INCEST AS AN ADULT LOVE EXPERIENCE:
THE ROLE OF EGO DEVELOPMENT AND ATTACHMENT

by

Rebecca St.Clere England
M.A. Simon Fraser University, 1990

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department
of
Psychology

© Rebecca St.Clere England 1997

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

March, 1997

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.
The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author’s permission.

L’auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L’auteur conserve la propriété du droit d’auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.
APPROVAL

Name: Rebecca St.Clere England

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Title of Dissertation: Incest as an Adult Love Experience: The Role of Ego Development and Attachment

Examining Committee:

Chairperson: Dr. Meredith Kimball

Dr. James Marcia
Senior Supervisor

Dr. Ray Kropman

Dr. Ronald Roesch

Dr. Adam Horvath
Internal External Examiner

Dr. William Marshall
External Examiner
Queen's University

Date approved: March 27, 1997
ABSTRACT

Ninety-one incest offenders were compared with an age-matched control group on measures derived from ego psychology, attachment theory, and the adult love literature. The incest group had significantly lower ego development scores as measured by Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test, and lower ego strength scores as measured by Barron's Ego Strength Scale. Hazan and Shaver's measure of attachment styles showed the incest group to have significantly lower scores on the Secure attachment style, and higher scores on the Avoidant attachment style. Dimensions of attachment measured with West, Sheldon, and Reiffer's Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire, produced a significant difference only on increased Feared Loss for the incest group.

Adequate ego development is considered necessary for mature adult love. Because incest can be viewed, from the perspective of the offender, as a type of adult love experience, control group individuals, matched on ego development to the incest group, were expected to resemble the offenders when describing a past love relationship. This hypothesis was not supported. Incest offenders, describing their incest relationship using Hazan and Shaver's Love Experiences Questionnaire, significantly differed from the ego development matched control group. Lack of emotional engagement characterized the incest relationship, distinguishing it from other love relationships. Results are
discussed in terms of the implications for the treatment of incest offenders, particularly the challenge to the clinician in balancing effective compassionate interventions with a realistic understanding of the incest relationship.
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INTRODUCTION

Incest can be viewed, from the perspective of the offender, as a type of adult love experience. As with other dysfunctional adult love relationships, the incest relationship has as its focus the gratification of early narcissistic needs, with accompanying unrealistic notions of the true nature of the relationship and the other individual. Incest is remarkable in this regard as the degree of distortion required is unparalleled in other dysfunctional love relationships. It is believed that deficits in the underlying constructs of attachment and ego development provide the necessary conditions for this type of relationship to evolve - in essence they are the genotype of which incest is a phenotypic expression. The core dynamics of attachment and ego development are viewed as necessary, but not sufficient conditions, as other factors play a significant role in whether an individual becomes an incest offender. Factors such as easy accessibility to a victim, personal history of childhood sexual abuse, and incest in the family of origin etc., are all important, however, they are either factors which are unchangeable (e.g., one's past) or are externally monitored (e.g., accessibility to potential victims is monitored by parole/probation). The dynamic underpinnings of incest behaviour are significant as these factors are relevant to psychotherapy.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate ego development, and
aspects of attachment of a particular group of individuals with significant
disturbance in their adult love experiences - incest offenders. Another goal is
to lend support to the notion that incest is one of several possible behavioral
expressions of a more common set of underlying personality characteristics.
To test this, incest offenders, describing their incest relationship, are not
expected to differ from a control group matched in terms of ego development,
describing one of their past love relationships.

Results will be discussed in terms of implications for treatment, particularly
the issue of differential treatment for clients who have committed a sexual
offense, and those who have not.

For the purposes of this study, four areas of literature will be reviewed.
The topic of incest will be discussed first, including a description of incest, its
prevalence, and what is known to date about incest offenders. Moving on to
the theoretical literature, ego psychology will be reviewed next, including a
discussion of theory and research. Attachment theory will then be reviewed,
again covering both theory and research. The final theoretical area reviewed
will be that of adult love, again covering both theory (integrating both the ego
psychology and attachment orientations) and research.

A section on integration will follow the theoretical review, and then some
specific issues will be discussed with respect to research with a forensic
population. A brief overview of the present study will follow, and will conclude with a specific itemization of the hypotheses to be tested.

**Literature Review**

**Incest**

**Definition.** The term incest is quite broad which gives rise to a problem in definition. Incest connotes both a behavioral dimension (the sexual activity) and a specific relationship between the individuals. With respect to the sexual activity, on one extreme is the criterion of genital intercourse (e.g., Weinberg, 1955), a definition which both overlooks incest between same sex individuals and undermines the impact of a variety of sexual acts on incest victims. On the other end of the continuum are sexual activities that do not involve touch, such as exposure in a sexualized manner, and overtly displayed sexual interest on a verbal level. For research purposes, Meiselman (1978) has suggested that acts which can be specified by discreet overt behaviours make a good case for inclusion. While seductiveness is clearly incestuous in nature, it is rarely included in both legal and research definitions. In terms of the behavioural aspect of incest, the present study uses Meiselman's definition. This definition clearly specifies the behaviours and thereby provides useful operational guidelines. The definition is as follows:

A very definite sexual approach, involving successful or unsuccessful
attempts at exposure, genital fondling, oral-genital contact, and/or vaginal or anal intercourse. Reports of 'seductive' behaviour that consisted of suggestive dressing or posturing, verbal suggestions or unusual possessiveness, or incest fantasies (are) not included unless there (is) some behavioural correlate (p.8).

The second aspect of the term incest has to do with the relationship between the individuals. Often overlooked when discussing incest is that the most prevalent form of incest takes place between siblings. This type of incest, however, is not the primary focus of mental health professionals, and is typically not what is being referred to when the term 'incest' is used. The common assumption when the term 'incest' is used is that it refers to sexual activity between a parent and a child. The traditional definition of this type of incest includes only relatives with biological ties, however remarried families, adoptive families, and common-law marriages are frequent in today's society. Clinicians and researchers are beginning to appreciate the impact of inappropriate sexual relations within these contexts, and the traditional definition has expanded with this awareness. Herman (1981) maintains that "from a psychological point of view, it does not matter if the father and child are blood relatives. What matters is the relationship that exists by virtue of the adult's parental power and the child's dependency" (p. 70). The nature of the relationship is a critical psychological factor which plays a central role in incest
having a traumatic impact on the victim. Geiser (1979) used the term "psychological incest" to reflect the violation not of a biological barrier, but of the psychological bond that exists between people who call themselves 'family'.

In terms of the psychological aspect of incest, the present study will use Geiser's definition, since definitions including only biologically related persons are overly restrictive and ignore the impact of sexual relations within a nonbiological family group. Incest therefore is viewed as those sexual behaviours (as defined above) between an adult male parent who lived with and in the victim's household for at least one year, and a female child victim of 18 years or younger, who was the biological child, adopted child, foster child, or stepchild of the perpetrator or the perpetrator's significant other.

Prevalence. During the past decade sexual abuse, and child sexual abuse in particular, has received unprecedented attention. Although it may be seen as a contemporary mental health concern, incest is an old problem whose scope is only now being acknowledged. A salient example of this is Freud's (1896) early conclusions that parental seduction of children was one of the causes of psychoneuroses. When confronted with both the negative public reactions from such statements, as well as the (to him) questionable pervasiveness of abuse, Freud recanted, and instead developed the theory of childhood incestuous wishes and fantasies, which became a cornerstone of psychoanalytic theory.
Although Freud's abandonment of the seduction theory is not generally supported, it still facilitates an ambivalence about the problem and prevalence of incest (Finkelhor, 1984). Until the 1960's, incest was viewed as quite rare, occurring primarily between retarded, seductive girls and inadequate, sociopathic fathers. In 1962, Cormier, Kennedy, and Sangowicz portrayed a more accurate picture of incest and suggested that its incidence vastly exceeded reported figures. There is no disagreement in the literature that reported incidence statistics are significantly lower than actual incidence. The methodological hurdles in obtaining disclosures from individuals regarding their incestuous behaviours are formidable. One approach has been that of Abel, Becker, Murphy, and Flanagan (1981) and Quinsey, Chaplin, and Carrigan (1979) who have gathered statistics from men already convicted of sexual offences. Although these works again highlight how extensive sexual abuse of children is in our culture, even this methodological approach does not get around the problem of finding out how many adults who are not charged, are engaging in incest.

The greatest source of information regarding prevalence, therefore, comes from disclosures made by victims. For victims there are also many factors which operate in the direction of under-reporting. Victims may not recall their abuse (false negatives) and even if they do, they are often confronted with their
own need to deny or minimize it, feelings of betrayal if they acknowledge it, stigmatization, and fear of becoming involved in the legal system.

What we know from victims is that the most common form of child sexual abuse in general involves a male perpetrator with a female victim. Although the reported incidence of male child victims has grown, boys are not victimized to the same extent as girls (Finkelhor, 1984). Likewise, the incidence of female perpetrators has also grown; however, it still remains that roughly 97% of offenders are male (Bass, 1983). Despite the fact that less than 6% of cases of child sexual abuse are reported outside the family (Russell, 1984), statistics based on those who have disclosed indicate a widespread problem. With respect to incest, Russell (1986) estimates that as high as 20% of women have had an experience of incestuous abuse at some time in their lives: 12% before the age of 14, and 16% before the age of 18. She also estimates that as much as 5% of all women have been abused by their fathers. With respect to biologic versus step fathers, Russell found that one out of forty women was sexually abused by a biological father, compared to one out of six women abused by a stepfather (Finkelhor, 1984).

The incest offender. There is a great deal of research regarding individuals who commit sexual offences. A difficulty in reviewing this body of research is in the classification of groups. As Abel et al.'s (1981) research has shown,
there is much more overlap between categories than was previously believed, which leads to difficulties in classification. Some research uses the term 'sexual offender', a heterogeneous category which often includes incest offenders. Other research focusses on 'rapists', a grouping which at times includes some of the more violent incest offenders or on 'child molesters', a grouping which not uncommonly includes incest offenders. Predictably, there is less research which specifically studies incest offenders. The following review will include a variety of research efforts, as there are many common themes which cut across categories, and many classifications not identified as 'incest offenders' do include them.

Generally, the most recent trend in the sex offender treatment literature appears to reflect a 'back to the drawing board' approach. One indication of this is a growing focus on attempting to understand the men who commit sexual offences, and how they differ from other offender populations. There is also more of a focus on understanding the factors operating in the lives of these men which predispose them to sexually offend (Graham, 1993).

This effort at understanding the make-up of the sexual offender has been approached from many different perspectives. One perspective is the examination of cognitive variables and how they may be related to offending. An example of this is Segal and Marshall's (1986) study which looked at the
discrepancies between self-efficacy predictions and actual performance in a population of rapists, child molesters, non-sex offender prisoners, and a control group of community males on a social interaction task with a female confederate. They found that the child molesters had the largest discrepancy scores (difference between how a subject predicted he would perform, and how he actually performed) and had particular difficulty in gauging their ability to answer the confederate's questions. They discussed their results in terms of a differential perception of social cues by sex offenders and the importance of cognitive variables in assessing social skills.

Another perspective is the identification of behavioral indices which differentiate sexual offenders from non-offending males. Lang and Langevin (1990) have investigated the marital relations of incest offenders compared to a group of non-criminal married males. They found that no differences emerged between offenders and the controls with respect to the range of sexual behaviours experienced or the degree of satisfaction with them. There were no group differences in the frequency of coitus nor in sexual dysfunction. They concluded that in general the lack of a satisfying emotional relationship between the incest offenders and their wives appeared as the most prominent factor in their marital relationships.

A third perspective reflects the growing interest in the family background
of sexual offenders, particularly their own history of abuse. Graham (1993) outlines a controversy in the literature in this area, which speaks to the very subjective reality of much 'objective' research. He notes that some researchers tend to believe, find, and publish low incidence of sexual and other forms of abuse (e.g., Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christenson, 1965; Langevin, 1983; Langevin & Lang, 1988). Offenders who report sexual abuse as children are sometimes seen as using this as an excuse, and these authors make the point that many males are sexually abused and never act out as perpetrators. From this perspective, little emphasis is placed on the importance of the victimization of the offender in the etiology of the offense. Other clinicians and researchers (e.g., Groth, 1979; Seghorn, Prentky, & Boucher, 1987; Tingle, Barnard, Robbins, Newman, & Hutchinson, 1986; Rada, 1978) have taken the opposite position and have reported incidents of sexual and physical abuse at much higher levels. These studies point to family backgrounds that are both chaotic and abusive. These authors contend that it is in a chronic environment of child sexual abuse, including emotional and physical abuse, that the predisposition to sexually offend arises. This latter view appears to be gaining greater support as more research is showing that sexual offenders are a traumatized population. Graham (1993) notes that his research supports "the clinical observations that a high percentage of these individuals have been severely abused as
Although there is a great deal of psychodynamic psychotherapy literature which has developed theory to understand the connection between experiences in childhood and later psychological (and behavioural) functioning, there is a paucity of such information in the sex offender literature. There are some studies which support the idea that sexual offenders have deficits beyond their sexual offending behaviour, a notion reminiscent of the early psychoanalytic thinking that sexual deviance is a symptom of a neurosis. Williams and Finkelhor (1990), for example, report that all of the eight studies they reviewed of incest offenders, which examined the characteristics of social isolation and lack of social skills, found them to some degree. Graham (1993) found that sexual offenders dealt with their own history of childhood sexual abuse by utilizing more dissociative defences and that these defences facilitate their subsequent offending.

**Treatment.** Unlike other forms of criminal behaviour, sexual offending has a long history of being viewed as a behaviour requiring treatment. Szasz (1991) noted that "sexual acts involve the use of the human body, inviting the illusion that sexual problems are medical problems" (p.34). The medicalization of sexual offending can be dated as early as 1901 with Krafft-Ebing's textbook on psychosexual disorders, *Psychopathia Sexualis*. In 1933, Havelock Ellis
wrote that paedophilia could be included under the classification called "parts of the body", which included lameness, squinting, the pitting of small pox, necrophilia, and zoophilia. He believed that there was no congenital basis for paedophilia but that it was a general indiscriminating sexual tendency among those who possessed weak minds (senility), or a "luxurious speciality of a few overly refined persons" (Barnard, Fuller, Robbins, & Shaw, 1989).

Psychoanalysts like Krafft-Ebing, Ellis, and Freud believed that "all sexually deviant behaviours are theoretically and etiologically similar and that they represent a single type of psychopathology" (Lanyon, 1986).

With the rise of behaviourism in the 1950's, treatment of sexual offending moved away from the psychoanalytic perspective, and in ensuing decades behaviour therapy methods dominated in the treatment of sex offenders (Langevin et al. 1988). In recent years, the behavioural approach seems to be losing its hold as the unilateral treatment of choice. Despite the appearance of effectiveness of the behavioural methods, Langevin and Wright (1988) note that in evaluating the effectiveness of therapy methods applied to sex offenders (such as aversive conditioning) the number of men refusing or dropping out of treatment has to be considered. They also note that from society's perspective criminal offences are involved for most men presenting with sexual anomalies and this fact "will influence what must be done in the therapy of sex
offenders." The problem with this is that in making society the client, and focusing almost exclusively on changing the problem behaviours (as we have done with homosexuality until recently) the nature of sex offenders' psychological problems have been relatively unaddressed.

There has also been little to no investigation of what forms of therapy (if any) sexual offenders themselves feel would be most beneficial. Langevin and Wright (1988) found that only 49.4% of convicted sexual offenders wanted treatment, and that the most frequently utilized therapy for sexual offenders (aversive conditioning) was viewed by the offenders as least acceptable (along with castration and/or drug therapy to reduce sex drive). They also found that the order of preferences in therapies from the offender's point of view was individual psychotherapy, social skills training, and lastly, group therapy. Langevin and Wright note that because so many sex offenders refuse to consider that they even have a sexual problem, lack of motivation to change must be dealt with as an initial therapeutic goal. They further suggest that perhaps "improving congruence between therapist and offender-patient goals may enhance treatment compliance and therapy success for sex offenders generally."

At this point it may appear that sex offender treatment has not advanced significantly over the past 100 years. In 1901 Krafft-Ebing despaired at the
difficulty and tiresomeness of treating child molesters, and thought that more often than not it was a waste of time. He concluded that the most effective treatment measure was to keep the potential child molester away from children. Barnard et al. (1988) note that our society does this through incarceration, however, this is an incomplete and temporary solution, since due to civil rights considerations, sexual offenders are eventually released. As clinicians we are still left with the task of somehow altering the internal psychological predisposition of the sexual offender.

A diversity of positions and opinions can be found in the sex offender treatment literature. One position is held by the 'nothing works' proponents (Schwartz, 1992) who emphasize that treatment is ineffective with sexual offenders, a position which raises questions regarding our own need to view sexual offenders as dissimilar and incorrigible. Marshall (1993) not only presents evidence refuting the 'nothing works' position, but contends that there is a need to create a climate that will encourage treatment providers to publish outcome data, and that a position of 'nothing works' will discourage such efforts. Marshall and Pithers (1994) assert that recent relatively well-controlled evaluations have shown that treatment programmes are effective, if they are comprehensive, cognitive-behaviourally based, and include a relapse prevention component.
Two recent meta-analyses have been conducted which support sex offender treatment efficacy. Hall (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of 12 studies which found that overall 19% of offenders who completed treatment programmes committed additional sexual offences, compared to 27% of sexual offenders in comparison conditions. The most extensive study is that of Hansen and Bussiere (1996) a meta-analysis of 61 treatment programmes, which similarly concluded that treatment for sexual offenders is indeed effective.

In conclusion, incest remains a significant and widespread problem in our culture. Treatment is effective, however specifying what types of treatments by what providers and for what types of offenders is unresolved. With respect to incest, very little is understood about the dynamics of the incest offender, and the experience of incest from the point of view of the offender. The present study is one effort to contribute knowledge in this area.

**Ego Psychology Theory**

**Description.** Psychoanalytic theory is an attempt to account for the inner world of process and experience of human beings, as well as the outer world of observable behaviour. In doing so it attempts to provide constructs which can add to our understanding of normal development and functioning, psychopathology, and psychotherapy. One of these constructs is the ego. The term *das Ich* (the 'I', translated later to 'ego') was in familiar use before Freud's
time, however Freud originated its development from a commonly used term to a more sophisticated construct. In Freud's earliest writings he used the term in two ways: firstly, to distinguish a person's self as a whole from other people, and secondly, as a term which denotes a particular part of the mind characterized by special attributes and functions. It is in this second sense that the term was used in his account of the 'ego' in his Project for a Scientific Psychology of 1895 (Freud, 1950a, Part I, Section 14). Freud then left the subject of the ego untouched for about 15 years, until 1910 when he wrote about 'ego instincts' which combine the functions of repression with those of self-preservation. His development of the concept of narcissism in 1914 also led the way to a detailed examination of the ego and its functions. As Freud began to focus his interests on understanding psychosis, problems in the theory emerged concerning the individual's relationship with reality. Since the ego was defined as that part of the mental apparatus that is in contact with the external world, Freud began to place increasing emphasis on its strength and, correspondingly on the role of reality. Greenberg and Mitchell (1983) note that in 1924 Freud's understanding was that:

the external world governed the ego in two ways: firstly, by current, present perceptions which are always renewable, and secondly, by the store of memories of earlier perceptions which, in the shape of an
'internal world', form a possession of the ego and a constituent part of it...[The internal world is] a copy of the external world...[In psychosis] The ego creates, autocratically, a new external and internal world;...this new world is constructed in accordance with the id's wishful impulses [due to] some serious frustration by reality of a wish. (p.55)

Over the next several years, Freud expanded his understanding of the development and role of the ego. In 1926 he moved to the position that internal danger situations could also be triggered from outside one's own psyche, and that ego maturation was an important factor in the experience of anxiety. In 1937 certain aspects of the ego were given a role in the determinations of patterns of defence.

Loevinger (1978), outlining the history of ego psychoanalytic theory, noted that two main courses emerged in the years following Freud's death. One group, best known in the works of Anna Freud, Heinz Hartmann, Rudolph Loewenstein and David Rapaport basically held to the drive paradigm, but made modifications. In their theories they emphasized that not all functions are derived from drives, but that there are ego functions that are autonomous with respect to drives from the start, and other ego functions that may originate in drives, but later become autonomous. In so doing, these theorists have extended the drive paradigm to account for ego phenomena.
This can be seen in Anna Freud's work where she describes the role of the ego in defences directed against external perceptions. In *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defence* (1936) she stressed the critical developmental role of environmental conditions. Her concepts of "identification with the aggressor" and "defence against reality situations" challenged the view that motivation was dependent exclusively on internal drives and their vicissitudes. She believed that specific behaviours constituting these defences arose from specific constellations of external conditions: the aggressor who is identified with is, at least to some extent, a figure in reality; defences against reality (e.g., against a child's small size and vulnerability) originate with a realistic situation.

In Hartmann's *Ego Psychology and the Problem of Adaptation* (1939) he also sought to modify classical analytic theory to enhance the role of reality and of the ego in the determination of human motivation. Hartmann approached psychological development as a problem of adaptation and argued that the ego does not solely owe its origin and acquired characteristics to its relation to the outside world but that it is a structure that performs functions that are innate, and the result of an evolutionary process. This thinking is consistent with principles in ethology (e.g., Lorenz, Piaget) where structures of adaptation are seen to be facilitated or released by the external environment. Hartmann viewed the structure of the ego as performing certain functions. This
set of functions which he called the adaptive capacities of the ego, (e.g.,
perception, mobility, reality testing, etc.) are present from birth and determine
the nature of the individual's relationship to reality.

One of Loevinger's criticisms of this theoretical approach is that concepts
such as autonomous ego functions require new principles of normal functioning
which have little application and explanatory value in relation to problems of
psychopathology and the therapy of the neuroses. This became evident as
Hartmann started to bring data from the study of early object relations to bear
on his theory of the ego. He finally concluded that there were two reality
principles: one is the construct of the ego as a prefigured, innate mode of
adaptation, and the other is the result of conflict and idiosyncratic experience.
He stated that "the two processes, differentiation of psychic structure and
relation of the self to external objects, are interdependent" (Hartmann, Kris, &
Loewenstein; 1949). Therefore, "while the development of object relations is
codetermined by ego development, object relations are also one of the main
factors that determine the development of the ego" (p.242).

A second problem that Loevinger sees with this theoretical approach is its
inability to account for Freud's three principles of ego psychology - the
principle of mastery through change from passive to active, the principle of
progression through regression, and the principle that interpersonal schemes
give rise to intrapersonal schemes. Loevinger states that even the most ambitious systematization of psychoanalysis from this perspective, that of David Rapaport (1960), does not account for these three principles.

The second course of theoretical development is reflected in the works of Erik Erikson, Paul Ricoeur, and Hans Loewald. Essentially from this perspective, which Loevinger refers to as the 'ego paradigm', the term drive is reconceptualized to make it consistent with developments in theory of the ego. The ego is not viewed as a structure in relation to drives, the external environment, and the superego, but as something that is mutually structured along with reality, just as the drives and the environment are mutually structured. From this perspective then, neither the drives nor the environment are 'outside' of the ego. In infancy the drives are as much related to the environment as ego is later related to reality, but the organization of infancy is on a more primitive level. The basic force for ego development is understood to be the tension between a more maturely organized and less maturely organized system. Loevinger notes that this 'ego paradigm' is more consistent with Freud's efforts to find a small set of principles that simultaneously account for the facts of normal life, neurosis, and psychotherapy.

The concept of ego development is a multifaceted one, where historically more emphasis has been placed on differences between models than
similarities. Loevinger and Wessler (1970) however, notes many aspects in common between models. The first point of commonality is that all theorists project an abstract continuum that is both a normal developmental sequence and a dimension of individual differences. All represent holistic views of personality, and see behaviour in terms of meaning or purposes. Finally, all are more or less concerned with impulse control and character development, interpersonal relations, and cognitive preoccupations, including self-concept. Loevinger (1979) sums up ego development as a "complexity of moral judgement, the nature of interpersonal relations, and the framework within which one perceives oneself and others as people". Loevinger's most significant contribution has been her own version of the sequence of stages of ego development, summarized in Table 1, and described below.

The earliest measurable stage is called the Impulsive stage. This stage is hypothesized to occur from early to late childhood. At this stage the interpersonal mode is egocentric, dependent, and demanding. Conscious preoccupations centre around bodily feelings and impulse control is categorized as 'impulsive'. Cognitively the individual lives in a conceptually oversimplified world. When problems are perceived they are considered to be external and
### Table 1

**Loevinger's Ego Development Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Impulse Control, Character</th>
<th>Interpersonal Style</th>
<th>Conscious Preoccupations</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Impulsive, Fear of retaliation</td>
<td>Receiving, dependent, exploitive</td>
<td>Bodily feelings, mainly sexual &amp; aggressive</td>
<td>Stereotypy, conceptual confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protective</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Opportunistic, Fear of being caught, blaming</td>
<td>Wary, exploitive, manipulative</td>
<td>Self-Protection wishes, things, advantage, control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Δ/3</td>
<td>Conformity to external rules, Shame, guilt for breaking rules</td>
<td>Belonging, helping, superficial niceness</td>
<td>Appearances, social acceptability, feelings, behaviour behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-evaluated standards, guilt, long term goals &amp; ideas</td>
<td>Intense, mutual, responsible, communication</td>
<td>Differentiated feelings motives for behaviour, self-respect, traits, achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Tolerance, Coping with conflicting inner needs</td>
<td>Respect for autonomy</td>
<td>Vivid conveyed feelings, integration of physiological &amp; psychological self-fulfilment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reconciling inner conflicts, Renunciation of the unattainable</td>
<td>Cherishing of individuality</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
often associated with a place. Work is seen as onerous rather than as an opportunity. Rules are either not perceived or are seen as the arbitrary exercise of authority.

The second stage is labelled Self-Protective. The predominant interpersonal mode is manipulative and wary. The individual is more self-sufficient with conscious preoccupations centering around staying out of trouble and not getting caught. Impulse control is described as 'opportunistic' and rules are obeyed for the individual's own short-term advantage.

The third stage is Conformist. This stage is characterized by conformity to rules for their own sake. The person identifies themself with a group. Interpersonal mode includes elements of co-operation, loyalty, and helpfulness. Some inner life is perceived but only in banal and conventional terms. Conscious preoccupations centre around appearances and behaviour with some elements of feelings, problems and adjustment. Moral reasoning is reflected in cliches with a 'one size fits all' mentality.

The Conscientious stage is characterized by the emergence of a richly differentiated inner life and a sense of the many differences in traits among people. The person adheres to a set of beliefs that have been self-evaluated, rather than ones adopted by the group, aspires to achievement as measured by personal standards rather than worldly success, and feels responsible for others.
The interpersonal mode is intense, responsible, and mutual. Conscious preoccupations at this fourth stage include motives, traits, achievements, individuality, development, and roles, and work is seen as an opportunity.

The next stage is Autonomous, and has many of the characteristics of the previous stage. The aspiration for achievement is partially supplanted by a desire for mutuality and self-fulfilment. Inner conflict is accepted and coped with. Other people's autonomy is respected, and the interpersonal mode is interdependent.

There is a theoretical sixth stage which is labelled Integrated. This stage is descriptive of Maslow's self-actualized person. The interpersonal mode is one that not only values but cherishes individuality, and identity is the conscious preoccupation.

Loevinger also posits the existence of some transitional stages, however she does not have prototypic descriptions of these stages. One such stage is located between the Self-Protective and Conformist stages, another between the Conformist and Conscientious stages (which Loevinger refers to as Conscientious-Conformist, and others (e.g., Holt, 1980; Blumentritt, Novy, Gaa, & Liberman, 1996) refer to as the Self-Aware stage, and the third transitional phase is located between the Conscientious and Autonomous stages. As with other developmental theories, the underlying assumption is that the ego
develops through the progression of the above stages. Sequentiality asserts that the stages always occur in the same order, that no stage can be skipped, and the progress is ordinarily irreversible.

**Research.** The assessment approaches of different aspects of the construct of the ego (e.g., ego strength, ego functioning, ego identity, ego development, etc.) vary widely in terms of ease of administration, particular area of application, and theoretical orientation. A representative sample will be reviewed below.

A prime example of a short, easy to administer measure is the Factor C subscale (identified as a measure of ego strength), from the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). Items for inclusion were derived through factor analytic techniques rather than theoretical considerations. A 13 item scale, high scorers on Factor C are described in the manual as emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, and better able to maintain solid group morale. Despite extensive research however, the measure has poor reliability, homogeneity of items within scales, and independence between scales (Anastasi, 1982). Anastasi interestingly also makes the comment that with respect to validity, the factor analysis of ratings appears to "reveal more about the raters than the ratees" (p.514).

As an alternative to creating a new measure, another technique has been to
derive a measure of ego strength from already regularly administered assessment techniques. The Rorschach Prognostic Rating Scale (RPRS) (Klopfer, Kirkner, Wisham, & Baker, 1951) is an example of this, which has insured it some wider use, but has left it vulnerable to problems in validity (Hargrove, 1985).

Probably the most widely used measure of ego strength is Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es) a 52 item test with a True-False response set. Like the Factor C subscale from the 16PF, the Es is easy to administer and score, and like the RPRS, the Es was derived from items already collected on another measure - the MMPI (Hathaway & McKinley, 1940). Barron (1953) developed the Es to predict the response of neurotic patients to individual psychotherapy. To identify items for the scale, item responses of 17 patients who were judged independently as clearly improved after six months of psychotherapy were compared with item responses of 16 patients who were judged as unimproved after six months of psychotherapy. Items are scored in the direction most often chosen by the improved patients. Graham (1990) reports that scores on the Es are related positively to intelligence and to formal education. The relationship to age is less clear with some research showing no relationship, and some showing a negative relationship.

Schuldberg (1992) compared the MMPI-1 and MMPI-2 versions of the Es,
and found that the omitted items from the original version appeared to contribute little to the scale. The revised version compared favourably with the original in terms of internal consistency, and the two versions were highly intercorrelated. He noted that compared with the original, the new version had slightly higher correlations with other paper and pencil measures of psychological health and well-being.

Although the Es was derived atheoretically, it demonstrates some construct validity in that it has been shown to be significantly related in expectable directions to other measures of ego functioning such as the Bender-Gestalt Test (Martin & Blair, 1979) and the Ego Functions Assessment Questionnaire -Revised (Hower, 1987).

The Es has also attained a degree of construct validity as subsequent research has established a connection between it and other theoretically related constructs, such as; internal locus of control (Artwohl, 1979; Ittenbach & Harrison, 1990; Schill & Beyler, 1992), problem solving ability (Ittenbach & Harrison, 1990), lack of conformity (Martin & Blair, 1979), autonomy (Cannici & Glick, 1989; Ittenbach & Harrison, 1990), nightmares (Levin, 1989), coping (Schill & Tata, 1988; Schill & Beyler, 1992), self-defeating personality (Schill & Beyler, 1992), emotional regulation (Schill & Thomsen, 1987; Schill & Beyler, 1992), quality of object relations in males (Bartolf, 1991), feelings of
self-adequacy, and tolerant, balanced attitudes (Harmon, 1980), autistic thinking (Harrison & Newirth, 1990), and delay of gratification (Edelhofer, 1980; Bacheller, 1990).

Other assessment measures have been developed specifically for the purpose of measuring the ego (or some aspect thereof) and have strong theoretical roots.

One example is Marcia's (1966) ego identity status interview. With its developmental focus on adolescence, the identity status interview enables one to classify a person's process of resolution of drives, abilities, cultural demands, and rewards, based on evaluations of exploration and commitment. The four identity statuses of Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, and Diffusion have been shown to relate in theoretically consistent directions to moral thought, cognitive complexity, decision-making styles, intimacy and family patterns (Marcia, 1994).

Another example is Loevinger's Washington University Sentence Completion Test (SCT), a measure of ego development (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). The test was originally devised for use with women; however, in response to research needs, a form for men was also devised. More recently short forms have also been accepted for research use (Holt, 1980; Blumentritt, Novy, Gaa, & Liberman, 1996), with the 18 item parallel model having strong
empirical support for use as a short form (Novy & Francis, 1992). The SCT is a semi-structured projective test, its rationale being that since ego development reflects the person's frame of reference, a relatively unstructured test, permitting the respondent to supply their own frame of reference is most appropriate (Loevinger, 1979). At the same time, by providing 18 discrete answers and partially restricting the domain of the answers, the test is psychometrically simpler than other projective tests.

Interrater reliability for the SCT is good. Summarized in a review article by Hauser (1976), median interrater correlations ranged between .89 and .92 for self-trained raters on item ratings. Avery and Ryan (1988) found item rating reliabilities to average .92. This supported their use of a single rater, who had attained a reliability of .9 with protocols scored by raters trained at Washington University, for their protocols.

Construct validity of the SCT is supported through its relation to other measures related to ego functioning such as the Rorschach (Blatt & Berman, 1990), the Bellack Ego Functions Interview (Blatt & Berman, 1990), TAT (Sutton & Swensen, 1983), and Ego-Identity Incomplete Sentences Blank (Adams & Shea, 1979; Adams & Fitch, 1981; Adams & Fitch, 1982).

The SCT's construct validity is also supported in research which has demonstrated theoretically predicted relationships between the SCT and
intrapersonal factors such as age, IQ, and moral reasoning (Hauser, 1976), moral development (Liberman & Gaa, 1983), cognitive complexity (Avery & Ryan, 1988), authoritarian attitudes (Browning, 1983), psychological mindedness and the ability to construct new schemas (accommodation rather than assimilation) during difficult times (Helson & Roberts, 1994), developmental transitions in defence use in adolescence (Jacobson & Beardslee, 1986; Levit, 1993), openness to experience (McCrae & Costa, 1980), subjective experience of identity (Glodis & Blasi, 1993), maturity (Rootes & Moras, 1980; Levit, 1993), and locus of control (Adams & Shea, 1979).

The SCT has been shown to relate to family of origin factors such as higher incidence of divorce (Schamess, 1993), and shared dysfunctional perspectives of family adaptability and cohesion (Novy & Gaa, 1992).

Interpersonal functioning has been significantly related to ego development as measured by the SCT in such areas as; interpersonal character styles (Hauser, 1978), interpersonal integrity (Westenburg & Block, 1993), shorter relationship with partner prior to pregnancy (Schamess, 1993), responsible caring in relationships (White, 1985), and capacity for empathy (Zielinski, 1973; Miller, 1993; Carozzi & Gaa, 1983). In couples research, significant correlations have been found between SCT scores and intimacy maturity (White & Houlihan, 1990), and an unexpected finding of identical mean ego
level scores for husbands and wives (Nettles & Loevinger, 1983).

A final area of research attesting to the construct validity of the SCT is that which assesses change of ego development ratings following theory relevant interventions. Loevinger (1979) reviewed studies which demonstrated an increase in ego development in students following interventions including moral discussions and counselling and empathy training. Another study reviewed by Loevinger lends support to the theory that it is the tension between the more mature and less mature systems that produces change. In a work environment where the modal level for workers was Self-Protective Conformist, and that of staff was Conscientious-Conformist, ego levels for workers below the Conformist stage rose moderately, but there was no evidence of success in raising ego level above the Conformist stage. Loevinger notes that when few of the individuals doing the interventions are above the ego level of targeted population, a ceiling effect may be present which limits the potential development of the client. An interesting finding, this result has implications for the thorny issue of the relationship between the personal characteristics of a therapist to psychotherapy outcome.

Although there are several other measures, none have attained the prominence of the ones cited above. In large part this can be attributed to a trend in the last several years in North America for graduate schools in
psychology to move away from the psychodynamic orientation (Drew Westen, personal communication, June 26, 1996). One result of this is that several contributions of promise never progress beyond their seminal work. Examples of this include works by Hann (1977), Green (1954), Karush, Easser, Cooper, and Swerdloff (1964), Perlinger and Zimet (1964), Grinker, Werbel, and Dyer (1968), May (1968) and Bellak (1984).

Incest and ego psychology. Freud (1917) believed that the sexual drive is less accessible to external influence because it originally has no need of an external object for its satisfaction (unlike hunger, for example, which requires an external food source). Since one can satisfy one's sexual drive autoerotically (on one's own body), sexual instincts "retain this characteristic of being self-willed and inaccessible to influence in most people in some respect all through their lives". (p.401) Freud thought that this made sexuality quite vulnerable to narcissistic defences. Unlike adaptive narcissism which is a developmental precursor to more mature object relations, narcissistic defences are a turning away from the outer world where the individual's libido is withdrawn from the object (i.e., the other person) and instead sets the subject's own ego in its place. This is not an all or nothing process - the narcissism of early life is a universal and original state of things and disappears only to varying degrees with different individuals. In individuals who have
pronounced narcissistic defences, ego development is impaired, and disruptions in sexuality are one manifestation of this impairment.

Historically the first main area of work regarding psychodynamic conflict and adult sexuality was about the eroticized transference. Frayn and Silberfeld (1986) define this type of transference as "a demand for love in the absence of a capacity for loving" (p.323). Although intended to refer to a patient's feelings for their therapist, this "demand for love in the absence of a capacity for loving" also describes a core dynamic of the incest relationship. The incest relationship may be romanticized in the mind of the offender (Marshall, 1989), however, in reality, it is conducted in the context of a profound lack of attunement and regard for the victim.

Another body of literature which can be related to incest offending, is that which concerns therapists who become sexually involved with their clients. In a survey of psychologists, Pope, Levenson, and Schover (1979) found that 12% of males and 3% of females reported sexual contact with their therapy clients. Like incest, knowledge about the wrongfulness of the act is not a sufficient deterrent, reflected in 95% of a therapist offender sample continuing to sexually act out despite their reports of fears, conflicts, and guilt (Butler & Zelen, 1977).

The offending therapist is usually male, and tends to be in his 40s or 50s.
These therapists who 'mistake' the sexual transference as a bid for a real relationship, develop extensive rationalizations attesting to the benefit to the client. Not surprisingly, data indicates that client victims uniformly are younger, attractive females (Lowry & Lowry, 1975). This process of rationalization is very similar to that of the incest offenders, who 'misinterpret' their daughters' bids for physical affection and make 'cognitive distortions' which initiate and perpetuate their sexual offending.

Another area of commonality between the offending therapist and the incest offender is in their position of being at once caregiver and abuser. According to Lief (1982) the abuse of power is the core issue in sexual misconduct, and although sexual gratification is a significant factor, it is less important than the unconscious desire to exert power and control over the vulnerable and sometimes helpless patient. The aversive reactions to such offenders gives rise to overly simplistic assumptions of intentionality obfuscating a more sophisticated and compassionate view of the offender and the deleterious effects to the offender of his own behaviour (Celenza, 1991).

An interesting feature of the literature reviewed above is the relative lack of overlap. The construct of the eroticized transference, a product of the psychoanalytic perspective, paved the way for sexual offending during the course of therapy to be seen as counter-transferential, where the
psychodynamics of the therapist and the nature of the relationship are of primary focus. Despite the co-existence of this body of work, connections have not been made to other forms of sexual offending, for example, incest. To date it appears that the standard sex offender literature has remained relatively ignorant of the insights offered by the largely theoretical psychoanalytic literature.

Despite the little overlap, there is a substantial body of literature, identifying characteristics of sexual offenders, easily understood from an ego psychological perspective. Sexual offenders have been described as individuals who have difficulties with issues delay of gratification, especially in the area of impulses. For example, Langevin and Wright (1988) note the substantial number of sexual offenders who were alcoholic and/or abused drugs. Theoretically the connection between the high proportion of drug and alcohol problems in sexual offenders has not been addressed, however these behavioural problems can both be understood as reflecting an individual whose ego development may largely at the Impulsive stage. At this stage the individual is preoccupied with bodily feelings, and there is little ability to regulate impulses.

Another clinical presentation in sexual offenders is their difficulty distinguishing self from other, reflected in the frequently reported belief that
their victim has the same feelings that they have. This deficit in separating self from other is also related to their significantly lower ability to take the perspective of another, a necessary condition for empathy development. The development of victim empathy is viewed in the sex offender treatment literature as one of the most significant treatment goals, yet it is a formidable task as sexual offenders have significant difficulty in being accurately other-oriented. As noted above, lower levels of ego development have been established to be related to deficits in empathy (Zielinski, 1973; Miller, 1993; Carlozzi & Gaa, 1983).

Several aspects of sexual offenders speak to a predominantly self-protective orientation. Sexual offenders characteristically minimize the consequences of their behaviour, both to the victim(s) and to themselves. By doing this, the offender protects himself from having to tolerate the negative affect which would accompany a more realistic understanding of the significant harm he has caused. Incest is particularly interesting in this regard as it can take place over quite extended periods of time. To accomplish this the offender needs to construct a view of reality more pleasing than what is actually the case. Distortions during this period can range from interpreting a child's reactions as consent, to elaborate delusions which serve to perpetuate the offending, such as believing the daughter was a wife in a past life. After an episode of offending,
it is not uncommon for the offender to make efforts to reconcile their beliefs (i.e., that sexual involvement with one's child is wrong) with their behaviour. Like the sexually offending therapist, this reconciliation is often attained by a belief system which contains elements of the offender seeing the sexual activity as being beneficial to the victim. Again this speaks to a predominantly self-protective orientation where staying out of trouble and not getting caught are major preoccupations.

Deficits in the degree and kind of relatedness (an aspect of object relations) are supported by Groth's (1982) finding that sexual offenders exhibit an internal feeling of isolation and separateness from others, and that they tend to live life without the experience of belonging or relatedness to others. This failure to move from self-oriented to other-oriented functioning is consistent with a level of ego development which is largely at the self-protective stage. It is not until the next stage, Conformist, that one begins to identify oneself as being a part of a group. There is evidence that for incest offenders this development may be impaired. Graham (1993) notes that in the adult male incest offender predominant feelings of isolation begin in childhood and continue on throughout their marriages. He also found that sexual offenders reported significantly more self-alienation than two control groups, and described the self-alienated person as depersonalized and amnestic. This individual may
experience numbed body sensations, and estrangement from the self to the point of failing to experience feelings, wishes, or even a sense of identity. This speaks to an arrest in ego development where the individual is still preoccupied with more primitive personal issues such as appearances and being able to identify their own feelings. A felt sense of identity is not attained until the Autonomous stage where there is also greater comfort with interdependence, characteristics notably absent in the incest offender.

The psychoanalytic perspective has a lot to offer to shed light on our understanding of incest. Despite the extensive and varied literature from this orientation (e.g., normal development, eroticized transference, and the sexually offending therapist) there is little application of this orientation to sexual offenders. To the reader with even rudimentary knowledge, however, many of the characteristics and difficulties of sexual offenders can be understood from this orientation. More specifically, many of these characteristics and difficulties can be seen as relating to the construct of ego development. The SCT, a measure of ego development, is an assessment tool with a solid theoretical and empirical reputation. Since ego development has not been investigated with incest offenders, the first contribution of the present study will be to do so, using the SCT as the measure of ego development.

The MMPI remains the most frequently used inventory in sex offender
research and clinical practice (Knight, Rosenberg, & Schneider, 1985) and so the Es measure from it will be included in the present study, primarily on an exploratory basis. In particular, it is of interest to determine the relationship between the Es and the SCT.

**Attachment Theory**

*Description.* As indicated above, there were many points of departure in psychoanalytic theory towards the end of Freud's life, and after his death. Greenberg and Mitchell (1983) have roughly divided subsequent theorists into two main streams; those who understand object relations as within Freud's drive theory, but who made significant modifications, and those who overall rejected drive theory and constructed an alternative theoretical framework.

One theorist who rejected drive theory was Bowlby (1969), who developed what he called a "new type of instinct theory" (p.17). Bowlby disagreed with the drive model which viewed the child's tie to the mother as a derivative, secondary development, contingent upon the mother's function as the gratifier of the child's physiological and sensual needs. Instead, he viewed attachments being instinctually based: the mother does not become important because she gratifies, but is important from the start.

Bowlby understood attachment as a bond to a security-providing other, or an internal experience of one's relation to this other. During times of stress,
the infant or child finds comfort by returning to its attachment figure, and in
times of low stress can comfortably explore the environment, returning only
when stress levels increase. From these experiences of proximity and
distancing, Bowlby believed that infants and children construct inner working
models of themselves and their major social-interaction partners. These
working models and the resulting behaviour patterns become central aspects of
personality, and serve as relational templates throughout one's life.

The birth of attachment theory from behavioural observation has made it
somewhat vulnerable to the criticism that it is little more than a variant of
behaviourism (Bowlby, 1988). Although this is certainly not the case, it still
encounters difficulties due to its historical emphasis on behavioural observation.
Greenberg and Mitchell comment that Bowlby's attachment theory tends toward
the concrete, for example, the actual physical absence or presence of the
mother. Although they note that in later work, Bowlby increasingly
acknowledged the importance of emotional absence, inaccessibility, and
nonresponsiveness, these more subtle aspects of relationship have not been
integrated into broader theory. Greenberg and Mitchell (1983) also state that
Bowlby's attachment theory is underdeveloped in terms of the meaning of
experiences such as attachment, separation, and loss. They note that at times
he writes as if the experiences and fantasies of relationship and loss are
epiphenomena to the more concrete observables.

Perhaps it is in response to these observations that recent theorists have attempted to identify intrapsychic dynamics to account for different styles of attachment. Three such models are those of Crittenden (1990), Sperling and Berman (1991, 1992), and Bartholomew (1990). Sperling and Berman, Bartholomew in particular struggle with the observational foundation of attachment theory, and finding it inadequate (particularly with regard to insecure attachment) have developed theories to address the behavioural observations.

Crittenden first turned her focus to the representational model, and from that she developed a classification system of attachment styles. A theorist who has significantly developed the construct of mental representations, Crittenden (1990) distinguishes between three different organizational systems or meta-structures of representational models. The first, most primitive, is a single representational model that is applied to all relationships. This model impairs interpersonal functioning because it requires that all relationships be distorted to fit a single model. The second meta-structure has multiple unrelated models that permit the representation of unique aspects of a relationship, but preclude the development of a coherent sense of self. The third meta-structure includes an integrated generalized model along with
differentiated relationship-specific submodels.

Integrating this theory with work in the area of memory, Crittenden further suggests that the multiple models may be encoded in different memory systems. She notes that individuals vary in ability and motivation to compare information from different systems, and that the systems themselves differ in the extent to which they are conscious. Procedural memory for example is thought to be highly influential in guiding behaviour but is largely unconscious (Collins & Read, 1994).

Extending this work, Crittenden (1993) developed a model of attachment styles. A circumplex model with cognitive and affective axes, both of which can vary in terms of degree of distortion of reality, she has delineated four main types of attachment, with several subtypes. She has applied this model to understanding the development of psychopathology, including a predisposition toward violence (Crittenden, 1994). Characteristic of so much literature, where theoretical sophistication is orthogonal to empirical application, Crittenden's model remains largely only a theoretical contribution at this point.

Sperling and Berman's (1991, 1992) work attempts to strike a balance between theoretical sophistication and empirical applicability. Integrating psychoanalytic theory with clinical experience, Sperling and Berman (1991) devised an attachment classification which reflects the relative balance of the
relational drives for affiliation (dependence) and aggression (anger). Setting these two relational drives in an orthogonal relationship, yields a 2X2 matrix where four styles of insecure attachment are reflected in the polar scores (Figure 1).

Figure 1
Sperling and Berman's four prototypes of attachment styles

The four attachment styles are; Resistant/Ambivalent (high in both anger and dependence), Dependent (high in dependence, low in anger), Hostile (high in anger, low in dependence), and Avoidant (low on both anger and
dependence). A particularly appealing aspect of this model is that it posits secure attachment to be the balance attained between the two relational drives, as can be seen by its occupation in the centre area. This also means that each style has both a secure and insecure domain, a conceptualization consistent with clinical observations.

Finally, another theoretical effort is that of Bartholomew (1990). Following from Bowlby's theory that early attachment experiences are internalized by the child in the form of working models of self and others, Bartholomew has dichotomized these two variables to form a 2X2 matrix of positive and negative views of self and others (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL OF OTHER</th>
<th>MODEL OF SELF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Dismissing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
Bartholomew's four prototypes of attachment styles

This model yields four attachment styles; Secure (positive views of both self and other), Preoccupied (negative view of self and positive views of others), Fearful (negative views of both self and others), and Dismissing
(positive view of self and negative views of others). Corresponding to Bartholomew’s four category model, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) have developed a four-category adult attachment measure which classifies individuals into the four styles above.

Although widely used, the Bartholomew model is problematic theoretically and may be limited therefore in its clinical applicability, particularly with respect to psychotherapy. Bowlby (1988) emphasized the importance of input from a variety of sources in theory development, one of which being the analytic treatment of patients. An example of this is his discussion of analysis of patients who present as assertively independent and emotionally self-sufficient. He describes these individuals as unwilling to be beholden to anyone, and to whatever extent these individuals enter into relationships, they make sure they retain control. From the outside, they appear to manage wonderfully well, but there may be times when they become depressed or develop inexplicable psychosomatic symptoms. Only if symptoms or a bout of depression become severe is this individual likely to seek help, and then more likely will prefer drugs to therapists. This client can be described as having a false self (Winnicott, 1974), as suffering from pathological narcissism (Kohut, 1971), or as having a Dismissing attachment style (Bartholomew). Should such individuals finally engage in psychotherapy, Bowlby (1988) notes that they
move from the position of emotional self-sufficiency to an intense and anxious attachment with pronounced feelings of dependency - essentially from Dismissing to Preoccupied.

This is one example (the other being the Preoccupied status) which underscores the inherent problem in hypothesizing an orthogonal relationship between views of self and views of others. In his discussion of the views of self and others, Bowlby (1973) noted that "Logically these variables are independent. In practice they are apt to be confounded. As a result, the model of the attachment figure and the model of the self are likely to develop so as to be complementary and mutually confirming" (p.238). Nowhere in the clinical literature is it suggested, not even by Bowlby, that an individual with any form of insecure attachment would have a true positive view of self.

Research. Attachment theory, as noted above, developed as a result of behavioural observations, and as a field has retained a strong empirical slant. Mary Ainsworth, a colleague of Bowlby's, pioneered the empirical studies of attachment behaviour. Her work will be briefly reviewed first, followed by other researchers whose work can be traced to Ainsworth's original contribution.

In the 1960's, Ainsworth, created an experiment called the Strange Situation, in order to study infant attachment. In this situation the infant is
presented with eight increasingly stressful experiences, including two separation-from-mother episodes. On the basis of observations of the infants' responses, Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) delineated three styles or types of attachment which they labelled secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant. Although the secure attachment pattern is considered to be the optimal type of attachment, Ainsworth et al. make the point that this style does not entail more or less attachment than the other types. Attachment types reflect qualitative rather than quantitative aspects of attachment, and are predominantly descriptive of infants' expectations concerning mothers' accessibility and responsiveness.

Research in the area of infant and childhood attachment has yielded fairly consistent results in terms of relative frequencies of the three different styles (e.g., Campos et al. 1983) and stability across time (e.g., Waters, 1978), particularly in moderately stable environments (Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1994). Attachment styles have been found to be relatively stable over a five-year interval, and even 10 years after identification of a child's attachment style, significant correlates of attachment have been found (Bierhoff, 1991).

More recent work has been the application of attachment theory to an understanding of adult relationships. In 1987, Hazan and Shaver translated Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) descriptions of infants into terms appropriate to adult
attachment. They created three paragraphs with prototypical descriptions of the secure, avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent attachment styles. Using this measure with a newspaper sample, they found that 56% of the respondents reported themselves as secure, 25% avoidant and 19% anxious/ambivalent. In a university sample, results were 56% secure, 23% avoidant, and 20% anxious/ambivalent. A likertized version of this measure (Hazan & Shaver, 1990) yielded similar proportions (50% 'secure', 30% 'avoidant', and 19% 'anxious/ambivalent'). They note that these proportions are similar to three previous studies (Hazan & Shaver, 1987, Studies 1 and 2; Shaver & Hazan, 1987) in which the frequency of self-classification as 'secure' ranged from 51% to 56%; that of 'avoidant' from 23% to 28%; and that of 'anxious/ambivalent' from 19% to 21%. Feeney and Noller (1990) found similar results (55% secure, 30% avoidant, and 15% anxious), as did Mikulincer, Florian, and Tolmacz (1990; 56% 'secure', 25% 'avoidant', and 19% 'ambivalent').

Other models reflecting the typological approach to attachment include work by Collins and Read (1990) and Latty-Mann (1989); however, these models are not as widely known or used.

An alternative to the identification of typologies of attachment styles, is work which investigates dimensional aspects of attachment. The work of West, Sheldon, and Reiffer (1987) has focussed on developing a measure that
assesses a variety of aspects of adult attachment. The Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire (RAQ) (West, Sheldon, & Reiffer, 1987) was derived from a comprehensive review of the literature on both child and adult attachment. The development of this measure followed a construct-oriented approach in moving from operational definitions of each construct to be measured, to the generation of items. Their empirical method was similar to that of Loevinger (1957) which emphasizes "...the importance of psychological theory in generating an item pool; suppression of response style variance; substantive generalizability and scale homogeneity; and the importance of fostering convergent and discriminant validity at the beginning of test development" (p.98). The RAQ produces scores on seven behavioural dimensions of attachment which resemble the criteria used by Ainsworth et al. (1978) to assess infant attachment: Secure Base Effect or independent exploration, Proximity Seeking meaning distance reduction in times of stress, Separation Protest meaning perceived threat to the relationship due to the actual or anticipated physical separation, and Feared Loss meaning the ability to sustain confidence in the future of the relationship. Lack of Reciprocity was added as a dimension which is peculiar to adult attachment, and Perceived Unavailability/Unresponsiveness and Lack of Use of Attachment Figure are also assessed.
In addition, the RAQ also measures the presence of four pathological sub-types of attachment. These pathological sub-types are; Compulsive Self-Reliance, Compulsive Care-Giving, Compulsive Care-Seeking, and Angry Withdrawal. Continued empirical work with this measure has resulted in changes which has led to a revised RAQ with greater discriminability. The Lack of Reciprocity and Lack of Secure Base scales were eliminated, and the Perceived Unavailability/Unresponsiveness was broadened to the concept of Perceived Unavailable Responsiveness. The most recent RAQ (1994) is comprised of five dimensional scales and four patterns of attachment.

The authors report acceptable internal reliability for all of the scales (scale to total score correlations ranging from .71 to .85) and test-retest reliabilities (ranging from .68 to .82 for the dimensional scales, and .54 to .79 for the four patterns). The underlying theoretical structure of the RAQ scales was confirmed with factor analytic studies, and some evidence for discriminant validity has been indicated by the RAQ's ability to differentiate psychiatric patients from non-patients. West and Sheldon-Keller (1994) note that there are currently no normative scores for the scales on the revised version of the RAQ, however it has greater discriminability than the original RAQ.

The major contribution of this approach is that it does not presume a typology, and can investigate which aspects of attachment are particularly
relevant for different psychopathologies. For example, West and Keller (1993) found that Feared Loss was the most significant attachment dimension related to individuals with borderline personality disorder.

Incest and attachment theory. Attachment theory and research has recently been applied to forensic populations. Pistole and Tarrant (1993) investigated the attachment style of male batterers using the four attachment styles developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). Moretti et al. (1994) developed a treatment program for conduct disordered adolescents which focussed on attachment issues. In this work they took the view that conduct disorder is not so much a behavioural disorder, but rather an expression of an underlying attachment style, and found a treatment program based on this philosophy to be highly successful in reducing conduct disorder symptoms at an 18 month follow-up.

Marshall (1989), discussing the nature of attachments of sexual offenders, sees this as a central issue in any treatment programme. He theorizes that the vulnerability of the sexual offender arises primarily from poor quality attachment bonds between the child, who is to become the offender, and his parents. From this perspective, he suggests that poor attachments lead to low self-confidence and poor social skills. Poor quality attachments also provide the basis for poor adult intimacy and subsequent loneliness, which breeds
aggression and a self-serving life style. Marshall also theorizes that poor quality of attachment in early life leads to a diminished capacity for empathy which plays an important part in the socialization of internalized control over behaviour.


Ward and Marshall (1996), using Bartholomew's four category model, investigated the attachment styles of sexual offenders. They compared rapists and child molesters with violent non-sex offenders and non-violent, non-sex offenders (all groups were incarcerated men). Results indicated no mean differences on ratings of the secure, fearful, or dismissive styles, but child molesters scored highest on the preoccupied style. Rough classification into either secure or insecure resulted in 78% of child molesters classified as insecure (normative data indicates that 35-45% of individuals have an insecure attachment style with this measure). With respect to classification of sexual offenders, it is surmised that the child molester group would have included
some incest offenders; however, it also included such heterogeneous sexual offending as exhibitionism in front of unknown children, and homosexual acts of sodomy with force.

The author is not aware of any investigation of the attachment style of incest offenders specifically, nor has there been any investigation of dimensional aspects of attachment behaviour of incest offenders. The present study therefore makes the contribution of investigating the attachment styles and dimensions of attachment of incest offenders. Attachment styles will be assessed using Hazan and Shaver's (1987) measure, and dimensions of attachment behaviour will be assessed with West and Sheldon-Keller's (1994) revised RAQ.

Adult Love

Description. Love is perhaps the most significant human experience and a dominant theme in art, literature, and human life. Despite the significance of love in human experience, the psychological study of love is a relatively recent endeavour.

Shaver and Hazan (1988) note that the word love seems to have two meanings in ordinary conversation. It can be used to designate a discrete and fairly short-lived emotional state (e.g., a surge of passion/affection) and can also be used to describe a continuing disposition to experience that state in
relation to a particular person.

The development of a mature love relationship is understood to follow a progression from the first meaning to the second. Murstein (1988), in his review of the literature, notes that love typically has three stages: passionate, romantic, and companionate. Passionate love involves intense arousal and a strong sexual base. Romantic love is identified by its focus being the idealization of the partner, a stage which characterizes all love relationships in their formative stages (Bolton, 1961). Murstein (1988) states that both the passionate and romantic stages occur fairly early in a relationship, and in the absence of much real knowledge of the other. Byrne and Murnen (1988) go even further to state that "one major obstacle to learning about someone in a rational manner is the phenomenon of passionate love" (p.297). In an enduring close relationship these early stages evolve to companionate love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). The companionate stage is viewed both as the most mature and least intense form of love, reached only after a couple have come to know each other well.

Research. Research in this area can be generally described as primarily either typological or dimensional.

Probably the most predominant descriptive typology is Lee's (1976, 1988) six lovestyles, for which Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) have developed a
measure. Three of the styles, Eros (romantic love), Ludus (game-playing love), and Storge (best-friends love), are viewed as the primary styles, with three secondary styles resulting from combinations of the primary styles. The secondary styles are Mania (possessive love - a combination of Eros and Ludus), Pragma (pragmatic love - a combination of Ludus and Storge), and Agape (altruistic love - a combination of Storge and Eros).

Lee's six lovestyles relate to several aspects of adult love experiences. Higher scores on Eros combined with low scores on Ludus and Mania are associated with relationship satisfaction (Bierhoff, 1991). Bierhoff (1991) also found that while Eros remained the primary indicator of relationship satisfaction, Pragma and Agape were most related to relationship stability. Prasinos (1982) investigated the phenomenological correlates of the Lee's lovestyles, and suggested a developmental progression. He noted that one moves from Mania, where the main theme is fear of loss, the primary experiential mode is feeling, and the interpersonal focus is fusion, to Agape where the main theme is giving/loving, the primary experiential mode is feeling and thinking, and the interpersonal focus is other. Consistent with the notion of a developmental sequence is Kalichman and Sarwer's (1993) finding that sexually coercive college males had a primarily Ludic (game-playing) lovestyle.
The dimensional approach to the study of love investigates the different aspects of the experience of love. One major contribution in this area is the work of Hazan and Shaver (1987) who developed an inventory called the Love Experiences Questionnaire (LEQ). The items included were adapted both from previous love questionnaires (Dion & Dion, 1985; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1985; Hindy & Schwarz, 1984; Lasswell & Lobsenz, 1980; Rubin, 1973; Steffen, McLaney, & Hustedt, 1984) and information on infant-caretaker attachment (Ainsworth et al., 1978). The inventory is comprised of 12 subscales labelled: Happiness, Friendship, Trust, Fear of Closeness, Acceptance of Partner's Faults, Emotional Extremes, Jealousy, Obsessive Preoccupation, Sexual Attraction, Desire for Union, Desire for Reciprocation, and Love at First Sight.

Primarily, measures like the LEQ have been used to investigate the relationship between experiences of love and attachment styles, which will be reviewed later. Other independent variables have been studied (using the LEQ and other measures), however, which have yielded interesting results. For example, sexually coercive college males report less happiness, friendship, and trust in their intimate relationships (Kalichman & Sarwer, 1993), love and trust are more highly correlated for married versus unmarried couples (Dion & Dion, 1976), and friendship is correlated with length of marriage (Cimbalo, Faling & Mousaw, 1976).
Adult Love and Ego Psychology. Early psychoanalytic attempts at developing a theory of love can be found in Freud's introductory lecture *The Libido Theory and Narcissism* (1917). Freud's drive theory focussed on the connection of instincts and their satisfactions as providing the basis of attachment (and therefore, love). He defined 'libido' as being the energy which the ego directs towards the objects of its desires. The libido becomes attached to objects and is an expression of an effort to obtain satisfaction in connection with those objects. Freud defined egoism as having in view only the individual's advantage, and altruism as the absence of longings for sexual satisfaction. He theorized that "when someone is completely in love, altruism converges with libidinal object-cathexis" (p.467). Thus, there is the blend of both self and other orientation in love. Essentially, this represents a transformation of the pleasure principle into the reality principle. Ego development plays a central role in the development of mature love.

From a less structural, more relational, perspective, Modell (1968) notes that in early infancy "good enough" object relations in the external environment leads to the core of the earliest sense of identity. When the loving parent has been internalized and becomes part of the self, one is able to love oneself. This is the developmentally adaptive stage of narcissism which is essential for later mature development. As the infant matures, the predetermined innate timetable
of the ego progresses and through it the infant begins to experience the differentiation between the inner and outer worlds, and the beginning of perceptions of objects as separate from the self. Adaptive narcissism allows the infant and child to more readily accept the separateness of objects. This capacity paves the way for acceptance of the limitations of other objects, and of reality. As identity develops this capacity increases and allows for a mature form of loving which can be maintained in the face of privation and ambivalence. This form of love is dependent on the ego's function of accurately perceiving reality.

From an existential perspective, Buber (1958) states that the essential difference between primitive object relations and mature loving is that there is an acceptance of knowledge of the object. This knowledge is gained through perceptions which are external to oneself, as opposed to a 'knowledge' of the other person created from one's own internal world. Modell describes this as an "interpenetration" or "intercommunication" between knowledge gained from the perception of the object as that person really is and qualities attributed to the object by the subject. From the analytic perspective, mature love is characterized by an acceptance of the other individual as separate from the self, and an accurate reality-bound view of that individual. Kohut (1987) described it as caring, empathy, and the permission for the other to differ from the self.
Research. The psychoanalytic orientation has traditionally been theory rich and research poor, with the result that even today relatively little empirical work is done from this orientation. There is even less to review when the scope is narrowed to the realm of adult love experiences. Summarized below are some of the recent research projects investigating adult love from a psychoanalytic perspective.

Sperling's (1985) formulation of desperate love was proposed as an analytic and descriptive tool for examining fusional love relations (Sperling, 1988). Noting that problematic ego identity formation usually becomes behaviorally evident with the first adult-like intimate relationships, Sperling (1987) assessed ego identity, attitudes towards love, and desperate love. Results indicated that diffuse ego identity was associated with desperate love, and a romantic (as opposed to companionate) attitude toward love.

Sperling and Berman (1991) have also investigated desperate love with respect to their typology of attachment styles (reviewed above). Results indicated that for both sexes desperate love was strongly associated with the dependent attachment style. Only for males, however, was desperate love also strongly related to attachment styles with higher levels of manifest anger - the hostile and resistant/ambivalent styles. In addition, for men but not women, desperate love was associated with strong negative mood states. They suggest
that the combination of an attachment style with higher levels of anger in the context of an intimate relationship may be particularly toxic for men, which elicits both an intense need for fusion and negative affect regarding that involvement. This may also be exacerbated by external stressors, as Sperling and Berman also found an increase in negative mood state toward the end of the semester, which could reflect the greater stress associated with end of semester tasks.

Prasinos and Tittler (1984) investigated a variety of factors associated with Lee's lovestyles. Their finding of a positive association between ego strength and Agape, and a negative association with Mania, is consistent with Prasinos' (1982) assertion that the different lovestyles reflect different levels of development.

Little work has been done specifically with the construct of ego development and its relationship to adult love experiences. Schaness (1993) investigated the ego development of adolescent mothers, and concluded that their lower ego development scores reflected their vulnerability in their choice of sexual partners as an expression of their search for love.

Nettles and Loevinger (1983) investigated ego development and sex role expectations in couples in problem versus non-problem marriages. Not only were differences between spouses on ego development unrelated to whether the
marriage was a problem marriage, but mean ego level scores for husbands and wives were identical.

The most thorough examination of ego development with respect to adult love was that of Swensen and Eskew (1981). In an ambitious project, 776 married couples from different stages of the life cycle were assessed using a variety of measures. Results indicated that both amount of love expressed and the number of marriage problems, declined from the first stages of marriage to the last. What was particularly interesting was that in retired couples, higher ego development was significantly associated with more expressions of love. From these results, Swensen and Eskew suggest that as a consequence of demands external to a marriage, a husband and wife follow different paths of personal development. This can diminish intimacy and foster increasingly stereotypic modes of interaction, leaving the husband and wife increasingly estranged. Retirement provides the opportunity for the husband and wife to become reacquainted, and at this point individual levels of ego development play a critical role in the partners becoming either more loving or avoidant.

Adult love and attachment theory. Attachment theory asserts that early attachment experiences are critical for the development and nature of adult attachment. Role relations with attachment figures will differ with age; however, the adult's confidence in the availability and responsiveness of their
primary attachment figure is assumed to reflect not only the nature of the present relationship, but also past relationships with caregivers. Bowlby (1979) noted that falling in love is a phenomenon which is related to the formation of a bond, and is inextricably related to an individual's past experience with attachments. Shaver, Hazan, and Bradshaw (1988) describe numerous parallels between attachment and romantic love (for example, the attachment figure provides a secure base while the loved person makes the lover feel safe).

West and Sheldon-Keller (1994) have developed this further in their discussion of attachment and romantic love. They note that "movement towards adulthood requires young people to relinquish their parents as primary attachment figures"(p. 156). This makes adolescents vulnerable to experiencing feelings of loneliness and emptiness, resulting in the need to find someone who makes them feel necessary and wanted. When the young person falls in love, the resulting intimacy fosters again the experience of security, just as was experienced as a child. Although West and Sheldon-Keller acknowledge that these early, first loves are liable to break up, they play a significant role in the development of more permanent adult attachments, because something about intimacy and the importance of meaning something to another person has been experienced.

Shaver and Hazan (1988) state that adult love involves an integration of
three behavioural systems - attachment, caregiving, and sexuality. Therefore certain patterns of sexual behaviour ought to occur with particular attachment styles. For example, secure individuals would be expected to strive for mutual intimacy and pleasure, avoidant individuals would maintain emotional distance and may be promiscuous, and anxious/ambivalent individuals would tend to satisfy needs for security and love through sexual contact.

Research. Shaver and Hazan (1987) pioneered the work of applying attachment theory to adult love experiences, and found significant differences in adult love experiences in individuals of different attachment styles. Using the LEQ (described above) they found that securely attached individuals were more likely to characterize their most important love relationship as high on Happiness, Friendship and Trust, and low on Fear of Closeness, Jealousy and Emotional Extremes. Avoidant individuals indicated high Fear of Closeness, low Acceptance of Partner's Faults, and relatively high Jealousy and Emotional Extremes. Anxious/ambivalent individuals were highest of the three groups on Emotional Extremes, Jealousy, Obsessive Preoccupation, Sexual Attraction, Desire for Union, Desire for Reciprocation, and Falling in Love at First Sight. Across their different studies, however, only three of the subscales consistently differentiated between the secure and insecure attachment styles. These scales were Friendship, Fear of Closeness, and Emotional Extremes (the last two
negatively correlated with secure attachment). A compilation of these three scales can be identified as reflecting a 'secure love style'.

Hazan and Shaver's (1987) attachment styles have also been investigated with respect to Lee's (1976) typology. Levy and Davis (1988) found that Eros and Agape were positively associated with the secure attachment style, Ludus was positively associated with the avoidant style, and Mania with the anxious/ambivalent style.

In the last ten years there has been a proliferation of research investigating the relationship between attachment and adult love experiences (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). To note a few, attachment has been found to relate to; partner choice (Latty-Mann & Davis, 1996), emotional reactions following relationship breakup (Pistole, 1995), feelings of dependency, jealousy, and desperation (Williams & Schill, 1994), number, intensity, and stability of love relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1993), optimism about success in intimate relationships (Carnelley & Janoff-Bulman, 1992), marital adjustment (Senchak & Leonard, 1992), congruence of actual and ideal romantic relationships (Mikulincer & Erev, 1991), and interdependence, commitment, trust and satisfaction (Simpson, 1990).

Incest as a type of adult love experience. As noted above in Marshall's theoretical framework for understanding sexual offending, the role of intimacy
deficits is thought to be a critical motivational factor in offending. Incest is particularly interesting in this regard in that the sexual offending takes place in the context of what is socially construed as a loving relationship, albeit parent-child. Given this context it is particularly relevant to investigate the nature of the experience of love for these offenders.

Clinical evidence indicates that the transition from romantic to companionate love is not successfully negotiated by sexual offenders, and that their difficulties with adult love experiences is related to their offending. Marshall (1989) notes, for example, that many offenders seem to have rushed into live-in relationships with women without giving much thought to their actual compatibility with their partner. The incest relationship may be, at least for some offenders, a type of love affair. Some offenders evince a strong tendency to idealize and romanticize the relationship with their victims, and a number of incest offenders describe their behaviours with their victims as "courting" (Marshall, 1989). Justice and Justice (1979) described the majority of endogamic incest offenders as having a symbiotic personality type. These men have intense unmet affectional needs, and do not know how to be close and affectionate in a nonsexual or nonphysical manner. Similar to many of the dynamics of an affair, the father turns to the daughter in an attempt to meet affectional needs. Like other dysfunctional love relationships, there is a high
need for power and dominance (Sgroi, 1982) coupled with needs for affection and acceptance (Groth, 1982).

The present study makes the contribution of investigating the adult love experiences of incest offenders with respect to their victim, using the LEQ (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In addition to a presentation of scores attained on the 11 scales, offenders describing their incest relationship will be compared to a control group on the dimension identified as the 'secure lovestyle'.

Theoretical Integration

The Issue of Integration. The issue of integration is inextricably linked to change, with the ability to change reflecting personal, theoretical, and cultural development. For example, Goldfried (1980) notes that many of Freud's initial contributions were either ignored or rejected, as they did not fit into the generally accepted theoretical framework at the time. The most famous example of this of course being Freud's abandonment of the seduction theory.

The evolution of theory can be seen to follow a path very similar to that of individual development. The infancy of psychoanalytic thought was a romantic period, characterized by an idealization of Freud's contributions held by a united group of loyal followers. Disenchantment followed, some of it quite famous in its own right (e.g., Jung's falling out with Freud) and with that began the development of factions. Greenberg and Mitchell (1983) note that the
distinct schools of thought developed their own idiosyncratic language, rarely communicated with one another, and declared their position to be the only 'true psychoanalysis'.

With the development of a theoretical orientation so different from psychoanalysis as behaviourism, the lack of communication is quite pronounced. What is most interesting, however, is not so much the lack of communication, but the affective valance associated with the different camps. There is without doubt the tendency in each camp to denigrate the other. Wachtel's (1977) work integrating psychoanalysis with behaviour therapy began, as he states, as "a paper that would put those behaviour therapists in their place" and show "why behaviour therapy was bad and unworthy of the interest of the psychoanalytically initiated". He noted that his aversion to behaviour therapy was not based on any close examination of what behaviour therapists do, but "on a strong sense of 'us' and 'them'" (preface). This is further compounded by our tendency to "read or ignore articles and books on the basis of our allegiance with the author's theoretical camp" (Goldfried, 1980).

Paradoxically it appears that theorists from the more divergent orientations are predating more closely related theorists in taking steps toward integration. Marcia (1994) notes for example, that despite the significant similarities in the
fundamental propositions of attachment and separation-individuation theorists
"it is striking to see how little they cross-reference each other" (p.85).

Psychoanalysis has been accused and praised as having a theory for everything, and this case will not be an exception. Freud's concept of the narcissism of minor differences, a developmental construct to account for hate in love relationships, can perhaps shed light on the lack of communication between theorists.

Gabbard (1993) describes the self-preservative function of the narcissism of minor differences from a developmental perspective. The desire for fusion in love entails a loss of personal boundaries with a concomitant threat to the loss of one's identity as a separate individual. To deal with this anxiety, one must seek out and exaggerate differences in the service of preserving autonomy.

The more narcissistic vulnerability, the greater the tendency for this rapprochement crisis to be reconciled through the exaggeration of differences and devaluation of the other. Gabbard (1993) noted that years later, Freud saw this process as a more universal and generalized phenomenon, relevant to virtually all forms of human discourse.

In keeping with a developmental theory of theory development, the trend toward integration is seen as a more mature working through of rapprochement. Frank (1982) described the trend to integrate different theoretical orientations
as the "stirrings of rapprochement", similarly Goldfried (1980) commented that "the need for rapprochement is becoming ever more appropriate". It is in this spirit of looking to the similarities and the insights that different orientations can offer, that the present study is being done.

**Ego Psychology and Attachment Theory.** Ego psychology and attachment theory share several fundamental propositions. Both assert that childhood plays a crucial role in shaping personality, especially our later ways of becoming attached to, and intimate with, others. Similarly, both posit that the way people mentally represent themselves and others influences both behaviour and psychopathology. With respect to development, both understand it to include not only learning to control our aggressive impulses and finding acceptable ways to gratify our wishes, but also to include the development of the capacity for intimacy. Also with respect to development, both see conflict as inherent in human life, stemming from the positive and negative feelings associated in the mother child relationship, where the mother is both the dispenser of punishment and reward. Finally, both hypothesize that much of mental life is unconscious and that the unconscious has a significant impact on behaviour. This last proposition is more recent to attachment theory, owing its inclusion primarily through the work of Crittenden, discussed above.

Despite these fundamental similarities, however, there are important
differences where each can benefit from the other. Strupp (1977) noted the main criticism of psychodynamic theory has been its scant regard for empirical data. Psychoanalytic writings tend to deal with higher order abstractions and relatively untestable constructs. Attachment theory, however, has been closely connected with research, and results obtained through this orientation can perhaps shed light on the more ephemeral psychodynamic constructs.

A significant contribution from attachment theory is the construct of the working model, or the internal mental representation of interactions with caregivers. This construct may provide an important bridge from the more predominantly intrapsychic world of the ego to the world of interpersonal relations, particularly in intimate relationships.

Finally attachment theory can assist in that it offers organizational constructs (e.g., anxious/ambivalent attachment) which can meaningfully identify co-occurring phenomenon which can assist in the dialogue between internal states and interpersonal behaviours.

Conversely, ego psychology can be of great assistance to attachment theory. With its predominant emphasis on intrapsychic phenomena and a more comprehensive theory of development, constructs are available which could lend assistance to some attachment theory findings for which there is insufficient theory (e.g., the unequal distribution of attachment styles between
Most relevant perhaps for the clinician are the theoretical contributions from psychoanalytic psychology which can be of direct assistance in psychotherapy. An example of this is the observation by attachment theorists Collins and Read (1994), that once established, internal working models are actively self-perpetuating because of the biasing effect on incoming information and the tendency for individuals to both select and create environments that confirm their existing beliefs. Applying this to therapy, Bradford and Lyddon (1994) note the importance therefore of the therapist paying attention to their own feelings which are likely to be indicative of the "pull" from the client and "unhook" themselves from the interaction so as to not perpetuate the maladaptive schema. The landmark paper by Ogden (1979) on projective identification not only predates this development in attachment theory as it relates to psychotherapy by 15 years, but offers a much more sophisticated understanding of this complex interactional phenomenon.

The importance of integrated theory in clinical work cannot be underestimated. The question here is not so much what is right, but what is useful, and what is useful will vary as a client strives to integrate their thoughts, feelings, drives, fantasies, abilities, and relationships. A clinician who has at their disposal a multitude of constructs from which to make
informed interventions can only be assisted in their work. Frank (1982), discussing psychotherapy, emphasized the value of learning about a range of techniques from a variety of orientations and to have the flexibility to use them.

In the selection of theory and interventions, Marcia (1994) notes that theorists will espouse those theories that best encompass their own experience and are most useful for their purposes. The critical caveat that Marcia adds is that these choices inform therapeutic interpretations, and hence have direct impact on the lives of patients. Nowhere is this caveat more relevant than to the treatment of sexual offenders.

Research with Forensic Populations - Special Issues

Reppucci and Clingempeel (1978) raise several issues for researchers to consider when working with forensic populations. They have grouped some of these issues under the headings of the intrusion of values, the problem of ignoring environments, and the problem of ignoring subjects.

The Intrusion of Values

One pervasive assumption in psychological research is that of discriminating traits. This is the idea that a set of trait dimensions is applicable to all persons and that individual differences are to be identified with different locations on these dimensions. Reppucci and Clingempeel note that this
approach over-emphasizes personal shortcomings of minority and clinical groups by not taking into account environmental factors. In forensic research correctional subjects are continuously assumed to be deficient on a variety of trait continua in an effort to enable discrimination from non-correctional subjects.

In the present study, incest offenders are assumed to be distinct from the general population in ego development and attachment. However, the present study also asserts that incest offenders are not unique in this regard, and further that there is more in common between people who have deficits in these areas than different. This is reflected in the hypothesis that individuals matched on ego development will not be significantly different in terms of their adult love experiences.

The Problem of Ignoring Environments

Reppucci and Clingempeel assert that the problem of ignoring environments is evident in inadequate descriptions of the experimental situation and the experimenter. To address these concerns, a relatively detailed description will be provided.

The experimental situation. The incest offenders in the present study are men from three different lower mainland jails, two provincial and one federal.

The majority of the participants come from Stave Lake Correctional Centre,
a minimum security institution which is unique in some important aspects. On the most concrete, descriptive level, Stave Lake is a small (N=60) institution set in a beautiful wooded environment. Another important aspect is that it is the only institution in the province where the population is comprised solely of men who are serving time for having committed a sexual offence. One needs only a cursory introduction to corrections work to appreciate the implications of this, as sexual offenders (particularly those defined as child molesters) are historical targets of aggression from other inmates. A programme intensive institution, Stave Lake is a milieu where therapy is regarded as being of primary importance, with all inmates participating in the sex offender programme.

Ford Mountain Correctional Centre is the second provincial facility. Another small (approximately 60 inmates) minimum security institution, it is also set in a beautiful wooded environment. Ford Mountain is a protective custody institution housing a variety of inmates not suitable for general population, which includes sexual offenders. Generally sexual offenders serve time at Ford as opposed to Stave Lake if their position regarding their offending makes them unsuitable for treatment (e.g., they deny they committed a sexual offence, or they do not see themselves as needing treatment), or if their sentences are too short (less than one year) so they would have
insufficient time to take part in the Stave Lake programme.

Mountain Institution is a federal protective custody institution housing some 360 inmates, a high percentage of whom are sexual offenders. A very different atmosphere prevails at Mountain, an older institution with all the accoutrements of high security. Despite the atmosphere, size and population mixture, however, a sex offender treatment programme has been in effect for years where many inmates have devoted considerable effort to understanding their offending and learning how to prevent further offences.

The experimenter. A second issue to consider in the environment is experimenter characteristics. The experimenter in this study is an attractive, 37 year old female graduate student who has worked with forensic client populations for nine years.

One factor relevant to data collection at the Stave Lake site is that the researcher also works there as a therapist. Certain additional procedures were therefore instituted as needed to ensure that those inmates would feel that their participation was voluntary and confidential (i.e., not linked with any programme evaluations).

The Problem of Ignoring Subjects

The issue of social desirability is relevant to the present study. This
well-known tendency for individuals to present themselves in a socially
desirable, or more positive light has already been demonstrated to correlate
note that the ego strength scale from the 16PF changed the most under a
motivational distortion situation (normal versus job-seeking situation). Graham
(1990) echoed this with respect to the Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es), noting
that one must be very cautious in interpreting scores in profiles suggesting
defensiveness, since in such profiles Es scores tend to be artificially high. In
his dissertation concerning self-integration and self-defeating behaviour in an
experimental task, McCarter (1988) noted that not anticipating the confounding
effects between ego strength and social desirability was "a mistake", and
re-asserted Graham's caveat.

The issue of fake-good, or socially desirable response sets is particularly
relevant when doing research with criminal populations. Reppucci and
Clingempeel (1978) discuss the inherent demand characteristics placed on
incarcerated participants which, if not taken into account, significantly threaten
the validity of results and lead to erroneous conclusions. A example of this is
Pistole and Tarrant's (1993) study of the attachment styles of males convicted
of spousal assault. Without taking into account the potential response set of
these convicted men (who were participating in a treatment programme at the
time) they found similar proportions of the secure and insecure attachment styles as that obtained with a sample of college students. From this they concluded that "to the extent attachment dynamics, such as threats to the relationship and ensuing separation anxiety, affect violence, they do so for all attachment patterns" (p.5). This conclusion contradicts Mayseless' (1991) theory that violence in attachment relationships would be most prevalent in those who are insecurely attached, and flies in the face of an essential clinical understanding of spousal abuse - that being a problem in attachment.

Different propositions have been suggested to deal with the social desirability factor. One method is to partial out, or make a correction to get rid of it. Cattel et al. (1970) cite three reasons arguing against this method: one, social desirability may be a very real part of other aspects of self-expression; two, experimental results with of social desirability may not be the same as that produced and other situations; and three, in real life, the intelligent individual may modify their response set to different kinds of situations e.g., type of job that is sought, clinical malingering, etc.

Cattell et al. recommend integrating social desirability as a factor which is understood to operate to different degrees in different situations. To do this, different profiles of average distortions in certain situations would be calculated. From this, the researcher could then arrive at a constant to add or
subtract from each score to estimate the 'true' score. Although this method may be ideal, it is beyond the scope of the present study.

Recent research (Millham & Kellog, 1980; Nederhof, 1985) on the Marlowe-Crowne (MC) indicates that the scale predominantly measures the motive to avoid negative evaluation rather than a need to seek approval. This is consistent with Clark's (1987) finding that lower scores on a jealousy measure were associated with higher scores on the MC.

The motivation of avoiding negative evaluation is also descriptive of a self-protective ego development level, and therefore MC scores may have a close relationship to SCT scores, where one would expect high MC scorers to cluster around the self-protective ego development level.

For the purposes of the present study the MC will be included primarily on an exploratory basis, as there are no specific hypotheses which will be tested regarding it. Data analysis will include an investigation of the relationship of this variable to other test responses of the participants, and it will be of particular interest to explore the relationship between the MC and the SCT.

**The Present Study**

The aim of the present study is to investigate ego development and aspects of attachment in incest offenders. It is believed that understanding the nature of these psychological constructs in this population may shed some light on
why certain men commit incest. The present study will also examine the nature of the incest relationship from the point of view of the offender, framing it as an adult love experience. Further to this, the nature of this adult love experience of the offender (the incest) will be compared to a past love experience in a group of men who are matched in terms of ego development. Results will be discussed in terms of the implications for treatment of incest offenders.

**Hypotheses**

**Incest Offenders: Ego Development**

1. The incest offenders will score lower than the control group on the Sentence Completion Test (SCT) reflecting more primitive stages of ego development.

**Incest Offenders: Attachment styles and dimensions**

2. The incest offenders will score lower than the control group on the measure of the secure attachment style.

3. The incest offenders, as compared to the control group, will more highly endorse items on the RAQ, a dimensional measure of attachment, reflecting their greater difficulty in adult attachment relationships.

**Incest offenders and Controls: Secure Lovestyle Scores**

4a. The incest offenders will score lower than the community control
group on the measure of the Secure Lovestyle from the Love Experiences Questionnaire.

4b. A subgroup from the control group will be selected that matches the incest group both on age and on ego development scores. It is expected that incest offenders, describing their relationship with their incest victim, will have similar scores on the Secure Lovestyle measure as the matched community control group who are describing a previous love relationship.
PARTICIPANTS

Participants were recruited from December 1995 to November 1996. A total of 317 men took part in the study, from which the final sample of 200 participants was derived. The participants ranged in age from 23-68 years (M=46.81, SD=10.99).

INCEST GROUP

The incest group were identified as men who had made a very definite sexual approach, involving successful or unsuccessful attempts at exposure, genital fondling, oral-genital contact, and/or vaginal or anal intercourse with a female child of 18 years or younger with whom the offender had lived in the role of a parent in the household of the victim for at least one year. The child may have been either the biological child, adopted child, foster child, or stepchild of the offender or the offender's significant other.

Incest offenders were recruited from three institutions in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia; Stave Lake Correctional Centre (N=42), Ford Mountain Correctional Centre (N=26), and Mountain Institution (N=23). For each institution files were reviewed by the researcher to identify inmates who met the inclusion criteria. The researcher met with all possible participants, discussed the research, and obtained informed consent for those who agreed to
participate. Inmates were informed that their decision to participate (or not), would be held in confidence, and that their responses were anonymous.

Not all inmates who were approached agreed to participate. A total of 115 inmates were approached and 91 agreed to participate, yielding a response rate of 78%.

Control Group

The control group was derived from an initial population of 226 men, recruited using a variety of methods from a variety of settings. Participants included retirees, B. C. Rail train passengers, corrections staff, newspaper advertisement respondents, subjects solicited by undergraduate students for research participation credit, and any other willing individuals the researcher could find.

Again, not all potential subjects who were approached agreed to participate. The newspaper advertisement recruitment for example, yielded a 66% response rate despite the foot-in-the door step of the participant having to contact the researcher to get the process started, and the lure of a $250 lottery (this also does not take into account the population of men who read the advertisements over a three month period and did not respond).

From this pool of 226 participants, individuals whose primary sexual orientation was not heterosexual were selected out. From the remaining
participants, the control group was selected by matching age to within five years to the incest group participants.

**Incest and Control Groups Compared**

The incest group differed from the control group on a variety of demographic factors, summarized in Table 2.

Overall it can be seen that uniformly, the incest offenders have less education and lower incomes. Additionally, more incest offenders reported a difficulty with substance abuse. Most relevant clinically are the higher percentages of histories of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in the childhoods of the incest offenders.

**Measures**

**Demographic Data**

A brief demographic sheet was included which asked participants about their age, education, income, and certain factors regarding their developmental history (e.g., physical, sexual abuse, etc). An example is in Appendix H.

**Ego Psychology Measures**

**The Washington University Sentence Completion Test (SCT).** A short form (18 item version) of the original SCT was administered (Appendix A). The SCT is a semi-structured projective test where participants are asked to "complete the sentences". Examples of stems include: "When I am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incest Group (N=91)</th>
<th>Control Group (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school or less</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some university/college</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate work</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 or less</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,000-$75,000</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $75,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood Abuse History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
criticized...", "Rules are...", and "A man's job...". The protocols were scored by an experienced doctoral clinical student, trained according to the scoring manual of Loevinger and Wessler (1970). Reliability was checked by a second rater, the results of which are described in the Results section. The final protocol score (from 1 to 9) indicates the level of ego development which ranges from Impulsive to Integrated.

Barron's Ego Strength Scale. The MMPI-2 version of the Ego Strength (Es) scale is comprised of 52 items which deal with physical functioning, seclusiveness, moral posture, personal adequacy, ability to cope, phobias, and anxieties. Participants respond by circling either True or False to items such as, "I seldom worry about my health", "I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself", and "I have often been frightened in the middle of the night". Scores can range from zero to 52, with higher scores reflecting greater ego strength.

Attachment Measures

Likertized Version of Attachment Styles. This attachment measure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) yields scores for each of the three attachment styles: Secure, Avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent (Appendix B). The participant indicates degree of agreement of self-description to 13 statements on a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 being 'Not at all like me' and 7 being 'Very much like me'. Sample items reflecting secure attachment include: "I find it easy to trust others", "I feel
comfortable depending on other people", and "I don't often worry about being abandoned". The Anxious/Ambivalent style is reflected in such statements as: "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", and "I want to merge completely with another person". Items reflecting avoidant attachment include: "I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others", "I find it difficult to depend on others", and "Love partners often want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being".

This measure can be used to either classify an individual into an attachment category (highest score), or as a dimensional measure to ascertain the degree to which an individual has secure, anxious/ambivalent, and/or avoidant characteristics.

**Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire.** The Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire (RAQ, Appendix C) of West, Sheldon, and Reiffer (1994) is comprised of 43 items measuring a total of nine different scales. Five of these are dimensional scales of attachment behaviour and are identified (with a sample item) as: Proximity Seeking (e.g., "I turn to my attachment figure for many things, including comfort and reassurance"), Separation Protest (e.g., "I get frustrated when my attachment figure is not around as much as I would like"), Feared Loss (e.g., "I have a terrible fear that my relationship with my
attachment figure will end"), Perceived Unavailable Responsiveness (e.g., "When I'm upset, I am confident that my attachment figure will be there to listen to me"), and Lack of Use of Attachment Figure (e.g., "I talk things over with my attachment figure"). Four of the scales reflect patterns of behaviour and include (with sample item): Compulsive Self-Reliance (e.g., "Things have to be really bad for me to ask my attachment figure for help"), Compulsive Care-Giving (e.g., "I put my attachment figure's needs before my own"), Compulsive Care-Seeking (e.g., "I wish that I could be a child again and be taken care of by my attachment figure"), and Angry Withdrawal (e.g., "I wish there was less anger in my relationship with my attachment figure"). Participants rate their agreement on a five point Likert scale with positive and negative statements concerning their feelings about their attachment figure.

**Adult Love Experiences**

**Love Experiences Questionnaire.** The Love Experiences Questionnaire (LEQ, Appendix D), is comprised of 44 items measuring 11 different aspects of adult love. Participants rate their degree of agreement of self-description on a Likert scale ranging from a score of one, reflecting Very Strongly Agree, to seven, for Very Strongly Disagree. The eleven subscales (with sample items) are: Acceptance (e.g., "I was well aware of her imperfections, but it didn't lessen my love"), Emotional Extremes (e.g., "I was on an emotional roller
coaster in my relationship with her”), Fear of Closeness (e.g., "I sometimes felt that getting too close to her could mean trouble for me”), Friendship (e.g., "I considered her one of my best friends”), Happiness (e.g., "My relationship with her made me very happy”), Jealousy (e.g., "I couldn't help feeling jealous when she paid attention to others”), Obsessive Preoccupation (e.g., "I couldn't help thinking about her face, mannerisms, and movements”), Desire for Reciprocation (e.g., "More than anything, I wanted her to return my feelings”), Sexual Attraction (e.g., "I felt sexually aroused at the sight of her”), Trust (e.g., "I could confide in her about virtually everything”), and Desire for Union (e.g., "I felt there's no such thing as being too close to her”).

The Secure Lovestyle scale is comprised of scores from three subscales: Friendship, Fear of Closeness, and Emotional Extremes (the latter two scales being reverse coded).

Social Desirability

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The Social Desirability Scale (SD, Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) is a 33 item true-false self report measure (Appendix E). It was designed to measure an individual's tendency to present oneself in a socially desirable light and includes such items as: "I have never intensely disliked anyone", "I like to gossip at times", and "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake". Scores can range from zero to 33,
with higher scores reflecting greater social desirability.

**Procedure**

Participation in the study involved completion of the questionnaires outlined above. Participants were blind to the hypotheses, knowing only that they were participating in a 'Relationship Study' which investigated how men think and feel in relationships. The test package itself included an Information and Consent form, Demographic Sheet, and a Take Home Information Sheet. A cover sheet, preceding the attachment and love experiences measures, outlined the study's procedures, gave a general introduction to the measures, and emphasized the importance of answering every question. A second cover sheet, preceding the sentence completion, ego strength and social desirability measures, again reminded participants to answer every question. A final cover sheet at the end of the measures asked participants to make sure they had answered every question, and thanked them for their participation. These cover sheets were designed to collapse instructions, chunk the measures to make the package more user friendly, and provide the opportunity for reminding participants to answer every question. The administration of measures was in the following order: Hazan and Shaver's Attachment Questionnaire, Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire, Love Experiences Questionnaire, Sentence Completion Test, Barron's Ego Strength Scale, and the
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

The context in which participants completed the questionnaires varied. When possible (two occasions) the incest offenders completed the questionnaires in a large room with between 8 to 10 participants in the room. Often, the inmates were given the questionnaire to take away with them to some quiet spot, told to begin working on it immediately, and to return it as soon as it was completed. Questionnaires were generally returned within two hours, with none left outstanding. For inmates who had difficulty with reading and writing, assistance was provided by the author. Control group participants (apart from the train passengers) completed the questionnaires in their own homes.

After the questionnaires were returned, the consent forms were detached and kept separate from the completed questionnaires. This insured the confidentiality of responses as even the researcher had no way of connecting which consent forms belonged with which questionnaires. Finally, all participants were given information on how to contact the researcher or supervisor with any comments, or to obtain a more detailed description of the study and a copy of the results. One participant complained regarding the bias in the wording of the questionnaires which presumed a heterosexual orientation and a disclaimer was added as a result.
RESULTS

Demographic Findings

As noted above, the incest offenders differed from the control group with respect to the demographic factors. Table 2 (see page 84) provided a summary which indicated that incest offenders have less education and lower incomes, higher prevalence of substance abuse history, and higher percentages of a childhood history of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse.

All of the above differences, when tested, were significant. Incest offenders had less education $t(90)= 6.66, p<.0005, d=.99$, lower incomes $t(90)=3.24, p=.0024, d=.48$, and a higher proportion of incest offenders had a substance abuse history, 60% versus 20%, $z=5.60, p<.0005$. Finally, significantly higher proportions of incest offenders reported a childhood history of emotional abuse, 48% versus 26%, $z=3.06, p=.0022$, physical abuse, 62% versus 18%, $z=6.06, p<.0005$, and sexual abuse, 50% versus 11%, $z=5.65$, $p<.0005$.

Other findings with respect to the demographic variables are summarized in the correlation matrices in Appendix F, some results of which warrant mention here. It should first be noted that since none of the hypotheses were based on the results of the correlations, an alpha level correction was not applied to the correlation matrices. Therefore, for all of the correlation results reported,
interpretations need to be somewhat conservative.

The intercorrelations (Table F1) between the three childhood abuse conditions (emotional, physical, and sexual) ranged from .33, \( p<.0005 \) to .59, \( p<.0005 \). Similarly, substance abuse showed some relation to emotional abuse, \( r=.23, p=.0020 \), physical abuse, \( r=.37, p<.0005 \), and sexual abuse, \( r=.41, p<.0005 \).

Education and income were negatively correlated with the presence of physical and sexual abuse, \( r=-.19, p=.010 \) to \( r=-.28, p<.0005 \). The presence of emotional abuse was not significantly related to education or income. A history of substance abuse was negatively related to both education, \( r=-.44, p<.0005 \), and income, \( r=-.27, p<.0005 \).

Some interesting correlations were obtained with respect to age. Although unrelated to education, age showed some relationship to income, \( r=.26, p<.0005 \). There were also relationships found between age and the reporting of emotional abuse, \( r=-.24, p=.0012 \), physical abuse, \( r=-.23, p=.0022 \), and sexual abuse, \( r=-.15, p=.049 \), in childhood, although these correlations were not strong. A similar result was obtained between age and a reported history of substance abuse, \( r=-.28, p<.0005 \).

Social Desirability (SD) Findings

An important consideration in the present study was to assess the extent to
which social desirability may be affecting responses of the incest group, which if found, would have implications for how subsequent data would need to be analyzed. Table 3 summarizes the SD results.

The means of the two groups were quite similar with a difference of only 1.02. The matched $t$-test demonstrated no significant difference between the two groups, $t(90)=1.21$, $p=.231$, $d=.18$. The lack of any systematic difference between the groups on social desirability permitted continued analyses to be conducted without having to adjust for the SD scores.

The correlation matrix however, produced some interesting results in terms of the relationship between the SD and other variables. With respect to the demographic factors (Table F1), the SD was related to age, $r=.24$, $p=.0012$, and education, $r=-.17$, $p=.024$, but unrelated to income, $r=.056$, $p=.46$. The SD was also unrelated to a past history of substance abuse, $r=.010$, $p=.89$, or sexual abuse, $r=-.086$, $p=.25$, but was related to a childhood history of emotional, $r=-.20$, $p=.062$, and physical, $r=-.20$, $p=.062$, abuse.

**Ego Psychology Findings**

**Ego Development - Inter-rater Reliability.** The SCT is a projective test, therefore reliability with regard to the ego development ratings is the first issue to be addressed. As mentioned above, all protocols were scored by an experienced doctoral clinical student, trained according to the scoring manual.
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for the Marlowe-Crowne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incest Group (N=91)</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group (N=91)</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t(90)=1.21, p=.231, d=.18$
of Loevinger and Wessler (1970). In addition, both the primary rater and the reliability rater had undertaken additional training in scoring through a workshop. Scoring of the protocols for the present study was not commenced until the raters had attained a minimum of 80% identical agreement scores to the training materials.

A random sample of 20 protocols scored by a second rater yielded a 40% perfect agreement and a 90% agreement within 1/2 step. A contingency table of rater agreement is depicted in Table 4.

Kappa statistics were calculated to evaluate degree of agreement between the two raters. For 100% agreement, $k=.17$. This increased to $k=.68$, when the agreement was relaxed to within 1/2 step. Although 90% of the protocols were similarly rated within a half-step, the relatively low Kappas indicate that the reliability attained in the present study was not as good as one would have expected from the literature.

**Ego Development**

The mean for the control group fell between the Self-Aware and the Conscientious stages (between stages 3/4 and 4), similar to published norms (Blumentritt et al., 1996; Loevinger, 1985; Holt, 1980). The mean for the incest group fell between the Conformist and Self-Aware stages (between stages 3 and 3/4). Table 5 depicts the distributions of the I-Level scores
Table 4

Convergence Between Two Raters on SCT I-Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Δ/3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3/4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4/5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=20 protocols scored by both raters
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-Level</th>
<th>Incest</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ/3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N=182, \ U=3032.5, \ z=-3.1930, \ p=.0014, \ d=-.27\)
between the incest and the control group.

A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in ego development rankings between the incest group and the control group, and results supported this hypothesis ($U=3032.5$, $p=.0014$). This indicates a medium effect size ($d=-.27$).

Correlations with demographic variables (Table F1) indicated no relationship between SCT scores and age; however, correlations were obtained between the SCT and education, $r=.25$, $p=.00085$, and income, $r=.22$, $p=.0029$, although these correlations do not account for a substantial amount of variance. With respect to personal history, the SCT was correlated with a history of substance abuse, $r=-.23$, $p=.0018$. No relationship was established between the SCT and emotional abuse (although the correlation was in the expected direction); however, some relationship was indicated between the SCT and physical abuse, $r=-.15$, $p=.043$, and sexual abuse, $r=-.18$, $p=.017$.

It was expected that there would be a significant correlation between the SCT and social desirability (SD), as both can be related to the fear of negative evaluation. This was not found, however, as the correlation coefficient showed no relationship between the measures, $r=-.046$, $p=.54$.

**Ego Strength.** As discussed above, the Es was included on an exploratory basis. One important reason for including the Es was to determine its
relationship to the SCT. The correlation between these two measures was statistically significant, $r=.29$, $p<.0005$, however not particularly strong.

With respect to differences between the incest and control groups on the Es measure, the incest group (not surprisingly) scored lower on the Es, $M=33.29$, $SD=6.40$, than the control group, $M=37.05$, $SD=5.21$. This difference between the two groups was highly significant $t(90)=-4.17$, $p<.0005$, $d=.62$.

Correlations with the demographic variables (Table F1) produced a similar pattern of results as found with the SCT. Again, no correlation was found between the Es and age; however, correlations were obtained between the Es and education, $r=.18$, $p=.013$, and income, $r=.40$, $p<.0005$. With respect to personal history, the Es was also correlated with a history of substance abuse, $r=-.31$, $p<.0005$, physical abuse, $r=-.32$, $p<.0005$, and sexual abuse, $r=-.36$, $p<.0005$.

**Attachment Findings**

**Attachment Styles.** Results of findings on the attachment styles between the two groups are presented in Table 6.

The means are all in expected directions in that the incest offenders more highly endorsed both of the insecure attachment styles (avoidant and anxious/ambivalent) more than the control group, and conversely obtained
Table 6

Attachment Styles by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxious/ambivalent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-3.94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial critical p-value set at 0.02 (.05/3) for stepwise Bonferroni correction (N=91 matched pairs)
lower scores on the secure attachment style.

The difference between the two groups was not significant on the anxious/ambivalent attachment style, $t(90)=1.72, p=.089, d=.25$. Significant differences were found between the incest offenders and the control group in terms of their endorsement of both the avoidant, $t(90)=2.98, p=.004, d=.44$, and secure, $t(90)=-3.94, p<.0005, d=.58$, styles. This supports the second hypothesis that the incest offenders would score lower on the measure of secure attachment.

To estimate the percentage of participants in each of the attachment style categories, the highest score was used to classify them. For the incest group; 42.9% were secure, 26.4% avoidant, and 30.8% were anxious/ambivalent. For the control group the figures were; 65.9% secure, 19.8% avoidant, and 14.3% anxious/ambivalent. The distribution of these categories is significantly different between the two groups, $\chi^2 (2, N=182)=10.80, p=.0052$.

Results from the correlation matrices indicated some relationships between the attachment styles and other variables which warrant mention. With respect to the demographic factors (Table F2), age was unrelated to the avoidant style; however, it was correlated with both the anxious/ambivalent, $r=-.19, p=.010$, and the secure, $r=.14, p=.055$ styles. Education was unrelated to the anxious/ambivalent style, but related to the avoidant, $r=-.17, p=.019$, and
secure, \( r = .17, p = .022 \), styles. All three styles were related to income:
anxious/ambivalent, \( r = -.22, p = .0032 \), avoidant, \( r = -.19, p = .010 \), and secure, \( r = .21, p = .0042 \).

With respect to personal history (Table F2), expected correlations were obtained between the styles and a prior history of substance abuse:
anxious/ambivalent, \( r = .13, p = .076 \), avoidant, \( r = .24, p = .0012 \), and secure, \( r = -.23, p = .0022 \), although they are not strong. Finally, all three of the attachment styles had expected correlations with the three abuse conditions (e.g., the insecure styles positively correlated, and the secure style negatively correlated) with correlations which ranged from \( .14, p = .051 \), to \( .35, p < .0005 \).

Correlations between the attachment styles and ego development scores (Table F2) indicated no relationship between ego development and the anxious/ambivalent style (although the correlation was in the expected direction); however, correlations were found between ego development and the avoidant, \( r = -.20, p = .0062 \), and secure, \( r = .22, p = .0032 \), styles. The Barron's Ego Strength Scale fared somewhat better, showing correlations between Es scores and the anxious/ambivalent, \( r = -.23, p = .0012 \), avoidant, \( r = -.43, p < .0005 \), and secure, \( r = .36, p < .0005 \), styles.

**Dimensions of Attachment Behaviours.** To complete the RAQ, participants were asked if they currently had an attachment figure and what relationship
that person was to themselves. Individuals who did not currently have an attachment figure were asked to think of who most recently would have been their attachment figure and the relationship of that individual to themselves. These figures are summarized in Table 7.

Not surprisingly, there were fewer of the incest group who currently had an attachment figure (76 compared to 86 of the control group). In addition, of those participants who did have a current attachment figure, fewer of the incest offenders were reporting on a romantic (i.e., wife, girlfriend) relationship in comparison to the control group (79% for the incest offenders, compared to 86% of the control group). This resulted in a total of 71 age matched pairs for analysis.

Table 8 presents all of the data on the RAQ scales, including both the behavioural dimensions and the four behavioural patterns.

As Table 8 indicates, overall there are quite small differences in means between the two groups on the nine subscales; however all of the differences between the groups are in the expected directions.

After conducting paired samples \( t \)-tests to test for differences between groups, it was found that in general, the incest offenders were not very different from the control group on the RAQ, as the only subscale which attained significance was Feared Loss, \( t(70)=3.36, p=.0012, d=.56 \).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Attachment Figure</th>
<th>Incest Group (N=91)</th>
<th>Control Group (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife, girlfriend, e.t.c.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family (e.g. friend)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N - current relationship</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Most Recent Past Attachment Figure              |                     |                      |
| Wife, girlfriend, e.t.c.                       | 13                  | 2                    |
| Family member                                   | 0                   | 1                    |
| Non-family (e.g. friend)                        | 2                   | 2                    |
| **Total N - no current relationship**           | **15**              | **5**                |
Table 8

Dimensions of Attachment by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feared Loss</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation Protest</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity Seeking</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Unavailability</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Use</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsive Care-Seeking</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsive Care-Giving</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsive Self-Reliance</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angry Withdrawal</strong></td>
<td>incest</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial critical p-value set at 0.0056 (.05/9) for stepwise Bonferroni correction, (N=71 matched pairs)
In order to more further explore the RAQ, a factor analysis was performed. The initial analysis produced 10 factors with eigen values greater than 1, which accounted for 62.6% of the variance. A scree test however, indicated that only 3 factors should be included, which accounted for 41% of the variance. To test for significant differences between groups, t-tests were conducted, the results of which are summarized in Table 9.

Only the first factor was significantly different between the two groups, \( t(160)=2.36, p=.019, d=.37 \). This factor is characterized by high scores on items reflecting a mixture of feared loss, perceived unavailability/unresponsiveness, feelings of anger, and a tendency toward compulsive self-reliance. This factor could be described as 'rejection apprehension'.

Results from the correlation matrices (Appendix F) revealed some interesting relationships between variables. The demographic factors of age, education, and income, were most associated with the defensive stances of Compulsive Self-Reliance and Angry Withdrawal, and less so with Compulsive Care-Seeking and Feared Loss. Ego strength was correlated with every scale except Compulsive Care-Giving, while the SCT was only correlated with Separation Protest, Proximity Seeking, Compulsive Care-Seeking, and Angry Withdrawal. Childhood abuse and substance abuse were most associated with Feared Loss, Separation Protest, Lack of Use of Attachment Figure, and
Table 9

Differences Between Groups on the RAO Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAO Factor</th>
<th>incest</th>
<th>control</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial critical p-value set at 0.02 (.05/3) for stepwise Bonferroni correction (Incest N=76, Controls N=86)
Compulsive Self-Reliance.

Correlations between the RAQ and scores on the three attachment styles are summarized in Table F3. Higher scores on the Anxious/Ambivalent style were correlated with high scores on all of the RAQ scales except for Lack of Use of Attachment Figure, which had no correlation with this style. High scores on the Avoidant style were also correlated with high scores on all of the RAQ scales, this time with the exception being Compulsive Care-Giving which had no relationship. Finally, high scores on the Secure attachment style were correlated with low scores on all of the RAQ scales, with Proximity Seeking and Compulsive Care-Giving having no correlation to this attachment style.

Adult Love Experiences Findings

Love Experiences Questionnaire (LEQ). As outlined above, incest offenders responded to the LEQ with the relationship with their incest victim in mind. To control for a possible past versus current effect, the control group were asked to think of a past love relationship. Of the 91 control group participants, 15 had no past love relationship (i.e., they were currently still in the relationship with their first love). These 15 individuals tended to be older men in long marriages. This resulted in 76 matched pairs which could be retained for subsequent analyses.

Mean scores and standard deviations for each of the scales on the Love
Experiences Questionnaire for the two groups are summarized in Table 10, which shows that the incest group scored lower on every scale (Acceptance, Emotional Extremes, Friendship, Happiness, Jealousy, Obsessive Preoccupation, Desire for Reciprocation, Sexual Attraction, Trust, and Desire for Union) except Fear of Closeness, where they scored higher than the control group.

To test differences between the two groups, paired samples t-tests were performed for each scale. As Table 10 indicates, there are striking differences between the incest offenders and the control group, as there were significant differences between the two groups on every subscale.

The correlations matrices (Appendix F) revealed some interesting results. Table F4 summarizes the correlations between the LEQ scales, and the demographic factors, SCT, Es, and SD scores. Acceptance of Partner's Faults was correlated with higher education and SCT scores, while Emotional Extremes was only correlated with lower SD scores. The remaining nine scales; Fear of Closeness, Friendship, Happiness, Jealousy, Obsessive Preoccupation, Desire for Reciprocation, Sexual Attraction, Trust, and Desire for Union were all correlated with higher education, and increased incidence, in descending order, of sexual abuse, substance abuse, physical abuse, and emotional abuse.
Table 10

The Love Experiences Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-5.40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Extremes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Closeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-5.70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Happiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-7.67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jealousy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-7.13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obsessive Preoccupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-9.30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire for Reciprocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-7.35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Attraction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-11.19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-7.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire for Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incest</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-7.78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial critical p-value set at 0.0045 (.05/11) for stepwise Bonferroni correction, (N=76 matched pairs)
Finally, low scores on Emotional Extremes, Fear of Closeness, Jealousy, Obsessive Preoccupation, Desire for Reciprocation, and Sexual Attraction are all correlated with higher SD scores.

Correlations between the LEQ and scores on the three attachment styles are summarized in Table F6. High scores on the Anxious/Ambivalent style was only correlated with high scores on Desire for Reciprocation. The Avoidant style was correlated with high scores on Fear of Closeness, and low scores on Acceptance of Partner's Faults, Friendship, Happiness, Obsessive Preoccupation, Desire for Reciprocation, Trust, and Sexual Attraction. Finally the Secure style was correlated with low scores on Fear of Closeness, and high scores on Friendship, Happiness, Obsessive Preoccupation, Desire for Reciprocation, Trust, Desire for Union, and Sexual Attraction.

Finally, the correlations between the LEQ and RAQ scales are reported in Table F6. Given the large possible set of combinations, relatively few scales had significant correlations. No significant correlations were obtained between Acceptance of Partner's Faults, Emotional Extremes, Fear of Closeness, Happiness, Jealousy, Desire for Reciprocation, and Desire for Union and any of the RAQ scales. Friendship was correlated with low scores on Separation Protest, and Obsessive Preoccupation and Trust were both correlated with low scores on Lack of Use of Attachment Figure. Finally, Sexual Attraction was
correlated with low scores on both Lack of Use of Attachment Figure and Fear of Loss.

**Secure Lovestyle.** Again using only control group participants who reported having had a past love relationship, the Friendship, Fear of Closeness, and Emotional Extremes scales (the last two reverse scored) were used to compute the Secure Lovestyle, a compilation of characteristics most reflective of secure attachment manifested in adult love experiences. Results are presented in Table 11.

These results support the first phase of Hypothesis 4, that incest offenders will obtain significantly lower scores than the control group on the secure lovestyle scale, \( t(75)=-2.47, p=.012, d=.41 \).

The second phase of Hypothesis 4 is to test for differences between groups after matching the groups on ego development scores. A total of 71 participants could be found who matched with respect to ego development scores and who were within five years of age (the age criterion could be expanded as there was a non-significant correlation between age and SCT scores). A paired-samples \( t \)-test was conducted, the results of which are summarized in Table 12.
Table 11

**Secure Lovestyle Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure Lovestyle Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=76 matched pairs)

Table 12

**Secure Lovestyle Scores (SLS) of Ego Development**  
**Matched Incest and Control Group Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure Lovestyle Score</th>
<th># Pairs</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLS 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicated a lack of support for the hypothesis that ego development matched incest offenders would have a nonsignificant difference on the Secure Lovestyle score from the control group, $t(70) = -2.78$, $p = .007$. The near zero correlation coefficient (-.054) indicates that the ego development matching was not relevant in accounting for the differences between the scores.

Given the overlap between many of the ego development scores between the two groups, and that most matching took place in the middle, as opposed to lower, ranges of ego development, a further analysis was conducted focusing on the lower ego development participants. All incest offenders who scored at an ego development level of 3 or less, for whom there was a match in the control group who was within five years of age, were selected for analysis. This resulted in a total of 26 pairs. A paired samples t-test was performed on the Secure Lovestyle scores which again yielded a significant result, $t(25) = -2.05$, $p = .051$.

Results from the correlation matrices yielded few significant findings. Table F4 shows the correlations between the SLS and demographic factors, SCT, Es, and SD scores. None of these correlations attained significance. The SLS was also not significantly correlated with any of the three attachment styles (Table F6). With respect to the RAQ scales (Table F6), the SLS was correlated with high scores on both Proximity Seeking and Compulsive Care-
Seeking. Finally, the intercorrelations of the LEQ and the SLS (Table F5), showed only a correlation between SLS and Sexual Attraction (a scale which is not part of the SLS score).

**All Subsets Regression Analysis**

Finally, an exploratory analysis was done to determine which of all of the variables investigated best differentiated between the incest and the control group. An all subsets regression analysis was conducted which identified the ten subsets with the highest $R^2$ at each subset size (subset size being the number of independent variables included in the equation), the findings of which are contained in Appendix G.

Independent variables for inclusion were: demographic factors (education, income, reported history of substance abuse, and reported emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in childhood), Es and SCT scores, scores on the three attachment styles, and factor 1 from the RAQ (Rejection Apprehension). This resulted in a total of twelve independent variables used in the all subsets regression analysis. The LEQ was not included since the question of interest for this analysis was; what information about an individual, that one could obtain in advance, makes it more likely to predict that they are an incest offender?

As can be seen in Table G1, when group membership (incest group versus
control group) was regressed on the twelve independent variables, the three best predictors to emerge (in order) were; education and a childhood history of sexual and physical abuse.

When group membership was regressed on these three variables, this produced an adjusted $R^2$ of .35097, $F(3,178)=33.63, p<.00005, d=.86$. This result highlights the relevance of these factors in understanding incest offenders.
DISCUSSION

Demographic Findings

Results indicated that the incest offenders were consistently disadvantaged across all demographic factors. The two main areas covered were socio-economic status (SES), reflected in such variables as education and income, and childhood history of abuse.

Jails are populated by an over-representation of disadvantaged, minority status, and lower SES individuals. Two factors are likely operating which account for this disparity. The first is that more intelligent, educated, and financially well-off individuals have somewhat of a greater likelihood of either not getting convicted on charges for which they are guilty, or if found guilty, are less likely to serve time in jail.

An example of the operation of these factors is seen in conviction results on the charge for impaired driving. Impaired driving is interesting in that the proportion of charges across SES is more evenly distributed. Due to the proportion of more 'advantaged' individuals presenting a defence to this charge, substantial precedent has been established which makes this one of the easiest of charges when, if argued, will not result in a conviction (Bruce Cookson, personal communication, December 5, 1996).

The second factor which perhaps accounts for the over-representation of
lower SES individuals in jail is that there is a relationship between being disadvantaged across a variety of domains, and the likelihood of committing certain crimes. This issue may be particularly relevant with respect to education, as education was not only significantly related to many of the variables studied, but it also emerged as the single best predictor of whether an individual was a control or incest group member. When such a result emerges, one tactic is to treat the variable as a covariate thereby treating its variance as error variance. If it is the case however, that aspects of one variable are inextricably linked to another, then such a tactic would eliminate important information regarding the co-occurrence of related phenomena. With respect to education this is likely to be the case. Although incest cuts across all socio-economic classes, it may not do so equivalently. On the contrary, there is evidence that it may well not, as lower intelligence has been found to be a risk factor for sexual offending recidivism (Hanson & Bussiere, 1996), as has low employment stability and low SES (Maletzky, 1993).

The second important area of difference between the incest and control group was the prevalence of childhood abuse experiences. With respect to developmental history, Marshall (1989) describes the parental home of sexual offenders as disruptive and violent, and parenting behaviours as erratic and rejecting. The present study supports this position that incest offenders are
disadvantaged prior to the commission of their offending, with results demonstrating the significantly higher prevalence of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in their childhood histories. A downward drift of functioning may be indicated by the intercorrelations found between childhood history of abuse and such factors as education and income.

A final demographic factor which produced some interesting results was age. Although this factor was controlled for between the two groups, eliminating a confounding effect, some results warrant mention. There was some indication of a relationship between age and all three abuse conditions, indicating that the younger participants were more likely to report a childhood history of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. In addition, younger participants were more likely to have had a substance abuse problem (which was correlated with all three abuse conditions).

Two factors may be operating with these results. The first is the growing recognition of the prevalence of child abuse which enables individuals to identify certain experiences as abusive. This is perhaps particularly relevant for men acknowledging histories of sexual abuse. The second factor is the increasing incidence of child abuse related to the higher prevalence of family breakdown, as reviewed above.
Social Desirability (SD) Findings

Unexpectedly, there was no difference between the incest group and the control group on Marlowe-Crowne scores, a result also obtained by Grant-Hall (1989). Social desirability, however, was correlated with age but because age was matched between the incest and control groups, this did not introduce a confound.

The relationship of SD to age, however, is interesting, and has been found in a variety of studies (e.g., Welte & Russell, 1993; Ray, 1988). Research reviewed by Ray (1988) indicated that this relationship was evident only with females, and discussed the finding with the suggestion that a "loss of looks" in older women leads to a compensation of promoting themselves as having other virtues. The correlation found with age in the present study however, suggests that other issues must be operating.

One possibility may be a cohort effect, where individuals socialized during a particular time period may have more emphasis on connectedness with others and socially desirable behaviours. This may lend some support to the complaint one often hears from the elderly that our culture is deteriorating, at least in terms of how we treat each other. Two other possibilities may be developmental in origin. One, is that an increasing sense of vulnerability, in general, may lead to a more cautious, thoughtful approach to life which relates
to increased social desirability. The second may be related to developmental 
maturation wherein one becomes more other-oriented, compassionate, and less 
emotionally reactive.

**Ego Psychology Findings**

**Ego Development.** Results supported the hypothesis that incest offenders 
would demonstrate lower levels of ego development than the control group. 
The incest group mean was located between the Conformist and Self-Aware 
stages, whereas the control group mean was located between the Self-Aware 
and Conscientious stages. This difference between the groups is consistent 
with both theory and clinical observation; however, it was not as robust as 
expected.

A hindrance to a discussion of these findings is the relative absence of 
description in this range of ego development. Both the incest and the control 
group fall in between the Conformist and the Conscientious stages, two main 
stages for which there are detailed descriptions. This 'in between' level of 
development (labelled the Self-Aware stage by some writers, but which 
Loevinger simply refers to as Conscientious-Conformist) was regarded by 
Loevinger as transitional, which is perhaps why there is little detail regarding 
it. In 1979, Loevinger predicted that the modal level for high school graduates 
would fall in this Self-Aware stage, perhaps implying that more mature adult
samples would score higher. In 1985, however, Loevinger found that the means for all of her adult samples fell in this range, and subsequent research (e.g., Holt, 1980; Blumentritt et al., 1996) consistently has found this to be the case, leading Holt to refer to the Self-Aware stage as the "predominant American character type" (p.919). After finding high frequencies of Self-Aware stage individuals, Holt raised the issue that it may not be a transitional stage, but a major developmental stage in its own right. He also noted that given this predominance it remains relatively overlooked.

It is difficult to discuss, therefore, what particular aspects differ between individuals who are more toward the Conformist end of the continuum as opposed to those toward the Conscientious end, apart from the descriptions already provided of those two stages. Clearly since such a disproportionate number of individuals fall in this range (it would appear that we as a culture have not attained the level of ego development Loevinger may have thought), there is perhaps too much variability and more fine gradations need to be made in this range of ego development.

The confounding effect of the differences between the two groups on certain demographic factors is relevant when considering ego development. Loevinger and Wessler (1970) note that ego development scores have been found to be positively correlated with age, verbal fluency, and intelligence.
Age was controlled for by matching between the groups and, therefore, was not a threat to the interpretation of results; however, as noted above, the incest offenders have both lower education and employment earnings than the control group participants.

One argument may be that these socio-economic factors also need to be either matched, or their covariance accounted for, in order to have a more 'pure' measure of ego development. As Loevinger and Wessler (1970) note, however, some of these types of correlations are to be expected because they are theoretically consistent with aspects of ego development.

**Ego Strength.** As noted above, the Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es) was included on an exploratory basis, primarily because it remains one of the most commonly administered scales in sex offender assessment due to its inclusion in the MMPI.

Positive correlations with such demographic factors as education and income, and negative correlations with the three abuse conditions and substance abuse history, are all theoretically consistent with the construct of the ego. In addition, the significant difference between the incest and the control group in the expected direction lends support to the utility of applying this construct to incest offending. Finally, the strong positive correlation between the Es and the SCT lends support for the construct validity of these two measures.
Attachment Findings

Attachment Styles. In their theoretical framework linking attachment style and intimacy deficits in sexual offenders, Ward et al. (1995) predicted that avoidant offenders would seek out children for brief impersonal sex and avoid developing a relationship apart from the sexual encounters. In contrast, they predicted that an offender with an anxious/ambivalent style could be expected to view the child as a lover with sexual behaviour occurring often after some period of courtship-like behaviour. The case history of Wendell (Marshall, 1993b), an incest offender who became sexually involved with his daughter after his wife left him, appears to fit this description.

Results of the present study lend mixed support for these predictions with incest offenders. When highest scores were used to classify participants into types, incest offenders, as expected, were much less likely to be securely attached (42.9% compared to 65.9% of the control group), results which are consistent with previous research. Unexpectedly, the incest offenders were basically evenly divided between the two insecure attachment styles (26.4% avoidant and 30.8% anxious/ambivalent).

The above classifications are very general estimates, as the measure was originally intended to provide a dimensional assessment of degree of endorsement to each particular style, a more discriminating analysis. As
predicted, incest offenders obtained significantly lower scores on the measure of secure attachment. In terms of the two insecure attachment styles, a non-significant trend was indicated showing the incest offenders scoring higher on the measure of the anxious/ambivalent style, and a significant difference was found with incest offenders scoring higher on the avoidant style. The greatest difference, therefore, between the incest group and the control group on insecure attachment was found in the greater endorsement of statements describing the avoidant as opposed to the anxious/ambivalent style.

Again, there are significant relationships between attachment styles and certain demographic factors, factors which are unequally distributed between the two groups. These results support Hazan and Shaver's (1990) finding that individuals who are securely attached attain higher educational levels than insecurely attached individuals. Hazan and Shaver also found that anxious/ambivalent individuals were both the lowest income earners and had disproportionately lower SES family backgrounds.

**Dimensions of Attachment Behaviour.** The dimensions of attachment behaviours, measured with the RAQ, produced few significant results. The only scale which individually attained statistical significance was that of Feared Loss. The result that the incest offenders scored higher on Feared Loss than the control group has such obvious links to the reality of their current situation
that it lends little clinical insight. Some clarification of this may be obtained by having offenders reflect on how they typically have felt in their relationship with their attachment figure before their incarceration.

The result of the factor analysis, and the investigation of the one factor (Rejection Apprehension) which significantly differentiated between the two groups, perhaps provides a little more insight into the attachment characteristics of the incest offenders. The involvement of statements reflecting perceived unavailability/unresponsiveness, feelings of anger, and compulsive self-reliance, in addition to the feared loss items, may shed light on an attachment relationship that is characterized by low levels of trust, intimacy, and emotional engagement. The fact that these results are only based on incest offenders who currently had an attachment figure (79% of which were wives/girlfriends) lends some added support to the above.

**Adult Love Experiences Findings**

*Love Experiences Questionnaire.* Striking differences were obtained between groups on the LEQ, with the incest offenders scoring significantly lower than the control group on every scale, except Fear of Closeness, where their scores were significantly higher.

A overall description of this result can be summed up as an absence of engagement in the relationship with the victim. Many of the scales speak to
the extent to which a person gets 'caught up' or somewhat obsessed with another person, particularly during the early period of sexual relations. Emotional involvement is intense; thoughts are somewhat obsessive (particularly for more highly educated individuals); sexual attraction is high; and positive attributes are heaped on the love object. All of these are absent in the incest offender's experience.

The impression gained from these results is that of a detached, usuary relationship, where the victim's availability as a sex object is exploited, while little to no real interest or notice is taken in the child herself. This paints a very different picture than that of the isolated, yearning father who sets his child in the place of his wife, and becomes involved in this illicit, yet compelling, 'affair'. While this may certainly be the case for some offenders, these results strongly suggest that the incest relationship, in general, does not contain these qualities.

The Secure Lovestyle. The elements of the adult love experience, as measured by the LEQ, which most differentiate between securely and insecurely attached individuals are high scores on Friendship and low scores on Fear of Closeness and Emotional Extremes (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Scores on the Secure Lovestyle (the compilation of these scales), as expected, were significantly different between the incest and the control group.
After the ego development level was matched, however, it was expected that the differences between the two groups would disappear. Results did not support this hypothesis; a significant difference remained after the ego development matching. Even when selection was based on the lower ranges of ego development (I-level \leq 3) there remained a significant difference on the Secure Lovestyle scores between the incest and the control group.

This result shows a clear lack of support for the last hypothesis, and indicates that the incest relationship does not resemble any other sexual relationship (even those which could arguably be quite dysfunctional).

Limitations of the Present Study

Certain limitations of the present study need to be taken into account when interpreting results. Three main areas which warrant discussion are: heterogeneity within groups, systematic differences between groups, and the measurement of the dependent variables.

Heterogeneity within groups. With respect to the incest group, one factor, commonly raised in the literature, was whether the incest offender was the biological father of the victim. Much has been written regarding this factor, and research has demonstrated that biological relatedness is correlated with lower incidence of incest (e.g., Russell, 1984). Once incest has occurred, however, results are mixed in terms of biological fathers differing from non-
biological fathers (e.g., Erickson, Luxenberg, Walbek, & Seely, 1987; Groff & Hubble, 1984). While some research finds that the abuse perpetrated by step-fathers is greater (e.g., Russell, 1984), other research finds the opposite (e.g., Phelan, 1986). In terms of psychology, biological relatedness can be regarded as facilitating attachment, and it is the attachment or degree of 'father-ness' that is probably the critical variable. The importance of this dimension is reflected in Parker and Parker's (1986) work investigating the characteristics of incest offenders, where they found that both physical and psychological distance from the female child during the early years increased the probability of sexual abuse.

Another variable not assessed within the incest group was severity of abuse. Although some measurement of this variable has been done in other work (e.g., Russell, 1984), it was considered too complex to include in a meaningful way in the present study (how does one compare the fondling of a six year old natural daughter, to intercourse with a 14 year old step-daughter the offender has only known for one year?).

A third area of heterogeneity within the incest group was latency of offending behaviour to measurement of the dependent variables. For some offenders the incest was relatively recent, however, for others the incest had stopped many years earlier. This variability would serve to obscure the
differences between the groups as the offenders who had stopped offending many years earlier may have changed with respect to some of the dependent variables (e.g., may be in a new marriage and have developed more secure attachment, etc.).

Heterogeneity is also an issue with the control group. The most important issue being that the control group is not necessarily a non-offending group. The meaning drawn from comparing known offenders to a mixed control group is necessarily different than that drawn from comparing offenders to non-offenders. One disturbing result which underscores this issue is that obtained by Hayashino and Wurtele (1995). In their research on the cognitive factors in child molesters, they found that 19% of their control group reported some likelihood of engaging in sexual contact with a child if assured they would not be punished.

In the present study, the heterogeneity within groups would tend to obscure the differences between the groups. This may be reflected in the degree of overlap in ego development scores as well as the few significant findings on the RAQ scales. In any research project, however, compromises have to be made. The possible gain by controlling for these factors had to be traded off against greater corrections on the alpha levels for the increase in Type I error and the concomitant increased likelihood of not finding differences on the
variables of most interest (Type II errors).

**Systematic differences between groups.** A second general issue is the presence of systematic differences between the groups in addition to the main independent variable (i.e., whether the participant is an incest offender or a control group member) which may have impacted results.

The most obvious systematic difference between the groups is that the incest group was also a group of men who were in jail. Ideally, the most elucidating comparison would be with a group of incest offenders who were still living in their home (and still committing incest) although this would be a very difficult group to find. The impact of going to jail is extremely disruptive for an individual, threatening both financial and relationship security. In terms of impact on data, this systematic difference probably had its greatest distorting effect on the RAQ results, as this measure asks individuals to respond thinking of their relationship with a current attachment figure (in most cases a wife or girlfriend). This makes the RAQ result of increased Feared Loss for the incest group rather limited in its interpretability, as noted above.

A second factor is the likelihood that substantially more of the incest group were, or had been, involved in some form of therapy compared to the control group. Given the likelihood that more of the incest offenders had been involved in some form of therapy, one would expect this to reduce the
differences between the groups. Although many significant differences were obtained, again the degree of overlap in ego development (which as reviewed above, tends to increase after therapy) and the overall lack of differences on the RAQ scales may have been affected by this factor.

**Measurement of the Dependent Variables.** Two issues to consider with respect to the measurement of the dependent variables are: validity of the measures and different measurement methods (projective vrs self-report).

Ecological validity may be a factor to consider when interpreting results. For example, there may be some question regarding the extent to which the SCT may over-estimate the ego development of the incest offenders. In Bartek, Krebs, and Taylor's (1993) study of moral development and moral behaviour, teenage prostitutes scored significantly higher on the Kohlberg measure of moral reasoning than on a structurally analogous measure more specific to a situation involving a prostitute; whereas, their control group scored similarly across the two measures. Given the prostitute group's significantly higher scores on a measure of defensiveness, the authors concluded that the readily available defensive stance was activated by the more threatening and personally relevant dilemma, which then revealed a much lower level of moral reasoning than that assessed by the Kohlberg dilemma. Hanson and Gizzarelli's (1994) finding that incest offenders endorsed items reflecting male sexual
privilege and minimized the harm caused by sexual abuse of children may indicate that were ego development to be assessed with more experience-near stimuli, the results may have been lower.

Ecological validity may also have operated with respect to the LEQ scales, where a selective defensiveness served to distort responses on that measure, while the items of the MC did not trigger the same defensive responding because of the relatively non-threatening content. This would have had the effect of the incest offenders appearing more different from the control group than they may actually have been, because of their greater need to deny even their level of emotional involvement in the incest relationship.

The measurement instruments themselves are also less than ideal measures of the constructs of interest. Although each measure used has been accepted in the literature as a reasonable measure of its respective variable, the choice of self-report measures over other methods with stronger construct validity (e.g., the interview method) was made largely for pragmatic reasons. The inclusion of the one projective measure (the SCT) only underscored the very great amount of resources required to conduct a project of this size with anything other than self-report inventories! One could argue, however, that the only measures that are going to be used with any regularity are those which are user-friendly for both client and clinician, and so it is useful to use those
measures in research as it is results on those measures which will be required.

One projective measure however, was used in the present study, and its inclusion introduces a method variability which warrants mention. As Campbell and Fiske (1959) note in their classic article, the ideal arrangement is to balance both method and trait in order to make accurate interpretations. The lack of balancing between projective and self-report in the present study perhaps accounts for the finding that the Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es) produced more robust correlations than the SCT with other measures, as the other measures were also self-report in format.

Suggestions for Future Research

Some of the limitations discussed above suggest directions for future research. For example, one direction is to investigate what differences there may be in the dynamics of the incest relationship when the offender is the biological father. Although the present results in general do not support the picture of the romanticized incest relationship, Marshall's (1993b) case of Wendell, and the author's own clinical experience, indicates that at least for some offenders this dynamic may be central. It may well be that for this type of relationship, the biological factor may be quite relevant.

A more in-depth analysis of the attachment characteristics of incest offenders is indicated from the results of the present study. Although
differences were obtained regarding the styles, the dimensional measurement of attachment characteristics were only gleaned from the RAQ. If this area were to become more clear, it could assist in marital and family work with offenders.

With respect to the exploration of the father-daughter relationship, it would be interesting to explore this more fully with incest offenders, and compare their experiences as a father to non-offending fathers of daughters. Perhaps it is the non-engagement in the father-daughter relationship that is an important risk factor to sexual offending. This would have implications for more fully promoting the active involvement of fathers in their children's lives. Further, there may be an early critical period for paternal bonding, which, if missed, increases the child's vulnerability to victimization by the father.

Finally, another approach to more fully understanding the incest relationship would be to survey the experiences of incest victims and compare their descriptions of their relationship with their father/offender, on a variety of dimensions, to daughters who are not incest victims.

**Implications for Treatment of Incest Offenders**

Typical in sex offender work, the word 'treatment' is simply equated with a reduction in the offending behaviour. Many techniques can be applied in an attempt to produce a reduction in behaviour (e.g., incarceration, intensive
supervision, drug treatments); however, not all techniques that produce a desired result are 'therapy', and even fewer would be identified as 'psychotherapy'.

A central argument of the present work is that psychotherapy, as it is applied with other client populations, may be a useful component of in the treatment of incest offenders. The higher incidence of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse in the childhood histories of the offenders, the generally lower ego development, and at least some difficulties in attachment, are all problems to which psychotherapy can make a unique contribution.

Clinicians from both the ego psychology and attachment orientations have developed theory and interventions to address some of the difficulties which are evident in incest offenders. Some of these will be reviewed below, with reference to the findings from the present study.

Ego Psychology. The capacity for mature object relations depends upon the child developing a sense of self that is separate and distinct, with the ability to interact with the world and others.

Kohut understands the self to be the organizing centre of the ego's activities, with the ability to regulate self-esteem as the principal function (Klein, 1986). In early development, the mother is experienced by the child to be an extension of the child's self, as a "selfobject". Selfobjects function as
substitutes for the not yet existing psychological structures. With empathic parenting, the child internalizes the functions of the selfobject and becomes capable of meeting his own self-regulatory needs.

Selfobject injuries can result from the parent's inability to allow himself/herself to be idealized by the child, or from the use of shame to discourage unwanted behaviours in the child. This prevents the gradual phase-appropriate transmuting internalization, without which the individual cannot develop mature object relations. An inner feeling of deadness is the legacy of the unresponsive early environment. This deadness resulting from the failure of early object relations may be responded to with addictions, perversions, and/or sexualizations in order to feel alive (Klein, 1988).

The high rates of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse in the childhood histories of the incest offenders point to early developmental difficulties which leave incest offenders with little ability to regulate self-esteem during times of stress. This is reflected both in their higher incidence of substance abuse problems and in the incest itself.

To use one's child in a sexual way, is to treat that child as a selfobject, an extension of oneself, devoid of any individual identity, whose function is to alleviate one's own unpleasant internal state (Taylor, 1990). The findings from the LEQ, which speak to the lack of emotional engagement in the incest
relationship, are consistent with the victim serving the function of a selfobject to the offender.

Some impairment in the internalization of an idealized parent imago may be reflected in the ego development results. Very generally, the incest offenders are closer to the Conformist stage, where shame is experienced when one is found out for having done something wrong. The control group, however, are closer to the Conscientious stage, where internalized values lead to an experience of guilt when one does not live up to one's internalized moral code. In addition, it is only toward the Conscientious stage that there is a greater accurate awareness of the experience of another.

Ego development is necessary for mature object relations which in turn is inextricably linked to the sexual functioning of the couple. Incest generally takes place within a family context, while the offender is sexually active with a wife in what appears, at least on the outside, to be a functional marriage (Lang & Langevin, 1990). Kernberg (1991) notes that men especially have a high tolerance for discontinuity, manifested by an ongoing sexual relationship with a woman even when their emotional investment is elsewhere. This is descriptive of the Conformist stage of ego development, where there is little integration of experience, and a strong focus on appearances. Contradictions are expressed with little to no awareness or recognition. The sexual discontinuity can take
place over many years in the absence of any real intimate relationship, and is descriptive of the marital dynamic during the period of incest offending.

In contrast to this, is mature object love where a couple builds up a shared internal world of their respective experiences. This internal world becomes the repository of their love, and provides continuity through the discontinuities of daily life. As years unfold, sexual fidelity is intertwined with the faithfulness each member holds to this internal world. Mature object love also allows the couple to experience sexual freedom, by temporarily freeing both participants from their specific object relation, although their total sexual involvement is still contained by that object relationship. This capacity allows for sexual play, an interaction quite different from the restricted, mechanical quality of pornography (Kernberg, 1991). Another way of viewing this, is that a mature object relationship allows for adaptive regression in the service of the ego. A temporary withdrawal from reality, adaptive regression allows one to focus more on one's internal reality and provides a potential for change of psychological structures (Bilsker & Marcia, 1991). The inner reality, when shared in the relationship, is another contribution to the unique inner world of the couple, which again fosters greater intimacy, commitment, and freedom of expression.

To work with an individual with impaired object relations, the therapist
must first establish the empathic environment, which is the therapeutic rapport between client and therapist. This stage of the therapy is described by Cashdan (1988) as 'engagement'. During this period the establishment of the 'frame' and the stance of the therapist as a knowledgeable, benign, concerned and non-judgemental listener are important (Kernberg, 1992). The client's archaic selfobject demands, which surface during the transference, are addressed by the therapist, focussing on the feelings, needs, desires, and expectations. More mature elements of object relations develop as the client shares their internal world with the therapist. The main work of the middle period involves clarifying and confronting the projective identifications (Cashdan, 1988). This involves the intellectual understanding of the genetic roots of the trauma, and how they are manifested in current relationships and the transference relationship. The therapist's understanding and acceptance helps the client to accept and empathize with himself. As shame and humiliation diminish, the client is able to accept the previously disavowed parts of himself, and through transmuting internalization is more able to take over the selfobject functions provided initially by the therapist.

In group psychotherapy, regression is stimulated in part by stranger anxiety and group process. Change is effected by assisting clients in gaining emotional understanding of their reactions inside and outside the therapy situation, and by
examining the basic assumptions that support their characteristic perceptions and behaviours (Rutan & Stone, 1993). As in any other situation, the client uses available relationships to resume the process arrested in childhood. This is also re-enacted in the psychotherapy group, where the group acts as a collective super-ego (Winek and Faulkner, 1994). As Loevinger (1979) noted, it is the tension between the more mature and less mature systems which produces change. Through the processes of imitation and identification, both the group and the therapist become the new idealized parent imago. Through internalization, the psychic structure of the client shifts to a more mature level of functioning which allows for tolerance of feelings, introspection, and a willingness to understand as well as react.

**Attachment Theory.** Attachment theory asserts that attachment is a fundamental form of behaviour with its own internal motivation distinct from feeding and sex. The working models a child builds of his mother and her ways of communicating and behaving towards him and a comparable model of his father, together with the complementary models of himself in interaction with each, are built by a child in the first few years of life, and soon become established as influential cognitive structures (Bowlby, 1988).

As the securely attached child grows older and is treated differently by parents, the model becomes updated, and though there is always some time-lag,
the currently operative model is generally quite reality-bound. In the case of
the anxiously attached child, the updating of internal models is obstructed
through defensive exclusion of discrepant experience and information. These
internal models persist in a relatively unchanged state even when the individual
in later life is dealing with persons who treat him in ways entirely unlike those
that his parents adopted when he was a child.

The findings of the current study point to the lack of security that incest
offenders experience in intimate relationships, and their much greater
endorsement than controls of an avoidant defensive stance in such relationships.
Individuals with more avoidant interpersonal characteristics can be quite
difficult to work with because they are experienced by others as being more
hostile and defensive (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Avoidant individuals are also
less likely to be amenable to psychotherapy, at least in the early stages. This is
suggested by the finding that their defensiveness also colours their perception
of their attachment history so that they tend to idealize their relationships with
parents and avoid the negative feelings associated with those relationships
(Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Similarly Alexander (1993) found that lack of secure
attachment in adulthood predicted avoidance of childhood memories. For such
resistant individuals, the therapist must not lose sight of the great difficulty the
client faces when in later life (remembering that the average age of the
incarcerated incest offender in the present study is 47) he begins the process of self-examination. As Marcia (1994) notes, the longer the defensiveness continues, the more painful it becomes to shatter a structure that has grown increasingly rigid, and for whom the critical period of self-examination (i.e., adolescence) has passed. For these reasons, therapists working from the attachment orientation strongly emphasize the establishment of the secure base in the relationship between therapist and client (e.g., Sable, 1992).

In addition to the attachment findings in the present study, the higher incidence of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse in the childhood histories of the offenders also indicates that the clinician must be attentive to the therapeutic relationship.

Therapeutic interventions for such individuals has as its main objective the working through of the internal representations in the context of the relationship between the therapist and the client. Bowlby (1988) outlines five tasks for the psychotherapist working from the attachment theory orientation.

The first, and most essential, is to provide the secure base from which the client can explore the various unhappy and painful aspects of his life. The second, is the examination of other relationships in the client's life and the conscious and unconscious elements the client brings to those relationships. The third, is the examination of the relationship between the therapist and the
client, in order to elucidate the client's working models of self and other. The fourth, is to identify the current perceptions of self and other which have been created through the interactions with attachment figures from the past. Finally, the fifth, is to recognize which models of self and other may or may not be appropriate to his present and future.

Group psychotherapy from an attachment orientation in many ways resembles ego psychoanalytic group psychotherapy. With a greater emphasis on interpersonal learning, Yalom (1985) lists the twelve curative factors in group psychotherapy as: instillation of hope, universality, imparting of information, altruism, corrective recapitulation of the primary family group, development of socializing techniques, imitative behaviour, interpersonal learning from input, interpersonal learning from output, group cohesiveness, catharsis, and existential factors. Again, the interactions within the group pave the way for the clarification of unconscious mental representations of self and others in a supportive environment. In particular for sexual offenders, Graham (1993) sees group therapy as an excellent context within which to learn trust, self-assertion, self-expression. Group therapy also provides the means to reduce the alienation that these individuals suffer, a characteristic noted by other clinicians who work with offenders.
Integration of Ego Psychology and Attachment Theory in Treatment. In Bowlby's later writings, Bretherton (1990) points out that "the reader is reminded that attachment theory is concerned with some of the same issues that have long been the focus of psychoanalytic theories of object relations". Attachments are akin to psychotherapeutic transference, in that both the feelings and the understanding one has regarding the attachment figure are imbued with psycho-historical issues (Osofsky, 1988). As with transference, the internal representations of attachment figures do not fade, but are interrupted and then transferred to new relationships. In both orientations, the primary emphasis is on the therapeutic relationship as the vehicle for working through past conflicts. Horvath and Luborsky (1993) even argue that the therapeutic attention to the therapist-client relationship may be more beneficial than attention towards problem content. The 'problem content' in the treatment of sexual offenders, however, is so compelling that it can sabotage the therapeutic relationship. Comprehensive treatment needs to find a way to address both behavioural change and the faulty object relations strivings of the offender (Taylor, 1990).

In conclusion, the addition of psychotherapy may hold some promise in the treatment of incest offenders. The results of the present study support the position that this client group is disadvantaged across a variety of domains.
The early childhood histories, lower ego development, and difficulties with attachment all speak to a vulnerability in interpersonal relations where the trained psychotherapist can apply their unique knowledge and skills in assisting recovery.

Special Considerations in the Treatment of Sexual Offenders

The results of the present study indicate developmental and psychological disadvantages of the offender, and the detached utilitarian use of the daughter during the incest. In indicating the disadvantages of the offender, the results argue against the common negative countertransference reaction of more confrontational, controlling, and punitive interventions in the name of 'treatment'. In highlighting the detachment during the incest, the results also warn clinicians to be on guard for the positive countertransference, where the offender is seen in a more positive light, and the incest conceptualized in more romanticized terms.

By far our most common reaction to sexual offenders is negative; and we justify a variety of our behaviours and attitudes based on a defensive need to see offenders as dissimilar from ourselves. It is evident, as noted by several writers, that these attitudes are affecting treatment approaches - a concern not so prevalent in other client populations. Graham (1993), for example, emphasizes that treatment approaches that do not have a balanced view can be
abusive and may continue to traumatize the offender, increasing alienation and adding to the risk of his re-offending.

Evidence that re-traumatization of offenders by therapists is ongoing is found in Muster's (1992) work which surveyed professional therapists who worked with child sexual abuse victims who sexually acted out, adolescent sexual victim-turned-offenders, and adult sexual abuse victims who became offenders. She found that whereas the majority of therapists favoured flexibility, those therapists who were in the corrections field were the greatest supporters of confrontational and punitive therapy methods. Sympathetic methods were preferred with child clients; adolescent clients were ranked equally for pro- and anti-sympathetic methods; and adults were the least likely to receive sympathetic treatment.

Wiederholt (1992) also expresses concern regarding the approach to treatment of sexual offenders by therapists. He states that therapists should be motivated to help or treat from a humanistic position, building up reliable and trustful relationships with the offenders, and not having primarily narcissistic, academic, or financial goals. He further states that while therapists must have the capacity to resist manipulation by the offenders, the particular method of therapy is less important than the necessity of dealing with the problems of the patients without new traumatization. He notes that therapists themselves are
quite often repetitive traumatizers by acting as parent surrogates who merely employ different methods of traumatization. Wiederholt believes that therapists should not seek to make patients symptom-free, but should let them find their own way to eliminate symptoms, replacing society-threatening behaviour with acceptable human interactions. With respect to sex offender treatment therefore, it appears that it is especially important for the clinician to "know thyself" and to be able to differentiate negative countertransference reactions from therapeutic interventions.

Writing from a systemic orientation, Scott (1994) discusses the parallel process in which both sex offender and therapist, facing the task of recovery, feel burdened, frustrated, and alone. He sees group psychotherapy as a particularly good treatment method as it decreases the offender's sense of isolation while enabling clinicians to work as a team. The goal for the therapist is to create a safe environment which supports confrontation without making the offenders feel defensive or attacked. To achieve this aim, Scott states that interventions need to diffuse power struggles in order to assist offenders in moving beyond defensive postures, and that the role of an informed use of countertransference is integral to this process.

Another countertransferential reaction, equally as defensive and as distorting both to understanding and effective treatment, is the positive
countertransference. Not limited to, but probably most prevalent among, women (evident in the phenomenon where women fall in love with inmates), this countertransference serves to mute the harsh reality of sexual offending, the profound lack of caring, and utilitarian use of the female child by the father. One source of this positive countertransference can originate from the unresolved needs of the clinician to attain closeness with an unavailable other, perhaps particularly a father. Another source may be a form of denial in which the clinician needs to engage, in order to develop a rapport with the offender. Regardless, the danger of this positive countertransference is both a compromised understanding of the reality of sexual offending, and a greater likelihood of seriously underestimating the capacity of an offender to reoffend. Essentially this is a loss of clarity, as the dynamics of the clinician obfuscate the vision required to have an accurate understanding of the offender.

Closing Comments

The present study asserts that the effective treatment of incest offenders requires a strong blend of both compassion and clarity. Incest offenders appear to be disadvantaged in their experiences as children and have resultant psychological deficits. At the same time, the results also indicate an emotional detachment of the incest offender from his victim and the pronounced utilitarian nature of that relationship.
The challenge for the therapist is formidable, but hopefully attainable, at least to some degree. Farrenkopf (1992) studied 24 experienced sex offender therapists, investigating both personal impact and the components of adaptation (as opposed to burnout). Interestingly, along with factors found in other research looking at work-related stress, a unique factor which emerged as assisting in optimal adaptation was an acceptance of the "human dark side".

It is by accepting the 'dark side' of our own being, that we, in the words of John Donne, become "a piece of the continent, a part of the main". More particularly, it is in that acceptance that the therapist perhaps can find the resilience to work with the offender, compromising neither compassion nor clarity.
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1. When a child will not join in group activities
2. Raising a family
3. When I am criticized
4. A man's job
5. Being with other people
6. The thing I like about myself
7. My mother and I
8. What gets me into trouble is
9. Education

10. When people are helpless

11. Women are lucky because

12. A good father

13. A girl has a right to

14. When they talked about sex, I

15. A wife should

16. I feel sorry

17. A man feels good when

18. Rules are
APPENDIX 'B'

**ATT - LIKERT**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please read each of the following statements and rate how much each describes your feelings about close relationships. Think about all of your close relationships, past and present, and answer in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships.

1. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I find it easy to trust others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I find it difficult to depend on others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am nervous when anyone gets too close.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Love partners often want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT</td>
<td>ALL LIKE ME</td>
<td>VERY MUCH LIKE ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

8. I want to merge completely with another person.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

9. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

10. I feel comfortable depending on other people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

11. I feel comfortable having other people depend on me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

12. I don't often worry about being abandoned.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME

13. I don't often worry about someone getting too close to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT AT ALL LIKE ME
VERY MUCH LIKE ME
APPENDIX 'C'

RAQ-R

INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire, you will find questions about your relationship to one special person in your life. For these questions we call this special person your "attachment figure". By attachment figure, we mean:

- most likely, the person you are living with or romantically involved with
- the person you'd be most likely to turn to for comfort, help, advice, love or understanding
- the person you'd be most likely to depend on, and who may depend on you for some things

Your attachment figure may be your wife, girlfriend, or another special friend. You may have several people in your life to whom you are close in different ways, or it may be difficult to think of one person who means that much to you.

To answer the following questions, think of the person you feel closest to right now. This person is your attachment figure, even if the descriptions don't all seem to quite fit.

Is there someone in your life right now whom you would describe as your attachment figure? (yes or no)

If yes, what is the relationship of that person to you? My attachment figure is my __________________________ (e.g., wife, friend, brother, girlfriend, mother, father, sister, boss, co-worker, common-law, etc.)

If no, think of the person in your most recent past who would be your attachment figure. What is the relationship of that person to you? The person most recently who was my attachment figure was my __________________________ (e.g., wife, girlfriend, brother, mother, father, sister, friend, boss, co-worker, common-law, etc.) When answering the questions below, think back to that relationship and answer in terms of how you usually felt in that relationship.

The questions about your relationship with your attachment figure begin on the next page. Please think about each question and answer carefully. Be sure to answer every question, even if some seem hard to answer exactly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I turn to my attachment figure for many things, including comfort and reassurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I wish there was less anger in my relationship with my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I put my attachment figure's needs before my own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I get frustrated when my attachment figure is not around as much as I would like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel it is best not to depend on my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I want to get close to my attachment figure, but I keep pulling back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I often feel too dependent on my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I can't get on with my work if my attachment figure has a problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I enjoy taking care of my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don't object when my attachment figure goes away for a few days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I'm confident that my attachment figure will try to understand my feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I wish that I could be a child again and be taken care of by my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I worry that my attachment figure will let me down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I wouldn't want my attachment figure relying on me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I resent it when my attachment figure spends time away from me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I have to have my attachment figure with me when I'm upset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>2: DISAGREE</td>
<td>3: SOMEWHAT AGREE AND somewhat DISAGREE</td>
<td>4: AGREE</td>
<td>5: STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I rely on myself and not my attachment figure to solve my problems...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When I'm upset, I am confident that my attachment figure will be there to listen to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I feel abandoned when my attachment figure is away for a few days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I have a terrible fear that my relationship with my attachment figure will end</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I do not need my attachment figure to take care of me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My attachment figure only seems to notice me when I'm angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I talk things over with my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. It is easy for me to be affectionate with my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I expect my attachment figure to take care of her/his own problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am afraid that I will lose my attachment figure's love</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I feel lost if I am upset and my attachment figure is not around</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am furious that I don't get any comfort from my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am so used to doing things on my own that I don't ask my attachment figure for help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am confident that my attachment figure will always love me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am never certain about what I should do until I talk to my attachment figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>SOMewhat Agree</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I would be helpless without my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Things have to be really bad for me to ask my attachment figure for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I get really angry at my attachment figure because I think s/he could make more time for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I often feel angry with my attachment figure without knowing why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I feel that the hardest thing to do is to stand on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I feel that there is something wrong with me because I am remote from my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I don't make a fuss over my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I don't sacrifice my own needs for the benefit of my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>My attachment figure is always disappointing me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>When I am anxious I desperately need to be close to my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>It makes me feel important to be able to do things for my attachment figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 'D'

**LEQ**

1. Our relationship was characterized by mutual caring and tenderness.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

2. I couldn't help feeling jealous when she paid attention to others.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

3. I couldn't help thinking about her face, mannerisms, and movements.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

4. She kept me bouncing between my highest highs and my lowest lows.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

5. I could confide in her about virtually everything.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

6. I felt there's no such thing as being too close to her.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree

7. My love for her was an extremely enjoyable experience.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Very Strongly Agree
   
   Very Strongly Disagree
8. When I was first sexually involved with her, I had trouble concentrating on anything else.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

9. I felt almost as much pain as joy in my relationship with her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

10. I was well aware of her imperfections but it didn't lessen my love.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

11. I loved her so much that I often felt jealous.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

12. I could completely be myself when with her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

13. Sometimes my thoughts were uncontrollably on her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

14. I wished I could get closer and closer to her, that there would be absolutely no barriers between us.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree

15. I seemed to feel alternately wonderful and miserable with her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Strongly Agree
16. I considered her one of my best friends.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

17. She always seemed to be on my mind.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

18. I found it easy to overlook, sometimes even appreciate her faults.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

19. Nothing made me happier than having her attention.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

20. I sometimes felt that getting too close to her could mean trouble for me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

21. I sensed my body responding when she touched me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

22. I felt comfortable, "at home" with her.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED

23. I felt very possessive toward her.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREED
24. I could always depend on her for comfort and understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I made sure to keep some distance, some objectivity in my relationship with her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I couldn't allow myself to be completely known by her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. My relationship with her made me very happy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I felt sexually aroused at the sight of her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I was on an emotional rollercoaster in my relationship with her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. It would have been hard for her to do anything that I could not appreciate or sympathize with in some way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Sometimes I wished that she and I were a single unit - a "we" without clear boundaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. I avoided getting too "hung up" on her.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

33. More than anything, I wanted her to return my feelings.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

34. I felt comfortable expressing my true thoughts and feelings to her.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

35. I eagerly looked for signs showing her desire for me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

36. I felt complete trust in her.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

37. Being involved with her was the best possible feeling.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

38. I saw qualities in her that others failed to see.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

39. I paid a lot of attention to how she seemed to be feeling about me.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   VERY STRONGLY AGREE
   VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
40. I was very physically attracted to her.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Disagree

41. I often worried that she would 'leave me' for someone else.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Disagree

42. The greatest happiness I've known was with her.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Disagree

43. I melted when looking into her eyes.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Disagree

44. At times, I wished that she and I could just melt into each other, that we could get beyond our separateness.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very Strongly Agree

Very Strongly Disagree
INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it relates to you personally. Indicate your choice by circling either TRUE or FALSE.

1. Before voting, I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates............TRUE.......FALSE

2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help if someone is in trouble.................TRUE.......FALSE

3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged...............TRUE.......FALSE

4. I have never intensely disliked anyone...........TRUE.......FALSE

5. On occasion, I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life....................TRUE.......FALSE

6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way........................................TRUE.......FALSE

7. I am always careful about my manner of dress..TRUE.......FALSE

8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out at a restaurant...............TRUE.......FALSE

9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it........................................TRUE.......FALSE

10. On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability....TRUE.......FALSE

11. I like to gossip at times.........................TRUE.......FALSE

12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.............................TRUE.......FALSE
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. TRUE......FALSE

14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. TRUE......FALSE

15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. TRUE......FALSE

16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. TRUE......FALSE

17. I always try to practice what I preach. TRUE......FALSE

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people. TRUE......FALSE

19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. TRUE......FALSE

20. When I don't know something, I don't at all mind admitting it. TRUE......FALSE

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. TRUE......FALSE

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. TRUE......FALSE

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. TRUE......FALSE

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. TRUE......FALSE

25. I never resent being asked to return a favour. TRUE......FALSE

26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. TRUE......FALSE

27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. TRUE......FALSE
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others ........ TRUE ...... FALSE

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off .................................. TRUE ...... FALSE

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me .......................... TRUE ...... FALSE

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause ................................. TRUE ...... FALSE

32. I sometimes think that when people have a misfortune, they only got what they deserved ................ TRUE ...... FALSE

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings ................ TRUE ...... FALSE
APPENDIX F

Correlation Matrices of All Variables

F1 - Intercorrelations of Demographic Factors and Ego Development, Ego Strength, and Social Desirability Scores

F2 - Demographic Factors, Ego Development, Ego Strength and Social Desirability with Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire and Attachment Styles

F3 - Intercorrelations of the Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire and Attachment Styles

F4 - Demographic Factors, Ego Development, Ego Strength and Social Desirability with the Love Experiences Questionnaire and Secure Lovestyle Scores

F5 - Intercorrelations of the Love Experiences Questionnaire and Secure Lovestyle Scores

F6 - Love Experiences Questionnaire and Secure Lovestyle Scores with the Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire and Attachment Styles
Table F1

**Intercorrelations of Demographic Factors and Ego Development (SCT), Ego Strength (Es), and Social Desirability (SD) Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>SbA</th>
<th>EmA</th>
<th>PhA</th>
<th>SxA</th>
<th>SCT</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SbA</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmA</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhA</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SxA</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical $r$ for $p<.05=.15$, for $p<.01=.19$, for $p<.001=.24$

N=182

**Demographic Factors:**
- Edu - Education
- Inc - Income
- SbA - Substance Abuse
- EmA - Emotional Abuse
- PhA - Physical Abuse
- SxA - Sexual Abuse
Table F2

Correlations Demographic Factors and Ego Development (SCT), Ego Strength (Es), and Social Desirability (SD) Scores with Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire and Attachment Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>ShA</th>
<th>EmA</th>
<th>PhA</th>
<th>SxA</th>
<th>SCT</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrX</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUs</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giv</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avo</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical r for p<.05=.15, for p<.01=.19, for p<.001=.24
N=182, except RAQ scales where N=162

RAQ & Attachment Styles:

Los - Feared Loss  LUs - Lack of Use  Ang - Angry Withdrawal
Sep - Separation Protest  See - Compulsive Care-Seeking  A/A - Anxious/Ambivalent
PrX - Proximity Seeking  Giv - Compulsive Care-Giving  Avo - Avoidant
Una - Perceived Unavailability  Sel - Compulsive Self-Reliance  Sec - Secure
Table F3

Intercorrelations of the Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire (RAQ) and Attachment Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Prx</th>
<th>Una</th>
<th>LUs</th>
<th>See</th>
<th>Giv</th>
<th>Sel</th>
<th>Ang</th>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>Avo</th>
<th>Sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prx</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUs</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giv</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avo</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical r for p<.05=.15, for p<.01=.19, for p<.001=.24
N=182, except RAQ scales where N=162
Table F4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>SbA</th>
<th>EmA</th>
<th>PhA</th>
<th>SxA</th>
<th>SCT</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emo</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fea</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hap</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jea</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tru</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical r for p<.05=.15, for p<.01=.19, for p<.001=.24: N=167

**Scale Names:**
- Acc - Acceptance
- Emo - Emotional Extremes
- Fea - Fear of Closeness
- Fri - Friendship
- Hap - Happiness
- Jea - Jealousy
- Obs - Obsessive Preoccupation
- Rec - Desire for Reciprocation
- Sex - Sexual Attraction
- SLS - Secure Lovestyle
- Tru - Trust
- Uni - Desire for Union
Table F5

**Intercorrelations of the Love Experiences Questionnaire Scales and Secure Lovestyle (SLS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Fea</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Hap</th>
<th>Jea</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Tru</th>
<th>Uni</th>
<th>SLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emo</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fea</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hap</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jea</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tru</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical r for p<.05=.15, for p<.01=.19, for p<.001=.24

N=167

**Scale Names:**

- Acc - Acceptance
- Emo - Emotional Extremes
- Fea - Fear of Closeness
- Fri - Friendship
- Hap - Happiness
- Jea - Jealousy
- Obs - Obsessive Preoccupation
- Rec - Desire for Reciprocation
- Sex - Sexual Attraction
- Tru - Trust
- Uni - Desire for Union
Table F6

Correlations between Love Experiences Questionnaire (LEQ) and Secure Lovestyle (SLS) with the Relationship Attitudes Questionnaire (RAQ) and Attachment Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Fea</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Hap</th>
<th>Jea</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Tru</th>
<th>Uni</th>
<th>SLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prx</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUs</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giv</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avo</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical r for p<.05=.15, for p<.01=.19, for p<.001=.24
N=162 for RAQxLEQ, N=167 for LEQ x Attachment Styles
APPENDIX G

Results of the All Possible Subsets Regression Analysis

The following abbreviations have been used to described the relevant variables in Table G1 of this Appendix:

Ed - Education
Inc - Income
EmAb - Emotional Abuse in childhood
PhAb - Physical Abuse in childhood
SxAb - Sexual Abuse in childhood
SA - Substance Abuse history
Es - Ego Strength (Barron's)
SCT - Ego Development (Loevinger)
A/A - Anxious/Ambivalent attachment style
AVO - Avoidant attachment style
SEC - Secure attachment style
RAQ1 - factor 1 from RAQ
Table G1

**Prediction of Group Membership Using Demographic Factors, Ego Psychology measures, and Attachment measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>EmAb</th>
<th>PhAb</th>
<th>SxAb</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>SCT</th>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>Avo</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Raql</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 predictors</td>
<td>.367914</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 predictors</td>
<td>.371914</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 predictors</td>
<td>.374993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 predictors</td>
<td>.375129</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 predictors</td>
<td>.37523</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 predictors</td>
<td>.37544</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 predictors</td>
<td>.37529</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 predictors</td>
<td>.37534</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 predictors</td>
<td>.37542</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 predictors</td>
<td>.37547</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 predictor</td>
<td>.37552</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table shows the adjusted R² values for different combinations of predictors. The predictors are indicated by Xs, and the values for different models are given in the table.
Table G1 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>EmAb</th>
<th>PhAb</th>
<th>SxAb</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>SCT</th>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>Avo</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Raql</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.377886</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.377440</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.375279</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.373702</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.373025</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.369270</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.368150</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.367587</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.367370</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.367209</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **7 predictors** |    |     |      |      |      |    |    |     |     |     |     |      |
| .376970     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .369910     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .369679     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .369630     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .369238     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .368246     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .367364     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .367169     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .366631     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .365959     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |

| **6 predictors** |    |     |      |      |      |    |    |     |     |     |     |      |
| .369983     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .367119     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .365745     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .363433     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .362318     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .361579     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .361164     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .360672     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .359771     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .359372     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |

| **5 predictors** |    |     |      |      |      |    |    |     |     |     |     |      |
| .360166     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .359829     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .359574     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .359377     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .354970     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .354962     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .350718     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .350698     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .350613     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
| .350232     | X  |     | X    | X    |      | X  | X  | X   |     |     |     |      |
Table G1 cont.

Adjusted $R^2$  Ed  Inc  EmAb  PhAb  SxAb  SA  Es  SCT  A/A  Avo  Sec  Raq1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>.349120</th>
<th>.347751</th>
<th>.346914</th>
<th>.345124</th>
<th>.344470</th>
<th>.343346</th>
<th>.343160</th>
<th>.340915</th>
<th>.340167</th>
<th>.339340</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.334097</td>
<td>.332574</td>
<td>.328174</td>
<td>.327822</td>
<td>.325527</td>
<td>.324087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.331272</td>
<td>.303126</td>
<td>.274310</td>
<td>.263276</td>
<td>.259127</td>
<td>.252498</td>
<td>.245494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.202190</td>
<td>.190884</td>
<td>.190141</td>
<td>.180844</td>
<td>.098166</td>
<td>.085400</td>
<td>.059287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045749</td>
<td></td>
<td>.045239</td>
<td></td>
<td>.039833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=162
APPENDIX 'H'

THE RELATIONSHIP STUDY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

AGE: ________ years

EDUCATION: PUT A CHECK BESIDE THE FURTHEST YOU WENT IN SCHOOL

- elementary school
- some high school
- high school
- some college
- college
- some university
- some graduate school
- undergraduate degree
- some graduate degree(s)

ESTIMATED GROSS ANNUAL INCOME:

- less than $15,000
- $16,000 to $25,000
- $26,000 to $35,000
- $36,000 to $45,000
- $46,000 to $55,000
- $56,000 to $75,000
- $76,000 to $100,000
- $100,000 +

AS A CHILD, WERE YOU EVER ABUSED:

yes: ______ physically  ______ emotionally  ______ sexually
no: ______

HAVE YOU EVER HAD A PROBLEM WITH DRUGS AND/OR ALCOHOL?

yes: ______
no: ______

PROCEDURE:

On the next pages are lots of questions asking you about how you think and feel in relationships, and how you think and feel inside yourself. It will take about one hour.

Please make sure you answer every question. Any unanswered questions will make the entire package useless, which would be a waste of the effort you put in for all the questions you do answer.

Some of the questions may seem quite difficult, but please answer as openly and honestly as you can. There are no right or wrong answers. Also try to avoid answering in the middle - be as clear about telling us your opinions as you can.