ratings (mdn r = .21) indicated discriminant validity. Thus, as might be expected, there was substantial concurrence between self- and group peers' perceptions of an individual's

interpersonal functioning. Additionally, individuals' rated acceptance of others received from their peers correlated more positively with their mean ratings assigned to group peers (mdn r = .20) than did the parallel ratings for self-acceptance (mdn r = .04), supporting this acceptance measure's construct validity.

Consistent with the general view of the greater importance of social relationships to women, they received higher ratings than men on 11 of the 12 interpersonal indicators, with two reaching statistical significance. This pattern, considered with the consistently substantial correlations (.48 to .85) between early and late ratings on each interpersonal measure, suggests that these interpersonal measures largely functioned as expected.

The relative importance of attachment to parents versus peers may vary by situation, as may the correspondence of attachment with interpersonal conduct. For example, Armsden (1986, p. 73) found that in a few circumscribed areas, such as ease of showing feelings and being known, her undergraduate sample described their attachment to peers as being stronger than their attachments to parents.

The closer associations of interpersonal conduct with attachment to peers than to either mothers or fathers might be conceptualized as, at least in part, a problem of contextual influence. It may simply be that, in the context of peer groups, the level of peer attachment was more relevant to interpersonal conduct with peers than was

attachment to parents. In other circumstances, such as with superiors in an adult work setting, different patterns of association between attachment and interpersonal conduct might be found. Alternatively, the importance of peer attachment and its association with interpersonal conduct could be related to the developmental status of these college students, who may be in the process of transferring primary attachment away from home and parents. However, attachment measures less dependent on direct self-reporting might yield more consistent evaluation across targets of attachment and also reduce any self-report biases, self-presentation issues, and interferences by defenses.

While these students consistently reported greater attachment to mothers than to fathers (Table 1), their attachment to fathers related more highly to their interpersonal ratings in 10 of 12 instances. However, only for the later ratings of self- and other-acceptance did the correlations of father attachment reach or approach statistical significance. The relatively closer association of father attachment with interpersonal conduct may be seen as consistent with the role of father in bridging separation from mother and facilitating interpersonal relations with others outside the nuclear family. Perhaps, although attachment to mother is greater, it may be that the level of attachment to father is most salient in the level of interpersonal functioning with peers, or that too close attachment to mother at this developmental level is

negatively associated with more positive interpersonal relationships with peers.

Women's attachment and interpersonal ratings consistently correlated more positively than men's. Women obtained significant correlations for early and late ratings by both self and peers on self-acceptance, whereas only the correlations for men's late other-acceptance ratings given approached significance ($p < .10$). Wholly unexpected were the 30 negative correlations among the 60 associations of acceptance with men's attachment ratings, although 26 of the 20 negatives were with early ratings. In a puzzling departure from both the broader pattern and from these inverse associations, men's attachment-acceptance correlations exceeded those of the women for 9 of 10 instances for later acceptance ratings given to others, and all 10 of these associations were positive.

While speculative, these notable shifts of the men's correlations may suggest that with practice and exposure men became more comfortable with interpersonal relationships. Later in these groups they tended to rate their group peers in ways more consistent with their stated degree of attachment, possibly suggesting a shift towards more genuineness and congruence between internal representations and external relationships. Men's notable interoccasion shift from negative to positive correlations of attachment with how they rated peers for other-acceptance may be partially related to their greater opportunity to resolve

issues with the opposite sex because of the disproportionate
number of women in these small groups ($\underline{n}$ = 39), limited
sample of men ($\underline{n}$ = 17), or due to chance.

Taken separately, neither members nor facilitators had
notably positive associations between attachment and self-
acceptance. The sole significant correlation among these 60
was the negative correlation between attachment to mother
and early self-acceptance, and may be due to chance. The
correlations of acceptance of others with attachment were
sharply different, for 9 of these 30 attained or approached
statistical significance for group members, as also did 4 of
30 parallel correlations for facilitators. Most of these
larger associations involved members' ratings of their group
peers for acceptance of others, whereas for facilitators
they involved the other-acceptance ratings both given to and
received from these peers.

The third hypothesis concerned whether attachment was
associated with the range one used for rating group peers on
the interpersonal measures, and did not receive support.
These correlations were low and 12 of 20 were negative, with
only two approaching significance ($\underline{p}$ < .10), one positive
and one negative. The lack of association of attachment and
range of ratings given may be due to the restricted range of
the interpersonal ratings, small sample size, or chance.
Alternatively perhaps no systematic relation exists between
attachment and range of interpersonal ratings given. It was
thought that more securely attached individuals, because of

a less defensive style and greater willingness to take interpersonal risks, would tend to employ a wider range of ratings. However, it is possible that more securely attached individuals view themselves and others more favorably and are thus consistently more generous in their ratings, reducing the range of ratings they might have otherwise given others, which then should produce negative correlations.

Finally, while the measures used apparently have substantial validity and reliability, as discussed earlier, they are also likely have flaws and shortcomings. In particular, other measures of attachment have been developed, such as the four-category model by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) and the adult interview protocol attachment measure by Main and Goldwyn (1988). Such measures might provide a research opportunity to further test the relationship between security of attachment and levels of interpersonal functioning, as well as provide a further test of the validity of the IPPA measure, especially with a larger sample sensitive to smaller effect sizes.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, these findings indicated broad associations between the late adolescent's strength of attachment to peers and their interpersonal conduct. Self-reported attachment to peers was mainly associated with self- and peer-rated acceptance of self, as defined by items addressing expressiveness, openness, and dominance.

Surprisingly, attachment to mothers tended to be negatively associated with these items. Attachment to fathers was positively correlated with favorable ratings of small group peers for acceptance of others, as defined by items concerned with warmth, helpfulness, gentleness, and acceptance. These associations were clearer among this sample of 39 women than among the 17 men.

Contrary to expectations, attachment was not found to be related to the range used for interpersonal ratings of group peers. Like similar samples, these college students described their attachment as strongest to their mothers, next strongest to their fathers, and less strong to their peers.

There are a number of directions for further research in this area. Replication with a larger sample, especially a larger number of men, and with other non-student

populations, could lead to a better understanding of the relationship of attachment and interpersonal style. A larger sample would allow for analysis of the impact of discordant attachment levels for fathers and mothers versus concordant attachment for the dyad relative to both peer attachment and interpersonal conduct.

With any replication, additional parallel measures for attachment and interpersonal functioning could increase confidence in the findings, and lead to refinement of the measurement of both constructs. Inclusion of closely related measures, such as an object relations inventory or intimacy scales, could add depth of understanding to the various constructs and further enhance insights and knowledge of the individual in his or her interpersonal environment, which provides a critical security base. Further studies with a larger sample would permit analysis of the additional variables, and consideration should be given to including appropriate parallel measures.

In light of current concerns about gender differences and sex roles, research that facilitated further understanding of the relationship between attachment and interpersonal conduct would be a high priority. Such studies designed to reveal differences in the correspondence of attachment with interpersonal conduct for males versus females would be most helpful in light of the current interest in gender differences in relationships and parallel developmental lines, from both theoretical and practical

perspectives. For example, a better understanding of the associations of internal representations of self, others, and relationships, as mapped by attachment measures, with interpersonal conduct, could inform both corrective and preventive strategies in such critical issues as sexual discrimination, spousal abuse, acquaintance rape, sexual harassment, and the role of fathering in child development.

Perhaps less urgently, it would be helpful to understand how the relative importance of different attachment objects varies by life circumstances. Attachment to mothers, fathers, or peers may be relatively more important in some domains and in some circumstances than in others. For example, it would be interesting to learn whether the association of attachment with interpersonal style would change five years after graduation from college, or whether findings would differ for employed men and women of the same age who were not in college and not dependent on parents.

In any study, it would be useful to understand how age, socioeconomic status, marital status, parenting status, and related factors affect association of attachment status with interpersonal style. This remains an area for further research.

APPENDIX A

RATINGS OF BEHAVIORS IN GROUPS

INSTRUCTIONS: On this minibooklet's last page note that all group members' names have been listed. Encircle your own name. Starting with the following page, encircle the letter between the extremes of each scale that best represents *your personal impression of each members' actual behavior within all group sessions up to now.* These ratings will be most useful if you use the full range of possible ratings for each scale.

Rate all group members, including self and leader(s). These ratings will be fully shared with all group members later. Complete all ratings on each page before turning ahead to the next. Unlike other scales which address behavior, the Liked versus Disliked scale solicits your personal responses.

49

```
        a a a a a a a a a                              a a a a a a a a a a
H       b b b b b b b b b      H              a        b b b b b b b b b b      P
E       c c c c c c c c c      A              C        c c c c c c c c c c      A
L       d d d d d d d d d      R              T        d d d d d d d d d d      S
P       ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●      M              I        ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●      S
S       f f f f f f f f f      S              V        f f f f f f f f f f      S
        g g g g g g g g g                     E        g g g g g g g g g g      I
O       h h h h h h h h h      O                       h h h h h h h h h h      V
T       i i i i i i i i i      T                       i i i i i i i i i i      E
H       j j j j j j j j j      H                        j j j j j j j j j j
E       k k k k k k k k k      E                       k k k k k k k k k k
R       l l l l l l l l l      R                       l l l l l l l l l l
S       m m m m m m m m m m    S                       m m m m m m m m m m
        n n n n n n n n n n                            n n n n n n n n n n
```

```
        a a a a a a a a a a                             a a a a a a a a a a
        b b b b b b b b b b                  D          b b b b b b b b b b      S
H       c c c c c c c c c c      G           O          c c c c c c c c c c      U
A       d d d d d d d d d d      E           M          d d d d d d d d d d      B
R       ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●      N           I          ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●      M
S       f f f f f f f f f f      T           N          f f f f f f f f f f      I
H       g g g g g g g g g g      L           A          g g g g g g g g g g      S
        h h h h h h h h h h     E           N          h h h h h h h h h h      S
        i i i i i i i i i i                  T          i i i i i i i i i i      I
        j j j j j j j j j j                             j j j j j j j j j j      V
        k k k k k k k k k k                             k k k k k k k k k k      E
        l l l l l l l l l l                             l l l l l l l l l l
        m m m m m m m m m m                             m m m m m m m m m m
        n n n n n n n n n n                             n n n n n n n n n n
```

encircle your name

```
        a a a a a a a a a a
R       b b b b b b b b b b      A       _____ (a)
E       c c c c c c c c c c      C       _____ (b)
J       d d d d d d d d d d      C       _____ (c)
E       ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●      E       _____ (d)
C       f f f f f f f f f f      P       _____ (e)
T       g g g g g g g g g g      T       _____ (f)
S       h h h h h h h h h h      S       _____ (g)
        i i i i i i i i i i             _____ (h)
O       j j j j j j j j j j      O       _____ (i)
T       k k k k k k k k k k      T       _____ (j)
H       l l l l l l l l l l      H       _____ (k)
E       m m m m m m m m m m      E       _____ (l)
R       n n n n n n n n n n      R       _____ (m)
S                                S       _____ (n)
```

Base your rating primarily on observed behavior.
Consider what interpersonal behaviors you have observed and what the person says. Discount anecdotes reported by others, or other second-hand information.

Rate what is most characteristic.
Behavior manifested varies with the persons involved and with the individual's role. Rate what is most typical of the person.

Consider the individual's reactions to you.
In arriving at a judgement consider the individual's attitude and interactions to you along with other information.

Avoid inferences.
As much as possible base your ratings on directly observable behavior.

Consider each behavior individually.
Make no effort to present a consistent portrait. People may manifest, for good reasons, seemingly contradictory behaviors.

Rate quickly.
If you cannot decide, go on to the next item and come back later to those items you skipped.

Rate every statement.
If you feel uncertain about a judgement, record your best guess. Be sure to judge every statement.

APPENDIX B

INVENTORY OF PARENT AND PEER ATTACHMENT (IPPA)

Informed Consent Letter

This research is conducted in order to increase information about people's interpersonal styles, and specifically as these styles relate to interpersonal style in the Small Interpersonal Group Experiential Learning (SIGEL) groups.

It should take less than 30 minutes to complete this questionnaire, including reading the instructions, reading each question carefully, and answering each question thoughtfully.

Your participation in answering this questionnaire is voluntary and you may withdraw from participating at any time without penalty. Your answers and all information will be held strictly confidential, and you will remain anonymous with regard to any research findings. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire.

The procedures for completing this questionnaire have been explained in class. Please feel free to ask if you have any further questions. Other questions about the test or any concerns that you have will be answered by Dr. John Hurley, 106 Olds Hall, 355-4615.

Remember, the research will hold these answers in complete confidentiality so please answer in a way that reflects your perception of the stated situation as accurately and faithfully as possible.

RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks about your relationships with important people in your life--your mother, your father, and your close friends. Please read the directions to each part carefully.

Part I

Each of the following statements asks about your feelings about your mother or the woman who has acted as your mother. If you have more than one person acting as your mother (e.g., a natural mother and a step-mother) answer the questions for the one you feel has most in-fluenced you.

Please read each statement and circle the ONE number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some-times True	Often True	Almost Always o Always True
1. My mother respects my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel my mother does a good job as my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wish I had a different mother.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My mother accepts me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My mother expects too much from me.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I get upset easily around my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My mother trusts my judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some- times True	Often True	Almost Always or Always True
16. I tell my mother about my problems and troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel angry with my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I don't get much attention from my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My mother understands me.	1	2	3	4	5
21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I trust my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off my chest.	1	2	3	4	5
25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.	1	2	3	4	5

Part II

This part asks about your feelings about your father, or the man who has acted as your father. If you have more than one person acting as your father (e.g., natural and step-father) answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you.

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some- times True	Often True	Almost Always or Always True
1. My father respects my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel my father does a good job as my father.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wish I had a different father.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My father accepts me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I like to get my father's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show aound my father.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My father can tell when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Talking over my problems with my father makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My father expects too much from me.	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some-times True	Often True	Almost Always or Always True
10. I get upset easily around my father.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I get upset a lot more than my father knows about.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When we discuss things, my father cares about my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My father trusts my judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My father has his own problems, so I don't bother him with mine.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My father helps me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I tell my father about my problems and troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel angry with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I don't get much attention from my father.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My father helps me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My father understands me.	1	2	3	4	5
21. When I am angry about something, my father tries to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I trust my father.	1	2	3	4	5
23. My father doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I can count on my father when I need to get something off my chest.	1	2	3	4	5
25. If my father knows something is bothering me, he asks me about it.	1	2	3	4	5

Part III

This part asks about your feelings about your relationships with your close friends. Please read each statement and circle the ONE number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some-times True	Often True	Almost Always Always True
1. I like to get my friend's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My friends can tell when I'm upset about something	1	2	3	4	5

	Almost Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Some-times True	Often True	Almost Always or Always True
3. When we discuss things, my friends care about my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Talking over my problems with my friends makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I wish I had different friends.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My friends understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My friends help me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My friends accept me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel the need to be in touch with my friends more often.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My friends don't understand what I'm going through these days.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel alone or apart when I'm with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My friends listen to what I have to say.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I feel my friends are good friends.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My friends are fairly easy to talk to.	1	2	3	4	5
15. When I am angry about something, my friends try to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My friends help me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5
17. My friends care about how I am.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I feel angry with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I can count on my friends when I need to get something off my chest.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I trust my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My friends respect my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I get upset a lot more than my friends know about.	1	2	3	4	5
23. It seems as if my friends are irritated with me for no reason.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I can tell my friends about my problems and troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
25. If my friends know something is bothering me, they ask me about it.	1	2	3	4	5

ADULT ATTACHMENT PROTOTYPES

Instructions

Following are descriptions of three typical patterns of feelings in close relationships. While no description fits anyone perfectly, please check the one that does the best job of describing the way you usually feel in close relationships.

A. _____   I am comfortable without a lot of closeness. It is important to me to be independent and self-reliant. I'd rather not depend on others or have others depend on me.

B. _____   I want closeness, but I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I worry that others won't care about me as much as I care about them.

C. _____   I am comfortable with closeness, and find it relatively easy to trust and depend on others. I don't worry about being hurt by those I'm close to.

Please rate the extent to which each of the above is like you.

	not at all like me	somewhat like me	very much like me
Pattern A.	1 2 3	4 5	6 7
Pattern B.	1 2 3	4 5	6 7
Pattern C.	1 2 3	4 5	6 7

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). Infancy in Uganda. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1969). Object relations, dependency, and attachment: A theoretical review of the infant-mother relationship. Child Development, 40, 969-1025.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. American Psychologist, 44, 709-716.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. Child Development, 41, 49-67.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Arend, R., Gove, F. L., & Sroufe, L. A. (1979). Continuity of individual adaptation from infancy to kindergarten: A predictive study of ego-resiliency and curiosity in preschoolers. Child Development, 50, 950-959.

Armsden, G. G. (1986). Attachment to parents and peers in late adolescence: relationships to affective status, self-esteem and coping with loss, threat and challenge (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1986). UMI Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 86-13,133).

Aronoff, J., & Wilson, J. P. (1985). Personality in the social process. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bales, R. F., & Cohen, S. P. (1979). SYMLOG; A system for the multiple level observation of small groups. New York: Free Press.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,_ _61,_ 226-244.

Behrends, R. S., & Blatt, S. J. (1985). Internalization and psychological development throughout the life cycle. _The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child,_ _40,_ 11-39.

Berzoff, J. (1989). The role of attachments in female adolescent development. _Child and Adolescent Social Work,_ _6,_ 115-125.

Blake, W. (1915). The marriage of heaven and hell. In J. Sampson (Ed.), _The poetical works of William Blake_ (p. 251). New York: Oxford University Press.

Blatt, S. J., & Behrends, R. S. (1987). Internalization, separation-individuation, and the nature of therapeutic action. _Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought,_ _6,_ 187-254.

Blatt, S. J., & Blass, R. B. (1990). Attachment and separateness: A dialectic model of the products and processes of development throughout the life cycle. _Psychoanalytic Study of the Child,_ _45,_ 107-127.

Blehar, M. C., Lieberman, A. F., & Ainsworth, M. D. D. (1977). Early face-to-face interaction and its relation to later infant-mother attachment. _Child Development,_ _48,_ 182-194.

Bornstein, M. H. (1989). Maternal responsiveness: Characteristics and consequences. _New Directions for Child Development,_ _43,_ 1-112.

Bowlby, J. (1953). Some pathological processes set in train by early mother-child separation. _Journal of Mental Science,_ _99,_ 265-272.

Bowlby J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. _International Journal of Psycho-Analysis,_ _39,_ 350-373.

Bowlby, J. (1969). _Attachment and Loss: Volume 1: Attachment._ London: The Hogarth Press.

Bowlby, J. (1973a). _Attachment and Loss: Volume III: Separation: Anxiety and Anger._ New York: Harper Colins.

Bowlby, J. (1973b). Self-reliance and some conditions that promote it. In R. Gosline (Ed.), Support, innovation, and Autonomy (pp. 19-22). London: Tavistock Publications.

Bowlby, J. (1979). The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds. London: Tavistock/Routledge.

Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and Loss: Volume II: Loss: Sadness and Depression. NY: Harper Collins.

Bowlby, J. (1988). A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment Theory: Retrospect and Prospect. Growing Points of Attachment Theory and Research. [Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Serial No. 209], 50, 3-35.

Bus, A. G., & Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1988). Attachment and early reading: A longitudinal study. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 149, 199-210.

Cassidy, J. (1988). Child-mother attachment and the self in six-year-olds. Child Development, 59, 121-134.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. Psychological Bulletin, 122, 155-158.

Cohn, D. A. (1990). Child-mother attachment of six-year-olds and social competence at school. Child Development, 61, 152-162.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 644-663.

Egan, G. (1976). Interpersonal Living: A Skills/Contract Approach to Human-Relations Training in Groups. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Emde, R. N., & Harmon, R. J. (Eds.). (1982). The development of attachment and affiliative systems. New York: Plenum Press.

Epstein, S. (1983). Scoring and interpretation of mother-father-peer scale. Unpublished manuscript. University of Massachusetts, Amberst, MA.

Epstein, S., & Meier, P. (Eds.). (1989). Constructive thinking: A broad coping variable with specific components. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57_, 332-351.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). _Childhood and Society._ NY: W. W. Norton. (Originally published 1950).

Fenney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58_, 281-291.

Folkman, S. (1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: A theoretical analysis. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46_, 839-852.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. _Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 21_, 219-239.

Fong, G. T. (1982). Self-schemas and judgments about others. _Social Cognition, 1_, 191-204.

Frances, A., & Dunn, P. (1975). The attachment-autonomy conflict in agoraphobia. _International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 56_, 435-439.

Franz, C. E., & White, K. M. (1985). Individuation and attachment in personality development: Extending Erikson's theory. _Journal of Personality, 53_, 224-256.

George, C., & Main, M. (1979). Social interactions of young abused children: Approach, avoidance, and aggression. _Child Development, 50_, 306-318.

Gifford, R., & O'Connor, B. (1987). The interpersonal circumplex as a behavior map. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52_, 1019-1025.

Greenberg, M. T. (1982). _Reliability and validity of the Inventory of Adolescent Attachments._ Unpublished manuscript. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M., & Leitch, C. J. (1983). The nature and importance of attachment relationships to parents and peer during adolescence. _Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12_, 373-386.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59_, 270-280.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,_ 270-280.

Horney, K. (1950). _Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization._ New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Humphrey, L. L., & Benjamin, L. S. (1986). Using structural analysis of social behavior to assess critical but elusive family processes. _American Psychologist, 41,_ 979-989.

Hurley, J. R. (1990). Constructive thinking and elevated ratings of self in interpersonal groups. _The Journal of Psychology, 124,_ 563-573.

Hurley, J. R. (1976). Two prepotent interpersonal dimensions and the effects of trainers on T-groups. _Small Group Behavior, 7,_ 77-98.

Hurley, J. R. (1978). Toward seeing ourselves as others see us. In L. R. Wolberg & M. L. Aronson (Eds.), _Group Therapy_ (pp. 105-118). NY: Stratton.

Hurley, J. R. (1986a). Interpersonal behavior, range of ratings, and personal security. _Psychological Reports, 59,_ 219-228.

Hurley, J. R. (1986b). Leaders' behavior and group members' interpersonal gains. _GROUP, 10,_ 160-177.

Hurley, J. R. (1989a). Affiliativeness and outcome in interpersonal groups: Member and leader perspectives. _Psychotherapy, 26,_ 520-523.

Hurley, J. R. (1989b). Self-acceptance and other-acceptance scales for small groups. _Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 115,_ 484-513.

Hurley, J. R. (1991). Self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and SYMLOG: Equivalent measures of the two central interpersonal dimensions? _Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47,_ 576-581.

Hurley, J. R. (1994). The "Big Five" personality dispositions, everyday thinking, and later behavior in small informal groups. _Unpublished Manuscript._

Hurley, J. R., & Bennett, M. K. (1988). Interpersonal ratings and mutual eye contact. _Small Group Behavior, 19,_ 528-543.

Hurley, J. R., Feintuch, B., & Mandell, M. J. (1991). Novice leaders' first three groups: Change and consistency in acceptance of self and other. _Journal of Social Psychology, 131_, 233-245.

Hurley, J. R., & Marsh, V. M. (1986). Contrasting interpersonal correlates of mutual eye contact reports by self and others. _Perceptual and Motor Skills, 63_, 1267-1274.

Hurley, J. R., & Rosenberg, D. B. (1990). Group members' gains in acceptance of self and others associated with leaders' behavior. _Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 116_, 413-434.

Kenny, M. E. (1987a). The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year college students. _Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16_, 17-29.

Kenny, M. E. (1987b). Family ties and leaving home for college: Recent findings and implications. _Journal of College Student Personnel, 28_, 438-442.

Kenny, M. E. (Ed.). (1990). College seniors' perceptions of parental attachments: The value of stability of family ties. _Journal of College Student Development, 31_, 39-46.

Kestenbaum, C. J. (1984). Pathological attachments and their relationship to affective disorders in adult live. _The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 44_, 33-49.

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. _Child Development, 59_, 135-146.

Krishnamurti. (1964). _Think on these things_. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

LaFeniere, P. J., & Sroufe, L. A. (1985). Profiles of peer competence in the preschool: Interrelations between measures, influence of social ecology, and relation to attachment history. _Developmental Psychology, 21_, 56-69.

Lazarus, R. S. (1966). _Psychological stress and the coping process_. New York: McGrow-Hill.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). _Stress, appraisal, and coping_. New York: Springer.

Leary, T. (1957). Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press.

Loewald, H. N. (1970). Psychoanalytic theory and the psychoanalytic process. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 25, 45-68.

Lorr, M., & McNair, D. M. (1963). An interpersonal behavior circle. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 68-75.

Main, M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent studies, changing methodologies, and the concept of conditional strategies. Human Development, 33, 48-61.

Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1988). An adult attachment classification system. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Department of Psychology. Berkeley, CA.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 35, 63-78.

May, B. A. (1991). The interaction between ratings of self, peers' perceptions, and reflexive self-ratings. Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 483-493.

McNeil, L. W. (1974). Cognitive complexity: A brief synthesis of theoretical approaches and a concept attainment task analogue to cognitive structure. Psychological Reports, 34, 3-11.

Melges, F. T., & Swartz, M. S. (1989). Oscillations of attachment in borderline personality disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 146, 1115-1120.

Merenda, P. F. (1987). Toward a four-factor theory of temperament and/or personality. Journal of Personality Assessment, 51, 367-374.

Munro, A. (1969). Parent-child separation: Is it really a cause of psychiatric illness in adult life? Archives of General Psychiatry, 20, 598-603.

Oppenheim, D., Sagi, A., & Lamb, M. E. (1988). Infant-adult attachments on the Kibbutz and their relation to socioemotional development 4 years later. Developmental Psychology, 24, 427-433.

Pistole, M. C. (1989). Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6, 505-510.

Ricks, M. H. (1985). IX. The social transmission of parental behavior: attachment across generations. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing Points of Attachment: Theory and Research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, No. 209: vol. 50, 211-227.

Ryan, R. M., & Lynch, J. H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. Child Development, 60, 340-356.

Schneier, C. E. (1979). Cognitive structure and preference for constructs in impression formation: A field experiment. Psychological Reports, 45, 459-467.

Shaver, P., & Hazan, C. (1987). Being lonely, falling in love: Perspectives from attachment theory. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 2, 105-124.

Shaver, P., & Hazan, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. Journal os Social and Personality Relationships, 5, 473-501.

Shaver, P., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love (pp. 68-99). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. Child Development, 48, 1184-1199.

Steinberg, L., & Steinberg, S. B. (1986). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. Child Development, 57, 841-851.

Stern, D. N. (1985). The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Wiggins, J. S. (1982). Circumplex model of interpersonal behavior in clinical psychology. In P. C. Kendall & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), Handbook of Research Methods in Clinical Psychology (pp. 183-221). NY: Wiley.

Woike, B. A., & Aronoff, J. (1992). Antecedents of complex social cognitions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 97-104.