INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®
800-521-0600

Associations Between Parenting Style and Quality of Attachment to Mother in Middle Childhood and Adolescence

Leigh Karavasilis

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Psychology

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

July 1999

Abstract

Associations between parenting style and quality of attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence

Leigh Karavasilis

Associations between parenting style and the quality of child attachment to mother were investigated in middle childhood and adolescence. Two hundred and two children in middle childhood (grades 4-6) and 212 adolescents (grades 7-11) participated. In the younger group, secure attachment was assessed by the Network of Relationships Questionnaire (NRI; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) and two types of insecure attachment by the Coping Styles Questionnaire (CSQ; Finnegan et al., 1996). In adolescence, secure attachment and three types of insecure attachment were measured by the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). All participants provided ratings on three dimensions of parenting style characteristic of their families (parental involvement, psychological autonomy granting, and behavioral control) using the Steinberg Parenting Styles Questionnaire (Lamborn et al., 1991). As predicted, the three parenting factors successfully differentiated between different styles of attachment to mother. At both ages authoritative parenting (i.e., higher levels of all three parenting dimensions) was positively associated with secure attachment to mother, whereas negligent parenting (i.e., lower levels on all three parenting dimensions) predicted insecure attachment, although results were less straightforward for preoccupied attachment.

Further, unique patterns of contributions by the parenting dimensions distinguished between different types of insecure attachment. Specifically, parental involvement and psychological autonomy granting uniquely predicted secure and fearful attachment but in opposite directions; parental involvement and behavioral control made independent negative contributions to avoidant/dismissing attachment; and psychological autonomy granting uniquely contributed to preoccupied attachment in adolescence. Findings on the whole were consistent across the two age groups except for preoccupied attachment in middle childhood, for which results were non-significant. Validity of the measure for insecure attachment in middle childhood was also discussed.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Anna Beth Doyle for her guidance, support, and encouragement throughout this process. To my committee members, Dr. Dorothy Markiewicz and Dr. Dale Stack, thank you for your constructive comments and helpful suggestions. Special thanks to Joelle Dyan for allowing me to use data from her research and also to all of my lab mates who have offered their invaluable support and understanding along the way.

I am deeply grateful to my parents and to both of my sisters whose faith and love over the years has fostered in me the courage to forge my own path toward discovering what is fulfilling to me. Also thanks to my friends who were always ready to play whenever I managed to emerge from under the avalanche of books and papers. And last, but certainly not least, I extend my heart-felt appreciation to Abby Ostien who somehow managed to stick around through all of the madness and who never fails to provide the light at the end of the tunnel.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Appendices

List of Appendices (Continued)

Associations between parenting style and quality of attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence

Findings consistently support the relation between attachment security and cognitive, emotional, and behavioral sequelae across development (Goldberg, 1991; Rice, 1990). It is widely accepted that the behavior of the primary attachment figure, typically the mother, has an ongoing influence on the nature of the child's attachment security. Yet little is known regarding the association between parenting factors and attachment orientation beyond early childhood. Attempts to identify factors that contribute to the development and maintenance of different attachment styles in middle to late childhood remain sparse. "Insofar as attachment researchers believe that relational support remains necessary to the maintenance of secure attachment and its correlates, the contribution of the continuing quality of care merit greater consideration" (Thompson, 1998, p. 48). It is believed that an individual's attachment orientation may be more malleable in earlier stages of development, becoming more fixed over time (Bowlby, 1969). Therefore, knowledge of how later parenting relates to attachment may also aid future research in identifying the timing for interventions while children are still in the their formative contexts.

Attachment orientation and parenting styles have separately been found to influence children's adjustment throughout different stages of development. Although both have considered parental qualities such as sensitivity, involvement and support, only research in the arena of parenting styles has emphasized factors such as demandingness, limit setting, degree of control and discipline (Bretherton, Golby, & Cho, 1997). A main focus of the present investigation was to evaluate the association between various

parenting style dimensions and attachment in order to broaden the context within which to study the antecedents of attachment. More specifically, the present study was designed to examine the association between children's perceptions of three aspects of parenting (i.e., parental involvement, fostering of psychological autonomy, and behavioral monitoring/control) and the quality of children's attachment to their mothers in middle childhood and adolescence.

Attachment Theory

More than twenty-five years ago John Bowlby, combining principles from psychoanalytic theory and ethology, introduced Attachment theory to explain the emotional distress experienced by infants as a result of separation from their attachment figure (Bowlby, 1973). The quality of the attachment relationship is largely determined by the history of interaction between the dyad. It is the attachment figure's characteristic ways of responding to the infant's signals which are viewed as determining how the child will learn how to best achieve his/her attachment needs (Bowlby, 1988a) with maternal sensitivity and responsiveness being essential to the development of secure infant-mother attachment (Ainsworth, 1982; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Grossmann & Grossmann, 1990; van IJzendoorn, 1995). Over time these patterns of relating within the attachment relationship become internalized and more characteristic of the individual him/herself and, in turn, will influence the nature and quality of future intimate relationships (Bowlby, 1988a).

In hypothesizing about a possible mechanism by which individuals develop particular attachment styles, Bowlby proposed that as the child develops more complex

cognitive abilities, attachment goals correspondingly shift from general proximity-seeking behavior to more psychological domains of adaptiveness (Bowlby, 1969). With this increase in abstract mental processes, the child begins to internalize early attachment experiences; a process ultimately leading to the construction of "internal working models" that consist of mental representations of the dependability of intimate others and of the worthiness of the self in relation to these significant others (Bretherton, 1990; Main, 1991). "A growing body of work is consistent with the hypothesis that early experiences in the family contribute to representational models that guide emotional reactions, interaction patterns, expectations, and processing biases in adult personal relationships" (Bartholomew, 1993, p. 62) in a way that perpetuates originally held beliefs and behaviors. For instance, individuals whose early attachment experiences provide responsiveness and security come to feel confident in the availability of the attachment figure, to view themselves as worthy of affection and to value healthy, intimate relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). In contrast, those who experience inconsistency or rejection in the primary attachment relationship have been shown to develop a negative self-view and/or to anticipate, provoke, and attend to similar dynamics with future partners (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Cassidy, Kirsh, Scolton, & Park, 1996; Fox, Kimmerly, & Schafer, 1991; Hodges, Finnegan, & Perry, 1997; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Consequently, early attachment experiences help provide a framework within which to understand social and psychological functioning throughout development.

Despite Bowlby's description of working models as self-perpetuating and

increasingly more stable over time, they are not viewed as impenetrable to change. Bowlby conceptualized the process of "construction-reconstruction" as allowing the individual potential for growth and change. For example, shifts from insecure to secure attachment orientation may occur within the context of an intense emotional relationship (e.g., with a romantic partner or therapist) where experiences that are inconsistent with the existing model can result in the working model being updated (Bowlby, 1988a). In this way, both the individual and intimate others play important roles in dynamically influencing the outcome of interactions, the quality of the relationship and, conceivably, one's attachment orientation. In fact, Bowlby came to adopt a transactional view of working models of attachment whereby infant development is conceived of as following along one of an array of potential pathways, some of which are more optimal than others with regard to psychological and emotional well-being (Bowlby, 1988a). At each instance, the path along which a child proceeds is not fixed but is determined by the interaction between the individual in his/her present state and larger environmental context. Accordingly, changes in how one is treated and/or changes in other environmental variables can lead to shifts toward more or less adaptive trajectories. Although such changes can occur across the lifespan, it is thought that the older that an individual becomes, the more difficult it is for changes to take place (Bowlby, 1969). Therefore, attachment style is taken to represent more than the quality of a specific relationship while not being a "purely intrapsychic and a historical product of early experiences that remains impervious to outside influences" (Kobak & Hazan, 1991). At the same time others have noted that, although Attachment theory appears to focus on

individual characteristics, it actually involves the quality of the relationship more generally (Furman & Wehner, 1994). Viewed in these terms, an individual's general orientation to attachment relationships influences the pattern of interaction within the dyad, while simultaneously specific experiences over time can serve to modify the particular style of attachment. Thus, it is possible that changes in the promotion of more optimal parenting at different stages of development may affect the primary attachment relationship in such a way that can enhance movement toward increased security.

Some researchers argue that what appears to be consistency in attachment orientation within and across relationships is largely dependent upon stability in environmental contexts and influences (Fox, 1995). Consistent with this view, evidence suggests that attachment style is somewhat malleable over time as individuals' contextual factors change, different developmental transitions are made, and new relationships and experiences are encountered (Bartholomew, 1993; Baldwin, Keelan, Fehr, & Enns, 1996). In addition, it has been suggested that discontinuity in attachment orientation is most likely to occur during major transitions in development, e.g., toddlerhood and adolescence (Fox, 1995). Shifts in how successfully both children and their parents are able to negotiate the demands of each new stage of development may result in changes in the quality of attachment. Several empirical avenues are available for pursuing the study of such changes, including the investigation of how parenting factors influence the perception of ones' self and of the primary attachment figure during different developmental periods.

The framework of Attachment theory, as set forth by Bowlby, was extended by the work of Mary Ainsworth and her colleagues with the development of the Strange

Situation (Ainsworth, et al., 1978). This strategy of assessing the quality of child-parent attachments has stimulated an abundance of empirical research and is widely used and highly regarded for its reliability and validity (Steele, Steele, Croft, & Fonagy, 1999). Through intensive longitudinal home observations of the mother-infant dyad during the first year of life and a separation-reunion episode in the laboratory, Ainsworth delineated three distinct patterns of attachment that are consistent with Bowlby's original conceptualization: secure, insecure-resistant (also referred to as anxious-ambivalent or preoccupied), and insecure-avoidant (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

The Strange Situation is a procedure designed to intensify infant's attachment behavior during a brief separation from and reunion with the primary attachment figure in a laboratory setting (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Based on individual differences in the strategies employed to cope with reunion (i.e., seeks contact with parent, is comforted by proximity, is able to resume exploration of novel environment) three patterns of attachment emerged that were validated against those defined in Ainsworth's original home observations. Findings typically reveal that approximately 70% of infants exhibit a predominantly secure attachment orientation, 20% avoidant, and 10% resistant in North American samples which is roughly the distribution Ainsworth cited in her original study (van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988). Secure children in the Strange Situation are pleased when reunited with the caregiver, appear to be able to effectively regulate their emotional state, and to balance their attachment needs with exploration of their physical and social environment. In contrast, children characterized as insecure-avoidant exhibit little outward signs of distress, avoid their parent upon reunion, and appear to be content

in exploring their environment. Despite this outward display of independence, physiological measures show heightened levels of arousal during these separation/reunion experiences that supercede those of visibly distressed secure infants (Spangler & Grossmann, 1993). Children who are avoidantly attached also exhibit lower quality, length, intensity and concentration of solitary play bouts when compared to secure infants (Main, 1983). These observations suggests that avoidant children are not simply engrossed in play, but actually suppress their negative emotion and attachment-eliciting behavior perhaps as a means of preventing further maternal rejection. Insecure-resistant infants, on the other hand, are clearly distressed upon separation and remain inconsolable and preoccupied with maternal availability even after her return. Consequently, the coping strategy used by these children interferes with their abilities to attend to other developmentally appropriate demands of their physical and social worlds.

More recently, a fourth category, the disorganized pattern, has been identified in children who were previously difficult to classify using the three-category system (Main & Solomon, 1986). These children are observed to have no coherent strategy for dealing with separation thought to result from fear of the attachment figure; they exhibit confused, erratic and temporarily disorganized reunion behavior, for example, clinging to the mother while leaning away and freezing with trance-like expressions. Disorganized attachment is more commonly found among maltreated populations who have experienced more severe parenting problems (Cichetti, Toth, & Lynch, 1995).

While some researchers contend that temperament, defined as proneness to distress, appears to distinguish to a moderate degree between children identified in the

Strange Situation as secure or insecure (e.g., Fox, Kimmerly, & Schafer, 1991; Seifer & Schiller, 1996), others emphasize that attachment is not the same as, or a product of, temperament (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994; Vaughn, Lefever, Seifer, & Barglow, 1989). Whereas temperament appears to relate to infants' responses to separation and level of distress, attachment status is defined by the child's reunion behavior and ability to use of the attachment figure as a source of comfort. It is interesting to note that temperament and maternal caregiving appear to be unrelated during the first three months of life (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1988a). However, infants' whose mothers responded promptly and reliably to their signals at earlier points in time cried less by 12 months and were also more likely to be securely attached (Ainsworth et al., 1978). In addition, infants described as difficult shortly after birth have been observed to form secure attachments while many who were characterized as easy became anxious, moody, and demanding (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

It has recently been argued that research has failed to reveal a relationship between attachment and temperament, in part, due to methodological limitations of the Strange Situation and that significant findings are emerging with the use of the Attachment Q-sort (Vaughn & Waters, 1990). The Attachment Q-sort assesses secure-base behavior during normal, every-day, mother-infant interactions (see Seifer & Schiller, 1996). However, one home observation study showed that maternal involvement and responsivity were related to attachment security using the Attachment Q-sort procedure even after controlling for temperament (Wachs & Desai, 1993 in Rothbart & Bates, 1998). As Seifer and his colleagues point out, it is unlikely that child characteristics (e.g., temperament)

have no influence on child-parent relationships, however the weight of the evidence, thus far, supports the claim that mothers, at least initially, play a more central role than their infants in affecting the quality of the parent-child attachment (Goldberg, 1991; van IJzendoorn, 1995). Viewed in somewhat different terms, it is perhaps those infants who fail to successfully influence their attachment figure to fulfill their attachment needs who must develop secondary strategies that are characteristic of the insecure patterns of attachment.

Parental Correlates of Attachment

"What began as a competent caregiver-infant pair led to a flexible resourceful child...such predictability is not due to the inherently higher IQ of a securely attached infant or, apparently, to inborn differences in temperament" (Matas, Arend, & Sroufe, 1978, p. 556). Empirical research on attachment theory has continued to amass a great deal of support for the association between secure attachment and positive adaptation versus insecure attachment and poor adjustment throughout development (for review see Goldberg, 1991; Rice, 1990). In light of such evidence, study of potential precursors to and causal factors in the development of the different styles of attachment warrants attention. Of particular interest is the influence of parenting on the quality of children's attachments across different periods of development. Investigation of the behavior of primary attachment figures toward their children continues to provide strong evidence for some important associations between caregiving behavior and attachment orientation in infancy and early childhood. For instance, mothers of secure one-year-old infants are observed to be more tender and careful in their physical interactions, have more contingent

face-to-face interaction, show more positive and less negative affect, and are consistently responsive and sensitive to their infants' signals (Ainsworth 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bartholomew, 1993; Main, 1996). In contrast, mothers of insecure-avoidant infants are more rejecting of attachment behaviors, more averse to physical contact, show more anger and interact in an intense and intrusive manner (Ainsworth 1982; Ainsworth et al. 1978; Bartholomew, 1993; Isabella, 1993; Main, 1996). Finally, mothers of insecure-resistant infants are characterized as unpredictable in their behavior, more inept and de-synchronized in their parenting interactions, insensitive, uninvolved, and inconsistently responsive to their children's signals (Ainsworth 1982; Ainsworth et al. 1978; Bartholomew, 1993; Isabella, 1993; Main, 1996).

Contingent upon the attachment figures' readiness to respond to their attachment needs, children are believed to develop characteristic adaptive strategies in order to optimize their chances for survival (Main, 1990). Unlike securely attached children, those who are insecure appear to be unable to count on their attachment figure to alleviate distress and/or to serve as a secure base from which to explore their social and physical environments (Ainsworth, 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1978). Whereas securely attached infants need only be concerned with alerting the caregiver of impending danger, children who are insecurely attached carry the added burden of regulating their own behavior and emotions in coordination with that of their caregivers (Main, 1990). Consequently, these children find themselves in a quandary where their ability to explore their environments in such a way that will facilitate the development of a broad range of competencies is compromised; in essence, the balance between developmentally appropriate autonomy

and dependence, a hallmark of psychological well-being, is disrupted.

Moreover, given the differences in the caregiving experiences, not only between children with secure and insecure attachment orientations but also between those with different types of insecurity, a picture begins to emerge of how the challenges faced by children with these different orientations, and their corresponding ways of coping, are quite distinct. Whereas insecure-avoidant children come to expect maternal unavailability and adopt a defensive strategy of denying negative feelings following separation, secure infants are certain of maternal availability and use open and appropriate communication that increases the likelihood of having their attachment needs met (Grossmann & Grossmann, 1991). In fact, the more upset avoidantly attached children become, the less likely they are to directly communicate their feelings of distress to their parent with the opposite being true for those securely attached. As mentioned previously, this pattern of avoidance is thought to develop as a strategy to circumvent frustrating and further alienating an already unresponsive mother when she is most needed and/or to avoid frustration themselves (Grossmann & Grossmann, 1991; Main, 1990). Findings that further substantiate this premise show that avoidant infants become less cuddly by one year of age yet still attempt to initiate contact with their mothers, who exhibit an aversion to physical affection (Ainsworth, 1982). Rather than attempting to seek physical attention in a direct and obvious way that may increase the risk of rejection, these children tend to make contact with their mothers' distal parts such as their feet. In contrast to avoidant children who come to view their mothers as consistently unavailable, insecure-resistant children develop an uncertainty of maternal availability (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). As a

result of the unpredictability exhibited by mothers of insecure-resistant children, it appears that these youngsters become preoccupied with the availability of a "secure-base". Such preoccupation interferes with their ability to explore and develop competence, autonomy, and maturity (Isabella & Belsky, 1991). Thus, they learn to maximize their attachment output through exaggerated reactions to potential threat so as to ensure parental responsiveness (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994; Main, 1990).

Research investigating the relationship between the parenting qualities of the primary attachment figure and childhood attachment has focused special attention on the importance of maternal sensitivity. Sensitivity, as defined by Ainsworth, includes the ability and willingness to perceive the infant's communication (i.e., behavior, emotional expression, vocalization), interpret them from the infant's point of view, and respond to them promptly and appropriately according to the child's developmental needs (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Maternal sensitivity is one of the variables found to most consistently differentiate among childhood attachment classifications (de Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997; Grossmann & Grossmann, 1991; Isabella, 1993; Thompson, 1998). Yet there is some debate as to what this factor represents (see Seifer, Schiller, Sameroff et al., 1996; Thompson, 1988).

Some researchers contend that maternal sensitivity may perhaps be the most critical factor influencing attachment status and that investigations finding variable, often weaker, effects than those reported in Ainsworth's seminal work do so as a result of using less rigorous methodologies (Isabella, 1993). Ainsworth's original work involved a prospective design starting when infants were three weeks old and extensive home

observations across many months. Other researchers acknowledge the strong and consistent findings of the relation between sensitivity and attachment status while citing evidence that a subset of children appear to be less susceptible to parental influences (e.g., Pederson & Moran, 1999). Research using sibling data demonstrated that over 60% of siblings showed concordant attachment styles with concordant relations to maternal sensitivity, yet non-concordance between siblings' attachment could not be explained by differences in maternal sensitivity (Pederson & Moran, 1999). Still others contend that maternal sensitivity is perhaps not the most appropriate way to understand what is important about parenting style with regard to the attachment relationship as sensitivity is often not well-defined and is frequently confused with parental love, warmth and affection, and "good parenting" (Seifer & Schiller, 1996; Seifer, Schiller, Sameroff et al., 1996). Instead, it is argued that sensitivity likely involves numerous components rather than a single construct, a fact which may also explain the modest effect sizes typically reported in the attachment literature (e.g., Seifer & Schiller, 1996). A main focus of the present investigation involves consideration of more clearly defined constructs of parenting style and their relation to attachment in later childhood.

A pattern of results consistent with parental correlates of infant attachment orientation also emerges from attachment research beyond infancy. For example, mothers of secure toddlers have been shown to be more constructively involved during free play sessions, more enthusiastic, positive and non-controlling in their interactions in comparison to mothers of insecurely attached children (Achermann, Dinneen, & Stevenson-Hinde, 1991). Furthermore, home observations of the attachment relationship

in early childhood show that mothers of secure children exhibit a more positive mood, engage in more well-coordinated styles of interaction, provide more relaxed home environments and appear to enjoy their children more (Stevenson-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995). As part of the same investigation, mothers of secure children were also higher in their use of monitoring, planning, affirmations, and sensitive interactions with their children during a joint task in a laboratory setting. In comparison, mothers of insecure-resistant children were the least responsive and showed more friction in their interactions during home observations, but notably were rated similarly to mothers of secure children in terms of responsiveness and friction during the joint task. Thus, these mothers demonstrated that they were capable of very sensitive interactions when motivated by their own internal state. Similar observations have been made by other researchers (e.g., Ainsworth et al., 1978). In contrast to the infant literature with 12-month-old-infants, mothers of avoidant preschoolers were not found to behave intrusively, although they exhibited lower levels of monitoring behavior and less planning overall (Stevenson-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995).

The finding that mothers of insecure-avoidant children were not intrusive during the preschool years suggests that a possible developmental shift in attachment may occur between infancy and the preschool years that would illustrate the dynamic interaction within the dyad (Stevenson-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995). Closer inspection of the infant literature reveals that maternal rejection (defined by negative affect and interfering manipulation) at one month of age is most highly related to insecure-resistant attachment at 12 months; maternal rejection from four to nine months of age does not differentiate

between avoidant and resistant attachment at 12 months; maternal rejection after nine months is related to insecure-avoidance at 12 months (Isabella, 1993). It is argued that as infants become more cognizant of the risks of being engaged with a hostile parent, they consequently develop a more avoidant strategy of interacting which may then result in the mothers of these children becoming more withdrawn. In line with the observation of a developmental shift in maternal rejection and avoidant attachment and the relation between maternal withdrawal and avoidant attachment, findings from studies of maltreated infants show that at 12 months, children who have experienced neglect have an increased likelihood of being classified as insecure-resistant, whereas by 18 months they are more likely to be classified as insecure-avoidant (Youngblade & Belsky, 1990). As this example illustrates, the study of attachment must be attuned to stage salient factors that might be important in the development and maintenance of different patterns, as well as the possibility of bi-directional or interactive processes. The present researcher is unaware of any study that has implemented a longitudinal design that would allow for the relation between these developmental and transactional processes and attachment within the same dyads to be properly examined.

Further empirical study of the relations between parenting behavior and childhood attachment comes from research that has looked at mothers' attachment status and maternal behavior during the Strange Situation with children between ages two and four. Findings show that, as expected, mothers who were secure were clear and helpful in preparing their children for separation and more affectionate and responsive upon reunion (Crowell & Feldman, 1991; van IJzendoorn, Juffer, & Duyvesteyn, 1995). Those

classified as dismissing were physically distant and cool, did little in terms of preparing their child, left without difficulty and rebuffed their children's attempts for contact during reunion. Conversely, preoccupied mothers tended to be anxious about leave-taking, were less helpful and more confusing in preparing their children, avoided interaction upon reunion, and had difficulty interpreting their children's behavior accurately. These results replicate earlier findings that utilized a tool-using task rather than separation (Crowell & Feldman, 1988). Interestingly, findings such as these have been used to suggest that an individual's style of attachment links early childhood experiences to later parenting behavior in a way that may help explain what seems to be an intergenerational transmission of attachment style (Crowell & Feldman, 1988). As Bowlby proposes, the child develops a pattern of behavior toward the attachment figure that parallels the behavior of the attachment figure toward him or her; this pattern then serves as a basis for the workings of his or her own internal processes (Bowlby, 1991).

Also of interest is the strong correspondence (i.e., 75%) between parents' classifications using the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985; Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985), infants' attachment behavior in the Strange Situation and his/her subsequent representational models of self and others (Main, 1991; van IJzendoorn, 1995). The relation between parent and child classification is thought to be mediated by the patterns of parental responsiveness (e.g., support, sensitivity, involvement, warmth) associated with the parent's classification. Mothers who are found to be autonomous/secure are better able to respond appropriately to their infants' attachment behavior and have children who are secure; mothers who are dismissing tend

to rebuff their infants' attachment-eliciting behaviors and have children who are also avoidant; mothers who are preoccupied are characterized by their inability to respond reliably and predictably to their infants' signals, are insensitive one moment and overly compensating the next according to their own attachment needs, and have children who are correspondingly anxious-resistant (van IJzendoorn, 1995). These results are strongly predictive whether the AAI is completed when the child is five years old, a few months following measurement of the child's attachment at one year and even prior to the child's birth (Crowell & Feldman, 1991; van IJzendoorn, 1995). Nonetheless, it is important to note that, although maternal sensitivity appears to be highly predictive and may mediate the observed relationship between mother and child attachment classification, much of the variance in child attachment is left unexplained, some of which may be accounted for by other aspects of parenting. In addition, further consideration of the problems with respect to treating maternal sensitivity as a unitary construct already discussed should be noted since it is likely to leave a great deal unexplained (see Seifer & Schiller, 1996; Seifer et al., 1996).

A growing body of research compellingly demonstrates that the pattern of attachment developed early in life is critically influenced by the way in which the attachment figure treats the child (Bowlby,1988a). Bowlby proposed that it is throughout the formative years, from birth through adolescence, that confidence in the availability of attachment figures, or lack thereof, is gradually established (Bowlby, 1973). Despite the premise that the development of attachment orientation in the primary attachment relationship is not restricted to infancy and toddlerhood, little work has been done to

investigate the influence of parenting behavior on attachment beyond early childhood. One study has used the AAI which measures general state of mind rather than specific parenting behavior (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). This research showed that adolescents with secure working models perceived their families as highly supportive, whereas those who were dismissing reported receiving little family support and described their parents as more rejecting and less loving (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Preoccupied teens, on the other hand, reported their parents to be more loving and supportive than avoidant teens did, but also described these relationships as role-reversing. A recent study using the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), a self-report measure of attachment, provides findings compatible to those using the AAI (Strayer & Preece, 1999). Results indicated that college students' reports of security of attachment was related positively to parental caring and negatively to parental over-control with the opposite relations holding for fearful attachment (Strayer & Preece, 1999).

At the core of attachment theory is the importance of a *secure base* that is provided by a caregiver who is able to meet the child's attachment needs while simultaneously providing *support and encouragement toward exploration* beyond the parent-child bond for the development of secure attachment (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1988a). Based on theory and research findings, it is expected that a source of security for children in middle childhood and adolescence is competent parenting that fosters a balance between these two factors of closeness and autonomy.

Parenting Styles

An aspect of the development of attachment orientation that has not been well

explored is the influence of more general, but well-defined, dimensions of parenting such as those used in the study of parenting styles and children's adjustment. Moving beyond the more specific parenting characteristics typically considered in attachment research may contribute to further elucidating the broader context within which attachment develops.

Similar to work in the area of attachment, research on parenting styles has also focused on cognitive, social, and behavioral adjustment across the lifespan. Empirical study of parenting styles supports "authoritative" parenting as leading to optimal psycho-social, academic and behavioral adjustment (Steinberg, 1996; Steinberg, Darling, Fletcher, Brown, & Dornbusch, 1995). The "authoritative" style of parenting consists of high levels of loving and responsive involvement (*parental involvement*), strong encouragement toward psychological autonomy and individuation through non-coercive discipline (*psychological autonomy*), and high demands for age appropriate behavior with consistent limit setting and parental monitoring (*behavioral control*). These three parenting dimensions are conceptually parallel to those originally delineated by Baumrind in her longitudinal research that used observational, questionnaire, and interview methods (Baumrind, 1971, 1991). "Authoritarian" parenting, on the other hand, is defined by relatively lower levels of parental involvement and psychological autonomy granting and higher levels of behavioral control (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg et al., 1995). Further building on the work of Maccoby and Martin (1983), Steinberg and his colleagues define "Indulgent" parenting as being characterized by high parental involvement but low fostering of psychological autonomy and behavioral control, and finally "Neglectful" parenting consisting of low levels on all three parenting

dimensions.

Investigation of children's perception of parenting in their families supports authoritative parenting as facilitating healthier overall adjustment (i.e., academic success, social competence, low depression, low delinquency), in contrast to negligent parenting which is linked to the poorest outcomes (Steinberg et al., 1995). The associations for the other two parenting styles and adjustment are mixed; authoritarian parenting is related to fewer behavioral problems but more internalized distress and indulgent parenting to less serious forms of delinquency but higher social competence. Other investigations have produced similar findings, linking authoritative parenting to positive outcomes such as greater social competence and self-reliance, more positive orientation toward school and work, lower internalized distress and lower levels of deviant behavior such as school misconduct, drug use and delinquency (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991). These findings largely parallel previous observational research that found high levels of parental involvement and psychological autonomy, and moderate behavioral control, to be related to higher self-esteem in childhood and adolescence (Baumrind, 1971; Parish & McCluskey, 1992). Interestingly, findings also indicate considerable consistency in the relation between the optimal influence of authoritative parenting on psychosocial development across different ethnic groups (i.e., Asian-, African-, Hispanic- and European-American) living in the United States (Steinberg et al., 1995). The strength of these effects were also comparable across ethnic groups, except for the relation between authoritative parenting and academic success, which was stronger for European- and Hispanic-American teenagers.

A recent debate in the research of parenting styles involves the use of a

typological verses dimensional approach (Barber, 1996; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Darling and Steinberg (1993) argue that parenting styles are best conceptualized as the context that moderates the influence of specific parenting practices and, further, that a dimensional approach that simply considers high and low levels of a single variable (e.g., control) fails to take into account the presence of other parenting factors that may influence its meaning. Therefore, they contend that when parenting dimensions are considered together, they can capture the constellation of parental attitudes toward the child that contribute to the emotional climate within which specific behaviors are moderated and expressed. Counter to this view, others argue that the typological approach makes it difficult to ascertain what aspects of parenting effect which developmental outcomes (e.g., Barber, 1996). For example, parental control has been found to involve two dimensions, psychological (interference with experiences that promote child's individuation) and behavioral (monitoring and demands for age-appropriate behavior), each exhibiting differential influences; high psychological control has been shown in cross-sectional and longitudinal research to lead to internalizing problems in pre-adolescence and adolescence whereas low behavioral control is more closely related to externalizing difficulty (Barber, 1996). It appears that both approaches have merit, and as suggested by others, the decision of which to use should be based upon theoretical considerations (e.g., Steinberg et al., 1995).

In reviewing the research on parenting styles, the positive relations found between optimal parenting and healthy adaptation are reminiscent of the healthy adjustment outcomes characteristic of securely attached children. Further, optimal caregiving in the

parenting styles literature also seems to overlap with the kind of competent parenting (e.g., sensitive, accepting, cooperative) that has been shown to contribute to secure attachment versus insecure attachment. This observation has also been made by others (e.g., Bowlby, 1973; Bretherton, Golby, & Cho, 1997). It has been proposed that "a multidimensional approach of parenting antecedents should replace the search for the unique contribution of sensitivity" (de Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997). Although both literatures have considered parental qualities such as sensitivity, involvement and support, only parenting styles research has emphasized factors such as demandingness, limit setting, type of control and discipline (Bretherton et al., 1997). The present investigation can be thought of as treating attachment security itself as a positive outcome with respect to the quality of parenting the child experiences. All three dimensions of parenting style will be evaluated together but not aggregated into typologies in order to allow for evaluation of their joint and individual effects.

Middle Childhood and Adolescence

A limitation of attachment research is its tendency to draw inferences from the infant literature despite behavioral differences manifested at older ages that likely involve children's expanding competencies and relationship experiences (Ainsworth, 1991). With this evolving maturity, the factors that are most important in defining the quality of the attachment relationship are subject to change. For example, a recent study demonstrated that although parental availability remained important for secure attachment to parents during pre-adolescence and adolescence, children's emerging competency and independence during this stage of life reduced their instrumental dependency on their

parents (Lieberman, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 1999). Hence, the significance of this type of parental involvement in maintaining secure attachment appears to decline during this stage of life.

A commonly held belief, at least in western cultures, is that adolescence is a tumultuous time of conflict during which children begin the "natural" process of detachment from their parents as they move toward increased autonomy and begin to develop intimate relationships outside of the immediate family (Grotevant, 1998; Steinberg, 1990). Consequently, much research has focused on rifts in the parent-adolescent relationship rather than on the continuity in the quality of this relationship through the adolescent period. Yet empirical research suggests that the maintenance of emotional connectedness between parents and their children through this developmental transition toward increased autonomy has significant implications for healthier overall well-being (Grotevant, 1998; Steinberg, 1990). Conceivably, this may be a period of development, like toddlerhood, where the reliability and responsiveness of the attachment figure as a secure base becomes more salient and important as children confront new challenges and situations that may present potential threats (Ainsworth, 1991; Laursen, Hartup, & Koplas, 1996). Indeed, adolescence has been referred to as the "second individuation phase" (Blos, 1979).

The balance between autonomy and connectedness continues to be a vital part of the foundation upon which secure parent-child attachment rests. Although the relation between many of the parenting correlates of attachment are well supported in the infant and early childhood literature, empirical data necessary to establish these associations in

later childhood is lacking. In light of the ongoing process of construction and re-construction of the internal working models of attachment, understanding of the links between the influence of parenting and quality of attachment requires a developmental perspective since the meaning and effects of parenting, as well as the needs of the child, are likely to change as the child matures. As such, "parents must be responsive not only to the child's current needs and capabilities but also to the emergent needs that are fostered by the interactive activity they share" (Thompson, 1998, p. 28). In fact, normative shifts are believed to occur in the nature of the child's attachment relationship to his or her parents throughout development, although research is warranted in order to identify and better understand when and how these transitions take place (Ainsworth, 1991). As mentioned previously, a main goal of the present research was to extend empirical study of the association between parenting and attachment beyond the traditional investigation of infancy and early childhood to later stages of development.

Closer consideration of adolescence indicates that as children enter this period of life, they undergo radical developmental changes in physical, hormonal, cognitive, and social realms which affect their emerging sense of self in a way that may have an important impact on the nature of relationships (Grotevant, 1998). By adolescence, children's views of the parent-child relationship are fairly well-established as a result of years of experience, but as they become more autonomous, a process of re-evaluation of the parent-child relationship and re-negotiation of roles and boundaries begins. For instance, with respect to cognitive changes, children's reasoning becomes more abstract, complex, and self-reflective (Keating, 1990). With this increase in cognitive sophistication, individuals are

more capable of reflecting on their own inner experience and of re-evaluating their view of relationships while taking others' perspectives into account. Although the way in which they perceive certain aspects of the caregiving relationship may not change, its significance to the quality of the attachment may. Further, these more advanced mental abilities make change possible through insight, whereas in earlier stages of development, change appears to require concrete modifications in relationship experiences (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985).

In addition, it is important to underscore the changes that take place in children's social networks as they move from the mother-infant dyad and immediate family circle in early life, to interactions with playmates in the toddler years, to reciprocal friendships in middle childhood, and finally to more mature and intimate relationships in later adolescence. As children's social networks broaden, research shows that the amount of time spent with other family members dramatically declines while simultaneously experience is gained in new voluntary relationships in which children learn how to better appreciate their own and others' individuality (Grotevant, 1998). These experiences, in combination with cognitive maturation, are thought to result in a shift from unilateral parent-child relationships to more symmetrical ones which may further influence the way in which children interpret and ascribe meaning to different aspects of the parenting they receive. Consequently, the transition between middle childhood and adolescence is a particularly interesting period to study as children further separate from the attachment figure in order to begin exploration of intimate relationships outside of the immediate family. This is thought to be one of the most fundamental challenges of this period of life,

not only for children, but also for their parents who are called upon to foster their children's autonomy in a way that will allow them to grow in an optimally healthy way. Thus, changes in children's physical, cognitive, and interpersonal functioning warrants investigation of the way in which parenting practices relate to children's attachment quality during later stages of child development. Studying how children and their parents navigate these transitions may be most promising in furthering our understanding of the variables that are most important in defining the quality of the attachment relationship through development. For instance, fostering adolescents' psychological autonomy and placing less restrictive control on their behavior within a context of warmth and support is likely to provide the balance between autonomy and relatedness that is optimal in providing adolescents with the security to assert their emerging independence.

Measuring Attachment Beyond Early Childhood

In infancy and early childhood the Strange Situation (Ainsworth et al., 1978), or its appropriate modification (Main & Cassidy, 1988), has been used to directly measure attachment orientation through the observation of overt behavioral responses to separation and reunion between the child and the primary caregiver. Similarly, the Attachment Q-Sort (Vaughn & Waters, 1990) relies on secure base behavior to rate mother-infant attachment quality. As individuals further develop their language and representational abilities, new avenues become available for the assessment of internal working models of attachment. Efforts to measure corresponding attachment styles in late adolescence and adulthood use indirect methods designed to probe the current underlying working models of the primary or present attachment relationships rather than focusing on overt behavior

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; George et al., 1985).

The Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985) was the first measure designed to uncover adults' working models of attachment that closely parallel the categories childhood attachment originally delineated by Ainsworth. The AAI was originally intended for use in the prediction of the quality of the parent-infant attachment relationship. It remains the most widely regarded interview procedure. This structured interview focuses on tapping the individual's state of mind with respect to early attachment experiences and how he or she views the influence of these experiences on present functioning. By evaluating the coherence and distortions of the individual's discourse, the unconscious representation of their internal working model can be assessed and attachment classification determined. Several investigations have demonstrated the AAI to have impressive reliability, discriminant validity, and predictive validity of the individual's responsiveness to infant's attachment cues and also of the quality of the offspring's attachment (see van IJzendoorn, 1995).

A further change in the study of attachment beyond childhood emerged with the use of self-report measures. The first self-report measure was developed to assess adult attachment style in the study of romantic relationships and reflects secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent attachment styles that are analogous to those found in the infancy literature (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Each style has been shown to relate in meaningful ways to mental models of self and social relationships and to relate to experiences with parents in predictable ways (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Extending this earlier work on adult attachment, Bartholomew proposed a four-category model of attachment (Bartholomew,

1990). From interviews with adolescents, Bartholomew identified two underlying dimensions of working models that were originally hypothesized by attachment theory - "self" as worthy of love and support and "other" as available and responsive. When these two dimensions are crossed, four different styles emerge: secure (positive self/positive other), dismissing-avoidance (positive self/negative other), preoccupied (negative self/positive other), and fearful-avoidance (negative self/negative other). This work lead to the development of the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), a self-report measure of attachment. The RQ distinguishes between two different types of avoidance by splitting the insecure-avoidant attachment of other self-report measures into two types, dismissing and fearful (Bartholomew, 1990). Working from their two-dimensional framework, they reasoned that individuals who have a negative view of intimate others may have either a negative self-view (i.e., fearful attachment) or may defend against such self-devaluation and instead present a positive self-view (i.e., dismissing attachment).

When using self-report measures of attachment, it is important to note that the factors deemed important in judging attachment from the AAI may be the same as those that lead to distortions in self-reports of attachment. For example, dismissing individuals on the AAI may be similar to secure individuals on Hazan and Shaver's measure as a result of defensive processes against a negative self-view, whereas individuals determined to be avoidant using this self-report measure must be consciously aware of their negative self-view. Hence, it is important that such conscious and unconscious processes be taken into account when using self-report measures since they are subject to reporting biases that

may otherwise overlook these two types of avoidance. Dismissing attachment on the RQ conceptually corresponds with the AAI's dismissing style and fearful attachment corresponds with Hazan and Shaver's avoidant style (Bartholomew & Shaver, 1998). Besides attempting to take into consideration the presence of such defensive processes, Bartholomew has also shown that self-report data using the RQ is significantly correlated with coded interviews of attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Additional consideration of the psychometric properties of the RQ in measuring attachment will be more fully explored in the subsequent consideration of the methodology used in the present investigation.

Research using the RQ has also verified that attachment style is more than the sum of the underlying self and other dimensions, but that each prototype adds to the prediction of a distinct profile of interpersonal functioning, beyond that which can be explained by personality measures (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Additionally, although attachment theory seems to imply that individuals possess single, reasonably consistent working models, empirical evidence supports the idea that individuals possess multiple attachment styles across different situations and partners (e.g., Baldwin et al., 1992; Bartholomew, 1990; Goosens & van IJzendoorn, 1990). Therefore, although some moderate consistency does exist, it may be more accurate to evaluate the degree to which individuals exhibit each style of attachment.

To date, there have been serious limitations in the study of attachment security during middle childhood which may, at least in part, be attributable to the absence of a previously established method by which to measure attachment styles in this age group

(Finnegan, Hodges, & Perry, 1996; Hodges, et al., 1997). As Bowlby aptly points out, there is need for:

> "the development of psychological methods for assessing patterns of attachment and their derivations at each phase of the life cycle...To cast light on the problems of continuity and discontinuity of both patterns of attachment and also of different degrees of resilience and vulnerability, prospective studies following personality development through different phases of the life cycle and in different environments are plainly indispensable" (1988b, p. 9).

In light of normative shifts that are believed to occur in the attachment relationship throughout development, establishing such measures is a vital and necessary step toward constructing a more complete picture of how attachment relates to parenting and adjustment during this period of life.

Research that distinguishes between styles of insecure attachment, both in development and outcome is especially needed, as has been underscored in much of the attachment literature (Berlin, Cassidy & Belsky, 1995; Hodges et al., 1997). Until recently, studies in middle childhood have been unable to make such distinctions due to the absence of an appropriate measure that distinguishes types of insecurity. At the same time, studies using categorical measures at earlier and later developmental stages have all too often forgone making such distinctions and instead combine insecure categories in order to increase sample size and improve statistical power. As noted above, existing evidence suggests that developmental trajectories for different styles of attachment exhibit distinct precursors and differential adjustment outcomes. Given the potentially opposing

differences between styles, research that does not differentiate between insecure styles may fail to provide important information about these distinct patterns, both in how they differ from each other and also from secure attachment.

Recently, Finnegan and her colleagues devised the Coping Styles Questionnaire (CSQ; Finnegan et al., 1996), a self-report measure of preoccupied and avoidant styles of coping with close relationships in middle childhood that follows the conceptualization of emerging working models of intimate relationships (Finnegan et al., 1996; Hodges et al., 1997). Similar to the traits that characterize avoidance in infants, young children, adolescents and adults, the avoidance scale of the CSQ for pre-adolescence was designed to capture denial of distress and affection toward the attachment figure, avoidance of her while engaging in exploratory behavior and following separation, not seeking her during times of stress, and not using her as a helpful resource. High scores on the preoccupied scale is characterized by a profile that closely parallels that of insecure-resistance in infants, anxious-ambivalence in children, and preoccupied attachment in adults. This scale was designed to reflect a strong need for the attachment figure during novel or stressful situations, difficulty with separation from her and continued distress following reunion, excessive concern with her whereabouts, and trouble with exploration and meeting new challenges due to over-dependency on the attachment figure.

Research using the CSQ has attempted to address the problem of differentiating between patterns of insecure attachment and concurrent adjustment in middle childhood and has provided strong evidence for sequelae of these two styles that parallel those from research of earlier and later stages of development (Finnegan et al., 1996; Hodges et

al.,1997). Although initial efforts using the CSQ appear promising, additional research is necessary in order to establish its validity as a measure of attachment.

Summary and Objectives of the Present Study

Attachment theory contends that the quality of the primary attachment relationship is largely determined by the history of interaction in the parent-child relationship (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973). There is strong empirical support for the claim that the primary attachment extends beyond early childhood and continues to provide important influence throughout development (Ainsworth, 1989; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hodges et al., 1997). Further, the infant and early childhood attachment literature, as explicated above, consistently supports parenting competence (e.g., sensitivity, responsiveness, support, etc.) as important to the development of attachment security and also of the various types of insecurity (e.g., Achermann et al., 1991; Ainsworth et al., 1978; Crowell & Feldman, 1988, 1991; Stevenson-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995). Although these relations have been extensively researched in infancy and early childhood, little work has been conducted with older age groups. There has been a considerable amount of research, however, conducted on the influence of parenting styles on children's adjustment during later stages of childhood and adolescence. The parenting styles literature has consistently shown authoritative parenting to be optimal for children's positive adjustment outcomes (Steinberg et al., 1995). Interestingly, the different dimensions of this optimal parenting style (i.e., high degrees of parental involvement, fostering of psychological autonomy, and behavioral control) bear close resemblance to the type of caregiving that lead to secure quality of attachment in infancy and early

childhood. In addition, the adaptive outcomes related to optimal parenting style (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991; Baumrind, 1991) closely parallel those associated with secure attachment (Goldberg, 1991; Rice, 1990).

The present research attempted to bring together the attachment and parenting styles literatures in the investigation of how established parenting factors relate to the quality of children's attachments to their mothers in middle childhood and adolescence. A primary objective in elucidating the relation between parenting and attachment at these later stages of development is to help bridge the gap that presently exists in the developmental literature. A simultaneously goal is to broaden the framework typically used in studying parental correlates of attachment, by including such variables as psychological autonomy and behavioral control that are likely to become increasingly important as children mature.

As mentioned above, in order to avoid overlooking important differences between types of insecure attachment it is necessary that these be differentiated in measurement and in analysis. A measure that makes such a distinction between types of insecurity in middle childhood has recently become available, but has yet to be validated as a measure of attachment. The present research used the CSQ (Finnegan et al., 1996) as a measure of two different types of insecurity in middle childhood in an attempt to clarify some of the parental correlates of avoidant and preoccupied attachment for this age group. These same associations were also investigated in adolescence using the RQ (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) which is a well-established measure of secure and three insecure styles of attachment. As a secondary objective, this study may help provide some validation for the

use of the CSQ as a measure of two types of insecure attachment by examining the consistency of results with theoretically and empirically grounded predictions and also by comparing the patterns of relations across the two ages groups.

Specifically, the following questions were investigated: Does the association between the dimensions of parenting style (*Parental Involvement-PI*, *Psychological Autonomy-PA*, and *Behavioral Control-BC*) distinguish between secure and insecure attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence? Are these parenting dimensions also able to differentiate between the various types of insecure attachment? Is continuity observed in these associations across middle childhood and adolescence?

Hypotheses

Based on the research previously reviewed, it was expected that:

1) Children who reported higher levels of **security** were expected to also report having parents who provide loving and responsive involvement (PI), foster their psychological autonomy (PA) through democratic discipline while exerting a significant degree of behavioral control (BC) through appropriate monitoring of behavior and limit setting. High levels on all three of these dimensions represents *authoritative* parenting which is deemed the most optimal parenting style (Steinberg et al., 1995).

2) A negative relation was expected between children's levels of **avoidant** (elementary school) and **dismissing-avoidant** (high school) attachment and their views of PI, PA and BC. Low levels on all three of these dimensions is referred to as *negligent* parenting and is found to be the least optimal parenting style

(Steinberg et al., 1995). Thus, such non-optimal parenting is believed to correspond with research findings that show mothers of children with avoidant attachment to be withdrawn, neglectful, and consistently rejecting (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994; Isabella, 1993; Stevenson-Hinde et al., 1995).

3) Evidence suggests that mothers of children who are more **preoccupied** tend to be inconsistent in their parenting, being at times highly insensitive and uninvolved while at others fairly capable and sometimes overcompensating (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Stevenson-Hinde, 1995). Therefore, a significant relation between preoccupied attachment and overall PI and BC was not expected. However, a negative relationship was expected to emerge in relation to PA since mothers of these children have been found to behave intrusively and in a manner that inhibits their children's emerging autonomy (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994).

4) In addition, children's reports of their level of **fearful** attachment (high school only), also an avoidant style, were expected to be negatively associated with PI, PA, and BC. Evidence has shown this attachment style to be related to uncaring and intrusive over-control (Strayer & Preece, 1999). Given that fearful-avoidance is distinguished from dismissing-avoidance by a negative self-view, it is anticipated that lack of nurturance toward personal competence and efficacy, as measured by parental fostering of psychological autonomy, may play a stronger role in the prediction of this type of avoidant attachment.

Exploratory Analyses. The presence of age and sex differences in dimensions of parenting, as well as their interactions in relation to attachment were explored. Also,

possible interactive effects between the dimensions of parenting style in relation to attachment were tested since high or low levels of one parenting factor may have a very different effect depending on the level of others. Only significant results were reported.

Comparisons between Middle Childhood and Adolescence. Given the cross-sectional nature of the present study, as well as the use of different measures of attachment for middle childhood and adolescence, changes between these two developmental periods were neither testable nor directly comparable. Nonetheless, the observed pattern of results for both age groups were compared as a means of identifying consistencies or discrepancies that may exist between these two periods. In general, parenting that fosters 1) children's psychological autonomy (PA) and 2) provides appropriate supervision and demands age-appropriate behavior (BC), in addition to warm and responsive caring, was expected to be optimal in facilitating security for both age groups. However, as children make the normative transition from middle childhood to adolescence, their need for psychological autonomy (PA) is expected to become increasingly more salient and may therefore contribute more strongly to prediction. In accordance with increasing independence in adolescence, it is also anticipated that the overall degree of behavioral monitoring and limit setting (BC) that is developmentally appropriate and optimal decreases. Children who reported receiving parenting that was sensitive to their developmental needs were expected to be more securely attached. Thus, differences that emerge between middle childhood and adolescence may reflect an increasing need for psychological autonomy and a decreasing reliance on behavioral management and control in adolescence in comparison to middle childhood.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from a larger investigation of social support and self-esteem in children from different ethnic groups residing in Canada. The present study used questionnaire data obtained from the subset of 432 children who were living with their biological mothers in two parent families. As a result of being absent from one of the two testing sessions (9 elementary school students) and insufficient time (19 high school students), 28 participants were excluded from the analyses due to missing data on one or more measure of interest. Thus, 414 participants remained in the final sample for the present study. Participants comprised 202 elementary school children in grades 4 through 6 (89 boys and 113 girls) and 212 high school students in grades 7 through 11 (103 boys and 109 girls). The exact number of participants in each grade is presented in Table 1. These children were between 9 and 18 years of age from two French-language elementary schools and one high school in the suburban Montreal area. The mean age for the elementary school sample was 10.6, SD = 1.0 and for the high school sample was 15.1, SD = 1.2.

Participants in both age groups came from a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds, as reported by children and shown in Table 2, with several different languages being spoken in their households (see Appendix A). The mean socioeconomic status for the elementary school sample was 49.7 (SD = 18.0) for the elementary school sample and 48.8, (SD = 16.8) for the high school sample, using Blishen, Carrol and Moore's (1987) Socioeconomic Index for Occupations in Canada. SES for both groups fall in the lower-

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Male and Female Participants in Each Grade Level, Elementary School (N=202) and High School (N=212) Listed Separately.

Grade	Males n	Females n	Total n
4	25	48	73
5	40	34	74
6	24	31	55
Total	89	113	202
7	5	7	12
8	13	24	37
9	50	46	96
10	24	21	45
11	11	11	22
Total	103	109	212

Table 2

Ethnic Background Listed Separately for Elementary School and High School Samples.

	Elementary School (N=202)		High School (N=212)	
Ethnic Background	n	%	n	%
Canadian	14	6.9	3	1.5
Québécois	53	26.2	13	6.6
Greek	16	7.9	68	34.7
Arabic/Mid Eastern /N. African	38	18.8	39	19.9
Caribbean/Haitian	33	16.3	34	17.3
Hispanic	0	0	12	6.1
East/South Asian	21	10.8	7	3.6
Russian/Slavic/European	9	4.6	3	1.5
Jewish	6	0.5	4	2.0
First Nations	1	0.5	13	6.6
Mixed	6	3.1	0	0

Note: Data was missing on ethnicity for 7 elementary school and 16 high school participants.

middle class range. SES was computed based on children's reports of the occupational status of one parent if only one was employed or on the average of the two parents' occupations if both were employed. It is important to note that the accuracy of the elementary school children's reports of parental occupation was questionable as many of them were unsure of their parents' occupations and educational attainments. Therefore, SES was not used as a control variable in the analyses.

Measures

All questionnaires used in the present study were translated into French by a translator unfamiliar with the hypotheses and then independently back-translated into English to ensure the accuracy of the French translation.

Participants were asked to complete a General Information Sheet (see Appendix B) in order to obtain demographic information such as age, sex, grade level, languages spoken, socioeconomic status, ethnic background, and parental education and occupation.

Steinberg Parenting Styles Questionnaire. The Steinberg Parenting Styles Questionnaire (Lamborn et al., 1991) was used to assess children's perception of parenting practices characteristic in their families. This self-report measure consists of 36 items that assess three parenting dimensions: parental involvement (loving, responsive, involved; 15 items, e.g., "How often does your family do something fun together"); Psychological autonomy (democratic discipline, encourage individual expressiveness within family; 12 items; e.g., "Tell you that their ideas are correct and that you should not question them"); and behavioral control (parental supervision, monitoring; 9 items; e.g., "How much do your parents REALLY know where you are most afternoons after

school?"). The questionnaire and items pertaining to each parenting dimension are provided in Appendix C. For the scales measuring parental involvement and psychological autonomy, five items and three items, respectively, were asked regarding both mother and father separately. As indicated by Lamborn et al. (1991), averages across identical items relating to mother and father were then used to compute the overall parenting scales. Several items were reverse scored and scales were computed such that higher scores reflect higher levels of parental involvement, psychological autonomy, and behavioral control. Because the interval of measurement used for items varied, responses were weighted so that each had equal value prior to computing the composite scores for the scales.

The internal consistency values for all variables, including Parental Involvement, Psychological Autonomy, and Behavioral Control scales, are presented in Table 3, separately for the younger and older samples. One item was dropped from the Parental Involvement Scale (i.e., "My parents push me to think independently") and one from the Psychological Autonomy scale (i.e.,"How much do your parents emphasize that you shouldn't argue with adults") for both samples in order to improve the internal reliability of the scales. The internal consistency reported by the authors for their sample of adolescents between ages 14 and 18 were $\alpha = .72$, $\alpha = .86$, and $\alpha = .76$ (Steinberg et al., 1992). Predictably, these reliabilities are closer to those found for the current, slightly younger, high school sample, but nonetheless those for the elementary school sample are within acceptable range for consideration.

Several studies provide support for the validity for the Steinberg Parenting Styles

Table 3

Internal Consistency Values for Elementary School and High School Samples.

	Grades 4 - 6		Grades 7 - 11	
Scale	α	n	α	n
Parental Involvement	.55	195	.76	199
Psychological Autonomy	.65	188	.69	196
Behavioral Control	.73	191	.79	202
Felt Security (NRI Social Support)	.89	201	.94	211
Preoccupied Coping	.67	200	N/A	
Avoidant Coping	.73	201	N/A	
Social Desirability	.75	202	.70	212

Note: Internal consistency values expressed as Cronback's alpha coefficients.

Questionnaire (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992; Steinberg et al., 1995). Adolescents from authoritative homes (i.e., scores above the median on all three scales) were higher than their peers on a range of adaptive outcome variables, whereas those from non-authoritative homes (i.e., scores below the median on all three parenting factors) showed poorer outcomes compared to their peers (Steinberg et al., 1991). Using a prospective design, high parental involvement, high psychological autonomy, and high behavioral control were found to be significant factors in predicting scores on academic engagement and achievement one year later (Steinberg et al., 1992). The longitudinal design used by these researchers provided support for their hypothesis that the positive outcome follows from and is not simply associated with the child's report of parenting behavior. In addition, by partialling out the effects of shared method variance and social desirability at Time 1, these researchers provide evidence for the internal validity of their parenting measure.

In considering the use of the dimensions of parenting style used in the present research, it is important to note that these constructs are based on longitudinal research originally completed by Baumrind (1971, 1991) that applied factor analytic strategies to observational, questionnaire, and interview data. In her research, Baumrind acknowledged the influence of the child on parenting behavior and as a result made efforts to disentangle parent behavior from child behavior in her analysis of the direction of influence. In so doing, she constructed parenting style dimensions that were characteristic of parent rather than of the parent-child relationship.

Another important point worthy of mention, is the validity of using this parenting

measure to predict children's patterns of attachment to mother alone. This was assessed by evaluating the correlations between items that relate to mother and father independently. The observed correlations were positive, significant, and moderate in size (average $\underline{r} = .46$). Additionally, other authors have reported considerable convergence between ratings of mother's and father's parenting (e.g., Baumrind, 1991).

Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI). The Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) was used to assess participants' perceptions of the quality of their relationships with their mothers, as well as with other partners not considered in the present study. This self-report measure consists of 33 items assessing 11 social provisions (3 items for each). These include Reliable Alliance (permanence of relationship), Companionship, Affection, Intimacy (disclosure), Admiration (reassurance of worth), Instrumental Help, Nurturance given to mother, Satisfaction, Relative Power, Conflict, and Punishment. Items and subscales are presented in Appendix D. Children were asked to rate the extent to which each provision was met in their relationships with their mothers using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from little or none (1) to the most (5). The mean Cronbach's alpha originally reported for all 11 scales across 9 relationships (i.e., mother, father, grandparent, older brother, younger brother, older sister, younger sister, best friend, and teacher) was .80 (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). Although the authors did not report individual alphas for each scale in each relationship, reported by the authors, the lowest reliability was above .60.

A composite score for social support was calculated by combining scores for Reliability, Companionship, Affection, Intimacy, Admiration, Instrumental Help, and

Nurturance (Furman & Buhrmester, 1992). The internal consistencies for social support from mother were high; values are presented in Table 3. Social support was used as a measure of felt security in elementary school children's attachments to their mothers. The validity of using the composite social support score as a measure of secure attachment, is provided by its high correlation with a well validated measure of security, the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) for the high school sample. The Social Support scale correlated .67 with the RQ's secure attachment and was significantly negatively correlated with each of the three insecure styles. Similarly, Furman reports data that the Social Support scale correlates .70 with security as measured by the Behavior Styles Questionnaire (BSQ; Furman & Buhrmester, 1992) and the two insecure styles. The BSQ is a 3-category, self-report measure of attachment that has been used with older ages.

Coping Strategies Questionnaire (CSQ). In order to assess patterns of insecure attachment for participants in grades 4-6, the short-form of the Coping Strategies Questionnaire was used (CSQ; Finnegan et al., 1996). The short-form of the CSQ is a 20 item self-report measure of preoccupied and avoidant styles of relating to mother during day-to-day stressors. The 20 items utilized were the most reliable of the original 36 items on this measure. Ten of the items assess preoccupied style, for example, "You are at the movies with your mother and you have to go out to the bathroom. When you come back in the movie it is so dark you can't find your mother. Some kids would calmly look for their mother and not be too worried, but other kids would look for their mother and would be very upset until they found her. Which is more like you?". The remaining 10

items measure avoidant style, for example, "One day you have a problem with a friend at school. When you get home, your mother can tell you are upset and starts talking to you about it. Some kids would feel comfortable talking to their mother about their feelings and problems, but other kids would just want their mothers to leave them alone. Which is more like you?". Items are presented in Appendix E . The response format was a Harter two-stage forced-choice. First children chose whether the insecure style being measured by that item was characteristic of them or not (e.g., choice between preoccupied or non-preoccupied response). Following this, participants indicated whether their choice was "sort of true" for them or "really true". Scale scores for each item range from 0 for indicating a non-preoccupied/non-avoidant style to 1 or 2 depending on the degree to which the corresponding insecure style applies to them. Several items were reverse scored such that for all items higher scores indicated higher levels of preoccupied or avoidant coping.

The Cronbach's alpha for the full 36-item sub-scale were reported by the authors to be .86 for preoccupied and .84 for avoidant (Finnegan et al., 1996). Sub-scale reliabilities of the shortened version used in the present study were .67 and .73, respectively. Although these were lower than the reliabilities reported for the full measure, they are within acceptable range. In addition, the two-week test-retest reliability of the Preoccupied and Avoidant scales were reported to be .83 and .76, respectively (Finnegan et al., 1996). The 1-year stability coefficients were .67 and .53, respectively. Divergent validity has also been provided by showing that the scales relate differently to different variables of adjustment (internalizing versus externalizing problems). The

correlations between the sub-scales was also reported to be -.47, supporting that each measures somewhat different constructs.

Relationships Questionnaire (RQ). Attachment security with mother for adolescents in grades 7-11 was obtained using the Relationship Questionnaire developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (RQ; 1991). This continuous, self-report measure includes four vignettes, each characteristic of a different style of attachment (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, fearful). This 4-style typology is based on Bowlby's conceptualization of attachment as reflecting working models based on one's view of self and of the primary attachment figure. The model of self can be positive (worthy of love and affection) or negative (unlovable and unworthy) and the model of other can also be positive (available and caring) or negative (rejecting and uncaring). Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point Likert scale, with scores ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much), the degree to which each of the four vignettes applies to how they feel about their mothers (items are presented in Appendix F). As some authors have suggested, the different attachment styles are not mutually exclusive and so individuals may be viewed as possessing each of the different attachment styles to different degrees (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990; Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan, 1994). Therefore, continuous ratings of the four attachment styles for each participant may be more sensitive to individual differences than categorical measures which restrict participants to one style of attachment.

Validation of this measure and evidence of good psychometric properties has been provided by many studies (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994; Scharfe & Bartholmew, 1994). Taking into account the greater conscious

awareness inherent in self-report measures of attachment, self-report ratings of attachment have been validated against rating of attachment obtained from interviews and reports from best friend and romantic partner, all of which have been shown to be moderately consistent (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The authors of the RQ have also shown the four-category system to possess strong predictive validity for adjustment outcome and interpersonal functioning, as well as discriminant validity for the underlying constructs of self and other.

A review of three studies also assessed the validity of the self- and other-model dimensions thought to underlie the four styles of attachment measured by the RQ (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Using structural equation modeling, the convergent validity in the measure of the self and other dimensions was supported across self, peer, partner, and expert rater reports. The self and other dimensions were also uncorrelated, a finding showing discriminant validity of the RQ. Moreover, the self-model converged with direct measures of positivity of self-concept and the other-model converged with measures of interpersonal orientation, thus providing evidence for the convergent validity of these dimensions and also of the reliability of assessing these dimensions through self-representation. These researchers also showed that these two dimensions of the attachment construct were not reducible to personality factors and that comfort with intimacy and relating in close relationships were central to these constructs.

Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (CSD). The Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (CSD; Crandall, Crandall, & Katkovsky, 1965) was used to statistically control for participants' positive self-presentation. This measure consists of

twenty items (e.g., "I have never felt like saying unkind things to a person"). Based on Crandall et al.'s (1965) procedures, the elementary school students were asked whether or not they agreed with each statement by circling "yes" or "no" for each item (see Appendix G); the high school students, on the other hand, were asked whether each statement was "true" or "false" with respect to themselves (see Appendix H). In pretests, the authors found that children below grade 6 had difficulty responding with "true/false" due to a lack of familiarity with this format and that they were able to more accurately respond to questions phrased for "yes/no" responses.

The split-half reliability reported by the original authors was good, ranging from .69 to .90 for boys and girls in grades 3 through 12. In addition, the 1-month test-retest reliability was .90 for the "yes/no" form and .85 for the "true/false" version. Age, sex, and race effects were found to be significant, with younger, female, and black children being more likely to respond to items in socially desirable ways.

The convergent validity of this measure has also received support (Crandall et al., 1965). Research has shown significant negative correlations between this measure of social desirability and achievement themes in children's stories of TAT-like pictures and various free-play behaviors (e.g., instigating verbal and physical aggression, approval seeking, effort directed toward achievement). The internal consistency values for Social Desirability in the present study were good with $\alpha = .75$ for the elementary school students and $\alpha = .70$ for the high school students.

Procedure

Permission to conduct the investigation was granted by the Laurenval School

Board in Laval, Quebec. Schools were then approached and sent a description of the study and the questionnaires that were to be used. Two francophone elementary schools and one francophone high school agreed to participate.

The present study was part of a larger investigation and consisted of two phases. Prior to the initial phase of the study, the researchers explained Phase I to each class and handed out letters and consent forms (see Appendices I and J, respectively) to students. The legal age for consent in Quebec is 14. Therefore, participants who were 14 years and older were asked to complete the consent forms themselves while those who were under 14 years of age who chose to participate were required to have their parents complete the forms indicating whether or not their child could participate in the study. Following Phase I of the study, participants and their parents were sent another letter explaining Phase II of the project with a new consent form (see Appendices K and L, respectively) to be completed and returned to the school. Of those students asked to participate, 72% and 63% of the total sample completed Phase I and Phase II, respectively.

During both phases, data collection took place in the students' classrooms during regular school hours. Children who chose not to participate left the rooms with their teacher during testing. Depending on class size, two or three experimenters were present in each classroom during each administration to ensure that questionnaires were completed correctly and to answer participants' questions. For the elementary school sample, instructions were given to students simultaneously when all children were ready to begin each questionnaire, whereas the high school students were given written instructions and were instructed to ask for additional explanation from the testers as needed.

During Phase I, participants were asked to complete the General Information Sheet and several other measures not relevant to the present study. Given the lengthy questionnaire packet for Phase II, elementary school children completed the measures over two one-hour sessions, whereas the high school students were given one 90-minute session. The order of questionnaires completed during this phase were the Network of Relationships Inventory (collected during Phase II/Session I for elementary school), the Social Desirability Questionnaire, the Coping Styles Questionnaire (elementary school) or the Bartholomew Relationship Questionnaire (high school), and the Steinberg Parenting Styles Questionnaire.

Results

Data Screening

Prior to statistical analysis, social desirability, parental involvement, psychological autonomy, behavioral control, and social support for both elementary school and high school samples, as well as avoidant coping and preoccupied coping for the elementary school and secure, avoidant, preoccupied, and fearful attachment for the high school were examined for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and univariate and multivariate outliers.

Values that fell beyond three standard deviations from the mean were considered to be univariate outliers. For the elementary school sample, one participant had an extreme low score on parental involvement and two on the social support; one participant had an extreme high score on the CSQ Preoccupied Style and one on the CSQ Avoidant Style. Each of these outliers was pulled in to exactly three standard deviations from the

mean in order to reduce the disproportionate influence they may have on the results of the analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). There were no univariate outliers found for the high school sample. Mahalanobis distance in conjunction with Cook's distance criterion (degree of influence of a given case on the regression coefficients) were used to identify multivariate outliers; none were found.

Univariate normality was assessed by evaluating the histogram and skewness for each variable. Tables 4 and 5 show the mean, standard deviation, skewness and transformations for each of the psychological variables for the elementary and high school samples. Transformations were performed in order to improve the distributional characteristics of significantly skewed variables, therefore resulting in closer adherence to the assumption of normality for multiple regression (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). In addition, following each regression analysis, residual plots were examined for normality; no significant departures were evident. Notably, social support was moderately negatively skewed in the elementary school sample and thus it was reflected prior to a square root transformation. This reflection resulted in reversing the magnitude of the scale. The signs reported in the results have been reversed again, such that high values indicate high social support in order to allow for ease of interpretation of results. All other transformations were straightforward as indicated in Tables 4 and 5. It should also be noted that parental involvement was negatively skewed for the elementary school sample but was not transformed because doing so did not substantially improve its skew.

Finally, wherever interaction terms were used as part of exploratory analyses in multiple regression, variables were centered in order to eliminate potential multicollinearity

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness with Transformations for All Variables for the Elementary School Sample (N= 202).

Variable Name	M	SD	Skewness/SE	Transformation: (Skewness/SE)
Parental Involvement	.87	.08	-5.13	*reflected, square root: 4.59
Psychological Autonomy	.58	.10	.32	
Behavioral Control	.79	.12	-2.25	
Social Support	90.18	12.10	-7.34	reflected, square root: 2.94
Preoccupied Coping	.67	.39	2.98	
Avoidant Coping	.43	.38	6.46	square root: -0.69
Social Desirability	10.36	3.94	.71	

*Note: Transformation did not considerably change skew, therefore the non-transformed variable was used in analyses to facilitate ease of interpretation.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness with Transformations for All Variables for the High School Sample (N=212).

Variable Name	M	SD	Skewness/SE	Transformation: (Skewness/SE)
Parental Involvement	.81	.10	-0.98	
Psychological Autonomy	.57	.11	1.44	
Behavioral Control	.74	.14	-2.52	
Social Support	83.64	15.26	-4.28	
Secure Attachment	5.16	1.94	-4.38	
Preoccupied Attachment	2.64	1.92	5.89	square root: 3.87
Dismissing Attachment	3.30	2.05	2.46	
Fearful Attachment	2.24	1.82	8.34	log base 10: 4.79
Social Desirability	9.83	3.69	1.29	

between main effect and interaction terms.

Preliminary Analyses

Pearson correlations were computed among the predictor variables in order to evaluate the strength of their association and avoid the use of redundant variables in the same multivariate analyses. These correlations were also used to verify that the relations between variables were in the expected direction. Tables 6 and 7 show matrices of all pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients between psychological variables separately for each sample.

Given evidence of differences in parenting practices across different ethnic groups (e.g., Ellis & Petersen, 1992; Knight, Virdin, & Roosa, 1994), two 2 (sex) x 4 (ethnicity) MANCOVAs with social desirability as a covariate were conducted to test for the presence of ethnic group differences (Canadian, Greek, Middle Eastern, West Indian) on the dimensions of parenting style (parental involvement, psychological autonomy, behavioral control) for the elementary school and high school samples, separately. No main effects for or interactions with ethnicity emerged as significant. Similarly, some findings suggest that attachment may vary according to ethnicity (see van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988), so two 2 (sex) x 2 (ethnicity) MANCOVAs with social desirability were also conducted on attachment for the elementary school group (secure, avoidant, preoccupied) and for the high school sample (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, fearful). Again, there were no significant main or interaction effects for ethnicity on attachment. Consequently, ethnicity was not further considered in the main analyses.

Table 6

Correlation Matrix for the Elementary School Sample Variables (N=202).

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Sex[a]	-	-.09	.20**	.08	.15*	.14	.15*	.26**	-.20**
2. Grade		-	-.13	-.18*	-.07	-.03	-.15*	-.27**	.14*
3. SocDes			-	.30**	.17*	.07	.18*	.17*	-.22**
4. PI				-	.17*	.27**	.49**	.14*	-.38**
5. PA					-	-.06	.26**	-.05	-.12
6. BC						-	.22**	.13	-.28**
7. Socsup							-	.34**	-.46**
8. Preocc								-	-.45**
9. Avoid									-

Note: Socdes = Social Desirability; PI = Parental Involvement; PA = Psychological Autonomy; BC = Behavioral Control; Secure = Secure Attachment; Socsup = Social Support; Preocc = Preoccupied Coping; Avoid = Avoidant Coping. [a] Sex (male=1; female=2).

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$

Table 7

Correlation Matrix for the High School Sample Variables (N=212).

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sex	-	-.01	.11	.09	.09	.16*	-.05	-.09	-.09	.09	.12
2. Grade		-	-.07	-.26**	-.19**	-.18**	-.08	-.06	.15*	-.03	-.17*
3. SocDes			-	.24**	.23**	.18**	.24**	-.09	-.21**	-.10	.22**
4. PI				-	.36**	.31**	.42**	-.11	-.42**	-.29**	.58**
5. PA					-	.08	.35**	-.16	-.26**	-.25**	.40**
6. BC						-	.14**	-.14	-.26**	-.07	.14*
7. Secure							-	-.23	-.45**	-.55**	.67**
8. Preocc								-	.22**	.25**	-.45**
9. Dismiss									-	.30**	-.14*
10. Fear										-	-.49**
11. Socsup											-

Note: Socdes = Social Desirability; PI = Parental Involvement; PA = Psychological Autonomy; BC = Behavioral Control; Secure = Secure Attachment; Preocc = Preoccupied Attachment; Dismiss = Dismissing Attachment; Fear = Fearful Attachment; Socsup = Social Support.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$

Design

Because different attachment measures were used for the elementary and high school samples, analyses were conducted separately for the two samples. Thus, age differences in the patterns of association could not be examined statistically, but patterns of findings for each sample were observed for consistency.

Grade and Sex Differences. For the elementary school sample, a 2 (sex) x 3 (grade) between-subjects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted to assess for sex and grade differences on each of the dependent variables (i.e., parental involvement, psychological autonomy, behavioral control). Social desirability was entered into the analysis as a covariate. Using Wilkes' Lamba criterion, neither the main nor interactive effects emerged as significant predictors, although social desirability was a significant covariate, F (3, 193) = 5.94, $p<.001$, whereby higher parental involvement (PI; $p<.01$) and psychological autonomy (PA; $p<.05$) were associated with higher social desirability.

Likewise, a 2 (Sex) x 4 (Grade) between subjects MANCOVA was conducted for the high school sample and is summarized in Table 8. A multivariate main effect was found only for Grade, F (12, 527) = 3.84, $p<.001$. The tests of between-grade effects revealed significant differences for all three criteria with a general trend for children in higher grades to report lower levels of parental involvement (PI), F (4, 201) = 4.13, $p<.01$; psychological autonomy (PA), F (4, 201) = 7.02, $p<.001$; and behavioral control (BC), F (4, 201) = 2.59, $p<.05$. A summary of means is presented in Table 9. Results from follow-up pairwise comparisons that used Bonferroni correction for each main effect indicated that

Table 8

Multivariate Analysis of Variance Summary for Parenting Dimensions in the High School Sample (N=212).

Source of Variance	Wilks' Lambda	Hyoth df	Error df	MultivariateF
Sex	.99	3	199	.33
Grade	.80	12	527	3.84***
Sex x Grade	.95	12	527	.79

***p<.001.

Table 9

Sample Means and Standard Deviations for Parenting Dimensions by Grade in High School (N=212).

Parenting Dimensions:		PI		PA		BC	
	n	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Grade							
7	12	.87[a]	.10	.64[a]	.10	.80	.11
8	37	.83[a]	.10	.63[a]	.10	.74	.14
9	96	.80[a]	.10	.54[b]	.10	.76	.13
10	45	.80[a]	.11	.59[a,b]	.11	.73	.14
11	22	.73[b]	.08	.55[a,b]	.11	.69	.14

Note: PI = Parental Involvement; PA = Psychological Autonomy; BC = Behavioral Control.

Means with different superscripts are significantly different at $p < .05$.

children in grade 11 reported having parents who were less involved (PI) than children in lower grades; children in grade 9 reported receiving less psychological autonomy (PA) than grades 7 and 8 but not significantly different from higher grades; there were no pairwise differences between grades for behavioral control (BC). Finally, social desirability was again a significant covariate, $F(3, 199) = 6.64$, $p<.001$. As was the case for the elementary school children, higher parental involvement (PI) and psychological autonomy (PA) were related to higher social desirability.

Multiple Regression Analyses. Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted in order to test the predicted associations between the three parenting style dimensions (parental involvement, psychological autonomy, behavioral control) and each of the four attachment styles, separately. Grade, sex, and social desirability were entered as a block on the first step of each regression as covariates, followed by the three parenting dimensions as a block on the second step in order to test each hypothesis. As part of exploratory analyses, sex by parenting interaction terms were entered on the third step of the regressions. Two-way interactions between the parenting dimensions on the third step were also explored by repeating the analyses and entering interaction terms on the third step. Only significant findings from these exploratory analyses are reported.

Secure Attachment

As the results for the elementary school in Table 10 indicate, the first step was significant with the control variables as a block accounting for 5% of the variance and with social desirability contributing 3% unique variance to secure attachment as measured by the NRI social support. On the second step, the parenting dimensions entered together were

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Felt Security[a] for Grades 4 through 6 (N=202).

Variables	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.05	3.31*
Sex	.10	.14	.01	1.43		
Grade	-.07	-.10	.01	-1.05		
Socdes	.15	.18	.03	2.07*		
Step II					.23	20.21***
PI	.40	.47	.13	5.92***		
PA	.19	.26	.03	2.96**		
BC	.12	.22	.01	1.80		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]NRI Social Support; dependent variable reversed and subjected to square root transformation; signs have been reversed to allow for ease of interpretation.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

also significant, explaining 23% of the variance. Both parental involvement and psychological autonomy contributed uniquely to the prediction of secure attachment in elementary school (13% and 3%, respectively). This suggests that in addition to joint contributions of all three parenting factors, both of these parenting dimensions also made independent contributions to social support for the elementary school children.

Table 11 presents the results for the high school sample. The control variables emerged as significantly related to secure attachment (Bartholomew RQ ratings of security to mother), together accounting for 7% of the variance. However, closer inspection of the unique contribution of social desirability revealed that this covariate actually explained virtually all of the variance for that step. Again, on step 2, the block of parenting dimensions significantly predicted secure attachment, with parental involvement and psychological autonomy emerging as significant unique predictors, explaining 8% and 4% of the overall 18% for the step.

Avoidant/Dismissing Attachment

The results for the elementary school sample, presented in Table 12, show that the covariates on step 1 were significant, explaining 9% of the variance for avoidant coping style measured by the CSQ with sex and social desirability adding unique variance (3% and 4%, respectively). The block of parenting dimensions on step 2 was also significant, accounting for an additional 12% of the total variance above and beyond the variance explained by the control variables, as predicted. Parental involvement and behavioral control contributed independently to prediction, explaining 6% and 2% unique variance.

Results for dismissing attachment in the high school participants are presented in

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Secure Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 (N=212).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.07	5.22*
Sex	-.09	-.05	.01	-1.26		
Grade	-.07	-.08	.00	-1.01		
Socdes	.25	.24	.07	3.67***		
Step II					.18	16.83***
PI	.33	.42	.08	4.74***		
PA	.22	.35	.04	3.40***		
BC	.03	.14	.00	.46		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholmew RQ ratings of security to mother.

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

Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Avoidant Attachment[a] for Grades 4 through 6 (N=202).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.09	6.67***
Sex	-.18	-.22	.03	-2.55*		
Grade	.05	.09	.00	.76		
Socdes	- .2	-.24	.04	-2.87**		
Step II					.12	9.45***
PI	-.25	-.37	.06	-3.79***		
PA	-.10	-.15	.01	-1.17		
BC	-.15	-.25	.02	-2.34*		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]CSQ Avoidant Coping style with mother; dependent variable subjected to square root transformation.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 13. Step 1 was significant, with social desirability independently explaining 4% of the 7% overall variance explained by the block. Step 2 was also significant and explained a total of 15% of the variance for the regression. Interestingly, as was the case for avoidant attachment in middle childhood, parental involvement and behavioral control added uniquely to the prediction of dismissing-avoidant attachment, explaining 7% and 1% of the variance, respectively.

Exploratory analyses also revealed that when the sex by parenting dimension interaction terms were entered on the third step, a significant sex x behavioral control interaction emerged. Further analyses revealed that lower levels of behavioral control were associated with higher levels of dismissing attachment for boys but not for girls. The follow-up analysis for this interaction is presented in Tables 14 and 15.

Preoccupied Attachment

Analysis for the elementary school sample revealed that after controlling for the effects of the covariates on step 1, the parenting dimensions as a block did not significantly predict Anxious Coping style and, contrary to hypothesis, neither did psychological autonomy when considered by itself. A summary of the results are presented in Table 16.

Conversely, as shown in Table 17, results for the high school participants indicated that although the covariates on step 1 were not significant, the parenting dimensions entered as a block on step 2 significantly explained 5% of the overall variance for preoccupied attachment as indicated by the Relationship Questionnaire vignette ratings. Psychological autonomy and behavioral control explained virtually all of the variance for the step. Nevertheless, only psychological autonomy emerged as a significant unique

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Dismissing Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 (N=212).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.07	4.88**
Sex	-.06	-.09	.00	-.90		
Grade	.13	.15	.02	1.87		
Socdes	-.20	-.21	.04	-2.90**		
Step II					.15	13.14***
PI	-.31	-.42	.07	-4.41***		
PA	-.11	-.26	.01	-1.68		
BC	-.13	-.26	.01	-1.94*		
Step III					.02	4.00*
BCxSex	.39		N/A	1.00*		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of dismissing attachment to mother.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 14

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Behavioral Control Predicting Dismissing Attachment[a] for Boys in Grades 7 through 11 (n=103).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.06	2.92
Grade	.15	.17	.02	1.49		
Socdes	-.17	-.19	.03	-1.72		
Step II					.23	7.33***
PI	-.26	-.37	.05	-2.59*		
PA	-.08	-.16	.01	-.79		
BC	-.34	-.35	.07	-2.95**		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of dismissing attachment to mother.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 15

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Behavioral Control Predicting Dismissing Attachment[a] for Girls in Grades 7 through 11 (n=109).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.06	3.44*
Grade	.23	.12	.01	1.19		
Socdes	-.12	-.22	.05	-2.31		
Step II					.17	7.81***
PI	-.37	-.46	.11	-3.57**		
PA	-.06	-.34	.02	-1.61		
BC	.03	-.14	.00	.28		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of dismissing attachment to mother.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 16

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Preoccupied Attachment[a] for Grades 4 through 6 (N=202).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.13	10.12***
Sex	.22	.26	.04	3.20**		
Grade	-.23	-.27	.05	-3.49***		
Socdes	.10	.17	.01	1.40		
Step II					.02	1.68
PI	.06	.14	.00	.82		
PA	-.12	-.05	.01	-1.70		
BC	.07	.13	.00	.93		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]CSQ Preoccupied Coping style ratings with mother.

**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 17

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Preoccupied Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 (N=212).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.02	1.48
Sex	-.09	-.09	.01	-1.29		
Grade	-.07	-.05	.00	-.98		
Socdes	-.09	-.10	.01	-.13		
Step II					.05	3.71*
PI	-.03	-.12	.00	-.44		
PA	-.17	-.18	.02	-2.30*		
BC	-.14	-.15	.02	-1.92		
Step III					.04	4.54*
PIxPA	.15		.02	-2.25*		
PIxBC	.13		.02	-1.87		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of preoccupied attachment to mother; dependent variable subjected to square root transformation.

*$p < .05$.

predictor, independently explaining 2% of the variance. Moreover, although the main effect of parental involvement contributed minimally to the prediction of preoccupied attachment in adolescence, its association was moderated through its interactions with each of the other two dimensions. The interaction terms for PI were entered on step 3 and explained 4% variance above and beyond the main effects of the parenting variables with PI x PA explaining 2% of the variance independently.

Follow-up analyses of these interactions are presented in Tables 18 and 19. Results suggest that children in the high school sample who reported high levels of parental involvement and perceived parents as lower in psychological autonomy, and/or as lower in behavioral control, tended to be more preoccupied in their attachments to their mothers.

Fearful Attachment (high school sample)

The covariates entered as a block on the first step were not significant. Step 2, on the other hand was significant, explaining 13% of the variance for fearful attachment. Parental involvement and psychological autonomy emerged as unique predictors, each explaining 5% and 3%, respectively, of the variance independently. Summary of results are shown in Table 20.

Comparisons Between Middle Childhood and Adolescence

Predictions from parenting style dimensions together were significant for all attachment styles except for preoccupied attachment in middle childhood. For both age groups, the parenting factors as a block positively predicted secure attachment and negatively predicted insecure attachment to mother. It should be noted that in the prediction of secure attachment in adolescence, if behavioral control was considered by

Table 18

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Psychological Autonomy and Behavioral Control Predicting Preoccupied Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 Reporting Parental Involvement Below the Group Mean (N=105).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.00	.08
Sex	-.01	-.00	.00	-.08		
Grade	-.05	-.05	.00	-.47		
Socdes	-.01	.01	.00	-.06		
Step II					.01	.47
PA	-.05	-.03	.00	-.43		
BC	-.09	-.08	.01	-.90		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PA=Psychological Autonomy.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of preoccupied attachment to mother; dependent variable subjected to square root transformation.

Overall equation n.s.

Table 19

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Psychological Autonomy and Behavioral Control Predicting Preoccupied Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 Reporting Parental Involvement Above the Group Mean (N=107).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.06	2.08
Sex	-.14	-.18	.02	-1.45		
Grade	-.07	-.08	.00	-.68		
Socdes	-.15	-.18	.02	-1.51		
Step II					.14	8.60***
PA	-.31	-.33	.09	-3.36**		
BC	-21	-.25	.04	-2.31*		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PA=Psychological Autonomy.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of preoccupied attachment to mother. Dependent variable subjected to square root transformation.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 20

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Dimensions of Parenting Style Predicting Fearful Attachment[a] for Grades 7 through 11 (N=212).

Variable	β	r	sr^2	t	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step I					.02	1.42
Sex	.07	.06	.00	1.02		
Grade	-.03	-.02	.00	-.39		
Socdes	-.13	-.12	.02	-1.86		
Step II					.13	10.06***
PI	-.25	-.30	.05	-3.35***		
PA	-.20	-.27	.03	-2.86**		
BC	-.05	-.11	.00	-.21		

Note: Socdes=Social Desirability; PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy BC=Behavioral Control.

[a]Bartholomew RQ ratings of fearful attachment to mother; dependent variable subjected to logarithmic transformation.

**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

itself, it would have failed to achieve significance. However, it would have significantly predicted secure attachment for the younger group even if considered alone. Conversely, although psychological autonomy would have significantly predicted both types of insecure-avoidant attachment (dismissing and fearful) in adolescence, it would have fail to predict avoidant attachment in middle childhood if considered alone. These observations are in line with the expectation that, as children mature, their need for parental monitoring becomes less important to security in the primary attachment relationship, while encouragement toward psychological autonomy becomes more critical, carrying with it specific implications for quality of children's attachments. Given that the design of the present investigation does not allow for a direct test of this developmental hypothesis, the observations for behavioral control and psychological autonomy may prove helpful for future research that is aimed at investigating developmental differences in the relation between parenting factors and quality of attachment.

Interestingly, consistency in the relation between parenting and attachment across the two age groups was perhaps most evident in the pattern of significant unique predictors for the different styles of attachment to mother, as illustrated in Table 21. Parental involvement and psychological autonomy made independent contributions to the prediction of secure attachment across the two age groups. Likewise, parental involvement and behavioral control independently added to the prediction of avoidant and dismissing-avoidant attachment in middle childhood and adolescence, respectively. It is noted that the distinct pattern of unique predictors successfully differentiated among all attachment styles.

Table 21

Summary of the Pattern of Unique Predictors for the Elementary (N=202) and High School (N=212) Samples.

	Elementary School	High School
Secure	+ PI + PA	+ PI + PA
Avoidant/Dismissing	- PI - BC	- PI - BC[1]
Preoccupied	--none--	- PA
Fearful	n/a	- PI - PA

Note: PI=Parental Involvement; PA=Psychological Autonomy; BC=Behavioral Control.

Positive relations indicated by (+); negative relations indicated by (-).

[1] Boys only.

Power Analyses

Power analyses were performed post-hoc as a means of determining whether there was sufficient power to reveal the presence of significant effects for each of the analyses used to test the hypotheses. Power can be derived by virtue of knowing the sample size, number of predictor variables and size of the effect (Cohen, 1988). It was revealed that power was sufficient (above .80) for all analyses except for predicting preoccupied attachment in the elementary school sample where the power, given the sample size, effect size, and number of predictors was determined to be .43. The number of subjects that would have been required in order to achieve adequate power to reliably detect an effect that explains 2% (the ΔR^2 in this case) of the variance would have been approximately 475. In view of the small size of this effect, it is likely that it would not have been of substantive significance. Similarly, power was insufficient to detect small effects of interactions entered on the third step of the regression analyses and would have required between 390 and 490 subjects to produce significant results. Thus, only in these cases is it likely that given the sample size, number of predictors used in each analysis, and strength of the interaction effects measured in the present study, power was insufficient to detect a significant effect.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this research was to investigate how children's experience of the parenting they receive relates to the quality of their attachments to their mothers in middle childhood and adolescence. In particular, the present investigation addressed the following: 1) whether dimensions of parenting style (*parental involvement, psychological*

autonomy and *behavioral control*) were able to distinguish between secure and insecure attachment, 2) whether the parenting dimensions were able to differentiate between the various types of insecure attachment, and 3) whether consistency was observed in the pattern of association across middle childhood and adolescence.

Formulation of hypotheses for the present study relied upon previous research findings regarding the relation between parenting and the quality of children's attachments in infancy and early childhood, while taking into account developmental factors that come into play as children mature. As expected, parenting style successfully differentiated between secure and insecure attachment and, in addition, distinguished among types of insecurity in a manner largely consistent with prediction. In general, a positive association was revealed between the parenting factors and secure attachment to mother while a negative relation emerged for the different types of insecurity. Further, a unique pattern of associations of independent contributions by each parenting dimension was related to each of the insecure attachment styles, largely consistent across middle childhood and adolescence. Specifically, the constellation of independent predictors was identical across the two age groups for both secure attachment and avoidant/dismissing attachment, but not for preoccupied attachment for which results were non-significant in the younger group.

Differentiating Among Dimensions of Attachment

As predicted for children in both middle childhood and adolescence, security of attachment to mother was positively related to children's reports of parental involvement, psychological autonomy granting, and behavioral monitoring considered together. High levels of each of these parenting factors typify the authoritative parenting style shown to be

most optimal for children's positive adjustment (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991). Warm parental involvement and encouragement toward psychological autonomy both made joint as well as independent contributions to the prediction of secure attachment for both age groups. These results suggest that children's feelings of how securely attached children are in relationship to their mothers is more dependent on factors that promote their individuality in a context of loving support and responsiveness than on behavioral monitoring. Such parenting has been shown to be important to secure base behavior that balances exploration and autonomy with the felt security of having a competent, responsive and available caregiver at earlier stages of childhood (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1988). This body of research suggests that children who are securely attached have primary caregivers who are sensitive, supportive, and who appropriately monitor their children's behavior without being controlling in their interactions (Achermann et al., 1991; Stevenson-Hinde et al., 1995). The little evidence that exists from research on adolescence also seems to point to the positive relation between children's security and perceptions of support from their families (e.g., Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Strayer & Preece, 1999).

In considering the findings of the relative importance of these different parenting factors, it is possible that children who feel more secure in their attachment may more readily perceive behavioral demands as reasonable and may also be less dependent upon strict limit-setting in order to exhibit age-appropriate behavior. Consequently, other parental provisions, such as responsiveness and psychological autonomy granting, may emerge as more important to the development of secure attachment. Some research findings do suggest, in fact, that children with secure attachments tend to willingly comply

to parental requests even in their parents' absence, therefore making disciplinary encounters less necessary (Bretherton et al., 1997). In addition, findings using observational data link high levels of parental involvement and high levels of encouragement toward psychological autonomy with moderate levels of behavioral control as being related to more positive self-esteem in childhood and adolescence (Baumrind, 1971).

Though these positive findings between authoritative parenting and secure attachment may indicate that parents who are highly involved and encourage individual expression create a climate which fosters the development of attachment security, alternatively, more securely attached children may be more likely to elicit more optimal parenting from their caregivers. Of course, these interpretations are not taken to be mutually exclusive and present results may, in fact, be the product of a dynamic process of bi-directional influences. As discussed previously, children play an active role in constructing and co-constructing their interpersonal relationships, including influencing parental behavior. Thus, complex and multifaceted associations are likely to be continuously operating in the dyad.

In contrast to the more optimal parenting style associated with secure attachment, results from the current study found that children's perceptions of their parents' unresponsiveness, insensitivity toward their emerging autonomy, and lack of behavioral monitoring jointly predicted children's fearful attachment, an insecure-avoidant style measured in adolescence. In light of the negative view of the self and of the attachment figure associated with fearful attachment, it was anticipated that children's degree of fearful attachment would relate to their reports of negligent parenting as defined by low levels on

all three parenting dimensions (Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1995). Negligent parenting is the least optimal style in terms of its negative influence on children's psycho-social functioning (Baumrind, 1971; Lamborn et al., 1991). Under-involvement, lack of encouragement toward independence, and failure to provide appropriate supervision is likely to foster a sense of being under-valued and unloved. A recent study showed that fearful attachment style was negatively related to parental caring and positively related to parental intrusive over-control in late adolescence, whereas the opposite pattern was observed for secure attachment (Strayer & Preece, 1999). In the present study both parental involvement and fostering of psychological autonomy made independent contributions to fearful attachment, as they did for secure attachment, but in the negative direction. Further, it was the independent contribution of low levels of parental nurturance of adolescent autonomy that distinguished fearful-avoidant attachment from dismissing-avoidant attachment. It may well be that this lack of support toward independence and self-efficacy has specific implications for the development of a negative self-orientation characteristic of fearful attachment style.

Similarly, avoidant attachment in middle childhood and dismissing-avoidant attachment in adolescence were also associated with negligent parenting style. More specifically, avoidant attachment in middle childhood and dismissing attachment in adolescence were negatively related to all three parenting dimensions together. In this case, parental involvement and behavioral supervision contributed uniquely to avoidant attachment in middle childhood and dismissing attachment in adolescence, thereby distinguishing them from other styles of attachment. Further, exploratory analyses revealed

that adolescent reports of low behavioral supervision was important in predicting dismissing attachment for boys only. A tentative hypothesis is that a developmental variable may be operating whereby differences in maturity in boys and girls, combined with higher levels of externalizing behaviors among males, necessitates a greater degree of behavioral control and limit-setting by an authority figure in order for boys to feel cared for, valued, and safe. Interestingly, other researchers have found that parental monitoring is more important in buffering against delinquency in males than in females (Barnes & Farrel, 1992 in Grotevant, 1998).

Empirical research from the attachment literature shows that parents of avoidantly attached children 18 months of age and older are the most neglectful (Isabella,1993; Youngblade & Belsky, 1990), most withdrawn and provide the least monitoring (Achermann et al., 1991; Stevenson-Hinde et al, 1995). Likewise, avoidant attachment in adolescence is linked with children's reports of parents as less loving and supportive (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Such findings are consistent with results from the present investigation that show higher ratings of avoidant attachment in middle childhood and adolescence (including dismissing-avoidant and fearful-avoidant) to be related to children's experience of a general lack of competent parenting on all three dimensions. The picture that emerges is one where children who are more avoidant in relationship to their mothers hold views of their attachment figures as lacking in warmth and responsiveness, as failing to provide appropriate supervision and limit-setting, and as demonstrating a lack of respect for their naturally emerging independence.

As mentioned with respect to the relation between children's reports of parenting

and secure attachment, unidirectional as well as bi-directional effects are likely to be operating. Although children's reports may accurately reflect low levels of optimal parenting style that lead to avoidance, parents may also respond to children who exhibit an avoidant orientation in the primary attachment relationship by becoming more withdrawn. Such a dynamic has been hypothesized by researchers studying attachment in early childhood (e.g., Stevenson-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995).

Hypotheses regarding preoccupied attachment to mother were only partially supported. In middle childhood, the three parenting dimensions failed to predict preoccupied attachment to mother. In adolescence, however, children's reports of low levels of parental encouragement toward psychological autonomy and behavioral monitoring were related to the preoccupied attachment. Interestingly, similar to fearful attachment, the lack of encouragement toward independence made a unique contribution to preoccupied attachment. As highlighted above, it is possible that parenting that does not foster children's individuation may contribute to a negative self-view that is characteristic of both of these attachment styles. Although parental involvement was important to prediction, its influence was moderated by the other two parenting dimensions. These interactions revealed that for children who perceived their parents as highly involved, the less encouragement toward psychological autonomy and/or the less supervision and limit-setting they reported the more preoccupied they were in the quality of their attachment. Thus, parental involvement that does not respect the child's individuality and emerging independence, and/or that fails to provide appropriate limits on the adolescent's behavior, creates a non-optimal climate for the development of a secure-base.

Although only the relation of low levels of psychological autonomy granting was predicted for preoccupied attachment, the pattern of results was not surprising given evidence from research at younger ages that links insecure-resistant or anxious-ambivalent attachment with insensitive and intrusive maternal behavior (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Stevenson-Hinde et al., 1995). Despite evidence indicating that mothers of insecure-resistant children are capable of being responsive and affectionate with their infants (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Stevenson-Hinde et al., 1995; van IJzendoorn, 1995), as well as adolescents' reports of having relatively loving and supportive families (Kobak & Sceery, 1988), interference with children's emerging autonomy through inconsistent, intrusive, and coercive behavior on the part of the caregiver is believed to be characteristic of this type of insecure attachment (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994). As a result of being overly preoccupied with the attachment figure, a climate is created that does not allow for the establishment of a secure base from which the child can explore and successfully negotiate the important task of separation-individuation.

Reasons for the inconsistency between preoccupied attachment in middle childhood and adolescence are unclear. Certainly the presence of developmental differences between the two age groups is possible, however, it is suspected that the negative findings may be due to the inadequacy of the preoccupied coping scale of the CSQ as a measure of preoccupied attachment in middle childhood. Closer examination of the items on the CSQ raise the possibility that this scale does not sufficiently differentiate between responses that are age appropriate and those that capture preoccupied attachment style. It is unclear, for example, whether a "preoccupied" response to the following item may not also be endorsed

by a child who is more secure in their attachment style; "You get sick and have to spend a few days in the hospital. Some kids would want their mother to spend the whole time with them in their hospital room, but other kids wouldn't mind if their mother just visited them once or twice a day during visiting hours. Which is more like you?". Further, observation of correlations between the preoccupied coping scale of the CSQ reveals a significant positive correlation ($r=.34$, $p<.01$) with social support from the NRI, a measure of felt security. Whereas evidence from the present investigation provides some validation for the use of the avoidant coping scale of the CSQ as a measure of avoidant attachment, findings suggest that more time and effort must be invested before an adequate measure of preoccupied attachment in middle childhood is established.

Implications of Unique Patterns of Prediction in Attachment

Perhaps the most impressive finding that emerged from the present investigation is the strikingly distinct pattern of independent contributions made by the parenting dimensions to the quality of children's attachments to their mothers. These unique contributions not only successfully differentiated between secure and insecure attachments to mother, but also between types of insecurity. The need to distinguish between insecure attachment styles rather than simply focusing on security-insecurity has been repeatedly emphasized in the attachment literature (e.g., Cassidy & Berlin, 1994; Finnegan et al., 1996; Thompson, 1998). As summarized in Table 21, p. 77, parental responsive involvement and fostering of psychological autonomy made independent positive contributions to the prediction of secure attachment across both age groups and independent negative contributions to fearful attachment. For avoidant attachment in

middle childhood and dismissing-avoidant attachment in adolescence, responsive involvement and behavioral control both added uniquely to the observed association between parenting and quality of attachment. Finally, encouragement toward psychological autonomy contributed independently to the relation between parenting style and preoccupied attachment to mother in adolescence, whereas findings for preoccupied attachment in middle childhood were non-significant.

Results from the present investigation are encouraging in that they revealed a unique pattern of parental correlates for each style of attachment to mother in both middle childhood and adolescence. Thus, not only is the overall climate, or parenting style, that is created by all three parenting dimensions together important to the quality of the attachment relationship, but specific aspects of parenting individually contribute to the development of different types of attachment. Knowledge of such associations can help to elucidate potential avenues for programs of prevention and intervention that focus on improving the quality of children's attachments to their primary caregivers by fostering more competent parenting practices. For example, such efforts may utilize a strategy of targeting specific parenting behaviors that collectively influence the overall climate of one's parenting style as a way of promoting secure attachment. A further implication of the present findings is that knowledge of the particular type of insecure attachment that predominates for a given child can provide a window into the specific parenting factors that may require evaluation and possible intervention. Efforts such as these may prove worthwhile given the poor adjustment outcomes shown to be related to insecure attachment throughout different stages of life (Goldberg, 1991; Rice, 1990).

It seems reasonable to assume that interventions and prevention strategies are most effective when they are implemented within the family environment in which children's working models of attachment are established. For example, research shows that early attempts at intervention which have focused on improving maternal sensitivity have yielded favorable improvements in infant attachment security, although results have been variable and effect sizes small (van IJzendoorn, Juffer, & Duyvesteyn, 1995). Interventions that have shown some degree of effectiveness include a year-long intervention program using parent-infant psychotherapy that reportedly helped effect changes from insecure to secure attachment with a corresponding increase in maternal sensitivity (Lieberman, Weston, & Paul, 1991). Another intervention program included efforts to change mothers' own internal working models of attachment in order to facilitate their ability to assume their infants' perspectives and correctly interpret and appropriately respond to infants' signals (Erickson, Korfmacher, & Egeland, 1992). Initial findings appeared to show no difference between intervention and control groups, although a trend began to emerge in the second year of life along with corresponding increases in security for the treatment group and a decrease in security for the control group. Even though it may be too early to determine the ultimate success of such intervention programs, it does seem reasonable to assume that the earlier that intervention can be provided, the greater the likelihood of helping individuals move toward a more secure attachment orientation. Further, the variability and weak effects reported by intervention programs focused on maternal sensitivity suggest the need to look beyond parental factors such as parental warmth and support and to consider factors such as behavioral and psychological control.

Limitations

Given the correlational nature of the present research, causal interpretations cannot be made regarding the direction of influence between parenting and attachment, but present findings may indicate future avenues for investigation into the directionality of such effects. Although parenting is usually conceived of as exerting its influence on child attachment representations, the converse may also be true (for review see Thompson, 1998). While it is possible that children who exhibit different attachment styles may elicit different types of parental treatment, it may also be the case that the type of parenting children receive creates climates that facilitate the development of different patterns of attachment. It would not be surprising if the influence occurred in both directions. Additionally, although the present investigation did not evaluate the potential influence of child characteristics (e.g., temperament) on the attachment relationship in general, and on parenting behavior more specifically, such knowledge would be invaluable in clarifying the dynamic processes involved in the parent-child relationship.

The cross-sectional nature of the present investigation, particularly in combination with the use of different measurements of attachment for middle childhood and adolescence, did not allow for conclusions to be drawn with respect to the stability of attachment representations across development. Such inferences, particularly with respect to discontinuity, could only be derived from longitudinal research that uses equivalent measures of attachment at different ages. This being said, associations between parenting and each type of attachment were generally consistent across the two age groups, especially when considering the parenting factors that made unique contributions to the

prediction of attachment. Differences that were observed between the two age groups may be indicative of a methodological problem arising from the use of different attachment measures and/or may reflect the heightened need for both psychological and behavioral autonomy in adolescence.

Clearly, empirical study of how factors influencing attachment representations change across development and the way in which dynamic processes influence the relationship between parenting and attachment is warranted. As others have noted, associations between mother-child interactions reflect "continuity in the relationship rather than stability of discrete behaviors of either member of the pair" (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1988). A longitudinal approach that utilizes multiple measurement methods may contribute to understanding the transactional nature of these relations and may help to establish more effective intervention strategies for children with insecure attachment.

A further limitation, alluded to above, was the use of an attachment measurement in middle childhood that has yet to be appropriately validated. As such, caution should be taken in interpreting findings of the preoccupied and avoidant coping styles of the Coping Styles Questionnaire (CSQ; Finnegan et al., 1996) as reflecting attachment representations for this age group. However, adding to the available validity data from previous research (i.e., Finnegan et al., 1996; Hodges et al., 1997), the present study revealed a fairly consistent pattern of associations between parenting and avoidant attachment as measured by the CSQ and the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), a well-established measure of attachment. This information provides some validation for the appropriateness of using the CSQ as a measure of insecure-avoidant attachment in middle

childhood; however, the non-significant findings for the preoccupied attachment to mother in middle childhood as measured by the CSQ is troublesome. It is clear that in order for research on the study of different types of insecure attachment in middle childhood to move forward, further empirical research is needed that will establish and validate an appropriate measure of types of insecurity.

Use of children's self-reports for all measures allowed for the collection of data from a much larger and more diverse sample than would have otherwise been possible thus allowing for the greater generalizability of results. However, findings should be interpreted with caution due to the confounds of shared method variance and factors that may bias participants' perceptions. It is possible that the same biases operating in children's reports of their attachment orientation also affected their perceptions of the type of parenting they received. For example, those who were more securely attached may have perceived themselves and their attachment figures in a positive light and, as a result, reported that they received good parenting, while the reverse may be true for types of insecure attachment. However, it is important to recognize that children and adolescents have been shown to be reliable informants of their parents' behavior (e.g., Moskowitz & Schwarz, 1982). Further evidence supports the view that children's reports are objectively more accurate and more closely related to their overall adjustment than those of parents' own reports of their parenting behavior (Schaefer, 1965). Social desirability demands on how parents want to be perceived is believed to be a likely factor in the discrepancy between child and parent reports (Schwarz, Barthon-Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985). Moreover, Baumrind (1971, 1991) provides evidence to support the claim that the constructs of

parenting used in the present study are fairly independent of child characteristics. Close consideration of the items on the Steinberg Parenting Styles measure (Lamborn et al., 1991) indicate that these largely reflect concrete parenting behaviors of what parents actually *do* rather than how children *feel* about what their parents do, whereas children's attachment ratings appear to be more closely related to how they *feel* in relationship to their mothers. Therefore, the parenting factors measured in the present study were unlikely to simply reflect reporting biases that were contingent upon type of attachment. As well, the unique pattern of relations of parenting styles to type of attachment, even controlling for social desirability, provides some validation of the current findings, despite shared method variance. One would be hard pressed to predict on the basis of shared method variance why, for instance, children higher in avoidant attachment would be particularly prone to perceive their parents as low in their involvement and *behavioral supervision*, while children who were more fearful in their attachment would be more apt to perceive their parents as uninvolved and *psychologically controlling*. Regardless of the potential discrepancy between parents', observational and child reports, information regarding how children internalize or construe the parenting they receive is fundamentally important to understanding the child's experience. "Attachment theorists recognize, of course, that security is shaped not by objective characteristics of maternal sensitivity but rather by subjective appraisals of sensitivity" in accordance with the child's characteristics and needs (Thompson, 1998, p. 2). Certainly, it would be informative if future research using more objective measure of parenting revealed specifically if, in what ways, or how children with different attachment orientations distort these experiences.

An additional methodological problem that would have emerged had parental participation been required, is the possibility of sampling bias due to over-representation of well-functioning children and families. For example, parents who are reportedly less involved with their children are conceivably less likely to consent to participate in research about their children than parents who are more highly involved (Steinberg et al., 1992). Although the present method was likely to allow the inclusion of children who experience a broader range of parenting practices, the study did forgo the advantage of obtaining information from the parents' perspectives. As mentioned above, although the problem with shared method variance remains, care was taken to control for participants' social desirability in the analyses. Also, the differential pattern of results was fairly consistent with hypotheses based upon a large body of empirical data, thus allowing for greater confidence in the observed results.

Despite limitations of the present research, findings were encouraging and point to the importance of independent and joint contributions of parental involvement, psychological autonomy, and behavioral control to different types of attachment in middle childhood and adolescence. Information regarding the stability of these effects awaits replication of these findings by future research with children in later childhood.

Conclusions

At the center of attachment theory lies the premise that the pattern of treatment the child experiences in relation to the primary caregiver is internalized and forms the basis of the quality of his or her attachment representation (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1988). Although research in early childhood has revealed consistent patterns of association

between the quality of maternal caregiving and quality of attachment, little work has been done to reveal these relations in later development. As stated by Waters et al. (1991), the state of affairs in attachment theory and research is that we presently have, "a theory of infant attachment, a theory of adult attachment, and a great deal in between left to the imagination". Further, it has been suggested that attachment research needs to take into account a broader theoretical perspective that considers the challenges characteristic of different stages of developmental (Furman & Wehner, 1994).

A goal of the present research was to extend investigation of the relation between parenting and quality of attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence, thereby helping to bridge the gap that presently exists in the developmental literature. In addition, the present study attempted to broaden the framework typically used in the study of parenting and attachment by moving beyond factors such as warm involvement and responsiveness in order to consider the contribution of variables such as of psychological and behavioral control. Results suggest that parental involvement and warmth, encouragement toward psychological autonomy, and behavioral supervision and limit-setting, are all important in providing a context within which to understand the development of secure versus insecure attachment in middle childhood and adolescence. Further, consideration of the constellation of unique contributions by the different parenting dimensions appears to be particularly meaningful in attempting to differentiate among types of insecurity.

To our knowledge, this was the first project to study parenting and its relation to different patterns of insecurity in middle childhood. Empirical research is still greatly

needed in order to establish a valid measure of attachment for this age group. Such efforts are of critical importance if attachment research is to move forward in its quest to establish continuity in understanding the development and maintenance of attachment orientation.

References

Acherman, J., Dinneen, E., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1991). Clearing up at 2.5 years. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9, 365-376.

Ainsworth, M. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In C.M. Parkes and J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), The place of attachment in human behavior (pp.3-30). New York: Basic Books.

Ainsworth M. (1989). Attachment beyond infancy. American Psychologist, 44, 709-16.

Ainsworth, M. (1991). Attachment to other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In In C.M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinds and P. Marris (Eds.), Attachment Across the Life Cycle (pp. 33-51). London: Routledge.

Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M .C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (Eds.) (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baldwin, M. W., Keelan, J. P., Fehr, B., & Enns, V. (1996). Social-cognitive conceptualization of attachment working models: Availability and accessibility effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 94-109.

Barber, B.K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. Child Development, 67, 3296-3319.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 147-178.

Bartholomew, K. (1993). From childhood to adult relationships: Attachment theory and research. In S.W. Duck (Ed.), Learning about relationships (pp. 30-62).

London: Sage Publications.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 226-244.

Bartholomew, K. & Shaver, P. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. Simpson & W. Rholes (Eds.), Attachment Theory and Close Relationships (pp. 25-45). New York: The Guilford Press.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology, 4, 1-103.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. Cowan & E.M. Hetherington (Eds.), Family transitions: Advances in family research series (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc..

Berlin, L., Cassidy, J., & Belsky, J. (1995). Loneliness in young children and infant-mother attachment: A longitudinal study. Merril-Palmer-Quarterly, 41, 91-103.

Blishen, B. R., Carrol, W. K., & Moore, C. (1987). The 1981 Socioeconomic Index for Occupations in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24, 465-488.

Blos, P. (1979). The adolescent passage: Developmental issues. New York: International University Press.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Disruption of affectional bonds and its effects on behavior. Canada's Mental Health Supplement, 59, 12.

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation. New York: Basic

Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988a). A Secure Base: Parent-child attachment and healthy humans development. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988b). Developmental psychiatry comes of age. American Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 1-10.

Bowlby, J. (1991). Postscript. In C.M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinds and P. Marris (Eds.), Attachment Across the Life Cycle (pp. 293-297). London: Routledge.

Bretherton, I. (1990). Communication patterns, internal working models, and the intergenerational transmission of attachment relationships. Infant Mental Health Journal, 11, 237-252.

Bretherton, I., Golby, B., & Cho, E. (1997). Attachment and the transmission of values. In J. E. Grusec and L. Kuczynski (Eds.), Parenting and children's internalization of values (pp. 103-134). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc..

Cassidy, J. & Berlin, L. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment: Theory and research. Child Development, 65, 971-991.

Cassidy, J., Kirsh, S. J. Scolton K. L., & Park, R. D. (1996). Attachment and representation of peer relationships. Developmental Psychology, 32, 892-904.

Cicchetti, D., Toth, S. L., & Lynch, M. (1995). Bowlby's dream comes full circle: The application of attachment theory to risk psychopathology. Advances in Clinical Child Psychology, 17, 1-75.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hilllsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Crandall, V. C., Crandall, V. J., & Katkovsky, W. (1965). A children's social desirability questionnaire. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 27-36.

Crowell, J. A. & Feldman, S. S. (1988). Mothers' internal models of relationship and children's behavioral and developmental status: A study of mother-child interaction. Child Development, 59, 1273-1285.

Crowell, J. A. & Feldman, S. S. (1991). Mothers' working model of attachment relationship and mother and child behavior during separation and reunion. Developmental Psychology, 27, 597-605.

Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. Psychological Bulletin, 113, 487-496.

de Wolff, J. & van IJzendoorn, M.. H. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. Child Development, 68, 571-591.

Ellis, G .J. & Petersen, L. R. (1992). Socialization values and parental control techniques: A cross-cultural analysis of child rearing. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 23, 39-54.

Erickson, M. F., Korfmacher, J., & Egeland, B. R. (1992). Attachments past and present: Implications for therapeutic intervention with mother and infant dyads. Development and Psychopathology 4, 496-507.

Feeney, J. A., Nollar, P., & Hanrahan, M. (1994). Assessing adult attachment. In M. B. Sperling & W.H. Berman (Eds.), Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives (pp. 128-152). New York: Guilford Press.

Finnegan, R. A., Hodges, E., & Perry, D. (1996). Preoccupied and avoidant coping

during middle childhood. Child Development, 67, 1318-1328.

Fox, N. A. (1995). Of the way we were: Adult memories about attachment experiences and their role in determining infant-parent relationship: A commentary on van IJzendoorn (1995). Psychological Bulletin, 117, 404-410.

Fox, N. A., Kimmerly, N. L., & Schafer, W. D. (1991). Attachment to mother/attachment to father: A meta-analysis. Child Development, 61, 21-225.

Furman, W. & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 21, 1016-1024.

Furman, W. & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. Child Development, 63, 103-115.

Furman, W. & Wehner, E. A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor & G. R. Adams (Eds.), Personal relationships during adolescence: An annual book series, 6 (pp.168-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1985). Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Goldberg, S. (1991). Recent developments in attachment theory and research. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 36, 393-400.

Goosens, F. & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1990). Quality of infants' attachments to professional caregivers: Relation to infant-parent attachment and day-care characteristics. Child Development, 61, 832-837.

Griffin, D. & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and other: Fundamental

dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 430-445.

Grossmann, K. E. & Grossmann, K. (1990). The wider concept of attachment in cross-cultural research. Human Development, 33, 31-47.

Grossmann, K. E. & Grossmann, K. (1991). Attachment quality as an organizer of emotion and behavior responses in a longitudinal perspective. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinds and P. Marris (Eds.), Attachment Across the Life Cycle (pp. 93-114). London: Routledge.

Grotevant, H. (1998). Adolescent Development in Family Contexts. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3. Social, Emotional, and Personality Development (pp. 1097-1141). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524.

Hodges, E., Finnegan, R. A., & Perry, D. (1997). Autonomy-relatedness out of balance: Preoccupied and avoidant relationships with parents and friends during middle childhood. Manuscript submitted for publication, Florida Atlantic University.

Isabella, R. A. (1993). Origins of attachment: Maternal interactive behavior across the first year. Child Development, 64, 605-621.

Isabella, R. A. & Belsky, J. (1991). Interaction synchrony and the origins of infant-mother attachment: A replication study. Child Development, 62, 373-384.

Keating, D. P. (1990). Adolescent thinking. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliott

(Eds.), At the threshold: The developing adolescent (pp. 54-89). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Knight, G. P., Virdin, L. M., & Roosa, M. (1994). Socialization and family correlates of mental health outcomes among Hispanic and Anglo-American children: Consideration of cross-ethnic scalar equivalence. Child Development, 65, 212-224.

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.

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

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 62, 1049-1065.

Laursen, B., Hartup, W., & Koplas, A. (1996). Towards understanding peer conflict. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 42, 76-102.

Lieberman, A. F., Weston, D. R., & Pawl, J. H. (1991). Preventative intervention and outcome with anxiously attached dyads. Child Development, 62, 199-209.

Lieberman, M., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (1999). Developmental patterns in security of attachment to mother and father in late childhood and early adolescence: Associations with peer relations. Child Development, 70, 202-213.

Maccoby, E. E. & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.),

Handbook of child psychology: Volume 4. Socialization, personality, and social development (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Main, M. (1983). Exploration, play and cognitive functioning as related to infant-mother attachment. Infant Behavior and Development, 6, 167-74.

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

Main, M. (1991). Metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive monitoring, singular (coherent) versus multiple (incoherent) model of attachment. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinds and P. Marris (Eds.), Attachment Across the Life Cycle (pp. 125-59). London: Routledge.

Main, M. (1996). Introduction to the special section on attachment and psychopathology: 2. Overview of the field of Attachment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64, 237-243.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: a move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton and E. Waters (Eds.) Growing points in attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50, 66-106.

Main, M. & Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of an insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern. In B. T. Brazelton & M. W. Yogman (Eds.), Affective development in infancy (pp. 95-124). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Matas, L., Arend, R. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (1978). Continuity of adaptation in the

second year: The relationship between quality of attachment and later competence. Child Development, 56, 547-556.

Moskowitz, D. S. & Schwarz, J. C. (1982). Validity comparison of behavior counts and ratings by knowledgeable informants. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 518-528.

Parish, T. & McCluskey, J. (1992). The relationship between parenting styles and young adults' self-concepts and evaluations of parents. Adolescence, 27, 915-918.

Pederson, D. & Moran, G. (1999). The relation of maternal interactive behavior and attachment representations to sibling attachments with their common mother. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, New Mexico, May.

Rice, K. G. (1990). Attachment in adolescence: A narrative and meta-analytic review. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19, 511-538.

Schaefer, E. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36, 413-424.

Scharfe, E. & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. Personal Relationships, 1, 23-43.

Schwarz, J. C., Barthon-Henry, M., & Pruzinsky, T. (1985). Assessing child-rearing behaviors: A comparison of ratings made by mother, father, child, and sibling on the CRPBI. Child Development, 56, 462-479.

Seifer, R., Schiller, M. (1996). The role of parenting sensitivity, infant temperament, and dyadic interaction in attachment theory and assessment. In E. Waters,

B. E. Vaughn, G. Posada, & K. Kondol-Ikemura (Eds.), Constructs, cultures and caregiving: New growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development.

Seifer, R., Schiller, M., Sameroff, A. J., Resnick, S., & Riordan, K. (1996). Attachment, maternal sensitivity, and infant temperament during the first year of life. Developmental Psychology, 32, 12-25.

Spangler, G. & Grossmann, K. E. (1993). Biobehavioral organization of securely and insecurely attached infants. Child Development, 64, 1439-1450.

Sroufe, L. A. (1979). The coherence of individual development: Early care, attachment, and subsequent developmental issues. American Psychologist, 34, 834-841.

Sroufe, L. A. & Fleeson, (1988). The coherence of family relationships. In R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), Relationships within families (pp. 27-47). Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Steele, H., Steele, M., Croft, C., & Fonagy, P. (1999). Infant-mother attachment at one year predicts children's understanding of mixed emotions at six years. Social Development, 8, 161-178.

Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict and harmony in the family relationship. In S. Feldman (Ed.), At the threshold: The developing adolescent (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Steinberg, L. (1996). Adolescence. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Steinberg, L., Darling, N., Fletcher, A., Brown, B., & Dornbusch, M. (1995). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment: An ecological journey. In P. Moen, G.

H. Elder, Jr. and K. Luscher (Eds.) Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development (pp. 423-466). Washington, D.C.: APA.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, L. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. Child Development, 63, 1266-1281.

Steinberg, L., Mounts, N. Lamborn, S., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across varied ecological niches. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1, 19-36.

Stevenson-Hinde, J. & Shouldice, A. (1995). Maternal interactions and self-reports related to attachment classifications at 4.5 years. Child Development, 66, 583-596.

Strayer, J. & Preece, C. (1999). Relations of self-evaluative emotional style to adult attachment and reported parenting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia, May.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidel, L. S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics. California State University, Northridge: Harper Collins Publishers.

Thompson, R. (1998). Early sociopersonality development. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3. Social, Emotional, and Personality Development (pp. 25-86). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wachs, T.D. & Desai, S. (1993). Parent-report measures of toddler temperament and attachment: Their relation to each other and to the social microenvironment. Infant Behavior and Development, 16, 391-396.

Waters, E., Kondo-Ikemura, K., Posada, G., & Richters, J. E. (1991). Learning to

love: mechanisms and milestones. In M. R. Gunner and L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), Self processes and development. Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology (Vol. 23, pp. 217-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the Adult Attachment Interview. Psychological Bulletin, 117, 387-403.

van IJzendoorn, M. H., Juffer, F., & Duyvesteyn, M.G.(1995). Breaking the intergenerational cycle of insecure attachment: A review of the effects of attachment-based interventions on maternal sensitivity and infant security. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 36, 225-248.

van IJzendoorn, M. H. & Kroonenberg, P. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the Strange Situation. Child Development, 59, 147-156.

Vaughn, B. E., Lefever, G. B., Seifer, R., & Barglow, P. (1989). Attachment behavior, attachment security, and temperament during infancy. Child Development, 60, 728-737.

Vaughn, B. E. & Waters, E. (1990). Attachment behavior at home and in the laboratory: Q-sort observations and Strange Situation classifications of one-year-olds. Child Development, 61, 1965-1990.

Youngblade, L. & Belsky, J. (1990). Social and emotional consequences of child maltreatment. In R. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), Children at risk: An evaluation of factors contributing to child abuse and neglect (pp. 109-146). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Appendix A: Languages Spoken at Home

Languages Spoken Listed Separately for Elementary School and High School Samples.

	Elementary School (N=202)		High School (N=212)	
Languages Spoken at Home	n	%	n	%
English only	7	3.6	2	1.0
French only	69	35.2	18	9.2
French & English	21	10.7	9	4.6
English & Other	14	7.1	63	32.1
French & Other	42	21.4	21	10.7
English & French & Other	33	16.8	74	37.8
Other	10	5.1	9	4.6

Note: Data was missing for 6 elementary school and 16 high school participants.

Appendix B: General Information Sheet

Information générale

Ton Nom _____
Prénom et nom de famille

Nom du Professeur_____

Nom de L'école_____

Année Scolaire_____

Age: _____

Sexe: _____

Quelle(s) langue(s) parles-tu à la maison: _____

_____

_____

Quelle(s) langue(s) est-ce-que ta mère parle a la maison? _____

_____

_____

Quelle(s) langue(s) est-ce que ton père parle a la maison? _____

_____

_____

Qui vit avec toi? _____Mère _____Père

_____Soeur _____Frère

Autres (spécifiez)_____

Nombre de frères _____

Nombre de soeurs _____

Dans quel pays est-ce-que ta mère est née? _____

Depuis combien de temps ta mère vit-elle au Canada? _____

Dans quel pays est-ce-que ton père est né? _____

Depuis combien de temps ton père vit-il au Canada? _____

Quels sont tes antécédents culturels (e.g. Québécois pur laine, Haïtien, Chinois, Hispanique, Arabe, Grec, Italien, etc.)?

_____

Quels sont les antécédents culturels de ta mère (e.g. Blanc, Haïtien, Chinois, Hispanique , Arabe, Grec, Italien, etc.)?

_____

Quels sont les antécédents culturels de ton père (e.g. Blanc, Haïtien, Chinois, Hispanique, Arabe, Grec, Italien, etc.)?

_____

Appendix C: Steinberg Parenting Styles Questionnaire

TA RELATION AVEC TES PARENTS

Avec qui vis-tu? ___*mere* ___*belle-mere* ___*pere* ___*beau-pere*
Completez les questions suivants en considerant ceux avec qui tu vis le plus.

1. Quand tu obtiens une BONNE note à l'école, laquelle parmi les réactions suivantes reçois-tu de tes parents ou de tes tuteurs? (Encercle un seul choix par ligne)

Ils me félicitent	**Jamais**	**Parfois**	**Généralement**

2. Quand tu obtiens une MAUVAISE note à l'école lesquelles parmi les réactions suivantes reçois-tu de tes parents ou de tes tuteurs? (Encercle un seul choix pour chaque ligne)

Ils me rendent la vie misérable	**Jamais**	**Parfois**	**Généralement**
Ils me font me sentir coupable	**Jamais**	**Parfois**	**Généralement**
Ils m'encouragent à travailler plus fort	**Jamais**	**Parfois**	**Généralement**

3. Pendant une semaine normale, jusqu'à quelle heure, au plus tard, peux-tu sortir les soirs de semaine (lundi au jeudi)?

1. Interdit de sortir
2. Avant 8:00
3. 8:00 à 8:59
4. 9:00 à 9:59
5. 10:00 à 10:59
6. 11:00 ou plus
7. Aussi tard que je le veux

4. Pendant une semaine normale, jusqu'à quelle heure, au plus tard, peux-tu sortir les soirs de fin de semaine (vendredi et samedi)?

1. Interdit de sortir
2. Avant 9:00
3. 9:00 à 9:59
4. 10:00 à 10:59
5. 11:00 à 11:59
6. 12:00 à 12:59
7. 1:00 à 1:59
8. Après 2:00
9. Aussi tard que je le veux

5. Mes parents savent exactement où je passe la plupart de mes après-midi, après l'école.

1- Oui

2- Non

6. A quel point tes parents ESSAYENT-ILS de savoir...

A.	où tu sors le soir?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**
B.	ce que tu fais de tes temps libres?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**
C.	où tu passes la plupart de tes après-midi après l'école?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**

7. A quel point tes parents savent-ils vraiment...

A.	qui sont tes ami(e)s?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**
B.	où tu sors le soir?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**
C.	ce que tu fais de tes temps libres?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**
D.	où tu passes la plupart de tes après-midi après l'école?	**Pas du tout**	**Un peu**	**Beaucoup**

8. Voici quelques-unes des choses que les parents (beaux-parents ou tuteurs) disent à leurs enfants. Réfléchis aux conversations que tu as avec ta famille et indique pour chacun des items suivants la fréquence avec laquelle tes parents disent des choses semblables. (Encercle un seul choix pour chaque ligne)

A. Ils te disent que leurs idées sont correctes et que tu ne devraient pas les remettre en question.

jamais rarement parfois souvent

B. Ils répondent à tes arguments par quelque chose comme "tu comprendras quand tu seras plus vieux".

jamais rarement parfois souvent

C. Ils te disent que tu devrais laisser tomber les arguments plutôt que de mettre les gens en colère.

jamais rarement parfois souvent

9. Maintenant, indique à quel point tes parents (beaux-parents ou tuteurs) insistent sur l'idée que tu ne devrais pas argumenter avec les adultes.

beaucoup assez un peu légèrement pas du tout

10. Indique si les énoncés suivants sont généralement vrai ou faux à propos de ton père (beau-père, tuteur). (Encercle un choix pour chaque ligne)

		Généralement vrai	**Généralement faux**
a.	Je peux compter sur son aide si j'ai un problème quelconque.	o	o
b.	Il me pousse toujours à faire de mon mieux dans tout ce que je fais.	o	o
c.	Il me pousse toujours à réfléchir par moi-même.	o	o
d.	Il m'aide dans mes travaux scolaires s'il y a quelque chose que je ne comprends pas.	o	o
e.	Il ne me permet pas de faire des choses avec lui lorsque je fais quelque chose qu'il n'aime pas.	o	o
f.	Il me laisse faire mes propres plans pour les choses que je veux faire.	o	o
g.	Quand il me demande de faire quelque chose, il m'explique pourquoi.	o	o
h.	Il devient froid et inamical si je fais quelque chose qu'il n'aime pas.	o	o

11. Indique si les énoncés suivants sont généralement vrai ou faux à propos de ta mère (belle-mère, tuteure). (Encercle un choix pour chaque ligne)

		Généralement vrai	Généralement faux
a.	Je peux compter sur son aide si j'ai un problème quelconque.	o	o
b.	Elle me pousse toujours à faire de mon mieux dans tout ce que je fais.	o	o
c.	Elle me pousse toujours à réfléchir par moi-même.	o	o
d.	Elle m'aide dans mes travaux scolaires s'il y a quelque chose que je ne comprends pas.	o	o
e.	Elle ne me permet pas de faire des chose avec elle lorsque je fais quelque chose qu'elle n'aime pas.	o	o
f.	Elle me laisse faire mes propres plans pour les choses que je veux faire.	o	o
g.	Quand elle me demande de faire quelque chose, elle m'explique pourquoi.	o	o
h.	Elle devient froide et inamicale si je fais quelque chose qu'elle n'aime pas.	o	o

12. A quelle fréquence les choses suivantes arrivent-elles dans ta famille?

A. Mes parents prennent du temps juste pour parler avec moi.

Presqu'à chaque jour	Quelques fois par semaine	Quelques fois par mois	Presque jamais
o	o	o	o

B. Ma famille fait quelque chose d'amusant ensemble.

Presqu'à chaque jour	Quelques fois par semaine	Quelques fois par mois	Presque jamais
o	o	o	o

Appendix D: Network of Relationships Questionnaire

Les Personnes Importantes Dans Ma Vie

Les prochaines questions concernent tes relations avec: 1. ta mère ou ta belle-mère (si tu as les deux, décris la relation entre toi et celle avec qui tu habites); 2. ton père ou ton beau-père (si tu as les deux, décris la relation entre toi et celui avec qui tu habites); 3. ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e); 4. tes camarades de classe; 5. tes cousin(e)s; et 6. tes tantes et tes oncles.

A chaque question, encercle un chiffre pour ta mère, un chiffre pour ton père, un chiffre pour ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), un chiffre pour tes camarades de classe, un chiffre pour tes cousin(e)s et un chiffre pour tes tantes et tes oncles.

1	2	3	4	5
Très peu ou pas du tout	Quelque peu	Beaucoup	Enormément	Le plus

****

1. Combien de temps libre passes-tu avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousins	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grand-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

2. Combien de fois vous arrive-t-il de vous mettre en colère ou de vous fâcher l'un(e) contre l'autre?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

3. Combien de fois cette personne t'a-t-elle montré à faire des choses nouvelles?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

4. A quel point es-tu satisfait(e) de ta relation avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

5. A quel point est-ce que tu dis tout à cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

6. T'arrive-t-il d'aider cette personne à faire des choses qu'il/elle ne peut pas faire tout(e) seul(e)?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

7. A quel point es-tu apprécié(e) ou aimé(e) par cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

8. A quel point est-ce que cette personne te puni?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

9. A quel point es-tu traité(e) avec respect et admiration par cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

10. Qui dit aux autres ce qu'ils doivent faire le plus souvent, toi ou cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

11. A quel point es-tu certain(e) que cette relation va durer, peu importe ce qu'il arrive?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

12. T'arrive-t-il de jouer ou d'avoir du plaisir avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

13. T'arrive-t-il d'être en désaccord ou de te disputer avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

14. Cette personne t'aide-t-elle à comprendre ou à réparer des choses?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

15. A quel point es-tu satisfait(e) de la façon dont çà ce passe entre toi et cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

16. T'arrive-t-il de partager des secrets et des sentiments personnels avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

17. T'arrive-t-il de protéger ou de veiller sur cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

18. A quel point es-tu apprécié(e) par cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

19. Cette personne te fait-elle savoir que tu as du talent pour toute sorte de choses?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

20. L'autre personne a-t-elle tendance à être le patron/la patronne dans votre relation?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

21. A quel point est-ce que cette personne te puni pour l'avoir desobei?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

22. A quel point es-tu certain(e) que votre relation va durer malgré les disputes?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

23. T'arrive-t-il d'aller à différents endroits et de faire des choses plaisantes avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

24. Est-ce qu'il t'arrive de te disputer avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

25. Cette personne te donne-t-elle un coup de main lorsque tu as une tâche à accomplir?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

26. As-tu une bonne relation avec cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

27. T'arrive-t-il de parler avec cette personne de choses que tu ne veux pas dire aux autres?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

28. Est-ce que tu prends soin de cette personne?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

29. Cette personne ressent-elle une profonde affection (amour ou amitié) pour toi?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

30. Est-ce que cette personne approuve ou apprécie les choses que tu fais?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

31. Dans ta relation avec cette personne, est-ce que l'autre tend à commander et à décider de ce qui devrait être fait?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

32. A quel point est-ce que cette personne t'a gronde pour avoir fait quelque chose que tu n'aurai pas du faire.

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

33. A quel point es-tu certain(e) que ta relation avec cette personne va se poursuivre dans les années à venir?

	Très peu ou pas du tout				Le plus
Mère	1	2	3	4	5
Père	1	2	3	4	5
Meilleur(e) ami(e)	1	2	3	4	5
Camarades de classe	1	2	3	4	5
Cousin(e)s	1	2	3	4	5
Autre parenté adulte (Tantes, oncles, grands-parents)	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E: Coping Styles Questionnaire

COMMENT JE SUIS

Nom: _____ Age: _____
(prénom) (nom de famille)

Date de naissance: _____ Année scolaire: _____
(mois/jour/année)

Professeur: _____

Encercle ton sexe: Garçon Fille

HISTOIRE DE PRATIQUE

Un jour, à l'école, ton professeur te remet un examen et tu remarques que tu as eu une mauvaise note. De retour à la maison, ta mère peut voir que tu es triste et te demande si tu veux en parler. Certains enfants aimeraient en parler à leur mère, tandis que d'autres aimeraient mieux qu'on les laisse seuls. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus? (Encercle un seul X)

Certains enfants aimeraient lui en parler		MAIS	D'autres aimeraient qu'on les laisse seuls.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

COMMENT JE SUIS

1. Un jour, tu vas au cinéma avec ton ami(e). Après le film, tu attends que ta mère viens te chercher en voiture pour te ramener à la maison. Ta mère est très en retard. Certains enfants resteraient calmes jusqu'à ce que leur mère arrive, mais d'autres enfants seraient très anxieux et inquiets qu'il lui soit arrivé quelque chose. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants resteraient calmes jusqu'à ce que leur mère arrive		MAIS	D'autres enfants seraient très anxieux et inquiets pour elle.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

2. Ta mère est absente depuis plusieurs jours, mais elle arrivera à la maison plus tard dans la journée. Certains enfants ne feraient pas toute une histoire du fait qu'elle revienne à la maison, mais d'autres enfants auraient hâte de la revoir. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne feraient pas toute une histoire de son retour		MAIS	D'autres enfants auraient hâte de la revoir.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

3. Tu as la chance de faire un voyage de quelques jours en Floride avec un(e) ami(e) et sa famille. Certains enfants s'ennuieraient trop de leur maison, leur quartier, leur pays et de leur mère pour y aller, mais d'autres enfants seraient capables d'accompagner leur ami(e) et sa famille pour ces vacances. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants s'ennuieraient trop de leur pays et de leur mère pour y aller		MAIS	Certains enfants seraient capables d'y aller	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

4. Un jour, à l'école, un de tes professeurs te dit quelque chose de méchant. Certains enfants diraient à leur mère qu'ils sont fâchés et en parleraient avec elle, mais d'autres enfants ne diraient pas à leur mère qu'ils sont fâchés et n'en parleraient pas avec elle. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants diraient à leur mère qu'ils sont fâchés et en parleraient avec elle		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne diraient pas à leur mère qu'ils sont fâchés et n'en parleraient pas avec elle.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

5. Ta famille déménage dans un nouveau quartier. Certains enfants aimeraient explorer un peu leur nouveau quartier tout seuls, mais d'autres enfants préfèreraient rester à la maison, sauf si leur mère les accompagnent. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants aimeraient explorer un peu tout seuls		MAIS	D'autres enfants préfèreraient rester à la maison, sauf si leur mère les accompagnent	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

6. Ta mère t'amène chez le médecin pour un examen. Pendant que tu es assis(e) dans la salle d'attente, elle te dit qu'elle doit aller faire des courses et qu'elle reviendra te chercher plus tard. Certains enfants ne se feraient pas de soucis si leur mère les laissait attendre tout seuls, mais d'autres enfants préfèreraient que leur mère attende avec eux. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne se feraient pas de soucis si leur mère les laissait attendre tout seuls		MAIS	D'autres enfants préfèreraient que leur mère attende avec eux	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

7. Un jour, à l'école, tu te sens malade et l'infirmière appelle ta mère pour qu'elle te ramène à la maison. Ta mère dit qu'elle viendra te chercher. Certains enfants commenceraient déjà à se sentir mieux juste à savoir que leur mère s'en vienne, mais d'autres enfants se ficheraient bien que leur mère vienne ou non. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants commenceraient déjà à se sentir mieux juste à savoir que leur mère s'en vient		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés que leur mère vienne ou non	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

8. Un soir, ta mère et toi allez au parc d'amusement. Certains manèges ont l'air un peu apeurants, mais ils ont aussi l'air amusants et excitants. Tu voudrais que ta mère t'accompagne sur ces manèges, mais ta mère te dit qu'elle est fatiguée et qu'elle veut seulement s'asseoir sur un banc et regarder. Certains enfants iraient sur ces manèges tout seuls, mais d'autres enfants n'iraient pas tout seuls. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants iraient sur ces manèges tout seuls		MAIS	D'autres enfants n'iraient pas tout seuls	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

9. Tu travailles à la maison à une recherche scolaire quand, tout à coup, tu as de la difficulté. Ta mère est dans la pièce juste à côté. Certains enfants demanderaient un peu d'aide à leur mère, mais d'autres enfants ne demanderaient jamais l'aide de leur mère même s'ils ont beaucoup de difficultés. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants demanderaient un peu d'aide à leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne demanderaient jamais d'aide de leur mère.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

10. Tu tombes malade et tu dois passer quelques jours à l'hôpital. Certains enfants voudraient que leur mère passe tout le temps avec eux dans leur chambre d'hôpital, mais d'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés si leur mère les visitait seulement une ou deux fois par jour pendant les heures de visite. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient que leur mère passe tout le temps avec eux	MAIS	D'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés si leur mère les visitait seulement pendant les heures de visite.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

11. Une nuit, pendant que tu dors, tu es réveillé par quelque chose d'apeurant. Peut-être as-tu fait un vilain cauchemar ou pensé qu'un inconnu essayait d'entrer dans la maison. Tu vas réveiller ta mère. Après s'être assurée que tout allait bien, elle te suggère de retourner te coucher. Certains enfants seraient capables de se rendormir assez rapidement, mais d'autres enfants resteraient effrayés et essayeraient de convaincre leur mère de rester avec eux très longtemps. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient capables de se rendormir assez rapidement	MAIS	D'autres enfants resteraient effrayés et essayeraient de convaincre leur mère de rester avec eux.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

12. Tu es intéressé(e) à apprendre à jouer un instrument de musique. Supposons que c'est la guitare. Tu découvres que ta mère jouait assez bien la guitare quand elle était jeune et elle t'offre de te donner quelques leçons. Certains enfants voudraient apprendre à jouer sans aucune aide de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants aimeraient bien que leur mère leur donne quelques leçons de guitare. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient apprendre à jouer sans aucune aide de leur mère	MAIS	D'autres enfants aimeraient bien que leur mère leur donne quelques leçons.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

13. Ta mère te dit qu'elle pense aller passer une semaine ou deux chez quelqu'un de sa parenté. Certains enfants seraient très fâchés qu'elle parte aussi longtemps et tenteraient de la convaincre de rester, mais d'autres enfants n'essayeraient pas de la convaincre de rester. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient très fâchés et tenteraient de la convaincre de rester		MAIS	D'autres enfants n'essayeraient pas de la convaincre de rester.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

14. Supposons que tu as un chien ou un chat que tu adores et qui devient tou d'un coup très malade. Ça te rend triste. Certains enfants diraient à leur mère qu'ils se sentent tristes, mais d'autres enfants ne diraient pas à leur mère qu'ils se sentent tristes. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants diraient à leur mère qu'ils se sentent tristes		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne diraient pas à leur mère qu'ils se sentent tristes.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

15. Tu es dans un camp de vacances depuis deux semaines et plusieurs des enfants de ton groupe ont reçu des lettres ou des appels de leur mère. Certains enfants ne seraient pas dérangés de ne pas avoir reçu de nouvelles de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants seraient déçus de ne pas avoir reçu de nouvelles de leur mère. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne seraient pas dérangés de ne pas avoir reçu de nouvelles de leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants seraient déçus de ne pas avoir reçu de nouvelles de leur mère.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

16. Tu es au cinéma avec ta mère et tu dois sortir pour aller aux toilettes. Lorsque tu reviens dans la salle de cinéma, il fait si noir que tu n'arrives pas à retrouver ta mère. Certains enfants chercheraient leur mère calmement sans trop s'inquiéter, mais d'autres enfants chercheraient leur mère et seraient très inquiets jusqu'à ce qu'ils l'aient retrouvée. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants la chercheraient calmement sans trop s'inquiéter	MAIS	D'autres enfants la chercheraient et seraient très inquiets Jusqu'à ce qu'ils l'aient retrouvée.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

17. Un jour, tu reviens de l'école et tu es encore fâché(e) à cause d'une dispute avec un(e) ami(e). Ta mère peut deviner que tu es fâché(e) et te demande si tu veux en parler. Certains enfants voudraient parler du problème à leur mère et se calmeraient assez vite, mais d'autres enfants resteraient fâchés et voudraient continuer d'en parler à leur mère très longtemps. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient lui en parler et se calmeraient assez vite	MAIS	D'autres enfants resteraient fâchés et voudraient continuer de lui en parler très longtemps.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

18. Toi et ta mère visitez un nouveau centre d'achats pour voir de quoi il a l'air. Ta mère te propose d'explorer le centre ensemble. Certains enfants voudraient absolument l'explorer tout seuls, mais d'autres enfants seraient d'accord pour l'explorer avec leur mère. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient absolument l'explorer tout seuls	MAIS	D'autres enfants seraient d'accord pour l'explorer avec leur mère.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

19. Toi et ta mère allez au cinéma ensemble. Lorsque vous entrez dans la salle, vous remarquez qu'elle est pleine de gens et vous n'arrivez pas à trouver deux places côte-à-côte. Certains enfants seraient déçus de ne pas pouvoir s'asseoir à côté de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants préféreraient être assis loin de leur mère de toute façon. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient déçus de ne pas pouvoir s'asseoir à côté de leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants préféreraient être assis loin de leur mère de toute façon.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

20. Ta classe va à Ottawa pour une sortie de classe de plusieurs jours. Ta mère a accepté d'accompagner le groupe pour servir de gardienne dans les chambres à coucher. Mais à la veille du départ de ta classe, ta mère décide qu'elle est trop occupée pour partir en voyage avec vous. Certains enfants voudraient encore partir en voyage avec leur classe, même si leur mère n'y allait plus, mais d'autres enfants ne voudraient plus partir en voyage si leur mère n'y allait pas. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient encore partir, même si leur mère n'y allait plus		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne voudraient plus partir si leur mère n'y allait pas.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

21. Un soir, pendant le souper, tu mentionnes que tu aimerais bien gagner un peu d'argent de poche. Après le souper, ta mère te demande si elle peut te donner quelques conseils sur comment gagner de l'argent dans le quartier. Certains enfants n'aiment pas recevoir de conseils de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants sont prêts à écouter les conseils de leur mère. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants n'aiment pas recevoir de conseils de leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants sont prêts à écouter les conseils de leur mère.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

22. En revenant de l'école, un méchant garçon t'arrête et te fait des menaces. Ça te fait peur et te met en colère. A ton retour à la maison, tu en parles à ta mère. Certains enfants resteraient tout près de leur mère et en parleraient très longtemps, mais d'autres enfants n'en parleraient pas très longtemps, puis se calmeraient. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants resteraient tout près de leur mère et en longtemps		MAIS	D'autres enfants n'en parleraient pas très longtemps, puis se calmeraient.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

23. Un jour, toi et ta mère allez au zoo. Ta mère te dit que parce qu'elle n'a pas passé beaucoup de temps avec toi dernièrement, elle aimerait bien regarder les animaux avec toi. Certains enfants seraient d'accord pour regarder les animaux avec leur mère, mais d'autres enfants préféreraient regarder les animaux tout seuls et retrouver leur mère plus tard. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient d'accord pour regarder les animaux tout tout seuls et retrouver leur mère plus tard.		MAIS	D'autres enfants préféreraient regarder les animaux avec leur mère.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

24. Un soir, à la maison, tu travailles à un devoir qui doit être remis le lendemain. Tu as quelques petits problèmes et tu commences à te mettre en colère. Certains enfants demanderaient de l'aide de leur mère s'ils en avaient vraiment besoin, mais d'autres enfants ne seraient pas capables de terminer leur devoir à moins que leur mère fasse presque tout le travail avec eux. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants demanderaient de l'aide de leur mère s'ils en avaient vraiment besoin,		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne seraient pas capables de terminer leur devoir à moins que leur mère fasse presque tout le travail avec eux.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

25. Ta mère doit rester à l'hôpital pour passer quelques tests. Certains enfants voudraient rendre visite à leur mère à l'hôpital, mais d'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés s'ils ne voyaient pas leur mère pendant quelques jours. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants voudraient lui rendre visite à l'hôpital		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés s'ils ne la voyaient pas pendant quelques jours.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

26. Toi et ta mère allez à Québec pour explorer un nouveau centre d'achats. A votre arrivée, ta mère te propose d'explorer tout(e) seul(e) pour une heure, puis d'aller la retrouver devant une certaine boutique. Certains enfants ne voudraient pas explorer un nouveau centre d'achats sans leur mère, mais d'autres enfants exploreraient un nouveau centre d'achats tout seuls. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne voudraient pas explorer un nouveau centre d'achats sans leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants exploreraient un nouveau centre d'achats tout seuls.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

27. Un jour, à l'école, il t'arrive un problème avec un(e) de tes ami(e)s. De retour à la maison, ta mère voit bien que tu es triste et commence à en parler avec toi. Certains enfants se sentiraient à l'aise de parler de leurs sentiments et de leurs problèmes avec leur mère, mais d'autres enfants voudraient seulement que leur mère les laissent seuls. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants se sentiraient à l'aise de parler de leurs sentiments et de leurs problèmes avec leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants voudraient seulement que leur mère les laissent seuls.	
X	X		X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

28. Tu as dû te rendre chez le médecin pour un examen et tu es assis(e) dans la salle d'attente avec ta mère. Ta mère veut te laisser seul(e) dans le cabinet du médecin, pendant qu'elle va faire des courses. Certains enfants seraient dérangés et tenteraient de convaincre leur mère de rester, mais d'autres enfants ne seraient pas si dérangés et ne tenteraient pas de convaincre leur mère de rester. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient dérangés et tenteraient convaincre leur mère de rester.

MAIS

D'autres enfants ne seraient pas dérangés et ne tenteraient pas convaincre leur mère de rester

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

29. Un jour, à l'école, ton professeur vous parle d'un nouveau projet de classe, une pièce de théâtre, et demande à tout le monde de décider ce soir-là qui veut jouer un rôle dans cette pièce. Le professeur vous suggère d'en discuter avec votre mère avant de décider de prendre un rôle. Certains enfants ne voudraient pas discuter de leur participation à la pièce avec leur mère avant de décider, mais d'autres enfants voudraient en discuter avec leur mère avant de décider. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne voudraient pas en discuter avec leur mère avant de décider

MAIS

d'autres enfants voudraient en discuter avec elle avant de décider.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

30. Un jour, à l'école, tu te sens malade après le dîner et tu vas vomir dans les toilettes. L'infirmière appelle ta mère et ta mère te dit de t'étendre sur un lit et qu'elle viendra te chercher plus tard. Certains enfants seraient anxieux et inquiets jusqu'à l'arrivée de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants ne feraient que s'étendre et essayer de se sentir mieux, sans être anxieux et inquiets. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants seraient anxieux et inquiets jusqu'à l'arrivée de leur mère

MAIS

D'autres enfants ne feraient que s'étendre et essayer de se sentir mieux, sans être anxieux et inquiets.

X	X	X	X
Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

31. Ta mère revient à la maison après être partie pendant une semaine ou deux. Certains enfants arrêteraient tout de suite ce qu'ils font et courraient pour l'accueillir en la serrant dans leurs bras ou en l'embrassant, mais d'autres enfants n'arrêteraient pas ce qu'ils font pour l'accueillir. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants arrêteraient ce qu'ils font pour l'accueillir en la serrant dans leurs bras ou en l'embrassant		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne s'arrêteraient pas pour l'accueillir.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

32. Tu voudrais vraiment faire partie d'une équipe sportive parascolaire, mais tu te rends compte que tu ne connais personne dans l'équipe. Tu demandes donc à ta mère de t'accompagner à la séance de qualifications. Elle te répond qu'elle peut t'y conduire, mais qu'elle ne pourra pas rester là avec toi. Certains enfants iraient seulement si leur mère pouvaient rester pendant les qualifications, mais d'autres enfants iraient même si leur mère ne pouvait pas rester. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants iraient seulement si leur mère pouvaient rester		MAIS	D'autres enfants iraient même si elle ne pouvait pas rester.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

33. Un jour tu reviens de l'école tout bouleversé(e). Ta mère te demande ce qui ne va pas. Certains enfants ne voudraient pas discuter du problème avec elle, mais d'autres enfants voudraient lui en parler. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne voudraient pas discuter du problème avec elle		MAIS	D'autres enfants voudraient lui en parler.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

34. Ta mère et toi êtes dans un centre d'achats rempli de monde quand, tout à coup, tu n'arrives plus à retrouver ta mère. Tu as peur mais, un peu plus tard, vous vous retrouvez. Certains enfants se remettraient vite de leur peur, mais d'autres enfants resteraient inquiets très longtemps d'être séparés à nouveau. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants se remettraient vite de leur peur		MAIS	D'autres enfants resteraient inquiets d'être séparés à nouveau.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

35. Tu veux apprendre comment faire quelque chose avec un ordinateur et tu as de la difficulté. Ta mère en connaît beaucoup sur les ordinateurs et t'offre de t'aider. Certains enfants ne voudraient aucune aide de leur mère, mais d'autres enfants accepteraient que leur mère les aide un peu. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants ne voudraient aucune aide de leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants accepteraient que leur mère les aide un peu.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

36. Un jour, à l'école, tu fais quelque chose que ton professeur comprend mal et il/elle te dispute. Ça te dérange. Certains enfants resteraient très anxieux jusqu'à ce qu'ils en parlent à leur mère, mais d'autres enfants ne seraient pas si anxieux d'en parler à leur mère. Quels enfants te ressemblent le plus?

Certains enfants resteraient très anxieux jusqu'à ce qu'ils en parlent à leur mère		MAIS	D'autres enfants ne seraient pas si anxieux d'en parler à leur mère.	
X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup	X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu		X Ils/elles me ressemblent un peu	X Ils/elles me ressemblent beaucoup

Appendix F: Relationship Questionnaire

Maintenant, relis chacun des paragraphes (voir ci-dessous). À quel point **chacun** de ces paragraphes décrit-il ta relation avec ta mère?

Encercle le **chiffre** qui te correspond le mieux.

Il est facile pour moi d'être proche de ma mère émotivement. Je me sens à l'aise de pouvoir compter sur ma mère et qu'elle puisse compter sur moi. Je ne crains pas de me retrouver seul(e) ou de ne pas être accepté(e) par ma mère.

Pas du tout **Beaucoup**

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Je suis à l'aise avec l'idée que ma relation avec ma mère ne soit pas très proche. Il est très important pour moi de me sentir indépendant(e) et autonome, et je préfère ne pas compter sur ma mère ou qu'elle ne compte pas sur moi.

Pas du tout **Beaucoup**

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Je veux être le plus proche possible de ma mère sur le plan émotif, mais je remarque souvent que ma mère hésite à se rapprocher de moi autant que je le voudrais. Je suis mal à l'aise si je n'ai pas une relation étroite avec ma mère, et je crains parfois qu'elle ne m'apprécie pas autant que je l'apprécie.

Pas du tout **Beaucoup**

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Je me sens mal à l'aise lorsque je me rapproche de ma mère. J'aimerais pouvoir devenir proche d'elle, mais j'ai de la difficulté à lui faire confiance ou à compter sur elle. Je crains d'être blessé(e) si je me laisse devenir trop proche de ma mère.

Pas du tout **Beaucoup**

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Appendix G: Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire for Children

Voici quelques questions à propos de choses qui arrivent à tous les enfants de ton âge. A chaque question, encercle OUI ou NON. Assure-toi d'avoir répondu à toute les questions.

OUI	NON	1.	Est-ce que ça te dérange parfois de partager tes choses avec tes ami(e)s?
OUI	NON	2.	T'arrive-t-il de frapper une fille ou un garçon plus petit que toi?
OUI	NON	3.	T'arrive-t-il de répondre de façon insolente ou "baveuse" à ton père ou à ta mère?
OUI	NON	4.	T'arrive-t-il de laisser quelqu'un d'autre être blâmé lorsque tu as fais quelque chose de mal?
OUI	NON	5.	Fais-tu toujours attention pour garder tes vêtements propres et ta chambre en ordre?
OUI	NON	6.	Aides-tu toujours les gens qui ont besoin d'aide?
OUI	NON	7.	T'arrive-t-il de te chicaner avec ta mère pour pouvoir faire quelque chose qu'elle ne veut pas que tu fasses?
OUI	NON	8.	T'arrive-t-il de dire des choses qui pourraient faire de la peine à quelqu'un?
OUI	NON	9.	Es-tu toujours poli(e), même avec les gens qui ne sont pas très gentils?
OUI	NON	10.	Obéis-tu toujours à tes parents?
OUI	NON	11.	T'arrive-t-il d'oublier de dire "s'il-vous-plait" et "merci"?
OUI	NON	12.	Souhaites-tu parfois pouvoir juste t'amuser, plutôt que d'aller à l'école?
OUI	NON	13.	Te laves-tu toujours les mains avant chaque repas?
OUI	NON	14.	As-tu déjà désobéi à un règlement?
OUI	NON	15.	Essayes-tu de te venger parfois quand on te fait quelque chose que tu n'aimes pas?
OUI	NON	16.	Te mets-tu en colère parfois quand tu ne peux pas en faire à ta tête?
OUI	NON	17.	T'arrive-t-il d'avoir envie de te moquer des autres?
OUI	NON	18.	Es-tu toujours heureux(se) de coopérer avec les autres?
OUI	NON	19.	Y a-t-il des fois où tu n'aimes pas qu'un(e) autre te demande de faire des choses pour lui/elle?
OUI	NON	20.	Te fâches-tu parfois quand les autres ne font pas ce que tu veux?

Appendix H: Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire for Adolescents

Ce questionnaire liste une série d'expériences qu'ont la plupart des enfants à un moment ou l'autre. Lis attentivement chacune de ces expériences. Après avoir lu une de celles-ci, décide si tu as déjà eu cette expérience. Si ta réponse est "oui", écris un "O" (pour oui) devant cette phrase, mais si ta réponse est "non", écris plutôt un "N" (pour non). Fais bien attention d'avoir donné une réponse pour toutes les expériences.

___ 1. Parfois, je n'ai pas envie de partager mes choses avec mes ami(e)s.

___ 2. Je ne frapperais jamais une fille ou un garçon plus petit que moi.

___ 3. Je ne réponds jamais de façon insolente ou "baveuse" à mon père ou à ma mère.

___ 4. Je ne laisse jamais quelqu'un d'autre être blâmé lorsque j'ai fait quelque chose de mal.

___ 5. Je fais toujours attention pour garder mes vêtements propres et ma chambre en ordre.

___ 6. J'aide toujours les gens qui ont besoin d'aide.

___ 7. Je me chicane parfois avec ma mère pour qu'elle me laisse faire quelque chose qu'elle ne veut pas que je fasse.

___ 8. Je ne dis jamais des choses qui pourraient faire de la peine à quelqu'un.

___ 9. Je suis toujours poli(e), même avec les gens qui ne sont pas très gentils.

___ 10. J'obéis toujours à mes parents.

___ 11. Je n'oublie jamais de dire "s'il-vous-plaît" et "merci".

___ 12. Parfois, je souhaiterais pouvoir juste "niaiser" et perdre mon temps, plutôt que d'aller à l'école.

___ 13. Je me lave toujours les mains avant chaque repas.

___ 14. Je n'ai jamais été tenté(e) de désobéir à un règlement ou à la loi.

___ 15. J'essaye parfois de me venger quand on me fait quelque chose que je n'aime pas.

___ 16. Je me mets parfois en colère quand je ne peux pas en faire à ma tête.

___ 17. J'ai parfois envie de me moquer des autres.

___ 18. Je suis toujours heureux(se) de coopérer avec les autres.

___ 19. Parfois, je n'aime pas qu'un(e) autre me demande de faire des choses pour lui/elle.

___ 20. Parfois, je me fâche quand les autres ne font pas ce que je veux.

Appendix I: Phase I Letter to Parents

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Le 1ier Fevrier, 1996

Chers parents,

Nous vous écrivons pour vous demander la permission de laisser votre enfant participer, à son école, à une des parties d'un projet de recherche approuvé par la Commission scolaire Laurenval.

Nous, au Centre de recherches en développement humain, étudions le développement social des enfants depuis plus d'une décennie. Grâce au soutien du Conseil de recherche en sciences sociales et humaines du Canada et du Fonds pour la formation des chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche du Québec, nous découvrons présentement comment les amitiés des enfants se développent. Parmi les facteurs impliqués se retrouvent les relations familiales, les réseaux sociaux et l'héritage culturel. Nous cherchons à comprendre comment la famille, les camarades de classe et les antécédents culturels influencent l'importance des amis pour les enfants. Cette recherche est importante parce que les relations positives avec la famille et d'autres enfants contribuent au sentiment de bien-être ainsi qu'à la réussite scolaire de l'enfant.

Nous travaillons avec des enfants de la 4e année au Secondaire V. Pour un des volets de notre étude, nous aimerions que votre enfant énumère ses ami(e)s de son année scolaire ainsi que ses préférences en terme d'amitié. Mais pour que notre étude soit valable, il est important que tous les enfants de la classe participent à cette tâche. La plupart des enfants aiment penser à leurs amis et prennent plaisir à faire cette tâche qui se déroulera dans la classe même et qui dure, au plus, 30 minutes. Soyez assurés que toute l'information recueillie restera strictement confidentielle et accessible seulement à l'équipe de recherche.

Nous espérons que vous permettrez à votre enfant de participer à cette tâche. Veuillez nous communiquer votre décision en remplissant le formulaire ci-inclus et en demandant à votre enfant de le ramener à son professeur. Nous aimerions connaître votre réponse, que vous permettiez ou non à votre enfant de participer. En guise de remerciement, chaque enfant retournant ce formulaire courra la chance de gagner un des certificats cadeaux pour des laissez-passer aux Cineplex Odéon. Il y aura un prix par classe.

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

Si vous avez des questions ou désirez avoir plus d'informations, n'hésitez pas à nous téléphoner aux numéros ci-dessous.

Nous apprécions votre coopération et nous vous en remercions.

Sincèrement vôtre,

Joelle Dayan, M.A.
Étudiante au doctorat
(848-7560)

Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D.
Professeure de psychologie
(848-7538)

Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D.
Professeure associée de
science sociale appliquée
et de psychologie
(848-3889)

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

February 1,, 1996

Dear Parents:

We are writing to ask permission for your child to participate, at school, in a part of a project approved by the Laurenval School Commission.

We at the Centre for Research in Human Development have been studying children's social development for over a decade. With support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Fonds pour la Formation des Chercheurs et l'Aide a la Recherche of Quebec, we are currently learning how children's friendships develop. Among the factors are family relationships, social networks and cultural heritage. We want to understand how family, classmates and cultural background influence the importance of friends for children. This work is important because positive relations with family and other children contribute to the child's sense of well-being and school achievement.

We are working with children in Grades 4 to 11. As a small part of our study, we would like your child to list his/her friends and friendship preferences in his/her grade. In order for our research to be meaningful, it is important that all children in the class participate in this task which is done in the classroom with confidential responses. Most children like thinking about their friends and enjoy the task, which takes at most 30 minutes. All information will remain confidential to the research team.

We hope that you will allow your child to participate in this task. Please have your child return the enclosed form to the teacher with your decision. We would like your answer whether or not you agree to your child's participation. To encourage your child to return the enclosed form, all children returning forms will be eligible for a raffle of gift certificates for Cineplex Odeon movie passes. There will be one prize per class.

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

If you have any questions or wish further information, please call us at the numbers below.

We appreciate and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Joelle Dayan, M.A.
Graduate Student
(848-7560)

Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
(848-7538)

Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D.
Associate professor of Applied
Social Science and of Psychology
(848-3889)

Appendix J: Phase I Consent Form

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Formulaire de consentement

Nom de l'enfant: .....

Nom du professeur: .....

École: .....

Année scolaire: .....

Ne cochez qu'une option

_____ Je consens à laisser mon enfant participer à la tâche de nomination des amis d'une durée de 30 minutes et faisant partie de l'étude dirigée par Joelle Dayan et supervisée par Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D. et Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D.

ou

_____ Je ne consens pas à la participation de mon enfant.

J'ai été informé(e) que mon enfant est libre de mettre fin à sa participation en tout temps.

_____
Nom du parent ou tuteur(e)
(En lettres moulées S.V.P)

_____ _____
Signature du parent ou tuteur Date

Veuillez faire parvenir ce formulaire au professeur titulaire dès que possible.

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Consent Form

Child's Name:.....

Teacher's Name:.....

School:.....

Grade:.....

Check one alternative

_____ I agree to allow my child to participate in the 30 minute friendship nomination task as part of the research project conducted by Joelle Dayan and Drs. Anna-Beth Doyle and Dorothy Markiewicz.

OR

_____ I do not agree to the above

I have been informed that my child is free to discontinue at any time.

_____
Name of Parent or Guardian (Please Print)

_____ _____
Signature of Parent or Guardian Date

Please return this form to the home room teacher as soon as possible

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

Appendix K: Phase II Letter to Parents

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Le 18 mars, 1996

Chers parents,

Nous vous remercions d'avoir permis à votre fils/fille de participer à la première partie de notre étude portant sur les amitiés. Comme nous vous l'avons mentionné auparavant, ce projet est subventionné par le Conseil de recherche en sciences sociales et humaines du Canada et le Fonds pour la formation des chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche du Québec. Dans la première partie de l'étude, nous avons demandé à votre enfant d'énumérer ses préférences en terme d'amitiés. Nous vous écrivons maintenant pour vous demander de permettre à votre enfant de participer à la deuxième partie de l'étude. Cette partie concerne les changements qui se produisent en vieillissant dans les relations des jeunes avec leur famille et les autres jeunes, et l'influence qu'a leur héritage culturel sur ces changements. Cette recherche est importante parce que les relations positives des enfants avec leur famille et leurs pairs contribuent à leur sentiment de bien-être et à leur réussite scolaire.

Nous vous demandons donc la permission de faire remplir des questionnaires à votre enfant à l'école. Ceux-ci portent sur leur héritage culturel, leurs relations avec leur famille et les autres jeunes et sur leurs perceptions d'eux-mêmes. Ces questionnaires seront complétés en une période d'environ 75 minutes. Un grand nombre d'enfants ont rempli ces questionnaires et la plupart y ont pris plaisir. Les enfants les rempliront en petits groupes lorsque leur professeur ne verra pas d'inconvénient à ce qu'ils quittent la classe. Bien entendu, personne ne sera obligé de participer et toutes les réponses sont confidentielles. Ils nous fera plaisir de vous envoyer les résultats de groupe de l'étude lorsqu'elle sera complétée.

Nous espérons que vous consentirez à ce que votre enfant participe à ce projet. C'est grâce à l'aide de parents tels que vous que les professionnels apprennent comment venir en aide aux familles pour améliorer le développement social des enfants. Veuillez nous communiquer votre décision en remplissant le formulaire ci-inclus et, comme auparavant, en demandant à votre enfant de le ramener à son professeur. Nous aimerions connaître votre réponse, que vous permettiez ou non à votre enfant de participer. En guise de remerciement, chaque

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

enfant retournant ce formulaire courra de nouveau la chance de gagner un des certificats cadeaux pour des laissez-passer aux Cineplex Odéon.

Si vous avez des questions ou désirez avoir plus d'informations, il nous ferait grand plaisir de parler du projet avec vous. N'hésitez pas à inclure votre numéro de téléphone sur le formulaire ou à contacter l'une de nous aux numéros ci-dessous. Merci encore pour votre coopération.

Sincèrement vôtre,

Joelle Dayan, M.A.
Étudiante au doctorat
(848-7560)

Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D.
Professeure de psychologie
(848-7538)

Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D.
Professeure associée de
science sociale appliquée
et de psychologie
(848-3889)

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

March 18, 1996

Dear Parents,

Thank you for permitting you son/daughter to participate in the first part of our study about friendships. As you recall, this project is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and by the Fonds pour la Formation des Chercheurs et l'Aide a la Recherche of Quebec. In the first part of this study, your child was asked to list his or her friendship preferences. We are now writing to ask for your child to participate in the second part of the study. This part concerns changes with age in children's relationships with their family and other children and the contribution of their cultural heritage to these changes. This work is important because positive relationships with family and peers foster the child's sense of well-being and school achievement.

We are asking permission for your child to complete questionnaires at school. The questionnaires ask students about their cultural heritage, their relationships in the family and with other children, and their self-perceptions. The questionnaires will be completed in one session of about 75 minutes. Many children have completed similar questionnaires and most enjoy them. The students will complete these questionnaires at times which are convenient for the teacher to excuse small groups from class. Of course no one is ever forced to participate and all answers are confidential. We will be pleased to send you a summary of the group results of the study when completed.

We hope that you will give your child consent to participate in this project. It is through the help of parents like yourselves that professionals learn how to assist families in improving children's social development. Please return the enclosed participation form to your child's teacher indicating your decision. <u>We would like to know your decision even if you do not agree to your child's participation</u>. Once again, to encourage a reply, <u>all children returning forms</u> will be entered in a draw for a Cineplex Odeon movie pass.

If you have questions or wish further information, we would

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

be most pleased to speak with you about the project. Please indicate a convenient telephone number on the form. Also, please do not hesitate to call any one of us at the numbers below. Thank you once again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Joelle Dayan, M.A.
Graduate Student
(848-7560)

Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
(848-7538)

Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Applied
Social Science & of Psychology
(848-3889)

Appendix L: Phase II Consent Form

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Formulaire de consentement

Nom de l'enfant: .....

Nom du professeur: .....

École: .....

Année scolaire: .....

Cochez la ou les cases appropriées

_____ Je consens à laisser mon enfant participer à la deuxième partie de l'étude sur l'amitié dirigée par Joelle Dayan et supervisée par Anna-Beth Doyle, Ph.D et Dorothy Markiewicz, Ph.D, et qui implique mon enfant à remplir quelques questionnaires portant sur son héritage culturel, ses relations avec sa famille et avec les jeunes de sa classe,

et/ou

_____ J'ai des questions à propos de l'étude et j'aimerais qu'on m'appelle.

_____ _____
Nom du parent ou tuteur(e) (En lettres moulées S.V.P) Numéro de téléphone

ou

_____ Je ne consent pas à la participation de mon enfant.

Veuillez faire parvenir ce formulaire au professeur titulaire le plus tôt possible.

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Consent Form

Child's name:.....

Teacher's name:.....

School:.....

Grade:.....

Check where applicable

_____ I agree to my child's participation in the second part of the friendship study by Joelle Dayan and by Drs. A.B. Doyle and D. Markiewicz, which involves the completion of questionnaires regarding cultural heritage, family and peer relationships, and self-perceptions.

Or

_____ I have questions about the project and wish to be called.

_____ _____

Parent's Name (Please print) Phone number

Or

_____ I do not agree to the above.

I have been informed that my child is free to discontinue at any time.

Please return this form to the home room teacher as soon as possible.

7141 Sherbrooke Street West
Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6