

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF-SYSTEM:
ATTACHMENT STYLES AND
DISCREPANT SELF-REPRESENTATIONS

by

Carolyn Jean Nesbitt

B.A. University of Waterloo

B.A. University of Western Ontario

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of
Psychology

© Carolyn J. Nesbitt 1994

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

April 1994

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

Approval

NAME: Carolyn Jean Nesbitt
DEGREE: Master of Arts (Psychology)
TITLE OF THESIS: Development of the Self System:
Attachment Styles and
Discrepant Self-Representations

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Chair: Dr. A. Paranjpe

Dr. M. Moretti
Associate Professor
Senior Supervisor

Dr. K. Bartholomew
Assistant Professor

Dr. J. Thompson
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Education
External Examiner

Date Approved: April 11, 1994

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Development of the self-system: Attachment styles and discrepant self-representations.

Author:

(signature)

Carolyn J. Nesbitt

(name)

April 14, 1994

(date)

Abstract

It was proposed that attachment styles reflect an integrated system of self-other contingency beliefs. Four attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing) were examined in relation to self-representations. Fifty-five first-year psychology students generated lists of adjectives on the Selves Questionnaire to describe their actual selves, the attributes they wished or felt they ought to possess, and the attributes they believed their parents wished or felt they ought to possess. Subjects were then interviewed according to the Family Attachment Interview regarding their childhood experiences with their caregivers to determine their attachment style. It was hypothesized that secure attachment would be negatively correlated with both own discrepancy and parental discrepancy. As well, it was predicted that fearful attachment would be positively correlated with both own and parental discrepancy, while preoccupied attachment would be positively correlated with own discrepancy. It was also predicted that dismissing attachment would be negatively correlated with own discrepancy but would not predict parental discrepancy. Results were in the directions predicted for attachment styles correlated with own discrepancy and mother discrepancy. However, attachment styles correlated with father discrepancy in the opposite directions to those predicted. Perhaps these results reflect different roles that mothers and fathers play in attachment formation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Marlene Moretti for the significant time and attention to detail that she put into this body of work. Her diligence has taught me a great deal about how to do good research and her support is greatly appreciated.

Thanks also to Dr. Kim Bartholomew who encouraged me to think critically about attachment theory and research.

Julie Carswell was invaluable in helping me pump out the statistics, while Vaneesa Wiebe, Cheryl Heinzl and Jocelyne Lessard were prompt and accurate coders.

To Amy Rein, my friend and confidante, thanks for those crucial telephone calls in the wee hours of the morning and your encouragement to "get through the process and get down to the writing".

To Angela Haig, thank you for your true and constant friendship which enabled me to clear my head and get the work done.

Table of Contents

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Attachment Theory	1
Internal working models	1
The Role of Outcome Contingency Beliefs in Attachment	2
Styles of Attachment	5
Secure	6
Fearful	6
Preoccupied	7
Dismissing	7
Development of Attachment Styles	8
Self-Discrepancy Theory	9
Properties of Self-Discrepancies	9
Development of Self-Discrepancies	11
Development of Self-Discrepancies in Conjunction with Styles of Attachment	14
Approach Orientation	15
Child's behaviours match parental guides	15
Child's behaviours do not match parental guides	15
Avoidance Orientation	16
Child's behaviours match parental guides	16
Child's behaviours do not match parental guides	18
Summary of Hypotheses	19
Secure	19
Fearful	19
Preoccupied	19
Dismissing	20
Method	21
Subjects	21
Procedures	21
Measures	22
The Selves Questionnaire	22
The Family Attachment Interview	24

Results	25
Descriptive Statistics	25
Discrepancy Scores	25
Attachment Scores	25
Self-Discrepancy Patterns in Attachment Styles .	31
Relationship of secure attachment to	
discrepancies	38
Relationship of fearful attachment to	
discrepancies	38
Relationship of preoccupied attachment to	
discrepancies	40
Relationship of dismissing attachment to	
discrepancies	40
Relationship of Mother by Father Interaction with	
Attachment	41
Sex Differences	46
Relationship Between Parental Discrepancies and	
Attachment Subscales	48
Discussion	54
Limitations	63
Summary	64
References	65
Appendix A	70

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of Discrepancy Scores	26
2. Zero-order Correlations Between Discrepancy Scores	27
3. Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Scores	28
4. Frequencies of Prototypic Attachment Styles . . .	30
5. Zero-order Correlations Between Styles of Attachment	32
6. Correlations of Main Scales of Attachment with Attachment Subscales	33
7. Correlations Between Styles of Attachment and Discrepancies	37
8. Correlations Between Styles of Attachment and Residualized Discrepancies	39
9. Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Secure Attachment as the Dependent Variable	42
10. Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Fearful Attachment as the Dependent Variable	43
11. Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Preoccupied Attachment as the Dependent Variable	44

12.	Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Dismissing Attachment as the Dependent Variable	45
13.	Regression Correlations Between Attachment Styles and Residualized Discrepancies for Males and Females	47
14.	Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Nonresidualized Discrepancies	49
15.	Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Residualized Discrepancies	51

Introduction

Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is designed to explain normative processes and individual differences among behaviour patterns within relationships (Bartholomew, 1990). From the perspective of an observer, the goal of the individual is to regulate behaviours in order to obtain or maintain proximity to the attachment figure. However, from the individual's internal perspective, the primary goal of the attachment system is "felt security" (Bretherton, 1985). Bowlby proposed that regardless of whether one is in real danger or not, one needs to *feel* secure. What begins as a biological foundation for protecting the individual from physical and psychological harm, develops into an internal motivation system which we call the attachment system (Bowlby, 1973; Bowlby, 1988).

Internal working models. We internalize our attachment experiences as working models of the self and others. A working model is a schematic mental representation that can be activated automatically and unconsciously. We carry a mental image of who we are (the self model), how we expect others to behave towards us (the others model) and the interaction between the two. When the individual is an infant, the other model is based on the behaviour of

caregivers (Bowlby, 1969; Bowlby, 1973). Later, when the individual is an adolescent or adult, the other model is elaborated to include significant peer and romantic relationships.

The models of self and others direct our feelings, behaviours, attention, memory and cognitions, about information related directly or indirectly to attachment (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). Thus, the models guide our appraisals of experiences and guide our behaviour. These models are interdependent, meaning that as the model of the self develops, it will influence and be influenced by the model of others.

The internal working model of the parent-child relationship is formed, not from an objective view of a caregiver, but from a history of a child's attempts to be close to a caregiver and a child's perception of the subsequent outcomes (a caregiver's responses). A child organizes relationship knowledge schematically, through actions and action outcomes (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985; Bretherton, 1985). That is to say, a child learns that his or her actions elicit particular responses from others and in this way, a child's knowledge of relationships is formed.

The Role of Outcome Contingency Beliefs in Attachment

The development of schemas as envisioned in attachment theory suggests that a child's future actions in a

relationship will be guided by outcome contingencies. Outcome contingency beliefs are beliefs that one holds regarding what will happen when one acts a certain way. A particular outcome is then seen as dependent or contingent upon a particular action. For example, if a child meets a caregivers' expectations, s/he may receive love. If a child does not meet expectations, love may be withdrawn. Love is the outcome contingent upon meeting a caregivers' expectations. Love withdrawal is the outcome which occurs when a child does not meet a caregiver's expectations. If a child wants love, s/he learns that s/he must meet caregivers' expectations and his/her future actions are guided in this way.

Much research has been done that shows how a child's behaviour is contingent upon a caregiver's response to a child. In a study by Ainsworth and her colleagues, children who behaved in a secure manner when distressed had mothers who were sensitive to the signals and communications of the infant, while those children judged to behave insecurely had mothers who were not sensitive to their infant (Ainsworth, Bell & Stayton, 1971, as cited in Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). In this study, mothers who responded to crying and were available when approached by their children were found to have secure children. Mothers who were insensitive but not entirely rejecting were found to have children who were insecure-ambivalent: these children approached their mother

but could not be calmed down. As well, mothers who were rejecting and insensitive to their infant's signals, who blocked or rejected the child's attempts towards access, tended to have children who were insecure-avoidant: these children avoided their mother.

These illustrations show that children organize their behaviour according to what they expect to happen. Their behaviour is contingent upon the response that they come to expect from a caregiver. Children learn to anticipate punishment or praise, or neither or both. They learn to do what it takes to feel safe and secure, whether that means seeking out a caregiver or avoiding a caregiver, or shutting out feelings towards a caregiver.

There is some evidence that patterns established early in infancy with parents influence future relationships with peers (Ainsworth, 1982; Main & Weston, 1981; Sroufe, 1983; Cassidy, 1988). Adolescent-family interactions have been found to predict attachment style ten years later (Allen & Hauser, 1991). Retrospective studies show continuity between remembered childhood attachment experiences and adult-adult relationships (Main & Goldwyn, 1988). However, retrospective studies do not provide the same continuity of attachment that longitudinal studies do and no longitudinal studies have been done from infancy to adulthood.

Intergenerational studies show that a caregiver's internal model of attachment also influences how s/he

behaves as an attachment figure towards his or her own child (Ricks, 1985). As well, a child's attachment style can be predicted from a caregiver's attachment style measured before the child is born (Fonagy, Steele & Steele, 1991; Ward & Carlson, 1991). In one intergenerational study, prenatal attachment measures of mothers-to-be predicted both the child's attachment style and the maternal grandmother's attachment style (Benoit, Vidovic & Roman, 1991).

To summarize, our childhood attachment experiences with caregivers shape our contingency beliefs and thus influence our adult attachment behaviours.

Styles of Attachment

Various systems have been developed for capturing variations in adult attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Main & Goldwyn, 1988). Bartholomew's (1990) model identifies four traitlike interactional styles of adult attachment: secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing. These styles are defined as prototypic and individuals are not expected to be categorized as one or another. Rather, people are measured on a continuum for each style. In studies, the prototype most closely matched determines the label given. It should be noted, however, that it is highly unlikely that someone would receive the maximum score in one category and the minimum score in the other three categories.

Secure. Bartholomew's (1990) model proposes that securely attached individuals have a positive view of themselves (a positive self model) which shows in their high sense of self-esteem. As well, they have a positive view of how others will behave towards them and believe that others will be responsive and meet their needs (a positive other model) (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

It is likely that securely attached people have contingency beliefs such that they expect the presence of a positive outcome. Therefore, when distressed, securely attached people seek comfort from others, which is referred to as having an approach orientation.

Fearful. Bartholomew's (1990) model proposes that those individuals who have a fearful style of attachment have both a negative view of themselves (a negative self model) and a negative view of how others respond to them (a negative others model). They have a low sense of self-esteem. Although they desire closeness, they avoid intimacy for fear of rejection, which is observed as an avoidance orientation (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Fearfully attached people may believe that they do not meet their caregivers' expectations (the outcome contingency) and expect rejection or punishment (the presence of a negative outcome). Some fearful people may have learned that they never will meet expectations: the outcome is not contingent upon their

behaviour as they will be rejected regardless. Still, they desire connection with others.

Preoccupied. Bartholomew's (1990) model proposes that those people who are preoccupied with attachment have a negative view of themselves (a negative self model) which shows in their low sense of self-esteem. However, they have a positive view of how others might treat them (a positive other model) (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

It is likely that the contingency beliefs held by people with a preoccupied style of attachment are that if they meet expectations, they will receive love. However, their negative self model suggests that they do not believe that they will meet expectations, and their ultimate contingency belief is that love will be withdrawn. They may have experienced the presence of positive outcomes, although inconsistently, and may have experienced the absence of positive outcomes (love withdrawal) when failing to meet expectations. Thus, people with a preoccupied attachment style have an approach orientation, seeking others when distressed, hoping to have their needs met, but not ultimately expecting to have their needs met.

Dismissing. Finally, Bartholomew's (1990) model proposes that those who are dismissing of attachment have a positive view of themselves (a positive self model) and a

negative view of how others respond to them (a negative other model). They appear to have a high sense of self-esteem which may border on arrogance. They are emphatically independent, preferring to be alone in stressful situations, displaying an avoidance orientation (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Those who are dismissing of attachment may hold the outcome contingency belief that they will be punished if they do not meet the expectations of their caregivers. However, by meeting expectations and avoiding others, dismissing people can avoid punishment, and so may come to expect the absence of negative outcomes. Others, then, are seen as not offering anything, positive or negative.

Development of Attachment Styles

Although Bartholomew's (1990) model identifies four attachment styles, Bretherton (p.14, 1985) reminds us that "the manner in which early patterns of interaction with attachment figures come to be organized into more traitlike interactional styles is not yet completely clear".

Consequences of interaction have also been investigated through research on adults in terms of self-representations. Self-discrepancy theory is an area where investigators have addressed the issue of early and sustained parental contingencies (Moretti & Higgins, 1990). This theory stresses that it is learned contingencies that play the most

important role in the development of beliefs about the self and others.

In the next section, aspects of self-discrepancy theory that are relevant to attachment will be reviewed.

Self-Discrepancy Theory

Self-discrepancy theory suggests that we have internalized schematic representations of the self which guide our behaviour (Higgins, 1987; Moretti and Higgins, 1988). The self consists of a system of representations, some of which function as reference points in the process of self-evaluation. Individuals evaluate their perception of themselves, their behaviour and their performance by comparing their behaviour to desired self-representations. In this way, desired self-representations function as standards for self-evaluation.

Properties of Self-Discrepancies. The first domain of self-discrepancy theory focuses on two types of desired self-representations: ideal-self-representations constitute hopes and wishes for the self and ought-self-representations reflect the duties and obligations of the self. These desired self-representations act as guides. The difference between where one believes one stands in relation to one's guide is a self-discrepancy.

A second domain of desired self-representations is whether they are considered by the individual to be desired by oneself or by others. It is this domain of self-discrepancies that is focused on particularly in this study as follows:

Actual:Own Self-Discrepancy = "the difference between who I believe I am and who I desire to be"

Actual:Other Self-Discrepancy = "the difference between who I believe I am and who I believe others desire me to be"

Self-discrepancy theory assumes that self-representations are organized in memory as cognitive structures that represent the relationship between actual-self and desired-self attributes (Higgins, 1987; Van Hook & Higgins, 1988; Strauman, 1989; Strauman & Higgins, 1987). Self-discrepancies are thought to be stable, internal representations that guide information processing. Like other cognitive structures, self-discrepancies must be available, accessible and applicable to influence the processing of self-relevant information. Like other cognitive structures, such as working models of attachment, self-discrepancies can influence information processing automatically, without intention or awareness. Once activated, discrepancies automatically focus conscious attention and direct encoding, identification,

interpretation and memory for self-related information (Bargh, Bond, Lombardi & Tota, 1986; Higgins, 1987).

Self-discrepancy theory postulates that people are motivated to reach a condition where their actual-self matches their desired-self (Higgins, 1987). Perceived discrepancies are thought to cause psychological distress. In order to decrease this distress, individuals are motivated to change their behaviour to meet their standards, thereby reducing the discrepancy. The greater the discrepancy is between two self-representations, the greater is the intensity of psychological discomfort and thus the more the individual will be motivated to reduce the discrepancy (Higgins, 1987).

Development of Self-Discrepancies

Self structures have their beginnings in infancy, when contingencies are first encountered (Higgins, 1989; Moretti & Higgins, 1990). Children perceive that different behaviours result in different responses from caregivers. Children learn that if they behave in a certain way, they can expect the presence of a positive outcome (love), the absence of a positive outcome (love withdrawal), the presence of a negative outcome (punishment) or the absence of a negative outcome (punishment withdrawal or no punishment). These four outcomes are contingent on children's behaviour.

As children mature, they are able to link their psychological situation to social contingencies in a more sophisticated manner (Moretti & Higgins, 1990). They believe, "If I do behaviour X, it means that I am an X person. Other people believe that it is good/bad for me to be X and will respond to me with behaviour Y. This will put me in psychological situation Z."

For example, "If I share my toys, it means that I am a kind person. Other people believe that it is good for me to be kind and will respond to me with love (presence of positive outcome) or punishment withdrawal (absence of negative outcome). This will make me happy or calm."

However, "If I hoard my toys, it means that I am a selfish person. Other people believe that it is bad for me to be selfish and will respond to me with love withdrawal (absence of a positive outcome) or punishment (presence of a negative outcome). This will make me sad or fearful."

Therefore, the individual's psychological situation is contingent upon the response of others which is contingent upon the individual's behaviour. This chain leads to a child learning to approach or avoid people, depending on their response to the child's actions.

For example, if a child is distressed, and the caregivers respond with hugs, nurturance and attention, the child will feel happy and loved. If the caregivers withdraw their love, the child will feel lost, abandoned and sad.

This child learns to focus on the presence or absence of positive outcomes (being nurtured). The contingency belief here is, "If I meet my caregivers' expectations, I will receive love. If I do not, love will be withdrawn." When distressed, this child learns to seek others for comfort and eventually an approach orientation develops. Thus, it is likely that secure and preoccupied attachment stem from positive outcome contingency beliefs.

On the other hand, if a child is distressed, and the caregivers respond with criticism and punishment, the child will feel threatened, nervous and worried. When the caregivers leave the child alone, the child will calm down and relax. This child learns to focus on the presence or absence of negative outcomes (being punished). The contingency belief here is, "If I meet my caregivers' expectations, I will not be punished. If I do not meet the expectations, I will be punished." When distressed, this child learns to avoid people and eventually an avoidance orientation develops. Thus, it is likely that fearful and dismissing attachment develop from negative outcome contingency beliefs.

The contingency belief "If I meet my caregivers' expectations, Y will happen" is generalized by the older child to "If my features match those desired, Y will happen", along with which comes the belief "My features do

(or do not) match." When it is believed that the features do not match the guide, a self-discrepancy exists.

Development of Self-Discrepancies in Conjunction With Styles of Attachment

According to Moretti and Higgins (1990), the development of types of self-guides and self-discrepancies stems from "(1) whether parents are oriented toward identifying and responding to the child's features that *match* or *do not match* their guides for the child, and (2) whether parents are oriented toward *positive outcomes (absent or present)* for their child or toward *negative outcomes (absent or present)* for their child" (p.303; italics added). When children experience positive outcomes, they will adopt an approach orientation. In contrast, negative outcomes are related to an avoidance orientation.

I will now explore the four types of caregiving by looking at the motivational dimension, approach and avoidance, and the dimension of whether the child's features match or do not match the parents' guides. In exploring the caregiving, I will show how the development of self-guides and self-discrepancies is related to the development of attachment styles.

Approach Orientation

Child's behaviours match parental guides. If the balance of a parent-child relationship 1) focuses on the behaviours of a child that *match* the guides that a caregiver has for a child and 2) is oriented towards *positive* outcomes, the response will be the *presence of a positive outcome* for a child (nurturance). If a child is consistently exposed to this situation, a child is likely to develop contingency beliefs where s/he expects the presence of a positive outcome, and will have an *approach* orientation when distressed. A child in this situation is most likely to have a *positive view of the self* and a *positive view of how others will behave* (*secure attachment*). A focus on matching parental guides may lead to *low actual:own discrepancy* and *low actual:parental discrepancy*.

Thus, a secure attachment style was predicted to correlate negatively with both *actual:own discrepancy* and *actual:parental discrepancy*.

Child's behaviours do not match parental guides. If the balance of a parent-child relationship 1) focuses on the behaviours of a child that *do not match* the desired guides that a caregiver has for a child and 2) is oriented towards *positive* outcomes, the response will be the *absence of a positive outcome* for a child (*love withdrawal*). If a child is typically in this situation, but on some occasions a

match occurs and a child receives a positive outcome, a child may attempt to modulate him/herself to get a match response. Such a child may wish to receive parental love and affection but may become focused or preoccupied with the possibility of losing parental love and affection. Thus, variability in caregiver response may lead to action (approach) not otherwise expected. A child exposed to this situation may have an *approach* orientation with the hope of the presence, but with the expectation of the absence, of positive outcomes. With an emphasis on behaviours that mismatch a caregiver's guide, such a child is likely to have a *negative view of the self* and a *positive view of how others might behave*, if only the child could measure up. A focus on mismatching parental guides may lead to *high actual:own discrepancy* and *high actual:parental discrepancy*. However, in modulating one's behaviour to fit parental expectations, actual:parental discrepancy may be reduced.

Thus, a preoccupied attachment style was predicted to correlate positively with actual:own discrepancy. No correlation was predicted between preoccupied attachment and actual:parental discrepancy.

Avoidance Orientation

Child's behaviours match parental guides. If the balance of a parent-child relationship 1) focuses on the behaviours of a child that *match* the guides that a caregiver

has for a child and 2) is oriented towards *negative* outcomes, the response will be the *absence of a negative outcome* for a child (punishment withdrawal). Such a child's safest action is to avoid a caregiver. In other words, a child in this situation anticipates meeting expectations and receiving nothing (no nurturance and no punishment) which is the contingency belief of the absence of negative outcomes and no hope of positive outcomes. On the occasions when a mismatch occurs, a child in this situation is punished, and therefore develops a *negative view of how others behave* along with an *avoidance* orientation. With the emphasis on behaviours that match a caregiver's guides, children may develop a *positive view of the self* and *low actual:own discrepancy*. A *dismissing attachment style* is predicted. It is noted that "dismissing [individuals minimize] the subjective awareness of distress or social needs that might activate the desire for close attachments" (Bartholomew, 1990, p.174). In the same way, dismissing individuals may minimize the relationship between meeting others' standards and close attachments. Dismissing attachment may therefore not be related to actual:parental discrepancy. In other words, parental discrepancy could be high or it could be low but would not reflect dismissing attachment.

Thus, a dismissing attachment style was predicted to correlate negatively with actual:own discrepancy. It was

also predicted that there would be no correlation between dismissing attachment and parental attachment.

Child's behaviours do not match parental guides.

Finally, if the balance of a parent-child relationship 1) focuses on the behaviours of a child that *do not match* the guides that a caregiver has for a child and 2) is oriented towards *negative* outcomes, the response will be the *presence of a negative outcome* for a child (punishment). If a child is typically in this situation, but on some occasions a match occurs and a child experiences the absence of a negative outcome (punishment withdrawal), a child may attempt to modulate him/herself to get a match response. Such a child may have an *avoidance* orientation with the hope of the absence but the expectation of the presence of negative outcomes. A child in this situation may develop a *negative view of the self* and a *negative view of how others behave* (*fearful attachment*). A focus on mismatching parental guides may lead to *high actual:own discrepancy* and *high actual:parental discrepancy*.

Thus, a fearful attachment style was predicted to correlate positively with both *actual:own discrepancy* and *actual:parental discrepancy*.

Summary of Hypotheses

I have discussed how children organize their behaviour and knowledge of relationships according to what they come to expect from the world and how they feel about themselves. These models of others and the self are carried forward into adult attachment relationships. It is through a series of beliefs about contingencies that both attachment style and self-representations (and therefore self-discrepancies) are formed. This notion is reflected in the predictions which are summarized as follows:

Secure. Specifically, a negative correlation between secure attachment and actual:own discrepancy was predicted. As well, a negative correlation between secure attachment and actual:parental discrepancy was predicted.

Fearful. A positive correlation between fearful attachment and actual:own discrepancy was predicted. As well, a positive correlation between fearful attachment and actual:parental discrepancy was predicted.

Preoccupied. A positive correlation between preoccupied attachment and actual:own discrepancy was predicted. No correlation was predicted for preoccupied attachment and actual:parental discrepancy.

Dismissing. A negative correlation between dismissing attachment and actual:own discrepancy was predicted. As well, it was predicted that there would be no correlation of dismissing attachment with actual:parental discrepancy.

Method

Subjects

Fifty-five first-year students at Simon Fraser University were given course credit in return for participation. Of this sample, 75% were born in Canada, 13% were born in Asia, and 12% were born elsewhere. Seventy-eight percent of subjects were Caucasian, 11% were Asian, 7% were South Asian and 4% were Hispanic. Their ages ranged from 18 years to 34 years, with a mean of 21.3 years. There were 26 (47%) females and 29 (53%) males. Eighty percent of the subjects had parents who were together while 20% of the subjects (26% of the Caucasians) had parents who were either separated or divorced. None of the non-Caucasians had parents who were separated or divorced.

Procedures

A notice was posted asking first-year psychology students to participate in a study in which they would be interviewed and would complete a set of questionnaires in exchange for course credit.

First, subjects completed the Selves Questionnaire (Selves), along with the Symptoms Checklist and a contingency questionnaire (see Appendix A). Next, the Family Attachment Interview (FAI) was administered and audiotaped. Subjects were then debriefed by the interviewer.

Measures

The Selves Questionnaire (Higgins, Bond, Klein & Strauman, 1986). This measure of self-discrepancy asks subjects to spontaneously list the attributes associated with several of their self-representations. Subjects are asked to list up to ten traits for the actual-self and each of the following desired-self-representations:

1) Actual-Self (traits one believes one actually possess)

Desired self-representations include:

2) Ideal-Own-Self (traits subject ideally hopes or wishes to possess)

3) Ought-Own-Self (traits subject think subject should possess)

As well, subjects are asked to generate two sets of traits for each of their mother and father:

4) Ideal-Other-Self(mother) (traits subject thinks mother ideally wishes subject possessed)

5) Ideal-Other-Self(father) (traits subject thinks father ideally wishes subject possessed)

6) Ought-Other-Self(mother) (traits subject thinks mother believes subject should possess)

7) Ought-Other-Self(father) (traits subject thinks father believes subject should possess)

Subjects rate the extent to which they believe they possess each attribute for the actual-self-representation and the extent to which they desire, or the "other" desires

them, to possess each attribute for the desired-self-representations using a four-point rating scale ranging from 1 (slightly) to 4 (extremely).

Discrepancy scores are calculated by comparing the attributes in each of the desired self-representations to the attributes in the actual-self. Attributes are classified into four categories:

- 1) match: identical or synonymous attributes differ in their extent ratings by not more than one point
- 2) synonymous mismatch: identical or synonymous attributes differ in their extent ratings by two or more points
- 3) antonymous mismatch: the attributes listed are antonyms
- 4) non-match: the attribute listed in the desired self-representation was not listed in the actual-self.

Synonyms and antonyms are operationalized using Roget's Thesaurus.

The ideal and ought discrepancy scores were combined for each of actual:own, actual:other(mother) and actual:other(father).

A coder scored the Selves Questionnaire to calculate the number of matches, antonymous and synonymous mismatches and nonmatches which ultimately determine scores for actual-self:own-guide discrepancy, actual-self:mother-guide discrepancy and actual-self:father-guide discrepancy. She had already achieved inter-rater reliability of 95.2% and 98.8% on a separate set of data.

The Family Attachment Interview (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). This structured interview consists of a series of questions designed to explore adults' representations of their childhood attachment experiences. It includes questions regarding the subject's childhood reactions to rejection and separation from the caregivers. Subjects are asked to describe how these experiences have influenced them. As well, subjects evaluate their relationships with their caregivers in the past and at present.

The focus in scoring is not based on the experiences alone, but on the coherence and idealization with which the subject remembers the interactions. A qualified coder listened to each of the audiotaped interviews to assign scores to subjects for 42 adjectives, including the four attachment categories: secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing. To determine inter-rater reliability, a subset of 15 audiotaped interviews was randomly selected from this current set of 55 interviews. Over 83% of the attachment ratings from the main coder were within one point of the ratings from the second coder, while 95% were within two points. Scores for the main coder were correlated at .83 with scores from the second coder, which concurs with Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) family ratings reliability, which ranged from .75 to .86.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

To determine whether the sample was comparable on discrepancy and attachment scores to published research, the distribution of scores in the sample was examined.

Discrepancy scores. Actual-self:own-guide discrepancy, actual-self:mother-guide discrepancy (mother) and actual-self:father-guide discrepancy (father) were all within acceptable ranges, and were similar to a previous sample of actual-self:ideal-guide discrepancy scores ($M=-.90$, $SD=5.03$) (Moretti & Higgins, 1990). Means and standard deviations of discrepancy scores are listed in Table 1.

The intercorrelations of the discrepancy variables were examined and significant positive correlations were found for own discrepancy with mother discrepancy, own discrepancy with father discrepancy and mother discrepancy with father discrepancy (see Table 2). These correlations are comparable to those reported by Moretti, Carswell and Higgins (1993).

Attachment scores. The means and standard deviations for secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing styles of attachment are comparable to those reported by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). Means and standard deviations of attachment scores are listed in Table 3.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Discrepancy Scores

<u>Discrepancy</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Own	-.80	2.60	55
Mother	-.87	1.95	54
Father	-.90	1.98	52

Table 2

Zero-order Correlations Between Self-Discrepancy Scores

Discrepancy	Own	Mother	Father
Own	1.00	.41**	.52**
Mother		1.00	.57**
Father			1.00

** $p < .01$

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Scores

<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Secure	4.42	1.88	55
Fearful	2.84	1.93	55
Preoccupied	3.64	2.08	55
Dismissing	2.15	1.42	55

Another way of examining attachment scores that is frequently used in attachment literature is to look at attachment in a categorical, prototypical way. The highest of the four ratings for a subject is considered to be the best-fitting category for that subject. Using this procedure, 45.5% of the sample was classified as secure, 23.6% as fearful, 23.6% as preoccupied and 7.3% as dismissing. This distribution is not dissimilar to that reported by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991): 47% secure, 21% fearful, 14% preoccupied and 18% dismissing. The frequencies of attachment style prototypes are listed in Table 4.

Next, the intercorrelations of the attachment variables were determined. Because secure attachment (positive self model, positive other model) is defined in opposition to fearful attachment (negative self model, negative other model), it was expected that they would be negatively correlated, and they were ($r(55) = -.64, p < .01$). For the same reason, preoccupied attachment (negative self model, positive other model) and dismissing attachment (positive self model, negative other model) were expected to be negatively correlated, and they were ($r(55) = -.57, p < .01$). These correlations are consistent with those of Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), who found that secure attachment was negatively correlated with fearful attachment ($r(75) = -.55,$

Table 4

Frequencies of Prototypic Attachment Styles

<u>Prototype</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Secure	25	45.5
Fearful	13	23.6
Preoccupied	13	23.6
Dismissing	4	7.3

$p < .001$) and preoccupied attachment was negatively correlated with dismissing attachment ($r(75) = -.50, p < .001$). However, whereas Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) found non-significant or low negative correlations for the other pairings, in the present sample secure attachment was found to be significantly negatively correlated with preoccupied attachment ($r(55) = -.53, p < .01$). Zero-order correlations for styles of attachment are listed in Table 5.

Because of this difference in intercorrelations, the attachment subscales were examined *post hoc* to determine whether the attachment ratings were correlated in expected directions with their subscales. With few exceptions, subscales correlated with attachment ratings as theoretically expected, thereby supporting the decision to continue using these ratings for analysis (see Table 6).

Self-Discrepancy Patterns in Attachment Styles

A relationship between self-discrepancy patterns and attachment styles was expected. Specifically, own discrepancy was predicted to be negatively correlated with secure and dismissing attachment and positively correlated with fearful and preoccupied attachment. As well, parental discrepancy was predicted to be negatively correlated with secure discrepancy and positively correlated with fearful discrepancy. Parental discrepancy was predicted to have no correlation with dismissing attachment.

Table 5

Zero-order Correlations Between Styles of Attachment

Style	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Secure	1.00	-.64**	-.53**	-.07
Fearful		1.00	.12	-.04
Preoccupied			1.00	-.57**
Dismissing				1.00

**p<.01

Table 6

Correlations of Main Scales of Attachment with Attachment Subscales

<u>Subscale</u>		<u>Secure</u>	<u>Fearful</u>	<u>Preoccupied</u>	<u>Dismissing</u>
Acceptance	Mother	.61**	-.51**	-.26	-.05
	Father	.44**	-.51**	-.04	-.10
Rejection	Mother	-.64**	.55	.45	-.12
	Father	-.55**	.69**	.30	-.09
Neglect	Mother	-.13	.10	.03	.07
	Father	-.29	.12	.10	.02
Consistency	Mother	.46**	-.38**	-.35**	.04
	Father	.47**	-.37**	-.34**	-.08
Push to Achievement	Mother	-.34**	.32*	.16	-.04
	Father	-.40**	.39**	.03	.07

Table 6 (continued)

Correlations of Main Scales of Attachment with Attachment Subscales

<u>Subscale</u>		<u>Secure</u>	<u>Fearful</u>	<u>Preoccupied</u>	<u>Dismissing</u>
Role Reversal	Mother	-.31**	.02	.37**	-.20
	Father	-.02	-.10	.10	.00
Anger	Mother	-.50**	.40**	.36**	-.07
	Father	-.13	.21	-.03	.01
Idealization	Mother	-.39**	.00	.28*	.09
	Father	-.57**	.10	.39*	.15
Proximity	Mother	.21	-.32*	.34*	-.41**
	Father	.37**	-.30*	.12	-.26
Dominance	Mother	-.19	.20	.02	.09
	Father	-.19	.26	.09	-.09
Closeness	Mother	.46**	-.37**	.08	-.42**
	Father	.35**	-.47**	.19	-.42**

Table 6 (continued)

Correlations of Main Scales of Attachment with Attachment Subscales

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Secure</u>	<u>Fearful</u>	<u>Preoccupied</u>	<u>Dismissing</u>
Quality				
Mother	.77**	-.59**	-.43**	-.03
Father	.68**	-.49**	-.43**	.07
Identification				
Mother	.45**	-.45	-.21	-.06
Father	-.07	-.12	.10	.03
Elaboration	.14	.12	.28*	-.38**
Coherence	.68*	-.15	-.37**	-.23
Don't Remember	-.21	-.07	.00	.28*
Laughter	-.17	-.10	.37**	-.07
Separation Anxiety	-.16	.04	.59**	-.49**
Self-Confidence	.77**	-.72**	-.52**	.26

~p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01

To test these hypotheses, actual-self:own-guide, actual-self:mother-guide and actual-self:father-guide discrepancies were correlated with secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles. The results are listed in Table 7.

The pattern of results was consistent with predictions for own discrepancy and attachment but failed to reach significance. As predicted, results indicated that secure attachment was significantly negatively correlated with mother discrepancy ($r = -.27, p < .05$). Also as predicted, dismissing attachment did not correlate with either mother or father discrepancy.

At this point, no other predictions were confirmed. However, as high zero-order correlations were noted between pairs of discrepancies (see Table 2), it was necessary to control for the shared relationship among the discrepancy variables to determine the unique relationship between discrepancy and attachment variables.

The relationship between self-discrepancy and attachment styles became clearer when correlational analyses were conducted to determine the unique contribution of residualized own discrepancy (own discrepancy controlling for its relationship with mother and father discrepancy), residualized mother discrepancy (controlling for its

Table 7

Correlations Between Styles of Attachment and Discrepancies

Attachment Style	<u>Discrepancy</u>		
	Own	Mother	Father
Secure	-.21	-.27*	.10
Fearful	.21	.24	.01
Preoccupied	.26	.15	-.02
Dismissing	-.21	.06	-.02

* $p < .05$

relationship with own and father discrepancy) and residualized father discrepancy (controlling for its relationship with own and mother discrepancy) to attachment style. Correlations are listed in Table 8.

Relationship of secure attachment to discrepancies.

Residualized own discrepancy correlated negatively with secure attachment in the direction predicted at a marginally significant level ($r = -.21$, $p < .10$). As hypothesized, it was found that residualized mother discrepancy correlated negatively with secure attachment ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$). However, it was surprising to find that residualized father discrepancy correlated positively with secure attachment opposite to the direction predicted ($r = .41$, $p < .01$).

A Williams t-test for two dependent r's showed that there was a significant difference between the correlation of secure attachment with residualized mother discrepancy and the correlation of secure attachment with residualized father discrepancy ($t = 14.96$, $p < .001$).

Relationship of fearful attachment to discrepancies.

Residualized own discrepancy was not significantly correlated with fearful attachment. As predicted, residualized mother discrepancy correlated positively with fearful attachment ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). Contrary to predictions, residualized father discrepancy was negatively correlated

Table 8

Correlations Between Styles of Attachment and Residualized Discrepancies

Attachment Style	<u>Residualized Discrepancy</u>		
	Own	Mother	Father
Secure	-.21 [~]	-.43**	.41**
Fearful	.16	.30*	-.23 [~]
Preoccupied	.29*	.23 [~]	-.28*
Dismissing	-.29*	.11	.06

[~]p<.10

*p<.05

**p<.01

with fearful attachment at a marginally significant level ($\underline{r}=-.23, p<.10$).

A Williams t-test for two dependent r's showed that there was a significant difference between the correlation of fearful attachment with residualized mother discrepancy and the correlation of fearful attachment with residualized father discrepancy ($\underline{t}=4.88, p<.001$).

Relationship of preoccupied attachment to discrepancies.

As predicted, preoccupied attachment correlated positively with residualized own discrepancy ($\underline{r}=.29, p<.05$). While not predicted, *post hoc* analyses revealed that residualized mother discrepancy correlated positively with preoccupied attachment at a marginally significant level ($\underline{r}=.23, p<.10$), while residualized father discrepancy correlated negatively with preoccupied attachment ($\underline{r}=-.28, p<.05$).

A Williams t-test for two dependent r's showed that there was a significant difference between the correlation of preoccupied attachment with residualized mother discrepancy and the correlation of preoccupied attachment with residualized father discrepancy ($\underline{t}=4.61, p<.001$).

Relationship of dismissing attachment to discrepancies.

As predicted, own discrepancy correlated negatively with dismissing attachment ($\underline{r}=-.29, p<.05$). Also as predicted,

dismissing attachment did not correlate with either mother discrepancy ($r=.11$) or father discrepancy ($r=.06$).

Relationship of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Attachment

At this point, possible additive and interactive contributions of variables were examined. Analyses were conducted by entering residualized mother discrepancy, residualized father discrepancy and residualized mother by father discrepancy interaction into a hierarchical regression with attachment as the dependent variable. In a second analysis, residualized father discrepancy was entered followed by residualized mother discrepancy to see if order of entry made a difference.

Additive effects were found for secure attachment (see Table 9). When residualized mother discrepancy was entered a significant correlation was obtained ($R=-.43$). When residualized father discrepancy was additionally entered, again a significant correlation was obtained ($R=.50$). The reverse analysis showed that when residualized father discrepancy was entered with secure attachment, a significant correlation was obtained ($R=.41$) and when residualized mother discrepancy was additionally entered, again a significant correlation was obtained ($R=.50$).

Table 9

Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Secure Attachment as the Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable: Secure Attachment

<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>R² Change</u>	<u>F Change</u>
Mother Discrepancy	.43	.19	.19	11.64***
Father Discrepancy	.50	.25	.06	3.88*
Mother x Father	.50	.25	.00	.09
Father Discrepancy	.41	.17	.17	10.27***
Mother Discrepancy	.50	.25	.08	5.09*

*p<.05 ***p<.001

Table 10

Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Fearful Attachment as the Dependent Variable

Predictor Variables	Dependent Variable: Fearful Attachment			
	R	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Mother Discrepancy	.30	.09	.09	4.99*
Father Discrepancy	.32	.10	.01	.45
Mother x Father	.33	.11	.01	.53
Father Discrepancy	.23	.05	.05	2.74
Mother Discrepancy	.32	.10	.05	2.71

*p<.05

Table 11

Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Preoccupied Attachment as the Dependent Variable

Predictor Variables	Dependent Variable: Preoccupied Attachment		
	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>F Change</u>
Mother Discrepancy	.23	.05	2.88~
Father Discrepancy	.31	.09	2.10
Mother x Father	.31	.09	.02
Father Discrepancy	.28	.08	4.28*
Mother Discrepancy	.31	.09	.79

~p<.10 *p<.05

Table 12

Summary of Regression Analysis of Mother by Father Discrepancy Interaction with Dismissing Attachment as the Dependent Variable

Predictor Variables	Dependent Variable: Dismissing Attachment			
	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>R² Change</u>	<u>F Change</u>
Mother Discrepancy	.12	.01	.01	.70
Father Discrepancy	.17	.03	.01	.75
Mother x Father	.18	.03	.00	.11
Father Discrepancy	.06	.00	.00	.16
Mother Discrepancy	.17	.03	.03	1.28

No additive effects were found for fearful, preoccupied or dismissing attachment (see Tables 10, 11 and 12).

No significant interaction was found for any of the attachment styles (see Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12).

Sex Differences

Although no specific hypotheses were made regarding sex differences, separate exploratory analyses were run *post hoc* for males and females as sex differences have been found in both discrepancy research (Rein, 1993) and attachment research (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Residualized own discrepancy, mother discrepancy and father discrepancy were entered and correlated with attachment styles for males and females separately. These correlations are listed in Table 13.

Four correlations appeared to show sex differences, specifically fearful attachment/mother discrepancy ($r=.38$, $p<.05$ for males; $r=.20$, $p>.10$ for females), preoccupied attachment/own discrepancy ($r=.42$, $p<.05$ for males; $r=.06$, $p>.10$ for females), preoccupied attachment/mother discrepancy ($r=.16$, $p>.10$ for males; $r=.29$, $p>.10$ for females) and dismissing attachment/own discrepancy ($r=-.36$, $p<.10$ for males; $r=-.14$, $p>.10$ for females). However, Fisher t-tests for two independent correlations determined that there were no significant sex differences for any of these combinations.

Table 13

Regression Correlations Between Attachment Styles and Residualized Discrepancies for Males and Females

Attachment	<u>Residualized Discrepancy</u>					
	<u>Own</u>		<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Secure	-.24	-.14	-.36 [~]	-.48*	.37 [~]	.43*
Fearful	.13	.18	.38*	.20	-.23	-.25
Preoccupied	.42*	.06	.16	.29	-.28	-.21
Dismissing	-.36 [~]	-.14	.17	.08	.00	.07

[~]p<.10 *p<.05

Males: n=29 Females: n=26

Bold indicates those correlations tested for sex differences.
Fisher t-test showed no significant differences.

Relationship Between Parental Discrepancies and Attachment Subscales

In an attempt to understand why secure attachment was negatively correlated with residualized mother discrepancy and positively correlated with residualized father discrepancy, attachment subscales were correlated with parental discrepancies for *post hoc* analysis. The nature of the relationship with mother versus the nature of the relationship with father was then examined. Correlations between attachment subscales and nonresidualized discrepancies are listed in Table 14 while correlations between attachment subscales and residualized discrepancies are listed in Table 15.

As may be expected, low residualized mother discrepancy was significantly associated with such features as high acceptance by mother, present closeness of mother, high quality of childhood with mother and identification with mother. It is interesting to note that the father/offspring relationship is also correlated with mother discrepancy. Low residualized mother discrepancy is associated with high acceptance by father, high consistency of father, present closeness of father and a high quality of childhood with father.

Unexpectedly, high residualized father discrepancy was associated with high consistency of father, high quality of childhood with father and coherence as well as low rejection

Table 14

Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Nonresidualized Discrepancies

Attachment Subscales		<u>Discrepancies</u>	
		Mother	Father
Acceptance	Mother	-.34*	.09
	Father	-.41**	-.08
Rejection	Mother	.14	-.07
	Father	.33*	-.03
Neglect	Mother	.06	.06
	Father	.30	.02
Consistency	Mother	-.14	.00
	Father	-.27*	.14
Expressiveness	Mother	-.19	-.12
	Father	.07	-.17
Push to Achievement			
	Mother	-.03	-.22
	Father	.08	-.13
Role Reversal	Mother	.15	-.09
	Father	.29*	-.06

Table 14 (continued)

Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Nonresidualized Discrepancies

Attachment Subscales		<u>Discrepancies</u>	
		Mother	Father
Anger	Mother	.14	-.10
	Father	.30*	-.09
Idealization	Mother	.05	-.12
	Father	.06	-.17
Proximity	Mother	.02	.19
	Father	-.10	.08
Dominance	Mother	-.11	-.15
	Father	.15	-.11
Closeness	Mother	-.19	.09
	Father	-.41**	-.14
Quality	Mother	-.38**	-.05
	Father	-.37**	.11
Identification	Mother	-.36*	.03
	Father	-.02	-.15
Elaboration		.07	.11
Coherence		-.06	.18
Separation Anxiety		-.09	-.23
Self-Confidence		-.27	-.06

~p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01

Table 15

Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Residualized Discrepancies

Attachment Subscales		<u>Discrepancies</u>	
		Mother	Father
Acceptance	Mother	-.42**	.12
	Father	-.34*	.17
Rejection	Mother	.24	-.28*
	Father	.37**	-.31*
Neglect	Mother	.04	.03
	Father	.21	-.13
Consistency	Mother	-.12	.20
	Father	-.31*	.39
Expressiveness	Mother	-.14	-.08
	Father	.18	-.31*
Push to Achievement			
	Mother	.07	-.27
	Father	.19	-.29*
Role Reversal	Mother	.16	-.27
	Father	.24	-.17

Table 15 (continued)

Correlations Between Attachment Subscales and Residualized Discrepancies

Attachment Subscales		<u>Discrepancies</u>	
		Mother	Father
Anger	Mother	.25	-.29*
	Father	.22	-.27
Idealization	Mother	.16	-.17
	Father	.24	-.31*
Proximity	Mother	-.06	.11
	Father	-.10	.15
Dominance	Mother	-.09	-.21
	Father	.13	-.37**
Closeness	Mother	-.35*	.16
	Father	-.30*	.07
Quality	Mother	-.42**	.23
	Father	-.46**	.38**
Identification	Mother	-.42**	.23
	Father	.14	-.22
Elaboration		.07	.00
Coherence		-.17	.28*
Separation Anxiety		.02	-.33*
Self-Confidence		-.31*	.22

~p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01

by father and low dominance by father. Thus, a belief that one is not living up to a father's standards may be a reflection of a healthy father/offspring relationship. As well, high rejection by mother and high anger with mother is associated with low father discrepancy. Thus, a child may turn to father and try to meet his standards if rejected by mother. These *post hoc* analyses were not adjusted for the number of correlations run, however, and should be interpreted with caution.

Discussion

Results confirmed a relationship between self-discrepancy and attachment styles. As predicted, secure and dismissing attachment were associated with low actual-self:own-guide discrepancy while preoccupied and fearful attachment were associated with high actual-self:own-guide discrepancy once the discrepancies had been residualized. Interestingly, a different pattern of results emerged for attachment and actual-self:mother-guide discrepancy versus actual-self:father-guide discrepancy. Secure attachment was associated with low actual-self:mother-guide discrepancy but high actual-self:father-guide discrepancy. Preoccupied and fearful attachment were associated with high actual-self:mother-guide discrepancy and low actual-self:father-guide discrepancy. Dismissing attachment, as predicted, was not associated with either mother or father discrepancy. However, one cannot hypothesize the null hypothesis (i.e. no correlation between two variables), find a non-significant result and assert that one has confirmed the null. Therefore, the results for the correlation between dismissing attachment and parental discrepancy are inconclusive.

Why is it that those who are more secure see themselves as living up to their mother's standards, while less secure

attachment is associated with meeting their father's standards?

Perhaps mothers and fathers are playing different roles. In our cultural context, a father's high standards may represent engaged involvement with a child. It may signify that a father is giving guidance to a child. A father's high standards may mean to a child "My father cares. My father is not neglectful." Because mothers seem to be ascribed the role of giving unconditional love, a mother's high standards, in contrast, may mean to a child "My mother rejects me."

Thus, perhaps due to the differing roles of parenting, the meaning of discrepancy in relation to attachment differs for mother-guides and father-guides. To further explore this possibility, a coder, who was blind to the *post hoc* hypothesis that different parental roles affect the correlation of attachment with parental discrepancy, rated eight of the audiotaped interviews with the following question in mind: "In what ways was the subject in relationship to the parents? Write down examples of what represents the quality of the relationship to each of the mother and the father separately."

This coder found *post hoc* that one subject who had a predominantly secure attachment style connected to her mother through comfort and soothing and to her father through common activities, although both parents were

approachable and provided encouragement: "My Mom was more my confidante. I'm emotionally close to my Mom. With my father, our relationship was not simply based on emotion. There was definitely a sense of camaraderie between us. I was Dad's little helper... He's always had high expectations for me. In high school, I had really good marks and wanted to go to med school. Now it's a different story and my marks aren't as good. I told him I thought maybe physio and he said, "Oh that's fine, that's good. I want you to be happy." But sometimes I feel like I'm letting him down because I suppose if I tried really hard, it's possible [to get good marks]. But he just wants us to be the best we can."

Low mother discrepancy may reflect the mother's nurturing connection to the subject. A high discrepancy with father might exist here because he is involved with the subject and has certain goals for her. High discrepancy with father may reflect involvement on the father's part. Perhaps not living up to her father's expectations (high discrepancy) would not have the same emotional valence for this subject, as it may not feel like a rejection of her, but rather as guidance. In contrast, not meeting her mother's expectations in a connection through nurturance might feel like rejection.

A subject who was predominantly fearful was in relationship with her mother "through scolding and nagging"

and the subject would withdraw: "I'd just disappear." The subject knew she did not meet her mother's expectations: "She was always nittering at me." The subject, however, aimed to meet her father's expectations: "If I disappointed my Mom, it didn't matter to me, whereas with my Dad, it was the worst thing in the world." "I'm scared to approach my Dad... It's the fear of disappointing him... I'm scared to approach him about things that might make him mad." She connects with her father through common activities but is afraid of him, is unable to express her opinions, and her father reinforces her silence and inhibition.

Perhaps with this fearful subject, the tendency is to meet her father's expectations (low discrepancy) for fear of not meeting them, whereas the subject realizes she does not meet her mother's expectations (high discrepancy) and that is where it stays.

A subject who was predominantly preoccupied went to his mother for comfort and soothing: "The more I acted out, the more she made a big fuss over me." The mother appeared to be over-involved: "I thought she wanted to run my life, so I did everything in my power to fight back." The mother made more of an attempt to connect than the father, although she related mainly through discipline with some comfort. This subject felt neglected by the father: "He was there, but he didn't seem to be there... He was doing his own thing."

This preoccupied subject seems to be in a push-pull struggle with his mother which could be associated with high discrepancy. In contrast, perhaps the subject believes the neglectful father has low expectations and so it is easier to meet his standards than the mother's standards.

A subject who was predominantly dismissing had a relationship with his parents that revolved around discipline. This subject has little connection with his parents. It is no surprise that discrepancy would not be correlated with attachment to either parent as the subject may not care enough about the connection to have it matter. If this were the case, parental discrepancy could be high or it could be low but would not reflect dismissing attachment.

Future research could determine and/or confirm the separate roles that mothers and fathers seem to play in our culture. It could be tested by examining distress. Increasing distress would be expected to be associated with increasing discrepancy for all attachment styles except dismissing. As well, contingencies that result from the differing relationships could be examined. Are the contingencies for mother and father different? If one fails to meet a father's expectations, is the outcome qualitatively different than when one fails to meet a mother's expectations? Are a father's expectations based around what one does while a mother's expectations are based around who one is, as might be suggested by culturally

prescribed roles of giving guidance versus giving unconditional love?

For alternative explanations as to why secure attachment is associated with low mother discrepancy yet high father discrepancy while fearful and preoccupied attachment are associated with high mother discrepancy yet low father discrepancy, the measures used are examined.

Perhaps the primary attachment is with the mother. When we score the attachment interview, we may actually measure the aspects of attachment associated with mother rather than both parents. Thus, a secure child may be secure with mother but not necessarily with father. Similarly, an insecure child may be insecure with mother but not necessarily with father. If the primary attachment is with mother, perhaps it is this attachment that generalizes most to our other relationships and this is assessed in the Family Attachment Interview. On the other hand, the interviewers may pull for information that associates the attachment scores more strongly with mother than with father.

It is also possible that the coders of the FAI weigh information regarding attachment differently for father than they do for mother. For example, if a father takes care of his children while they are sick, stays home from work and makes them soup and reads stories to them, that is considered to be wonderful. If a mother does this for her

children, it is not lauded as loudly. If a father fails to do these things, it may not be seen as neglectful, while if a mother fails to take care of her children while they are sick, it may be seen as neglect.

This possible differential evaluation of mothers' actions and fathers' actions are not a result of the interview nor the scoring system, but rather may reflect the cultural biases that coders may have. Fathers may be assumed to play a certain role, such as breadwinner or disciplinarian, while mothers may be expected to play a nurturing role by an interviewer or coder. It would be useful to explore possible differential interpretation of mothers' and fathers' actions in order for subscale and main scale ratings to reflect both relationships consistently.

Conversely, it could be that the interpretation by coders of mothers' and fathers' actions are consistent, but that coders weight certain subscale variables more heavily when deciding on main scale attachment scores. This differential weighting could be within mother and father attachment subscales or between mother and father attachment subscales. An examination of scoring procedures might be useful here.

Another possible explanation as to why secure attachment is associated with low mother discrepancy yet high father discrepancy while preoccupied and fearful attachment are associated with high mother discrepancy yet low father

discrepancy may be found in systems theory. Systems theorists suggest that when children's needs are not met by one parent, children turn to the other parent (Becvar & Becvar, 1993).

It has been suggested that men have relationships with their children through their wives, but after a divorce, they lose this connection and have to forge new connections directly with their children. This could suggest that a mother-child unit exists with father on the outside, but when the relationship with mother is problematic, children may attempt to connect with father. In this instance again, primary attachment may stem from a mother-child bond which is what may be captured when attachment is measured using the FAI.

If a child is securely attached to mother and sees him/herself as meeting mother's expectations (low discrepancy), then perhaps a dyad is formed where a child and mother may be a unit and father may be on the outside. An adult offspring may see him/herself as meeting mother's expectations, not meeting father's expectations, and may feel a sense of security in general.

If a mother-child primary attachment bond is insecure and a child does not believe s/he meets mother's expectations, then that child may turn to the father. The dyad may now be the father-child unit with the mother on the outside. The attachment with mother and the overall

attachment style is insecure. In later years, such an adult offspring may see him/herself as not meeting mother's expectations, yet meeting father's expectations, and may maintain an insecure attachment style.

That a systemic explanation is possible is supported by the *post hoc* analysis of self-discrepancies and attachment subscales. It appears that residualized father discrepancy is correlated with certain attachment-to-mother subscales, while residualized mother discrepancy is associated with certain attachment-to-father subscales. However, these correlations should be interpreted with caution as they are *post hoc* and not adjusted for the number of correlations done.

Future research could look at the nature of father-child relationships in comparison with mother-child relationships. If a mother-child relationship is good, does that mean that a father in this situation must be on the outside? Do secure children have qualitatively similar relationships with each parent?

When sex differences were examined *post hoc*, a pattern emerged, although not significant. It seems that mother discrepancy may be more highly related to fearful attachment for men, while mother discrepancy may be more highly related to preoccupied attachment for women. Thus, men who believe that they do not meet their mother's standards may tend to withdraw when distressed, while women who do not meet their

mother's standards may tend to become overly involved and enmeshed in relationships. This trend of sex differences could be explored in future research.

Limitations

This study was conducted with a western sample, using white female North American interviewer and coders. The results may therefore not be able to be extrapolated to other populations with a different cultural context. Certainly many of the possible *post hoc* suggestions regarding parental roles must be viewed with caution in light of cultural differences. Possible interviewing and coding biases mentioned above also could change from culture to culture. As well, the sample consisted of subjects who are in university, suggesting a higher socioeconomic and education level than the majority of the population. Again, results should be interpreted with caution when generalizing to the rest of the population.

Hypotheses were generated to predict correlations of attachment with own and parental discrepancy. As considerable overlap was found among the discrepancies, it was necessary to residualize these variables for the analysis. Because of the statistical procedures involved in sorting out the discrepancy variables, results may not mirror the exact relationship between attachment and self representations and so should be interpreted with caution.

Summary

In this study, the relationship between attachment styles and self-representations was explored. It is evident that internalized parental and self standards are related to attachment, and interesting that beliefs about mothers' and fathers' standards are not related to attachment in the same way. Consequently, many new questions and hypotheses have been raised regarding parental attachment and the measurement of it. It is hoped that this study will be helpful in integrating the theories of attachment and self-discrepancy, adding to our knowledge of self and relational development.

References

- Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and Prospect. In C.M.Parkes & J.Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The Place of Attachment in Human Behaviour*. New York: Basic Books.
- Allen, J. and Hauser, S. (1991, unpublished). Prediction of young adult attachment representations, psychological distress, social competence and hard drug use from family interactions in adolescence. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, Washington.
- Bargh, J.A., Bond, R.N., Lombardi, W.J. and Tota, M.E. (1986). The additive nature of chronic and temporary sources of construct accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 869-878.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K. and Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Becvar, D.S. and Becvar, R.J. (1993). *Family Therapy: A Systemic Integration*. Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn and Bacon.

- Benoit, D., Vidovic, D. and Roman, J. (1991, April).
Transmission of attachment across three generations. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Volume 1 Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss: Volume 2 Separation.* New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). The origins of attachment theory. Lecture 2. A *Secure Base.* New York: Basic Books, pp. 20-38.
- Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50,* 3-38.
- Cassidy, J. (1988). Child-mother attachment and the self in six-year-olds. *Child Development, 59,* 121-134.
- Fonagy, P., Steele, H. and Steele, M. (1991). Maternal representations of attachment during pregnancy predict the organization of infant-mother attachment at one year of age. *Child Development, 62,* 891-905.
Harvard University Press.
- Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy theory: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Bulletin, 94(3),* 319-340.

- Higgins, E.T. (1989). Continuities and discontinuities in self-regulatory and self-evaluative processes: A developmental theory relating self and affect. *Journal of Personality*, 52, 407-444.
- Higgins, E.T., Bond, R.N., Klein, R. and Strauman, T. (1986). Self-discrepancies and emotional vulnerability: How magnitude, accessibility, and type of discrepancy influence affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 5-15.
- Main, M. and Goldwyn, R. (1988). An adult classification system. *Unpublished manuscript*, University of California, Berkeley.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N. and Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton and E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 3-38.
- Main, M. and Weston, D. (1981). The quality of the toddler's relationship to mother and to father: Related to conflict behavior and the readiness to establish new relationships. *Child Development*, 52, 932-940.
- Moretti, M. and Higgins, E. (1990). The development of self-system vulnerabilities: Social and cognitive factors in developmental psychopathology. In R. Sternberg and J. Kolligan (Eds.), *Competence Considered*. New Haven: Yale University.

- Rein, A. (1993). *Toward an understanding of depression in women*. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C.
- Ricks, M. (1985). The social transmission of parental behaviour: Attachment across generations. In I. Bretherton and E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 211-230.
- Strauman, T.J. (1989). Self-discrepancies in clinical depression and social phobia: Cognitive structures that underlie emotional disorders? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 98(1), 14-22.
- Strauman, T.J. and Higgins, E.T. (1987). Automatic activation of self-discrepancies and emotional syndromes: When cognitive structures influence affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1004-1014.
- Sroufe, L.A. (1983). Infant-caregiver attachment and patterns of adaptation in preschool: The roots of maladaptation and competence. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *Minnesota symposium in child psychology, Vol. 16*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Van Hook, E. and Higgins, E.T. (1988). Self-related problems beyond the self-concept: Motivational consequences of discrepant self-guides. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(4), 625-633.

Ward, M. and Carlson, E. (1991). *The predictive validity of the Adult Attachment Interview for adolescent mothers.*

Unpublished manuscript.

CONSENT FORM

I hereby volunteer to participate in a study being conducted by Carolyn Nesbitt, under the supervision of Marlene Moretti, Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University.

I understand that I will be asked to complete four questionnaires and an interview as outlined in the page titled "INFORMED CONSENT".

I understand that I may withdraw my participation in this study at any time. I also understand that I may register any complaint I might have about the study with the researcher or with Dr. Roger Blackman, Chair, Psychology Department, Simon Fraser University.

Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

Phone Number: _____

Permanent Residence Phone Number: _____

Please keep a copy of the first page,

SELVES QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: Your Own Beliefs About You

In the following section of the questionnaire you will be asked to list the attributes of the type of person that YOU believe you actually are, ideally would like to be, and ought to be:

Your Actual Self:

Your beliefs concerning the attributes or characteristics you think you actually possess.

Your Ideal Self:

Your beliefs concerning the attributes or characteristics you would like ideally to possess; the type of person you wish, desire, or hope to be.

Your Ought Self:

Your beliefs concerning the attributes or characteristics you believe you should or ought to possess; the type of person you believe it is your duty, obligation, or responsibility to be.

In addition to listing the traits, you will be asked about the extent to which you believe you actually possess, would like to possess, or ought to possess each trait. Make these ratings after you have listed the attribute.

Please list the attributes of the type of person YOU believe you actually are:

EXTENT

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which YOU believe you actually possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person YOU would ideally like to be (i.e., wish, desire, or hope to be):

EXTENT

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which YOU would ideally like to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person YOU believe you ought to be (i.e., believe it is your duty, obligation or responsibility to be):

EXTENT

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____
- 5. _____
- 6. _____
- 7. _____
- 8. _____
- 9. _____
- 10. _____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which YOU believe you ought to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1 2 3 4
 slightly moderately a great deal extremely

PART II: Others' Beliefs About You

Other people also have beliefs about the type of person you are, the type of person they would ideally like you to be, or believe you ought to be. In this section of the questionnaire you will be asked to list the attributes of the type of person that your mother and your father ideally would like you to be and believe you ought to be.

Please list the attributes of the type of person your mother would ideally like you to be (i.e., wishes, desires, or hopes you to be):

EXTENT

- | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|
| 1. | _____ | _____ |
| 2. | _____ | _____ |
| 3. | _____ | _____ |
| 4. | _____ | _____ |
| 5. | _____ | _____ |
| 6. | _____ | _____ |
| 7. | _____ | _____ |
| 8. | _____ | _____ |
| 9. | _____ | _____ |
| 10. | _____ | _____ |

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which your mother would ideally like you to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person your mother believes you ought to be (i.e., believes it is your duty, obligation, or responsibility to be):

EXTENT

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which your mother believes you ought to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person your father would ideally like you to be (i.e., wishes, desires, or hopes you to be):

EXTENT

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which your father would ideally like you to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person your father believes you ought to be (i.e., believes it is your duty, obligation, or responsibility to be):

EXTENT

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____
- 5. _____
- 6. _____
- 7. _____
- 8. _____
- 9. _____
- 10. _____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which your father believes you ought to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

- 1 slightly
- 2 moderately
- 3 a great deal
- 4 extremely

Please list the attributes of the type of person a close friend would ideally like you to be (i.e., wishes, desires or hopes you to be):

	EXTENT
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____
9. _____	_____
10. _____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which a close friend would ideally like you to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

- | | | | |
|----------|------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| slightly | moderately | a great deal | extremely |

Please list the attributes of the type of person a close friend believes you ought to be (i.e. believes it is your duty, obligation, or responsibility to be):

	EXTENT
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____
9. _____	_____
10. _____	_____

For each attribute above, rate the extent to which a close friend beleives you ought to possess the attribute, using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
slightly	moderately	a great deal	extremely

INSTRUCTIONS:

Below is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully. After you have done so, please fill in one of the numbered circles to the right that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDING TODAY. Mark only one numbered circle for each problem and do not skip any items. If you change your mind, erase your first mark carefully. Read the example below before beginning, and if you have any questions please ask the technician.

EXAMPLE	NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE BIT	MODERATELY	QUITE A BIT	EXTREMELY
HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:					
1. Bodyaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

		NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE BIT	MODERATELY	QUITE A BIT	EXTREMELY
HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:						
1. Headaches	1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Nervousness or shakiness inside	2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Repeated unpleasant thoughts that won't leave your mind	3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Faintness or dizziness	4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Loss of sexual interest or pleasure	5	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Feeling critical of others	6	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The idea that someone else can control your thoughts	7	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles	8	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Trouble remembering things	9	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Worried about sloppiness or carelessness	10	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated	11	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Pains in heart or chest	12	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Feeling afraid in open spaces or on the streets	13	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Feeling low in energy or slowed down	14	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Thoughts of ending your life	15	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Hearing voices that other people do not hear	16	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Trembling	17	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Feeling that most people cannot be trusted	18	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Poor appetite	19	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Crying easily	20	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex	21	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Feelings of being trapped or caught	22	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Suddenly scared for no reason	23	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Temper outbursts that you could not control	24	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Feeling afraid to go out of your house alone	25	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Blaming yourself for things	26	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Pains in lower back	27	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Feeling blocked in getting things done	28	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. Feeling lonely	29	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. Feeling blue	30	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. Worrying too much about things	31	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Feeling no interest in things	32	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. Feeling fearful	33	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Your feelings being easily hurt	34	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Other people being aware of your private thoughts	35	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:

		NOT AT ALL	A LITTLE BIT	MODERATELY	QUITE A BIT	EXTREMELY
36. Feeling others do not understand you or are unsympathetic	36	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
37. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you	37	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
38. Having to do things very slowly to insure correctness	38	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
39. Heart pounding or racing	39	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
40. Nausea or upset stomach	40	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
41. Feeling inferior to others	41	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
42. Soreness of your muscles	42	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
43. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others	43	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
44. Trouble falling asleep	44	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
45. Having to check and double-check what you do	45	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
46. Difficulty making decisions	46	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
47. Feeling afraid to travel on buses, subways, or trains	47	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
48. Trouble getting your breath	48	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
49. Hot or cold spells	49	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
50. Having to avoid certain things, places, or activities because they frighten you	50	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
51. Your mind going blank	51	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
52. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body	52	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
53. A lump in your throat	53	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
54. Feeling hopeless about the future	54	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
55. Trouble concentrating	55	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
56. Feeling weak in parts of your body	56	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
57. Feeling tense or keyed up	57	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
58. Heavy feelings in your arms or legs	58	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
59. Thoughts of death or dying	59	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
60. Overeating	60	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
61. Feeling uneasy when people are watching or talking about you	61	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
62. Having thoughts that are not your own	62	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
63. Having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone	63	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
64. Awakening in the early morning	64	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
65. Having to repeat the same actions such as touching, counting, or washing	65	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
66. Sleep that is restless or disturbed	66	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
67. Having urges to break or smash things	67	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
68. Having ideas or beliefs that others do not share	68	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
69. Feeling very self-conscious with others	69	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
70. Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie	70	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
71. Feeling everything is an effort	71	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
72. Spells of terror or panic	72	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
73. Feeling uncomfortable about eating or drinking in public	73	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
74. Getting into frequent arguments	74	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
75. Feeling nervous when you are left alone	75	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
76. Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements	76	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
77. Feeling lonely even when you are with people	77	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
78. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still	78	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
79. Feelings of worthlessness	79	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
80. The feeling that something bad is going to happen to you	80	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
81. Shouting or throwing things	81	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
82. Feeling afraid you will faint in public	82	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
83. Feeling that people will take advantage of you if you let them	83	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
84. Having thoughts about sex that bother you a lot	84	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
85. The idea that you should be punished for your sins	85	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
86. Thoughts and images of a frightening nature	86	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
87. The idea that something serious is wrong with your body	87	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
88. Never feeling close to another person	88	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
89. Feelings of guilt	89	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
90. The idea that something is wrong with your mind	90	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙

RSQ

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which it describes your feelings about close relationships. Think about all of your close relationships, past and present, and respond in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships.

	Not at all like me		Somewhat like me		Very much like me
1. I find it difficult to depend on other people.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is very important to me to feel independent.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I find it easy to get emotionally close to others.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I want to merge completely with another person.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I worry about being alone.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am comfortable depending on other people.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I often worry that romantic partners don't really love me.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I find it difficult to trust others completely.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I worry about others getting too close to me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I want emotionally close relationships.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am comfortable having other people depend on me.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.	1	2	3	4	5
17. People are never there when you need them.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My desire to merge completely sometimes scares people away.	1	2	3	4	5
19. It is very important to me to feel self-sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I am nervous when anyone gets too close to me.	1	2	3	4	5

	Not at all like me	2	Somewhat like me	4	Very muc like me
21. I often worry that romantic partners won't want to stay with me.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I prefer not to have other people depend on me.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I worry about being abandoned.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I prefer not to depend on others.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I know that others will be there when I need them.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I worry about having others not accept me.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Romantic partners often want me to be closer than I feel comfortable being.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.	1	2	3	4	5

RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ DIRECTIONS!!!

1) Following are descriptions of four general relationship styles that people often report. Please read each description and **CIRCLE** the letter corresponding to the style that *best* describes you or is *closest* to the way you generally are in your close relationships.

- A.** It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.
- B.** I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.
- C.** I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.
- D.** I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

2) Please rate each of the above relationship styles according to the *extent* to which you think each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

	Not at all like me			Somewhat like me			Very much like me
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. People sometimes report that their relationship styles differ depending on the people they are with. Thus you may feel that your style varies with different friends, family members, or romantic partners.

Think of your present romantic relationship. Please rate to what extent each of the four styles is descriptive of the way you are in that relationship.

	Not at all like me		Somewhat like me			Very much like me	
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

THE OOI

On the following pages you will be asked about various expectations you may have experienced as a result of meeting or failing to meet standards that you hold for yourself and that others hold for you.

We all hold certain standards for ourselves, others may also hold standards for us. In addition, we have expectations about what may or may not occur if we meet or fail to meet these standards.

In this questionnaire you will be asked to rate the extent to which you hold certain expectations about what will happen if you meet or fail to meet the standards that a) you hold for yourself b) your parents held for you as a child and c) most people you know hold for you.

In addition, you will be asked to rate the extent to which these expectations may effect your behavior. For example, your expectations may influence you to pursue or approach some situations, or to avoid particular situations. It will be your task to decide whether or not a particular expectation has this effect on you and to what extent.

Please think about each question carefully. Try to be as honest as you can in responding - your answers will be kept confidential.

Please use the scale provided on the bottom of each page to make the extent ratings.

When I meet the standards that I hold for myself I expect to....

	Extent to which I hold this expectation	Extent to which this expectation effects my behavior
1) Do something nice for myself.....	_____	_____
2) Give myself a pat on the back.....	_____	_____
3) Celebrate with myself.....	_____	_____
4) Stop hurting myself emotionally.....	_____	_____
5) Congratulate myself.....	_____	_____
6) Reward myself.....	_____	_____
7) Stop physically hurting myself.....	_____	_____
8) Not really do anything.....	_____	_____
9) Stop ridiculing myself.....	_____	_____
10) Not make a big deal about it.....	_____	_____
11) Stop putting myself down	_____	_____
12) Not really notice it.....	_____	_____
13) Not really care about it.....	_____	_____

Extent Rating Scale

For each of the above outcomes, please rate the extent to which each outcome 1) is true for you, and 2) effects your behavior. If you have never experienced a particular expectation, simply put a '0' in the respective extent column(s). Otherwise use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

When I fail to meet the standards
I hold for myself I expect to...

	Extent to which I hold this expectation	Extent to which this expectation effects my behavior
1) Scold myself.....	_____	_____
2) Physically discipline myself.....	_____	_____
3) Physically hurt myself.....	_____	_____
4) Take away something I value.....	_____	_____
5) Take away care/concern from myself.....	_____	_____
6) Hurt myself emotionally.....	_____	_____
7) Not really do anything.....	_____	_____
8) Take away love/affection from myself.....	_____	_____
9) Ridicule myself.....	_____	_____
10) Not make a big deal about it.....	_____	_____
11) Take away emotional support from myself.....	_____	_____
12) Not really notice it.....	_____	_____
13) Not really care about it.....	_____	_____

Extent Rating Scale

For each of the above outcomes, please rate the extent to which each outcome
1) is true for you, and 2) effects your behavior.
If you have never experienced a particular expectation, simply put a
'0' in the respective extent column(s). Otherwise use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

When I met the standards my parents held for me as a child I expected that they would.....

	Extent to which I hold this expectation	Extent to which this expectation effects my behavior
1) Do something nice for me.....	_____	_____
2) Give me a pat on the back.....	_____	_____
3) Celebrate with me.....	_____	_____
4) Stop hurting me emotionally	_____	_____
5) Congratulate me.....	_____	_____
6) Reward me.....	_____	_____
7) Stop physically hurting me.....	_____	_____
8) Not really do anything.....	_____	_____
9) Stop ridiculing me.....	_____	_____
10) Not make a big deal about it	_____	_____
11) Stop putting me down.....	_____	_____
12) Not really notice it.....	_____	_____
13) Not really care about it.....	_____	_____

Extent Rating Scale

For each of the above outcomes, please rate the extent to which each outcome 1) is true for you, and 2) effects your behavior. If you have never experienced a particular expectation, simply put a '0' in the respective extent column(s). Otherwise use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

When I failed to meet the standards my parents held for me as a child I expected that they would

	Extent to which I hold this expectation	Extent to which this expectation effects my behavior
1) Scold me.....	_____	_____
2) Physically discipline me.....	_____	_____
3) Physically hurt me.....	_____	_____
4) Take away something I value.....	_____	_____
5) Take away their concern from me.....	_____	_____
6) Hurt me emotionally.....	_____	_____
7) Not really do anything.....	_____	_____
8) Take away their love/affection.....	_____	_____
9) Ridicule me.....	_____	_____
10) Not make a big deal about it.....	_____	_____
11) Take away their emotional support.....	_____	_____
12) Not really notice it.....	_____	_____
13) Not really care about it.....	_____	_____

Extent Rating Scale

For each of the above outcomes, please rate the extent to which each outcome 1) is true for you, and 2) effects your behavior. If you have never experienced a particular expectation, simply put a '0' in the respective extent column(s). Otherwise use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much