

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-2005

## The Relationship Between Attachment, Love Styles, and Marital Quality in a Sample of Married Members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Jeannine D. Nielson  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Nielson, Jeannine D., "The Relationship Between Attachment, Love Styles, and Marital Quality in a Sample of Married Members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (2005). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2846.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2846>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTACHMENT, LOVE STYLES, AND  
MARITAL QUALITY IN A SAMPLE OF MARRIED MEMBERS OF  
THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

by

Jeannine D. Nielson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family, Consumer, and Human Development

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

2005

## ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between Attachment, Love Styles, and  
Marital Quality in a Sample of Married Members of  
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

by

Jeannine D. Nielson, Master of Science

Utah State University, 2005

Major Professor: D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D.  
Department: Family, Consumer, and Human Development

Research on attachment suggests that attachment styles do exist in adulthood and appear to be an evolutionary product of infancy. This research was particularly focused on examining the relationship between attachment styles at various stages of the marital life cycle and the relationship of these styles of attachment to styles of love and marital quality among members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS).

(75 pages)

## CONTENTS

iii

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
CHAPTER	
I.    INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.   REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	5
Attachment in Adulthood.....	5
Adult Attachment.....	5
Similarities in Infant and Adult Attachment.....	6
Differences in Infant and Adult Attachment.....	7
The Formation of Adult Attachment.....	8
Attachment and Romantic Relationships .....	10
Attachment and Marital Quality .....	12
Social Research on Members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.....	14
Summary.....	17
III.  METHOD.....	18
Sample .....	18
Selection of the Sample .....	19
Procedures.....	20
Measures .....	21
Outcome Questionnaire.....	21
Revised Adult Attachment Scale .....	22
Sternberg's Triangular Love Scale .....	23
Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale.....	24
Analysis .....	25
Research Question One.....	25

	iv
Research Question Two .....	25
Research Question Three .....	25
Research Question Four .....	26
IV. RESULTS.....	27
Demographic Information.....	27
Question One.....	29
Question Two.....	29
Question Three .....	33
Question Four.....	35
V. DISCUSSION.....	39
Limitations .....	39
Research Questions .....	41
Question One.....	41
Question Two .....	42
Question Three .....	43
Question Four .....	45
Clinical Implications .....	47
Implications for Future Research .....	49
Summary.....	52
REFERENCES.....	54
APPENDIX.....	62

## LIST OF TABLES

v

Table	Page
1 Sternberg's Triangular Love Scale .....	9
2 Demographic Data .....	27
3 Chi-square Analysis of Marital Life Cycle Stage and Attachment Style .....	30
4 Mann-Whitney Test Examining Attachment Style and Love Style .....	32
5 Chi-square Analysis of Gender and Attachment Style .....	33
6 Mann-Whitney Test Examining Love Style and Gender .....	34
7 Kruskal-Wallis Test Examining Love Style and Marital Life Cycle Stage .....	36
8 <i>t</i> Test Examining Attachment Style and Marital Quality .....	37
9 Independent Samples <i>t</i> Test for Gender and Marital Quality .....	38
10 One-way ANOVA Examining Marital Quality and Marital Life Cycle Stage .....	38

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Attachment, as a field of study, has gained prominence through the work of researchers such as Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978), and Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1977), as well as from the more recent contributions of authors such as Hazan and Shaver (1987), Collins and Read (1990), Sperling and Berman (1994), and Simpson and Rholes (1998). The work of Ainsworth and Bowlby has pointed to the importance of attachment in the development of infants, children and youth, whereas the work of Hazan and Shaver, Sperling and Berman, Simpson and Rholes, as well as that of Collins and Read has moved it into the realm of adult life and relationships.

John Bowlby (1969) is credited, at least initially, for proposing the concept of attachment by suggesting that it is one of the critical developmental processes of infants and children. In proposing this notion, Bowlby defined attachment as "the propensity of human beings to make strong affectional bonds to particular others" (1977, p. 201). In fact, Karen (1994) stated that Bowlby believed that the human need to bond was instinctual and "...that people, too, must have bonding behavior and intergenerational cues, that they, too, must be prewired for some sort of relational experience..." (p. 93).

Although most of the early research focused on infants and children, using such techniques as the "strange situation" (Ainsworth et al., 1978), it is now widely assumed that attachment continues across the lifespan as individuals develop intrapsychically as well as interpersonally. It was Bowlby's belief that attachment was a lifelong process that he said "...characterize[s] human beings from cradle to the grave" and that

attachment bonds "...tend to persist relatively unchanged into and throughout adult life." (1977, pp. 203, 209).

Attachment has gained in importance as a lifespan phenomenon and become a critical field of study when one is attempting to understand relationship dynamics (i.e., mutuality with the caregiver and adult-adult relationships). Attachment theory attempts to elucidate the development of attachment bonds with others and offers an explanation about how and why people become attached to other people and the processes that are involved. The study of attachment theory is broad because human beings are such complex creatures. Because the study of attachment theory is significant across the life cycle, and because as Karen (1994) stated, "...it holds so many clues as to how we become who we are," it seems logical to wonder what role attachment plays in critical life experiences associated with adult relationships, namely, love style and marital satisfaction.

Research findings over the years are intriguing and have generated hypotheses about the attachment behaviors of people. Each research study builds upon the other as scientists take different perspectives on human behavior and the need that all humans have to become attached to another. This information is coupled with the ramifications of unfulfilled attachment needs. While there has been considerable research in the field of adult attachment in exploring the establishment of romantic relationships as well as in marital relationships, there has not been study examining attachment style across the marital life cycle and its potential influence on style of loving, and marital quality.



Information gleaned from this study has the potential to be of assistance to clinicians working with distressed couples to see the role, if any, attachment style plays in particular stages of the marital life cycle. For instance, is there a predominant attachment style unique to a particular marital life cycle stage? Does attachment style influence an individual's style of loving, or "the ways in which they love" (Sternberg, 1988, p. 51)? Do secure and insecure attachment styles influence marital quality?

This study investigated the styles of attachment that are manifest at various stages of the marital life cycle as specified by Carter and McGoldrick (1988), namely, the new couple, couples with young children, couples with adolescents, couples launching children, and couples in later life, and specifically addressing the identification of the most significant attachment styles at each stage of life. Using a cross-sectional sample, this research examined the relationship between the attachment styles and variables associated with love style (e.g., passionate love, companionate love) and marital quality across the marital life cycle.

With research focusing on adults and adult relationships, there have been efforts to determine if attachment patterns identified during infancy are applicable concepts for adults. Current research finds that, while we may use some different terminology for adult attachment processes, the basic concepts are similar and/or identical to the conceptualization of the early life attachment terms. Hesse (1999) indicated that the styles of attachment commonly associated with infancy include secure, avoidant, resistant or ambivalent, and disorganized, and that there is considerable similarity between the terms used in infancy/childhood and those presenting in the adult literature. For the

purposes of this study the terms secure and insecure were used in order to categorize the participants.

The following research questions were examined: The first question addressed by this study was "Is there a relationship between the style of attachment and a particular stage of the marital lifecycle? The second question was "Is there a relationship between attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and the perceived style of love the couple has?" The third research question asked, "Are there gender differences in attachment style, love style, and a given stage of the marital life cycle?" The final question asked, "Is there a relationship between gender and attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and marital quality?"

In summary, the relationship between adult attachment style, marital life cycle stage, gender, love style, and marital quality among married members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) was studied.

CHAPTER II  
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Attachment in Adulthood

A wealth of research literature by authors such as Bowlby (1969), and Ainsworth, et al. (1978) has demonstrated a relationship between infants and their caregivers in terms of what is referred to as attachment, as has literature addressing the area of attachment in adolescence (Newman & Newman, 1999), which is the foundation for adulthood and adult relationships. It seems that attachment, as it presents across the lifecycle, evolves in such a manner so as to influence adult relationships. In fact, Rothbard and Shaver (1994) suggest that the abundance of research asserting the connection between attachments formed in infancy with adult attachment styles is further evidence of the similarity of these patterns across the lifespan.

*Adult Attachment*

Adult attachment is defined by West and Sheldon-Keller (1994) as "...dyadic relationships in which proximity to a special and preferred other is sought or maintained to achieve a sense of security" (p. 19). This definition is similar to the definition of attachment in childhood proposed by Ainsworth et al. (1978) that refers to it as "the affectional bond or tie an infant forms between himself and his mother—a bond that tends to be enduring and independent of specific situations" (p. 302). While it appears that adult and infant attachment are parallel, it is important to point out the similarities, along with the differences in attachment at these two distinct life cycle stages.

*Similarities in infant and adult attachment.* Evidence suggests striking similarities between infant and adult attachment, such as the need to engage in some sort of physical contact with an attachment figure, behaviors characterized by Hazan and Zeifman (1999) as "...mutual gazing, cuddling, nuzzling, and kissing," as well as "skin-to-skin, belly-to-belly contact..." (p. 341). Research by Weiss (1982), Ainsworth et al. (1978), and Bowlby (1977) suggests that infants and adults desire to maintain close proximity with their attachment figure by physically placing themselves near them or by requesting them to come near by calling out to them. Weiss stated that both infants and adults show signs of "comfort and security" when in the presence of the attachment figure, and that both will protest when they believe that access to them is threatened.

Research further suggests that adults and infants exhibit similar symptoms of distress when separated from their attachment figures. Weiss (1975) noted that adults demonstrated severe reactions to being apart from their spouse during separation and divorce proceedings. He uses the terms "separation distress" and loneliness to describe their reactions, and further stated that many of the adults in his study experienced feelings of "apprehensiveness," "anxiety," and "panic." John Bowlby (1973) proposed the same type of response in infants separated from their attachment figure, as a "protest-despair-detachment sequence" in which the infant engages in behaviors such as intense crying coupled with an overwhelming desire to regain contact with the attachment figure, and finally, withdrawal.

Hazan and Zeifman (1999) noted that while adults use criteria such as "kindness," "responsiveness," and "familiarity," as the basis for establishing attachment bonds to another adult, Bowlby (1977) postulated that the same holds true for infants as they are

more likely to form attachment bonds with those who provide consistency of care, are familiar to them, and who are responsive to their needs.

As further evidence of the similarities between infant and adult attachment, Berman, Marcus, and Berman (1994) have suggested that there is a similarity between the "primary and secondary activators" in both adults and infants. The authors defined primary activators as fixed representations associated with attachment that involve behaviors such as "touching, stroking, and grasping, or eye contact and auditory stimulation" (p. 215), that occur only once during the course of a relationship and set the stage for attachment to occur.

Berman et al. (1994) defined secondary activators as "...behaviors and emotions that engage the attachment system within an attachment relationship at any given time" (p. 216) and occur repeatedly throughout the relationship. The authors suggest that secondary activators involve both "distancing behaviors," such as when the attachment figure walks away from the other that has the potential to convey a threat of loss of the attachment figure, while "proximity seeking behaviors" such as an embrace activate the attachment system as well. The authors noted that both distancing and proximity seeking behaviors have the potential of transforming an individual's sense of anxiety and security because they require that the individual attempt to interpret the meaning behind the behavior and thus determine how the individual will react. The authors posited that these processes occur along the same lines for adults as well as infants.

*Differences in infant and adult attachment.* As similar as the attachment phenomenon may appear to be, it makes logical sense to suggest that that which presents in adulthood is not only an evolved state founded on similarities, but also is comprised of

socio-cultural differences which may account, in part, for the complexity of attachment in adulthood and its differential presentation. Weiss (1982) noted that one of the most obvious differences between infant and adult attachment is the lack of reciprocity in the relationship between infants and caregivers, with infants as the recipient of care and the adult assuming the role of caregiver. Berman et al. (1994) referred to this as a uni-directional, non-reciprocal relationship between adults and infants, while a bi-directional, reciprocal, "give and take" relationship often characterizes adult relationships. Weiss also noted that unlike infant attachment relationships, adult attachment generally involves a sexual relationship. Weiss suggested that while the lack of an available attachment figure for infants has the tendency to overpower other "behavioral systems," rendering the infant unable to resume play and concentrate on other activities, adults appear capable of carrying on with their various activities in spite of the separation because of their assurance in the belief that the attachment figure will return.

#### *The Formation of Adult Attachment*

Hazan and Zeifman (1999) indicated that just as attachment to caregivers is crucial in the lives of infants, so is interdependence (a concept synonymous with attachment) in the lives of adults. While this may be the case, this current investigation suggests that one must take into consideration the fact that adult attachment evolves in the context of individual (e.g., intrapsychic), interpersonal, and socio-cultural factors. Thus, these mediating and interacting factors may, and most likely do, influence, as well as differentiate the formation of attachment from person-to-person (DeKay, 2000; Thompson, 1999).

Sternberg (1988) has posited that love can be organized into eight love styles (non-love, liking, infatuation, romantic love, passionate, fatuous, consummate, and companionate) with three components of love (i.e., intimacy, passion, and commitment). Sternberg referred to intimacy as feelings of emotional closeness and attachment to another. He noted that passion involves the desire for sexual fulfillment from one's partner and the need to be cared for and involved in a relationship, and that it is connected to the Intimacy component. He stated that commitment is comprised of two parts, the aspect of "decision" which refers to an individual deciding to enter into a relationship with another, while commitment refers to the long-term pledge to preserve the relationship. His "triangular theory of love" suggests that combining components together as illustrated in Table 1 forms the eight styles of love.

Table 1

*Sternberg's Triangular Love Scale*

Variable	Intimacy	Passion	Commitment
Non-love			
Liking	X		
Infatuated love		X	
Empty love			X
Romantic love	X	X	
Companionate love	X		X
Fatuous love		X	X
Consummate love	X	X	X

*Note.* (Sternberg, 1988, p. 51)

Sternberg (1988) defined the love style "non-love" as not having any of the components of love and is found among casual acquaintances or co-workers. He described "liking" as the feelings one has for a friend or acquaintance, and "infatuated love" as "love at first sight" and notes that it is manifested as intense physiological arousal and often disappears quickly. Sternberg defined "empty love" as a love style found in long-term relationships that have grown stale and are held together by the commitment to remain a couple, while "romantic love" is said to be typified by intimacy and passion that burns out quickly because it lacks the commitment component. "companionate love" is defined as the type of love typically seen in marriages that have endured for many years where there is intimacy and commitment, but no passion. Sternberg calls this love style a "committed friendship." Sternberg described "fatuous love" as the type of love found in "whirlwind courtships" where a couple meets and marries after knowing each other for a short amount of time. The most desired love style of all, according to Sternberg, is "consummate love," which is comprised of all three of the components of love. Sternberg argued that attaining this style of love is no guarantee that it will endure and that some couples do not appreciate that they were involved in this type of relationship until after it has ended.

#### *Attachment and Romantic Relationships*

If attachment style moderates proximity-seeking and contact maintaining, then perhaps romantic relationships will be related to the integration of two or more person's attachment styles. Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggested that attachment styles influence the types of romantic relationships individuals report. They reported that adults in their



study categorized as secure in their attachment orientation described their most significant relationship in positive terms such as "happy, friendly, and trusting," and that these relationships tended to last longer (p. 515). They further noted that anxious/ambivalent and avoidant individuals, on the other hand, reported relationships marked by "jealousy," "fear of intimacy," and "emotional highs and lows," "obsession," and "extreme sexual attraction," and unlike relationships found among secure individuals, the length of these relationships was shorter (p. 515).

Research by Simpson (1990) investigated the role of attachment in the formation and maintenance of romantic relationships and found that relationship quality was dependent on attachment style. Just as Bowlby (1969) believed that it was crucial for infants to form loving bonds with their caregivers, Hazan and Zeifman (1999) suggested that the same holds true for adults. Hazan and Zeifman referred to this attachment as "pair-bond relationships," and define it as the "prototype" of the attachment that occurs between the infant and the caregiver (p. 336). The authors further proposed that there is an "attachment hierarchy" with romantic partners replacing parents as attachment figures in the lives of adults. In addition, they noted that adult attachment appears to depend on the duration of the relationship, with newer couples desiring "physical proximity and contact" and couples who have been together longer desiring "mutual support and care" (p. 339).

Collins and Read (1990) also found a connection between attachment style and the types of romantic relationships individuals become involved in. Their research suggested that women who were rated as secure were more likely to perceive their partner as being dependable, were less likely to be jealous, and tended to view themselves

in a positive light by noting that they were good listeners and able to engage in higher levels of self-disclosure with their partner. The results for the men in the study mirrored those of the women, with men who are securely attached viewing their relationship positively, experiencing more trust with their partner, and expecting to marry their partner. Further, research by Feeney (1998) suggested that individuals who are securely attached are better able to cope with emotional or physical separation from their partner. Berlin and Cassidy (1999) cited a synopsis of research on adult attachment by Shaver, Hazan, and Bradshaw (1988) by stating, "...each partner is an attachment figure to the other: Each is the other's caregiver, and each typically seeks the other as a secure base" (p. 693).

#### *Attachment and Marital Quality*

In addressing the issue of marital quality Glenn (1990) stated that while many researchers use the terms marital satisfaction and marital quality interchangeably, that it is important to distinguish between the two. Spanier and Lewis (1980) have argued that marital satisfaction pertains to the couple's subjective feelings about the relationship, and that marital quality refers to relationship variables that include marital adjustment, communication, happiness, and satisfaction. They further contend that marital quality is a "process" that is determined by the degree of marital conflict, anxiety about the relationship, satisfaction, closeness, and agreement in decision making.

In addressing attachment across the marital lifespan Feeney (1999) examined individual attachment styles on the marital relationship, and found that "Comfort with closeness (secure versus avoidant)," and "Anxiety over relationships (ambivalent

attachment)" (p. 368), were correlated with reports of marital quality in terms of the amount of happiness experienced in the relationship. Feeney noted that increased anxiety on the part of the husband was negatively correlated with marital happiness, regardless of the wife's level of security. On the other hand, Feeney's study suggests that high levels of anxiety on the part of the wife were not correlated with marital happiness unless the husband scored low on the measure of comfort.

Further validation of the relationship between attachment styles and marital quality is found in the work of Berman et al. (1994) and Kobak and Hazan (1991). Berman et al. suggested that an insecure attachment style of one spouse tends to have a negative impact on the individual and the marriage. In their research with married couples, Kobak and Hazan examined the couple's working model or the foundation from which an individual characterizes the types of expectations they hold for others to be "psychologically available" for them, to be a significant factor in marital satisfaction. They suggest that securely attached individuals hold a positive view of the accessibility of their partner whereas insecurely attached individuals doubt the availability of their spouse or their own personal worthiness to get their needs met. Overall they found that when spouses perceived that their partner was available to them and that they could rely on them, it had a positive effect on their marriage and resulted in both partners feeling more secure in the relationship, which increased each partner's sense of marital satisfaction. Feeney (1999) summed up the association between attachment style and marital quality in her research. She noted that attachment in the marital relationship is a [two way street], with the attachment style of each partner having an impact on the

relationship as well as impacting the satisfaction each partner perceives in the relationship (p. 368).

*Social Research on Members of The Church  
of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*

There has been very little published research specifically targeting members of the LDS church. One exception is a book edited by James Duke (1998) titled *Latter-Day Saint Social Life*. In it are found numerous studies by various authors addressing such issues as Mormon religiosity, health practices, and also mental health issues. This section of the paper will highlight a few of the key findings of the researchers that are pertinent to our study of attachment styles, marital satisfaction, and love styles across the marital life cycle among married members of the LDS church.

Heaton (1998b) stated that by the end of 1990 approximately 7.76 million people belonged to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and that only one out of five LDS families was comprised of a couple married in the temple with children. According to Albrecht (1998), marriage in an LDS Church's temple suggests a higher degree of religious devotion and church attendance among members. Research by Heaton suggests that these individuals are less likely to divorce than church members married outside the temple.

In their study examining the "multiple dimensions of religiosity," Ellison, Gay, and Glass (1989) found a positive relationship between religious affiliation and overall life satisfaction. Hunt and King (1978) found that the level of "belief, effort, and participation" in religious activities served to solidify the marital bond, thus leading to increased "marital adjustment, happiness, and satisfaction." This is consistent with

research by Judd (1998), who noted that LDS church members have higher than average rates of happiness, and along with Protestants and Jehovah's Witnesses, have "greater life satisfaction." Judd posited that religious faith serves as a protective factor against the trials and tribulations that are a part of life.

Research by Duke and Johnson (1998) suggested that while LDS church members tend to be more religious than the general populace, there are gender differences in levels of religious devotion with LDS women being slightly more religious than LDS men. The authors noted that there were changes in levels of religiosity across the family life cycle with young single LDS men being less likely to describe themselves as religious, yet there were increases in this dimension when they married. Duke and Johnson also found that the birth of the first child signaled lower levels of religiosity among both LDS men and women but that this increased when the second child was born. They attributed this to pressures associated with establishing a home and a career, a parallel that will be made later to Carter and McGoldrick's (1988) model of the family life cycle.

Research by Heaton (1998a) and Albrecht (1998) suggested a positive relationship between marriage in an LDS temple, regular church attendance and increased fertility rates among members of the LDS church. Heaton proposed that this is most likely due to membership in the "pronatalist" culture of the LDS church, where he noted having large families is a "persistent theme" among church members.

In his research examining trends in marital satisfaction, Miller (1987) replicated a 1955 study that sampled families living in Provo, Utah, in order to examine changes in the perception of marital happiness. Miller reported that married couples in Provo, Utah, in 1983 were less likely to report that they were "very happy" or "happy" in their

marriage than those who participated in the 1955 study. Miller offered some interesting theories as to why this could be so. The first is that modern married couples have more pragmatic expectations about marriage and feel at ease admitting that they are not completely happy in their marriage. Miller stated the 1955 sample may have been reluctant to admit feeling this way since this type of response would have been seen as a radical departure from the LDS church's pro-family and pro-marriage stance. The second reason Miller gave for the results is that the population of Provo, Utah, was made up of individuals native to the area in 1955 in comparison to the 1983 sample, which was comprised of a more diverse population from areas outside of Utah. Third, Miller argued that while expectations about what constitutes a happy marriage have changed (i.e., "equality, affection, and companionship"), the implementation of these changes has lagged behind. His final argument is that modern couples eager to "have it all" are experiencing role strain and that this is directly affecting levels of marital satisfaction.

Research on marital stability and religious influence by Call and Heaton (1997) suggested that divorce rates were 2.4 times higher for couples where there was no religious affiliation and that this increased to 2.9 times greater if the wife regularly attended church and the husband did not. Conversely, the authors found that couples attending church regularly were less likely to divorce, results that are similar to those reported by Maller (1992) who argued that there is a "direct positive relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction"(p. 472), as nonreligious couples are not only twice as likely to get divorced, but the risk of marital discontent was also twice as high. In essence, based upon these findings the assumption can be made that the couple that "prays together, stays together," as Call and Heaton suggested that the "shared

participation” of religious activities can sustain the marital union. However, research by Wilson and Musick (1996) suggested that religious couples often remain committed to the marriage in spite of low levels of marital satisfaction.

#### Summary

Research on attachment suggests that attachment styles do exist in adulthood and appear to be an evolutionary product of infancy (Bowlby, 1969; Thompson, 1999). This research was particularly focused on examining the relationship between attachment styles at various stages of the marital life cycle and the relationship of these styles of attachment to styles of love and marital quality among members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS).

## CHAPTER III

## METHOD

## Sample

One hundred packets were distributed and 72 returned. Of those that were returned, five had scores that surpassed the OQ-45.2 cutoff score of 63 and could not be used, and one was not used due to an incomplete Sternberg scale, resulting in 66 packets being utilized. Of the 66 individuals in the final sample, the majority was Caucasian (97%,  $n = 64$ ), 47% were male ( $n = 31$ ) and 53% were female ( $n = 35$ ). The largest percentage (48.4%) of the sample was comprised of those 34 – 42 years of age (24.2%,  $n = 16$ ) and 43 – 52 years of age (24.2%,  $n = 16$ ), whereas the smallest (13.6 %,  $n = 9$ ), was among the 18 – 23 age group.

In examining educational attainment, data revealed that 39.4% ( $n = 26$ ) held college degrees, 21.2% ( $n = 14$ ) held advanced degrees, and 28.8% ( $n = 19$ ) reported they had attended college, yet had not graduated. Fifty percent ( $n = 33$ ) of the participants reported an annual income of \$60,000 or greater.

Most of the sample, 42.4% ( $n = 28$ ) dated less than 1 year before marrying and 50% ( $n = 33$ ) reported that their marriage to their spouse was a result of their first serious relationship. A majority of the participants 97% ( $n = 64$ ) reported that they had not cohabited before marrying. Nearly 35 % ( $n = 23$ ) of the sample had been married 21 years or more, while those married 11-20 years comprised 33.3% ( $n = 22$ ) of the sample and 12% ( $n = 8$ ) were married 6 – 10 years. Relative to marital adjustment, 83.3% ( $n = 55$ ) reported that they had never received marital counseling.



In order to categorize individuals into marital life cycle stages, participants were asked to report the age of their oldest child. A majority of the sample, 28.8 % ( $n = 19$ ), were in the couples with young children stage and 19.7% ( $n = 13$ ) were in the couples in later life stage. Both the newly married couples and the couples with adolescents stages each had 18.2% ( $n = 12$ ) individuals, while 15.2% ( $n = 10$ ) reported being in the couples launching stage.

#### Selection of the Sample

According to Carter and McGoldrick (1988), the family life cycle stages provide a means of describing the developmental transitions and subsequent rearrangement of the family system as it accommodates to the arrival, growth, and departure of family members. This study modified the Carter and McGoldrick model by assigning participants to each category according to the age of the oldest child in the family. One of two rationales for altering the Carter and McGoldrick model was to accommodate for those couples who have large families and will thus, find themselves in more than one category or stage. The other reason for making this minor change in their model was to accommodate those individuals who marry later in life and consequently either have no children or children who are younger than other adults their same age. By controlling for the age of the oldest child, it was hoped that confusion would be eliminated as well as ensure a systematic way of categorizing the participants. With this modification, the family life cycle will be referred to hereafter as the marital life cycle.

In as much as this study examined the nature of attachment for individuals who are married and its relationship to love styles and marital quality, the first stage of the

family life cycle, or "single young adults," has been excluded. The marital life cycle categories, in which participants ( $n = 66$ ) were assigned, were organized in the following manner:

1. The New Couple (Newlywed, No Children)
2. Couples with Young Children (Birth to 12-years)
3. Couples with Adolescents (Ages 13-19)
4. Couples Launching Children (Ages 20-29)
5. Couples in Later Life (Age 30+).

#### Procedures

This study involved the utilization of a sample drawn specifically from those who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). Due to the Logan, Utah, area being predominantly populated by members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the goal was to examine the relationship between attachment, loves style, and marital quality within the LDS population, this study drew upon 66 LDS individuals of whom 35 were female and 31 were male. Individuals participating in this study were randomly selected from LDS church directories.

Potential participants were randomly selected from LDS ward directories in a variety of wards in the Logan, Utah, area after the study was approved by the Utah State University Institutional Review Board (USU IRB). A letter was attached to the manila envelope containing the instruments informing participants about the nature and purpose of the study. The participants were asked to remove the letter and keep it in their personal file for future reference.

The method of informing the participants about the nature and purpose of the study is unique in that many studies require that participants provide their signature on an informed consent. Due to the fact that this research was conducted with a small sample and it was imperative to protect the identity of the participants, no signature was obtained and the participants remained anonymous. A covered box was placed at a specified location where the instruments were returned. The location was away from the residence of the researcher, but conveniently located for participants. The co-primary investigator picked up the instruments. In order to further insure that responses were anonymous, all data were group analyzed and any presentations and publications will be based on group data, thus no individual data were examined.

## Measures

### *Outcome Questionnaire*

The Outcome Questionnaire or OQ-45.2 (Lambert et al., 2004) is a rapid screen for individual psychopathology with items providing a total well-being score, as well as subscale scores for the following areas: subjective discomfort (SD) measures levels of depression and anxiety, interpersonal relationships (IR) examines an individual's experience of loneliness, conflict, and marital and family distress, and role performance (SR), which analyzes an individual's adjustment to school, work, and family roles, and provides a measure of overall quality of life (see Appendix).

In an examination of the reliability of the OQ-45.2, Lambert et al. (2004) noted that the test-retest reliability is quite strong with coefficients for the SD, IR, and SR subscales being .78, .80, and .82, respectively, with a coefficient of .84 for the total score.

The Internal Consistency of the OQ-45 is particularly strong as Lambert and associates report Cronbach alphas for the subscales as .92 for SD, .74 for IR, and .70 for SR, with an alpha of .93 for the total score. Lambert and associates noted that the concurrent validity of the OQ-45.2 is respectable as results of their research found validity coefficients ranging from .54 to .88. For the purposes of this study, individuals with total well-being scores above that of 63 will be excluded from the study, as will be those participants whose subscale scores exceed 36, 15, and 12 on the SD, IR and SR scales, respectively.

#### *Revised Adult Attachment Scale*

The first question answered by this study is "Is there a relationship between the style of attachment and a particular stage of the marital life cycle?" To answer this question, the Revised Adult Attachment Scale (Collins, 1996) was utilized. According to Collins this 18-item inventory ascertains the attachment style of individuals by exploring three subscales of attachment, namely, "Close," "Depend," and "Anxiety," with the scores being correlated to a particular attachment style. Participants were asked to rate their responses on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1- *Disagree Strongly* to 5- *Agree Strongly*. Items such as, "*I find it relatively easy to get close to people,*" were asked to assess the participant's level of closeness, or how comfortable they are in getting close to others or allowing others to get close to them. Dependency levels were assessed by items such as "*I am comfortable depending on others,*" while Anxiety levels were explored by items such as "*I often worry that romantic partners don't really love me.*" In examining the reliability of the RAAS, Collins reports that in three separate samples ( $n = 173, 130,$  and 100) that the Cronbach alphas ranged from .85 to .78 (see Appendix).

*Sternberg's Triangular Love Scale*

The second and third questions addressed in this study were "Is there a relationship between attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and the perceived style of love the couple has?" and "Are there gender differences in attachment style, love style, and a given stage of the marital life cycle?" Utilizing Sternberg's Triangular Love Scale (1988), the styles of love were formulated for participants at each stage of the marital life cycle. The Triangular Love Scale is composed of three primary scales, namely, intimacy, passion and commitment. Participants self selected their perceived style of love by responding to 45 items such as "*I feel that \_\_\_\_\_ really understands me*" and "*I cannot imagine my life without \_\_\_\_\_.*" Each question is formulated on a Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 = not at all, to 9 = extremely. The derived participant scores were used to assign them, based on the work of Sternberg, into one of seven love subscales that will be referred to in this study as the styles of love, namely liking, infatuation, empty love, romantic love, companionate love, fatuous love, and consummate love (see Appendix).

In an examination of the external validity of the scale, Sternberg (1997) found the Triangular Love Scale to be predictive of relationship satisfaction with the correlations for the three components of love being, .76 for intimacy, .76 for passion, and .67 for commitment. In analyzing the internal consistency of the scale, Sternberg noted that factor loadings were the highest on intimacy, passion, and commitment factors, and that all three Cronbach alphas were .91, .94, and .95, respectively, with a total coefficient alpha of .95.

*Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale*

The final research question asked, "Is there a relationship between gender and attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and marital quality?" To answer this particular question, participants completed the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS; Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson, 1995), with the total scale score derived as an index of marital quality. The RDAS is comprised of fourteen items divided into the three subscales, Consensus, Satisfaction, and Cohesion. All items were answered on a 6-point Likert scale. Items 1 through 6 measure consensus, items 7-10 assess satisfaction, and items 11 through 14 address cohesion. The RDAS Consensus scale consists of questions focusing on how often an individual perceives agreement with their partner on relational context areas such as religion, parenting and sexuality. With regards to satisfaction, respondents provided responses to questions such as how often they quarrel, which when taken together will provide a measure of subjective satisfaction. Finally, cohesion addresses the closeness in the relationship with questions addressing areas such as the frequency in which they engage in activities together (see Appendix).

According to Busby et al. (1995), the RDAS, though consisting of half of the items of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976), has been shown to provide as accurate a portrayal of couples as the full scale. The authors also note that the alpha for each of the subscales as well as the total score is particularly sound with reliability coefficients ranging from .95 to .79.

This study examined the relationship between attachment style and stage of the marital life cycle, as well as the relationship between attachment style and the variables associated with love style and marital quality at various points along the marital life cycle. These data were examined according to gender. The following clarifies the research questions that were examined and the methodology by which each was explored.

#### *Research Question One*

Is there a relationship between the reported style of attachment of a participant and the stage of the marital life cycle they have been assigned? For each of the five life cycle stages, a chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between perceived attachment style and marital life cycle stage.

#### *Research Question Two*

Is there a relationship between attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and the perceived style of love the couple has? Due to small sample size, this question was modified to read, "Is there a relationship between attachment style and love style?" It was addressed by performing a Mann-Whitney test in order to compare the ranks and determine whether or not the groups are significantly different from each other.

#### *Research Question Three*

Are there gender differences in attachment style, love style, and a given stage of the marital life cycle? In order to determine if there are differences between genders and attachment style, a chi-square test was conducted. Utilizing the Mann-Whitney test, we

examined differences between gender and love style. The Kruskal-Wallis statistical analysis was performed to identify differences between love style and marital life cycle stage.

*Research Question Four*

Is there a relationship between gender and attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and marital quality? In order to address this question we first examined the relationship between attachment and marital quality by performing an independent samples *t* test. Another independent samples *t* test was utilized in order to examine differences between gender and marital quality. Finally, a one-way ANOVA was performed in order to examine the relationship between marital quality and marital life cycle stage.



## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

## Demographic Information

A convenience sample consisting of 66 individuals, equally divided between each of the five categories described in the family life cycle by Carter and McGoldrick (1988), were involved in the quantitative analyses associated with this study. There were 31 males and 35 females who participated. Complete demographic data are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

*Demographic Data*

Characteristics	Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age of participants	18-23 years	9	13.6
	24-33 years	13	19.7
	34-42 years	16	24.2
	43-52 years	16	24.2
	53-older	12	18.2
Gender of participants	Male	31	47.0
	Female	35	53.0
Ethnicity of participants	Caucasian	64	97.0
	Hispanic/Latino	2	3.0
Education of participants	Less than HS	1	1.5
	HS diploma	5	7.6
	Some college	19	28.8

(table continues)

---

Characteristics	Variable	Frequency	Percentage
	College grad	26	39.4
	Advanced degrees	14	21.2
Income of participants	Less than 10K	3	4.5
	10K-20K	8	12.1
	20K-40K	9	13.6
	40K-60K	12	18.2
	60K+	33	50.0
Average years married	5 or less years	13	19.7
	6-10 years	8	12.1
	11-20 years	22	33.3
	21+ years	23	34.8
Age of oldest child	Newly married/none	12	18.2
	Newborn - 12 years	19	28.8
	13-19 years	12	18.2
	20-29 years	10	15.2
	30+ years	13	19.7
Average time dated	Less than 1 yr	28	42.4
	1-2 yrs	21	31.8
	More than 2 yrs	17	25.8
Number of serious relationships prior to marrying	First	33	50.0
	2-3 prior	30	45.5
	3+ prior	3	4.5
Couples cohabiting before marriage	No	64	97.0
	Yes	2	3.0
Couples who received counseling before marriage	No	55	83.3
	Yes	11	16.7

---

### *Question One*

The first research question addressed by this study is "Is there a relationship between the reported style of attachment of a participant and the stage of the marital life cycle they have been assigned?" In order to test for this a chi-square test of independence was performed. Although as shown in Table 3 there was no significant difference between marital life cycle stage and attachment style, most of the participants in the study were classified as securely attached based on their scores (84.8%,  $n = 56$ ).

As noted in Table 3, there were some interesting results that warrant further investigation. While 100% ( $n = 12$ ) of the newly married sample was classified as secure and 0% claimed an insecure attachment style, a majority of the participants with an insecure attachment style fell in the couples with young children stage 60% ( $n = 6$ ). Interest in these findings has to do with previous research suggesting that there is an inverse curvilinear relationship in marital satisfaction when children enter the family. Perhaps further investigation may correlate what appears to be the beginning of an inverse relationship between stages of the marital life cycle, attachment, and marital quality.

### *Question Two*

The second research question asked, "Is there a relationship between attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and the perceived style of love the couple has?" Due to the constraints imposed by the small sample size, attachment style, love

style, and marital life cycle stage could not be examined together. The research question was modified to read, "Is there a relationship between attachment and love style?"

The data produced a non-normal distribution that necessitated the use of the Mann-Whitney test. According to Vogt (1993), the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test rank orders the data, compares the ranks and determines whether or not the groups are significantly different from each other. The results of the analysis reported in Table 4 illustrate that for all of the love styles, with the exception of empty love, secure attachment had a significantly higher ranking than insecure attachment. When examining rank order, the most commonly noted love style among the securely attached was liking, whereas the least common was fatuous.

Table 3

*Chi-square Analysis of Marital Life Cycle Stage and Attachment Style*

Marital life cycle stage	Attachment Style		df	$\chi^2$	p
	Insecure	Secure			
Newly married			4	6.922	.140
Observed <i>n</i>	0	12			
Expected <i>n</i>	1.8	10.2			
Life cycle stage	.0%	100.0%			
Attachment style	.0%	21.4%			
Young children					
Observed <i>n</i>	6	13			
Expected <i>n</i>	2.9	16.1			
Life cycle stage	31.6%	68.4%			

(table continues)

Attachment style	60.0%	23.2%
Adolescents		
Observed <i>n</i>	2	10
Expected <i>n</i>	1.8	10.2
Life cycle stage	16.7%	83.3%
Attachment style	20.0%	17.9%
Launching		
Observed <i>n</i>	1	9
Expected <i>n</i>	1.5	8.5
Life cycle stage	10.0%	90.0%
Attachment style	10.0%	16.1%
Later life		
Observed <i>n</i>	1	12
Expected <i>n</i>	2.0	11.0
Life cycle stage	7.7%	92.3%
Attachment style	10.0%	21.4%
Total		
Observed <i>n</i>	10	56
Expected <i>n</i>	10.0	56.0
Life cycle stage	15.2%	84.8%
Attachment style	100.0%	100.0%

---

Gender is often a contributing factor that influences results and must be taken into consideration. In this research it was examined along three specific areas namely, gender as it relates to attachment style, love style, and marital quality across the marital life cycle. These variables were examined in research questions three and four.

Table 4

*Mann-Whitney Test Examining Attachment Style and Love Style*

Attachment and love style	Attachment style	<i>n</i>	Mean rank	<i>p</i> value
Liking	Insecure	10	18.45	.007**
	Secure	56	36.19	
	Total	66		
Companionate	Insecure	10	19.35	.011*
	Secure	56	36.03	
	Total	66		
Romantic	Insecure	10	19.80	.014*
	Secure	56	35.95	
	Total	66		
Consummate	Insecure	10	20.25	.018*
	Secure	56	35.87	
	Total	66		
Infatuation	Insecure	10	20.30	.018*
	Secure	56	35.86	
	Total	66		
Fatuous	Insecure	10	20.95	.025*
	Secure	56	35.74	
	Total	66		
Empty love	Insecure	10	24.90	.097
	Secure	56	35.04	
	Total	66		

\* $p \leq .05$  \*\* $p \leq .01$

*Question Three*

The third research question asks, "Are there gender differences in attachment style, love style, and a given stage of the marital life cycle?" A chi-square test was performed in order to determine if there were differences between gender and attachment style. The results in Table 5 reveal there were no significant differences in attachment style based on gender.

Table 5

*Chi-square Analysis of Gender and Attachment Style*

Gender	Attachment Style		<i>df</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	Insecure	Secure			
Male			1	.043	.835
	Observed <i>n</i>	5	26		
	Expected <i>n</i>	4.7	26.3		
	% Male	16.0%	83.9%		
	Attachment style	50.0%	46.4%		
Female					
	Observed <i>n</i>	5	30		
	Expected <i>n</i>	5.3	29.7		
	% Female	14.3%	85.7%		
	Attachment style	50.0%	53.6%		
Total					
	Observed <i>n</i>	10	56		
	Expected <i>n</i>	10.0	56.0		
	% Combined	15.2%	84.8%		
	Attachment style	100.0%	100.0%		

Due to the fact that the data involving love style and gender formed a non-normal distribution, a non-parametric test, the Mann-Whitney, was used. Results of the analysis depicted in Table 6 indicate there were no significant differences between gender and love style.

Table 6

*Mann-Whitney Test Examining Love Style and Gender*

Love style	Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Infatuation	Male	31	34.82	1079.50
	Female	35	32.33	1131.50
	Total	66		
Empty love	Male	31	34.11	1057.50
	Female	35	32.96	1153.50
	Total	66		
Liking	Male	31	32.06	994.00
	Female	35	34.77	1217.00
	Total	66		
Romantic	Male	31	33.60	1041.50
	Female	35	33.41	1169.50
	Total	66		
Fatuuous	Male	31	34.55	1071.00
	Female	35	32.57	1140.00
	Total	66		
Companionate	Male	31	32.60	1010.50
	Female	35	34.50	1200.50
	Total	66		
Consummate	Male	31	33.85	1049.50
	Female	35	33.19	1161.50
	Total	66		



In order to determine if there was a significant difference between love style and marital life cycle stage, the Kruskal-Wallis, also a non-parametric statistical analysis was performed. According to Vogt (1993), the Kruskal-Wallis is utilized when testing two or more independent samples and is an extension of the Mann-Whitney test. The Kruskal-Wallis ranks the groups and provides an average rank for each group. As shown in Table 7, there were significant differences in the prevalence of four of the love styles (i.e., infatuation, romantic, fatuous, and consummate love) depending on the marital life cycle stage. The results for this question were significant at alpha .05 and .01.

It is interesting to note that there was a trend in the ranking of the data, with the newly married group demonstrating the highest ranks for all of the love styles. A steady decline in ranking was noted beginning with the couples with young children, with the couples with adolescents having the lowest ranking in all of the love styles. There appears to be a steady increase however, as the participants move into the later stages of the life cycle. The results suggest a rise in scores, beginning with the couples launching stage and reaching the second highest point in the couples in later life stage.

#### *Question Four*

Research question four asks, "Is there a relationship between gender and attachment style at a given stage of the marital life cycle and marital quality?" As shown in Table 8, the only significant finding was for consensus and total RDAS score. The data indicate that those who are securely attached tend to agree more often with their partner in areas such as parenting, employment, and sexual relations.

Table 7

*Kruskal-Wallis Test Examining Love Style and Marital Life Cycle Stage*

Love style	Marital life cycle stage	<i>n</i>	Mean rank
Infatuation	Newly married	12	52.00*
	Young children	19	29.34*
	Adolescents	12	22.29*
	Launching	10	30.05*
	Later life	13	35.50*
	Total	66	
Empty love	Newly married	12	38.50
	Young children	19	30.53
	Adolescents	12	30.17
	Launching	10	34.90
	Later life	13	35.23
	Total	66	
Liking	Newly married	12	46.33
	Young children	19	29.84
	Adolescents	12	26.29
	Launching	10	28.00
	Later life	13	37.88
	Total	66	
Romantic	Newly married	12	50.88**
	Young children	19	29.50**
	Adolescents	12	22.71**
	Launching	10	30.00**
	Later life	13	35.96**
	Total	66	
Fatuous	Newly married	12	51.13**
	Young children	19	29.58**
	Adolescents	12	23.21**
	Launching	10	30.30**
	Later life	13	34.92**
	Total	66	
Companionate	Newly married	12	43.79
	Young children	19	30.11
	Adolescents	12	27.67
	Launching	10	29.65
	Later life	13	37.31
	Total	66	
Consummate	Newly married	12	49.71*
	Young children	19	29.63*
	Adolescents	12	23.50*
	Launching	10	30.70*
	Later life	13	35.58*
	Total	66	

\* $p \leq .05$  \*\* $p \leq .01$

Table 8

*t* Test Examining Attachment Style and Marital Quality

Marital quality	Attachment style	<i>n</i>	Mean	Std deviation	<i>t</i> Value
Consensus	Insecure	10	21.60	2.75681	-2.675*
	Secure	56	24.18	2.81623	
Satisfaction	Insecure	10	15.3000	2.40601	-1.545
	Secure	56	16.4286	2.07896	
Cohesion	Insecure	10	11.7000	4.214769	-.887
	Secure	56	12.6071	2.72149	
RDAS total	Insecure	10	48.6000	7.70570	-2.054*
	Secure	56	53.2143	6.33235	

\* $p \leq .05$

Individuals categorized as insecure consistently demonstrated lower scores on the marital satisfaction, cohesion, and consensus. The examination of marital quality and gender was not significant as shown in Table 9.

An examination of marital quality and marital life cycle stage revealed a significant relationship between cohesion, consensus and total RDAS score. Results for marital satisfaction were not significant, although it was very close. In comparing the means among the sample, the data in Table 10 shows that for cohesion, consensus, and total score, the couples in the newly married and later life stages consistently had the highest scores, while individuals in the couples with young children, couples with adolescents, and couples launching stages had the lowest scores.

Table 9

*Independent Samples t Test for Gender and Marital Quality*

Marital quality	Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean	Std deviation	<i>t</i> -Value
Consensus	Male	31	23.3871	2.92891	-1.044
	Female	35	24.1429	2.94202	
Satisfaction	Male	31	15.9677	2.13672	-1.031
	Female	35	16.5143	2.16077	
Cohesion	Male	31	12.4194	2.814394	-.128
	Female	35	12.5143	3.14709	
RDAS total	Male	31	51.7742	6.37552	-.843
	Female	35	53.1714	7.00624	

Table 10

*One-way ANOVA Examining Marital Quality and Marital Life Cycle Stage*

Marital quality	Marital life cycle stage	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	Mean square	<i>p</i>
Satisfaction	Between groups	4	2.435	10.349	.057
	Within groups	61		4.250	
	Total	65			
Cohesion	Between groups	4	2.741	21.878	.037*
	Within groups	61		7.982	
	Total	65			
Consensus	Between groups	4	3.352	25.272	.015*
	Within groups	61		7.540	
	Total	65			
RDAS total	Between groups	4	4.100	154.695	.005**
	Within groups	61		37.733	
	Total	65			

\* $p \leq .05$  \*\* $p \leq .01$

## CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are suggestive of a moderately significant relationship between attachment style and some love styles as well as love style and some of the marital life cycle stages. An interesting finding of this study was that the breakdown of attachment styles was similar to previous research (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Hazan, 1991; Mickelson, Kessler, & Shaver, 1997; Volling, Notaro, & Larsen, 1998), with a majority of participants, 85%, reporting a secure attachment style and 15% identifying themselves as not secure. Since this research focused on married individuals, we turn to research by Kobak and Hazan, who suggested that a possible explanation for this may be that marriage can influence attachment style. They cite previous research where more than 80% of husbands and 90% of wives describe themselves as securely attached. In their nationally representative sample, Mickelson et al. found that 61.4% of the married respondents were classified as securely attached while only 48% of divorced participants were categorized as such.

## Limitations

There are some limitations of this research that must be discussed. The first limitation is the fact that securely attached individuals appear to be over represented in our sample and that due to this, caution must be exercised when interpreting the results. There is a possibility, as suggested by Schumm and Bugaighis (1986), that social desirability could be an issue, as individuals completing self-report measures desire to

cast themselves in a positive light, resulting in them being less likely to report an insecure attachment style or an unhappy marriage.

Other limitations include the fact that it is a cross sectional study and the possibility of reverse causation potentially calling the results in to question. Cause cannot be inferred with this type of research design, therefore a longitudinal study that followed a group of newly married couples across the marital life cycle would remedy this confound as well as provide a wealth of information regarding the changes in attachment, love style, and marital quality across time.

Small sample size is another limitation that impacted not only the results, it also put constraints on the types of statistical tests that were utilized in order to analyze the data. As mentioned previously, a larger sample size might have resulted in a more significant outcome.

The purpose of this study was to examine members of the LDS church. This makes the external validity of this study questionable. Not only was the sample comprised of members of the LDS church, they were all predominantly Caucasian, well educated, and living in the same western county, making it difficult to generalize the results to different populations. Since nearly all of the individuals sampled for this study were active participants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, we must question if religiosity made them unique. For instance, research cited earlier (Albrecht, 1998; Duke & Johnson, 1998; Heaton, 1998a) suggests that members of the LDS church tend to be more religious, more educated, and more likely to have larger families.

It is possible that religious affiliation influenced the results, but just how this occurs is difficult to ascertain as Hunt and King (1978) argued that it is difficult to tease

apart the dual influences of marital stability and religiosity because "... the complex and often hidden operations, meta-rules, and scenarios of the family system probably interact with the explicit and invisible religious systems of the family members" (p. 399).

### Research Questions

#### *Question One*

The first research question addressed the possible relationship between attachment style and marital life cycle stage. Although the results were not significant, a few assumptions can be made. Since all of the newly married couples ( $n = 12$ , 100%) declared a secure attachment style, one could postulate that the newness of marriage coupled with the excitement of a shared future may have resulted in an exaggerated view of the relationship, thus resulting in a report of secure attachment. While this may be the case with newly married couples, there seems to be an "awakening" when examining the trends of the data suggesting that once the couple leaves the newly married stage, there was a modest increase in the reporting of insecure attachment. Whether the insecure attachment was always there and "colored" by the fascination of being newly married, or if it was a result of the stress that may be experienced as children are brought into the relationship is difficult to determine. What does manifest in the data is that the modest increase in insecurity is noted first in the couples with young children stage and appears to increase again with the participants in the couples with adolescents stage.

According to Carter and McGoldrick (1988), when children are introduced into the lives of couples, they face potential marital challenges, which may flow over into career and back into family. The stress of having children in the relationship may be

exacerbated when the children reach adolescence, bringing its own set of unique issues for the couple. They further note that as the years progress and couples reach the launching stage, there appears to be an increase in security, which is enhanced as the couple moves into later life.

While the research by Carter and McGoldrick (1988) suggests an inverse curvilinear trend, such a trend has been seen in the marital satisfaction literature. Interestingly, the data from this study seem to support the notion of stress promoted by Carter and McGoldrick. It is suggested that while this trend may merely be an artifact of the data, it is worth looking into in order to determine further research.

#### *Question Two*

Results for the analysis of attachment style and love style suggest a possible link between the two variables. Securely attached individuals were more likely to report higher levels of all of the love styles with the exception of empty love. The opposite was true for the individuals with an insecure attachment style; though caution is warranted due to the sample size of the insecure group.

Commitment to the marital relationship, as measured by the Triangular Love Scale, was also demonstrated by all of the individuals sampled. This was apparent even among those who identified themselves as insecurely attached and those with lower levels of the seven love styles. This finding is consistent with research from Davila and Bradbury (2001) who suggest that, in accordance with a dependence model of breakups as identified by Drigotas and Rusbult (1992), individuals who are insecurely attached are more likely to remain in a relationship because of their dependence on the relationship to



meet their emotional needs. Thus, Davila and Bradbury and Drigotas and Rusbult, both suggest that individuals will remain committed to a relationship even if they are not necessarily happy, making them more likely to have a differential view of their options of staying or abandoning the marriage.

Consistent with this, Wilson and Musick (1996) found that members of the LDS church had higher rates of "marital dependency" which they defined as "...the extent to which either spouse believes his or her life would be worse should the marriage end" (p. 31). The authors believe that this may be due to the fact that LDS church members are more often reminded about the value of marriage and are, therefore, more likely to engage in activities that strengthen their marriage and family. Their research suggested that these individuals are less likely to divorce; a fact that held true in spite of the level of marital satisfaction because, as the authors state, "...their religion makes a difference in how committed they are to [the marriage]" (p. 31). Research by Lee (1988) suggested that couples with young children are less likely to divorce. However, he stated that the commitment to an unhappy union dissipates once the children are grown and the couple no longer believes they must stay together for the sake of the children.

### *Question Three*

The third research question addressed whether there were gender differences in attachment style, love style, and marital life cycle stage. Consistent with previous research (Collins 1996; Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) no significant relationship between gender, attachment style, or love style was found. However, a possible link between marital life cycle stage and love style was noted, suggesting that

couples start out with higher levels of the seven different love styles, which steadily declines until the couple reaches the launching and later life stages of life and then there appears to be a gradual yet steady increase in the presentation of love styles.

All of the individuals sampled report being committed to their relationship as demonstrated by the love styles they reported. The amount of intimacy and passion varied and this variation appeared to be related to the marital life cycle stage each was in. Passion and intimacy were highest among the individuals in the newly married and later life stages, while sharp decreases were seen among the couples with adolescents stage.

These results appear to echo Sternberg's (1988) declaration that "...relationships will change over time" (p. 69), and that "couples who expect the passion to last forever, or the intimacy to remain unchanged, are in for a big disappointment" (pp. 82-83). He argued that while couples can expect changes in their relationship over time, it is possible to "build and rebuild them" (p. 83). The findings are also consistent with Carter and McGoldrick's (1988) assertion that while marital contentment declines during the stressful years of caring for small children and adolescents, couples typically experience increased happiness as the children leave the home and the partners are once again able to spend time together pursuing common interests.

Since marital life cycle stage was a significant factor in this research, it is interesting to note previous research that provides possible explanations as to why this is so. Steinberg and Silverberg (1987) noted in their research with couples with adolescents that the biggest predictor of marital satisfaction was the relationship the couple experienced with their same-sex children. They argued that adults at this stage often reevaluate and identify themselves in accordance with the issues their children are

confronting. The authors stated that marital satisfaction at this stage is often predicted by the "midlife identity" of wives and how they identify with their changing roles as the increased autonomy many experience at this time can cause them to reflect and question whether or not they are truly happy.

Research by Lee (1988) suggested that the most salient predictor of marital satisfaction for couples during later life is time spent in meaningful interactions with close friends. He proposed that these relationships serve to "solidify" the marital relationship as it "integrates the couple, as a couple, into a supportive social network" (p. 780). Having said this, the argument made by Schumm and Bugaighis (1986) is particularly relevant when they stated that "... more is to be gained from future research that seeks to evaluate why and how the family life cycle operates than from research that stops at showing its relatively weak effect on marital adjustment over time" (p. 167).

#### *Question Four*

The results of question four examining the relationship between attachment style and marital quality were not significant, yet there are significant results between attachment style and the consensus measure on the RDAS (Busby et al., 1995). The results also indicate that securely attached individuals consistently scored higher on the RDAS than those identified as insecurely attached. These results are consistent with research by Kobak and Hazan (1991), suggesting that securely attached individuals report higher levels of marital satisfaction than those demonstrating insecure attachment styles. The consistently high RDAS scores among the securely attached individuals in this study suggest that perhaps a larger sample size might have garnered significant results between

marital quality and attachment style since previous research (Davila & Bradbury, 2001; Davila, Karney, & Bradbury, 1999) indicates a link between the two variables.

The results suggest that the attachment style of those sampled appeared to differ according to the marital life cycle, thus raising questions about the stability of attachment styles. Simpson (1990) suggested that while attachment style can change, it does not appear to be dependent on the attachment style of one's partner. In other words, securely attached individuals do not become insecurely attached by virtue of being in a relationship with an insecure individual. Feeney (1999) appears to disagree as her research suggests that romantic relationships can impact attachment style and that insecurely attached individuals can, in time, become secure when involved in a secure, caring relationship and vice versa. In their research on attachment styles among newlyweds, Davila et al. (1999) found that the individuals in their study reported becoming more secure over time. The authors posited that a possible explanation for this is that as a marriage progresses, individuals become more at ease in the relationship and secure in their belief that their marriage will endure.

What are the consequences of attachment style on a marriage? Research by Kobak and Hazan (1991) suggested that securely attached couples report higher levels of marital satisfaction and believe that they can rely on their partner and that the opposite is true with insecurely attached individuals. In their research examining unhappily married couples, Davila and Bradbury (2001) found that insecurely attached individuals tend to report decreased levels of marital satisfaction and are less likely to divorce. In examining the stability of these unions, the authors posited that the individual's insecurity and their

resultant fear of abandonment are the glue holding the marriage together making them unlikely to divorce and more likely to stay in an unhappy marriage.

Davila and colleagues (1999) stated that attachment security among their sample appeared to be based not only on the personality characteristics of the individual, but on "specific marital events" or behavior on the part of one's spouse. A possible explanation that personality characteristics might influence attachment style is suggested by research by Mickelson et al. (1997), who found that securely attached individuals possess higher levels of self-esteem, have an internal locus of control, and are more extroverted and open to new experiences. Conversely, they found that insecurely attached individuals tend to possess an external locus of control, are more neurotic and introverted, and less open to new experiences.

#### Clinical Implications

The possible correlation between attachment style, love style, marital quality, and marital life cycle stage points to the importance of the study of attachment to clinical work with couples. For instance, Feeney (1999) noted that while an ambivalent spouse with an avoidant partner tend to have a stable relationship, it is not necessarily satisfying. She notes that ambivalent individuals often expend a great amount of effort in their relationships and expect to be rejected by their partner. Conversely, she stated that those with an avoidant attachment style find relationships confining and attempt to distance themselves from their partner and, therefore, put little effort in maintaining the relationship. In essence, there is an interaction between attachment styles and although neither report being satisfied with their relationship, they remain committed to

maintaining the marriage. Clinicians working with couples such as these could focus their interventions on resolving the "pursuer-distancer" cycle by assisting the ambivalent partner in restraining their efforts at pursuing their partner and helping the avoidant spouse to learn to initiate interactions with their mate.

The suggestion made by Davila and Bradbury (2001) that attention must be paid to couples in "stable unhappy marriages" who stay together in spite of an unhappy union as their reasons for staying appear to be based on an insecure attachment style that prohibits them from leaving due to insecurity and fears of abandonment. They noted that assessment of attachment style at the onset of couple's therapy can assist the clinician in identifying couples with "attachment vulnerabilities."

There are several possible foci therapists may take based upon the findings of this study in conjunction with current research. For example, when working with couples anticipating marriage, pre-marital strategies may include psychoeducation where the curriculum may attend to strategies to enhance and nurture the relationship, problem solving, the sexual relationship, and communication techniques, to name a few.

Along the line of prevention, marriage and family therapists may provide psychoeducation workshops for couples where the focus is on transitions across the life cycle and other pertinent skills. These may be approached from a "coaching" philosophy.

For couples presenting with what appears to be mixed attachment styles the therapist may provide explicit information as to effectively deal with "pursuer-distancer" issues mentioned previously. Another intervention for couples with children may be to assist them to enhance their use of multiple love styles as a means of increasing marital

quality. This may be accomplished by identifying strategies the couple can utilize to increase the amount of passion, intimacy, and commitment in the marriage with the caution that they must actively seek to nurture the marital relationship in order for it to thrive.

In all, a clear understanding of attachment style, love style, and marital quality through assessment allows the therapist to look at the many variables impacting the marital relationship. Once this has been determined, the therapist can tailor interventions that will effectively deal with the unique dilemmas couples present to therapy with.

#### Implications for Future Research

There is a large body of research suggesting that the study of attachment style is worthy of investigation in the field of marriage and family therapy. In addition to the research cited herein, further evidence can be found in research suggesting that attachment style plays a role in an individual deciding to divorce and the risk of multiple marriages (Ceglian & Gardner, 1999; Donovan & Jackson, 1990), as well as mental health functioning following a divorce (Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian, 1997). In fact, research is replete with examples of attachment theory as it relates to marital issues such as how attachment impacts marital functioning (Paley, Cox, Burchinal, & Payne, 1999), and domestic violence (Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart, & Hutchinson, 1997).

Interesting results could be obtained if utilizing a clinical sample of couples in order to determine the effects of attachment style, marital life cycle stage, and love style in couples experiencing marital distress. A study such as this would not have the limitation of response bias that the current research has as couples who present to therapy

are acknowledging that there are problems in their relationship that must be dealt with and therefore would be more likely to respond candidly to questions pertaining to themselves and their marriage. With response bias as a possible confound of the present study, future research in this area could involve the use of The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding scale developed by Paulhus (1991), in order to identify individuals attempting to paint a rosy picture of their marital relationship. A study examining the variables of attachment style, love style, and marital quality among other religious faiths could be carried out in order to determine the relationship among these variables and religiosity.

Increasing sample size would provide several benefits. An important advantage is that Bartholomew's (1990) four attachment styles, namely, secure, preoccupied, fearful, and dismissing, could be utilized. This breakdown of attachment provides a clearer picture of attachment style, as Bartholomew was able to tease apart the subtleties of attachment.

According to Bartholomew (1990), secure attachment denotes an individual who possesses high self-esteem and is involved in fulfilling interpersonal relationships. A preoccupied attachment style involves an individual who is emotionally needy in relationships, overly dependent on their partner and others for approval, and presents with a perceived sense of personal unworthiness. The dismissing attachment style is comprised of individuals who avoid relationships with others; valuing their independence and focusing on career or hobbies. Finally, a fearful attachment style includes those individuals who are "frustrated" in getting their attachment needs fulfilled due to their desire on the one hand to be close to others, yet experiencing an overwhelming fear of



rejection that requires that they keep others at bay. Consequently, it is not uncommon to see these individuals actively avoid social situations because of their fear of rejection.

The Bartholomew (1990) method is advantageous because it not only provides a more consistent presentation of attachment styles, but more particularly that of avoidant attachment, which, according to Bartholomew, is demonstrated in individuals with Fearful and Dismissing attachment orientations. In essence, these two styles delineate an individual who avoids attachment relationships out of fear of rejection or because of their lack of interest in establishing a relationship with another.

Another benefit of a larger sample size is the size of the means that could be generated. In the present study, while the means were significant, they were quite small. A study utilizing a larger sample might begin to see greater mean differences, thus adding greater significance to the statistical results.

As mentioned previously, a longitudinal study addressing these variables would benefit the field of marriage and family therapy as this type of research could reveal patterns across the various marital life cycle stages in order to determine what Schumm and Bugaighis (1986) referred to as the "how and why" of the different stages. Family researchers are already aware that each stage of the family life cycle presents the couple and family with particular challenges that must be navigated. A longitudinal study could cast light on specific patterns of relating and behavior that couples and families engage in. This information could enhance understanding of precisely how these life cycle dilemmas are resolved as well as the implications for long-term functioning when they are not properly dealt with. Information gleaned from a research design such as this would benefit not only the couple, it would also have an impact on the healthy

development of children as suggested by Davila and Bradbury (2001), as improvement in the functioning of one family subsystem would benefit the entire family.

### Summary

In summary, this research suggests that securely attached individuals were more likely to be the newly married couples, couples launching, and couples in later life stages of the marital life cycle. These individuals were also more likely to have higher mean scores across the seven different love styles, as well as to be more likely to have higher mean scores on consensus, or agreement in decision-making. For the individuals in the couples with young children and the couples with adolescents stages, the opposite appears true though sample size and small mean differences must be examined.

This study has potential application as it provides information to clinicians working with distressed couples about the marital life cycle stages and the potential stressors on the marriage associated with life cycle transitions. This research also attempts to highlight the relationship between "how people love," or their style of loving, and marital quality. This research is unique due to its inclusion of older couples that have been involved in long-term marriages and the impact this has on attachment style, love style, and marital quality. Research on attachment often utilizes unmarried college samples or newly married couples, and the focus on attachment across the marital life cycle allowed for an examination of older couples and the changes, if any, that take place among the variables studied.

While some of the results are consistent with previous attachment research, the fact that a study examining attachment, love style, and marital quality across the marital

life cycle has not been done before, a replication is welcomed in order to learn more about these factors and the role they play in marital relationships.

## REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Albrecht, S. L. (1998). The consequential dimension of Mormon religiosity. In J. T. Duke (Ed.), *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members* (pp. 253-292). Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Berlin, L. J., & Cassidy, J. (1999). Relations among relationships: Contributions from attachment theory and research. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 688-712). New York: Guilford.
- Berman, W. H., Marcus, L., & Berman, E. R. (1994). Attachment in marital relations. In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp. 204-231). New York: Guilford.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Orr, I., Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). When marriage breaks up—does attachment style contribute to coping and mental health? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 643-654.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.

- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130, 201-210.
- Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, D. R., & Larson, J. H. (1995). A revision of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 21, 289-308.
- Call, V. R., & Heaton, T. B. (1997). Religious influence on marital stability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 382-392.
- Carter, B., & McGoldrick, M. (1988). *The changing family life cycle* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Gardner.
- Ceglian, C. P., & Gardner, S. (1999). Attachment style: A risk for multiple marriages? *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 31, 125-139.
- Collins, N. L., (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, (810-832).
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Davila, J., & Bradbury, T. N. (2001). Attachment security and the distinction between unhappy spouses who do and do not divorce. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 371-393.

- Davila, J., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1999). Attachment change processes in the early years of marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 783-802.
- DeKay, W. T. (2000). Evolutionary psychology. In W. C. Nichols, M. A. Pace-Nichols, D. S. Becvar, & A. Y. Napier (Eds.), *Handbook of family development and intervention* (pp. 23-40). New York: Wiley.
- Donovan, R. L., & Jackson, B. L. (1990). Deciding to divorce: A process guided by social exchange, attachment and cognitive dissonance theories. *Journal of Divorce*, 13, 23-47.
- Drigotas, S. M., & Rusbult, C. E. (1992). Should I stay or should I go? A dependence model of breakups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 62-87.
- Duke, J. T. (1998). *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members*. Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Duke, J. T., & Johnson, B. L. (1998). The religiosity of Mormon men and women through the life cycle. In J. T. Duke (Ed.), *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members* (pp. 315-343). Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Ellison, C. G., Gay, D. A., & Glass, T. A. (1989). Does religious commitment contribute to individual life satisfaction? *Social Forces*, 68, 100-123.
- Feeney, J. A. (1998). Adult attachment and relationship centered anxiety: Responses to physical and emotional distancing. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 189-218). New York: Guilford.

- Feeney, J.A. (1999). Adult romantic attachment and couple relationships. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 355-377). New York: Guilford.
- Glenn, N. D. (1990). Quantitative research on marital quality in the 1980's: A critical review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 818-831.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman, D. (1999). Pair bonds as attachments: Evaluating the evidence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 336-354). New York: Guilford.
- Heaton, T. B. (1998a). Religious influences on Mormon fertility: Cross-national comparisons. In J. T. Duke (Ed.), *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members* (pp. 425-440). Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Heaton, T. B. (1998b). Vital statistics. In J. T. Duke (Ed.), *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members* (pp. 105-132). Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Hesse, E. (1999). The adult attachment interview: Historical and current perspectives. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 395-433). New York: Guilford.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Stuart, G. L., & Hutchinson, G. (1997). Violent versus nonviolent husbands: Differences in attachment patterns, dependency, and jealousy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 11, 314-331.

- Hunt, R. A., & King, M. B. (1978). Religiosity and marriage. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17, 399-406.
- Judd, D. K. (1998). Religiosity, mental health, and the Latter-day Saints: A preliminary review of literature (1923-95). In J. T. Duke (Ed.), *Latter-day saint social life: Social research on the LDS church and its members* (pp. 473-497). Provo, UT: Bookcraft.
- Karen, R. (1994). *Becoming attached: Unfolding the mystery of the infant – mother bond and its impact on later life*. New York: Warner.
- Kobak, R. (1999). The emotional dynamics of disruptions in attachment relationships: Implications for theory, research, and clinical intervention. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 21-43). New York: Guilford.
- Kobak, R. R., & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 861-869.
- Lambert, M. J., Morton, J. J., Hatfield, D., Harmon, C., Hamilton, S., Reid, R. C., Shimokawa, K., Christopherson, C., & Burlingame, G. M. (2004). *Administration and scoring manual for the OQ-45.2 (Outcome questionnaire)*. Orem, UT: American Professional Credentialing Services L.L.C.
- Lee, G. R. (1988). Marital satisfaction in later life: The effects of nonmarital roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 775-783.
- Maller, A. S. (1992). Reducing the risks of divorce: A responsibility of religious educators. *Religious Education*, 87, 471-478.



- Mickelson, K. D., Kessler, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1997). Adult attachment in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1092-1106.
- Miller, R. (1987). Trends in marital happiness in Provo, Utah: 1955-1983. *Sociology and Social Research*, 71, 294-297.
- Newman, B. M., & Newman, P. R. (1999). *Development through the life cycle: A psychosocial approach* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Paley, B., Cox, M. J., Burchinal, M. R., & Payne, C. C. (1999). Attachment and marital functioning: Comparison of spouses with continuous-secure, earned-secure, dismissing, and preoccupied attachment stances. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 13, 580-597.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). New York: Academic Press.
- Rothbard, J. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Continuity of attachment across the lifespan. In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp. 31-71). New York: Guilford.
- Schumm, W. R., & Bugaighis, M. A. (1986). Marital quality over the marital career: Alternative explanations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 165-168.
- Shaver, P. R., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The Psychology of love* (pp. 68-99). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 971-980.
- Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (1998). *Attachment theory and close relationships*. New York: Guilford.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38*, 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B., & Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*, 825-839.
- Sperling, M. B., & Berman, W. H. (1994). *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives*. New York: Guilford.
- Steinberg, L., & Silverberg, S. B. (1987). Influences on marital satisfaction during the middle stages of the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49*, 751-760.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). *The triangle of love: Intimacy, passion, commitment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 313-335.
- Thompson, R. A. (1999). Early attachment and later development. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 265-286). New York: Guilford.
- Vogt, W. P. (1993). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Volling, B. L., Notaro, P. C., & Larsen, J. J. (1998). Adult attachment styles: Relations with emotional well-being, marriage, and parenting. *Family Relations*, 47, 355-367.
- Weiss, R. S. (1975). *Marital separation: Coping with the end of a marriage and the transition to being single again*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weiss, R. S. (1982). Attachment in adult life. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stephenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* (pp. 171-184). New York: Basic Books.
- West, M. L., & Sheldon-Keller, A. E. (1994). *Patterns of relating: An adult attachment perspective* (p. 19). New York: Guilford.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1996). Religion and marital dependency. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35, 30-41.

## APPENDIX

**DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE****AGE:**

Check One:

- 18-23 years
- 24-33 Years
- 34-42 years
- 43-52 Years
- 53-Older

**GENDER:**

Check One:

- Male
- Female

**ETHNICITY:**

Check One:

- Caucasian (White)
- African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Other

**EDUCATION:**

Check One:

- Less Than High School Diploma
- High School Diploma or G.E.D.
- Attended College, No Diploma
- College Graduate
- Advanced Degree (Master's or PhD)

**INCOME:**

Check One:

- Less than 10,000/year
- 10,000 – 20,000/year
- 20,000-40,000/year
- 40,000-60,000
- 60,000 or more/year

**NUMBER OF YEARS MARRIED:**

Check One:

- 5 years or less
- 6-10 years
- 11-20 years
- 21 or more years

**WHAT IS THE AGE OF YOUR OLDEST CHILD:**

Check One:

- Newly married, No children
- Newborn-12 Years
- 13-19 Years
- 20-29 Years
- 30+ Years

**HOW LONG DID YOU AND YOUR SPOUSE DATE BEFORE YOU MARRIED?**

Check One:

- Less than 1 Year
- 1 Year – 2 Years
- More than 2 Years

**HOW MANY SERIOUS RELATIONSHIPS WERE YOU INVOLVED IN BEFORE YOU MARRIED YOUR SPOUSE?**

Check One:

- He/She was my first serious relationship
- 2-3 prior serious relationships
- More than 3 prior serious relationships

**DID YOU AND YOUR SPOUSE COHABIT BEFORE YOU WERE MARRIED?**

Check One:

- Yes
- No

**HAVE YOU AND YOUR SPOUSE SOUGHT MARITAL COUNSELING IN THE PAST?**

Check One:

- Yes
- No

Revised Adult Attachment Scale (Collins, 1996)

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which it describes your feelings about romantic relationships. Please think about all your romantic relationships (past and present) and respond in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships. If you have never been involved in a romantic relationship, answer in terms of how you think you would feel. Please use the scale below by placing a number between 1 and 5 in the space provided to the right of each statement.

- |     | 1-----2-----3-----4-----5   |                                 |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|
|     | Not at all<br>characteristic<br>of me   | Very<br>characteristic<br>of me |
| 1)  | I find it relatively easy to get close to people.                                       | _____                           |
| 2)  | I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others                                 | _____                           |
| 3)  | I often worry that romantic partners don't really love me.                              | _____                           |
| 4)  | I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like.                       | _____                           |
| 5)  | I am comfortable depending on others.   | _____                           |
| 6)  | I <i>don't</i> worry about people getting too close to me.                              | _____                           |
| 7)  | I find that people are never there when you need them.                                  | _____                           |
| 8)  | I am somewhat <i>uncomfortable</i> being close to others.                               | _____                           |
| 9)  | I often worry that romantic partners won't want to stay with me.                        | _____                           |
| 10) | When I show my feelings for others, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.    | _____                           |
| 11) | I often wonder whether romantic partners really care about me.                          | _____                           |
| 12) | I am comfortable developing close relationships with others.                            | _____                           |
| 13) | I am <i>uncomfortable</i> when anyone gets too emotionally close to me.                 | _____                           |
| 14) | I know that people will be there when I need them.                                      | _____                           |
| 15) | I want to get close to people, but I worry about being hurt.                            | _____                           |
| 16) | I find it difficult to trust others completely.   | _____                           |
| 17) | Romantic partners often want me to be emotionally closer than I feel comfortable being. | _____                           |
| 18) | I am not sure that I can always depend on people to be there when I need them.          | _____                           |

### The Sternberg Triangular Love Scale

The blanks represent the person with whom you are in a relationship. Rate each statement on a 1-to-9 scale, where 1 = "not at all," 5 = "moderately," and 9 = "extremely." Use intermediate points on the scale to indicate intermediate levels of feelings.

1. I am actively supportive of \_\_\_\_'s well-being.
2. I have a warm relationship with \_\_\_\_.
3. I am able to count on \_\_\_\_ in times of need.
4. \_\_\_\_ is able to count on me in times of need.
5. I am willing to share myself and my possessions with \_\_\_\_.
6. I receive considerable emotional support from \_\_\_\_.
7. I give considerable emotional support to \_\_\_\_.
8. I communicate well with \_\_\_\_.
9. I value \_\_\_\_ greatly in my life.
10. I feel close to \_\_\_\_.
11. I have a comfortable relationship with \_\_\_\_.
12. I feel that I really understand \_\_\_\_.
13. I feel that \_\_\_\_ really understands me.
14. I feel that I really can trust \_\_\_\_.
15. I share deeply personal information about myself with \_\_\_\_.
16. Just seeing \_\_\_\_ excites me.
17. I find myself thinking about \_\_\_\_ frequently during the day.
18. My relationship with \_\_\_\_ is very romantic.
19. I find \_\_\_\_ to be very personally attractive.
20. I idealize \_\_\_\_.
21. I cannot imagine another person making me as happy as \_\_\_\_ does.
22. I would rather be with \_\_\_\_ than with anyone else.
23. There is nothing more important to me than my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
24. I especially like physical contact with \_\_\_\_.
25. There is something almost "magical" about my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
26. I adore \_\_\_\_.
27. I cannot imagine life without \_\_\_\_.
28. My relationship with \_\_\_\_ is passionate.
29. When I see romantic movies and read romantic books I think of \_\_\_\_.
30. I fantasize about \_\_\_\_.
31. I know that I care about \_\_\_\_.
32. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
33. Because of my commitment to \_\_\_\_, I would not let other people come between us.
34. I have confidence in the stability of my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
35. I could not let anything get in the way of my commitment to \_\_\_\_.
36. I expect my love for \_\_\_\_ to last for the rest of my life.
37. I will always feel a strong responsibility for \_\_\_\_.
38. I view my commitment to \_\_\_\_ as a solid one.
39. I cannot imagine ending my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
40. I am certain of my love for \_\_\_\_.
41. I view my relationship with \_\_\_\_ as permanent.
42. I view my relationship with \_\_\_\_ as a good decision.
43. I feel a sense of responsibility toward \_\_\_\_.
44. I plan to continue my relationship with \_\_\_\_.
45. Even when \_\_\_\_ is hard to deal with, I remain committed to our relationship.



## Outcome Questionnaire (OQ-45.2)

Instructions: Looking back over the last week, including today, help us understand how you have been feeling. Read each item carefully and mark the box under the category which best describes your current situation. For this section, work is defined as employment, school, housework, childcare, volunteer work, and so forth.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always
1. I get along well with others.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
2. I tire quickly.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
3. I feel no interest in things.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
4. I feel stressed at work/school.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
5. I blame myself for things.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
6. I feel irritated.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
7. I feel unhappy in my marriage/ significant relationship.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
8. I have thoughts of ending my life.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
9. I feel weak.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
10. I feel fearful.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
11. After heavy drinking, I need a drink the next morning to get going (If you do not drink, mark "never").....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
12. I find my work/school satisfying.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
13. I am a happy person.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
14. I work/study too much.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
15. I feel worthless.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
16. I am concerned about family troubles...	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
17. I have an unfulfilling sex life.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
18. I feel lonely.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
19. I have frequent arguments.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
20. I feel loved and wanted.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
21. I enjoy my spare time.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
22. I have difficulty concentrating.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
23. I feel hopeless about the future.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
24. I like myself.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 0
25. Disturbing thoughts come into my mind that I cannot get rid of.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

26. I feel annoyed by people who criticize my drinking (or drug use). (If not applicable, mark "never").....  0  1  2  3  4
27. I have an upset stomach.....  0  1  2  3  4
28. I am not working/studying as well as I used to.....  0  1  2  3  4
29. My heart pounds too much.....  0  1  2  3  4
30. I have trouble getting along with friends and close acquaintances.....  0  1  2  3  4
31. I am satisfied with my life.....  4  3  2  1  0
32. I have trouble at work/school because of my drinking or drug use (If not applicable, mark "never").....  0  1  2  3  4
33. I feel that something bad is going to happen.....  0  1  2  3  4
34. I have sore muscles.....  0  1  2  3  4
35. I feel afraid of open spaces, driving, being on a bus, etc.....  0  1  2  3  4
36. I feel nervous.....  0  1  2  3  4
37. I feel my love relationships are full and complete.....  4  3  2  1  0
39. I have too many disagreements at work/school.....  0  1  2  3  4
40. I feel something is wrong with my mind.....  0  1  2  3  4
41. I have trouble falling/staying asleep....  0  1  2  3  4
42. I feel blue.....  0  1  2  3  4
43. I am satisfied with my relationships with others.....  4  3  2  1  0
44. I feel angry enough at work/school to do something I may regret.....  0  1  2  3  4
45. I have headaches.....  0  1  2  3  4



