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Abstract

Gender differences in the ways individuals think about and behave in close relationships are widely reported and reliable findings, yet there are also inconsistencies and exceptions in such patterns. More integrative and theory-driven approaches may better focus research efforts and deepen our understanding of the complexities of close relationships for women and men. Attachment theory provides a rich framework for examining the manner in which individuals engage in and make meaning of their affectional bonds. There appears good reason to speculate that gender and attachment style mutually shape the terrain of close relationships with others, yet the joint effects of gender and attachment style are rarely hypothesized and explicitly tested. A cross-sectional study of university undergraduates was conducted with 20 women and 20 men each screened into one of four attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing) using self-report measures (N=160). Participants reported on intimacy and influence strategies in their romantic relationship, closest same sex, and cross sex friendship. For the first dependent variable, attachment style significantly interacted with gender: 1) dismissing women reported higher intimacy than dismissing men; 2) patterns of intimacy within gender across relationship types differed for women and men. Relationship type was associated with different patterns of intimacy for women and men; e.g., men consistently reported highest intimacy in their romantic relationship whereas women’s most intimate relationship varied between same sex friendship and romantic relationship.
This research provides new support for hypothesized profiles of influence strategies for each attachment style: secure subjects were more likely than all others to use integration/compromise; fearful subjects to use avoidance; dismissing to use dominance; and preoccupied to use both domination and obliging strategies. Relationship type was associated with different patterns of influence use by gender: e.g., men used more dominance in same sex friendships than romantic relationships, whereas the reverse was true for women. This study illustrates the separate and joint effects of gender, attachment style, and relationship type on individuals’ reports of intimacy and use of influence strategies.
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INTRODUCTION

Our relatedness with others forms a web of interconnection through which we come to understand ourselves and out of which flows personal meaning and happiness (e.g., Campbell, Converse & Rodgers, 1976; Freedman, 1978; Klinger, 1977). The importance of meaningful relationships is illustrated both in the benefits of being in such relationships, such as better psychosocial adjustment and well-being, and in the risks to individuals without close bonds, such as loneliness (Reis & Shaver, 1988). Much of what makes up the terrain of psychopathology is comprised of difficulties in interpersonal functioning (West, Sheldon & Reiffer, 1987) and there is "empirical support for the hypothesis that a personality disorder is essentially a disorder of interpersonal relatedness" (Widiger & Frances, 1985, p. 620). As well, physical health is profoundly affected by deficits in and loss of close bonds with others (Hojat & Vogel, 1987; Jemmott, 1987; Lynch, 1977; Peplau & Perlman, 1982). Above and beyond the consequences of having (or not having) intimate connections with others, interpersonal closeness is intrinsically rewarding, involving feelings of being understood and cared for, affection, and pleasure in the fostering of one's own and another's growth (Jordan, 1985).

Gender differences in the ways individuals think about and behave in close relationships are widely reported (e.g., Aries & Johnson, 1983; Bell, 1981; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982; Dickens & Perlman, 1981). Women's relationships may be characterized by a
model of communality (Bakan, 1966), involving more confiding, personal concern, and sharing of emotional understanding, in contrast to men's more agentic orientation in relationships, involving shared activities, competitiveness, and less intimate disclosure. This greater emotional emphasis in women's relationships is evident in self-report and observational measures, in laboratory and naturalistic settings, in attitudes and behaviors (Reis, 1986). Gender differences in interpersonal experience may also be implicated in differences in adaptive outcomes for men and women. Investigations of loneliness (Reis, 1986) and adaptation to loss (Weiss, 1976) indicate that men may be more at risk for emotional or physical problems than women if they lose or do not have a romantic partner. At the same time, women are more likely to be sought out for support by both women and men under stress (Buhrke & Fuqua, 1987) and women's greater empathic concern about problems in their social networks (the "cost of caring") may be related to greater vulnerability to life events (Kessler & McLeod, 1985).

While there currently exists a significant body of empirical research into the importance, nature and functions of close relationships for women and men, there is a need for more integrative and theory-driven approaches that may better focus research efforts and deepen our understanding of the complexities of such bonds. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1973, 1980, 1982) provides a rich framework for examining the manner in which individuals engage in and make meaning of their affectional bonds with others. Differences in internal working models of
attachment shape motivational, cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of interpersonal processes (Shaver & Hazan, 1992). Intimacy and influence are overarching relational processes which encompass core dimensions of close relationships (e.g., Clark & Reis, 1988). The proposed investigation is directed both by empirical findings in the gender literature and by theoretical and empirical work in attachment, and attempts to examine how intimacy and influence processes in close relationships vary as a function of gender and attachment style.

The discussion which follows will begin by addressing the nature of gender differences in close relationships, with a specific focus on the role of type of relationship and gender composition of the dyad. Gaps and inconsistencies in this broad portrait of gender differences will be noted, and the notion of attachment style as a moderating variable will be introduced. Following an overview of the attachment theoretical perspective and recent findings in adult attachment, the limitations of the research to date will be discussed. The relational processes of intimacy and influence will then be presented, with an emphasis on gender patterns and attachment-style patterns. Finally, the intersecting relations amongst gender, type of relationship, and attachment to intimacy and influence processes, which form the crux of this thesis, will be proposed.

Gender Patterns in Three Types of Close Relationships

Prevailing Differences in Men's and Women's Relationships
Of the many elements that shape the patterning of close bonds with others, none is as basic as gender (Bell, 1981). Women generally are encouraged to develop and use relational skills such as empathy, emotional expressiveness, and nurturance, whereas men's socialization teaches them to guard against emotional expression (Basow, 1992). In a review of theories and research into gender differences in emotional development, Brody (1985) concludes that there are "gender differences in several areas of emotional functioning, including nonverbal sensitivity, expressiveness, self-reports of anger, fear and sadness, the quality of defenses, and cognitive correlates of recognition ability" (p. 102).

The results of several studies suggest that women more than men construe their relationships holistically, with an affective and verbal focus; in contrast, men more than women emphasize the instrumental nature of their relations with others and interact with them in a more differentiated way (e.g. Aries & Johnson, 1983; Barth & Kinder, 1988; Davidson & Packard, 1981; Hendrick, 1988; Parker & de Vries, 1992). Women score higher in measures of perspective-taking, empathic concern and communal orientation, and report being more behaviorally interdependent with their friends than do men (Omoto & Mooney, 1991). The consistency of these findings has prompted Wright (1982) to characterize women's relationships as face-to-face and men's relationships as side-by-side, reflecting women's emotional, personalized focus on the other, in contrast to men's focus on shared external activities.
The Gender Composition and Type of Relationship

The above mentioned findings on gender differences in close relationships focus on the sex-of-subject variable. Recent work however has illustrated the need to consider the gender composition of the dyad, which apparently plays an important role in the extent to which gender differences in interaction are evident (Reis, 1986). One consideration of relationship type involves whether the participants are same sex or cross sex pairs. A second consideration is whether the relationship is a romantic one, or is a friendship. Tschann (1988), for example, notes that in studies of self-disclosure it is important to assess whether or not respondents are currently in a romantic relationship, since disclosure patterns vary for women and men depending on relationship status: investigators may expect fewer gender differences in samples of single people than among those who are in romantic relationships. Despite the "potency of relationship type for influencing answers to questions about close relationships....it is relatively rare for a single investigation to span several relationship types" (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 1989, p. 804).

Friendship

In response to the question "What is it that makes your life meaningful?" respondents of both genders have cited close friends more frequently than any other source, including romantic partners, who were listed next most often (Klinger, 1977). Despite this, friendship has been until recently an understudied
relationship, its meaning and importance in men's and women's lives largely unexamined by psychologists (Caldwell & Peplau, 1982). In part this may be due to the uniquely ambiguous boundaries of friendship (Wright, 1982); the term can be used to describe a range of different relationships from casual acquaintance to intimate confidante (Hays, 1988). Friendship has been identified as one of the least programmed and socially defined relationships (Aries & Johnson, 1983), lacking any public rituals to honor or celebrate friendships of any kind. Some authors have argued that "our well-developed ideology about marriage and the family, our insistence that these are the relationships that count for the long haul, have blinded us to the meaning and importance of friendship in our lives" (Rubin, 1985, p. 9).

**Same sex friendship.** Same sex friendship is the most common relationship most individuals have throughout their lives (Dickens & Perlman, 1981; Woolsey, 1987). Homosociality, or the tendency to prefer the company of others of the same sex (Lipman-Blumen, 1976), is a well-established finding for both men and women. Same sex relationships tend to illustrate the gender pattern most obviously; that is, the side-by-side versus face-to-face distinction seems most applicable to women's and men's interactions with others of the same sex, and is less clearly evident when women and men interact with each other (Reis, 1986).

Women's same sex friendships have been found to show more depth and involvement (Barth & Kinder, 1988), and to be more
intimate and emotional and less focused on activity sharing (Aukett, Ritchie & Mill, 1987) than men's same sex friendships. When under stress, women more than men will report that they have increased contact with their same sex friends (Burhke & Fuqua, 1987). Intimacy in itself may be experienced by women as a kind of assistance, or therapeutic experience (Candy, Troll, & Levy, 1981; Davidson & Packard, 1981). The talk of women friends has been viewed as a defining feature of their relationships (e.g., Davidson, 1983), creating "a mosaic of noncritical listening, mutual support, enhancement of self-worth, relationship exclusiveness, and personal growth and self-discovery" (Johnson & Aries, 1983, p. 353).

At the same time, women's friendships are not exclusively warm and supportive; a number of authors have identified several barriers to women's closeness with other women, including the general taboo against displays of anger in women, competition with other women for males, women's greater burden of responsibility for the raising of small children, homophobia, and the generally negative view that society has of women (Basow, 1992; Pogrebin, 1987; Raymond, 1986; Rubin, 1985). Despite such barriers, the emotional closeness in women's connection with other women has been described in terms of love: "indeed these relationships may be even more loving for some women than their marital and kin relationships" (O'Meara, 1989, p. 532). Further, some research suggests that terminating a close same sex friendship is more painful for a woman than is ending a romantic
relationship, whereas the opposite pattern holds for men (Pierce, Smith, & Akert, 1984).

Men's closeness in same sex friendships is characterized by an avoidance of disclosure and emotionality, the essence of which is captured in terms such as solidarity (Arnold & Chartier, 1986). A number of barriers to male same sex closeness have been identified by Lewis (1978), including the traditional male sex-role, the pressure to compare and compete, aversion to vulnerability and openness, homophobia, and a dearth of role models for emotional intimacy. Fox, Gibbs and Auerbach (1985) state: "It is likely that a main obstacle to men's friendship is that the masculine role is phrased almost universally as a power role, in which the social and economic rewards of power are as considerable as the penalties for weakness" (p. 500).

Cross sex friendship. If friendship in general may be considered an understudied relationship, then cross sex friendship qualifies as an "ignored" relationship (O'Meara, 1989, p. 525). It is evident that most people have a preponderance of same sex friends in their social network, and that close cross sex friendships are a less common experience. In fact, some investigators have described cross sex friendships as anomalous (Booth & Hess, 1974), and certainly few researchers have focused on the nature and dynamics of cross sex friendships (Sapadin, 1988). While this description reflects the relatively less prevalent nature of cross sex friendship, it also raises the issue of the how the relationship itself is viewed.
Cross sex friendship is fraught with ambiguity, making it more difficult for the actors and observers of this relationship to label and understand its nature. O'Meara (1989) identifies several aspects of this ambiguity in cross sex friendship, apparently deriving from its less frequent occurrence and the complexities inherent in heterosexual gender dynamics. Arising out of this are a number of "challenges" (O'Meara, 1989): 1) determining the type of emotional bond; 2) dealing with sexuality; 3) issues of equality and power; and 4) presenting the relationship to others as valid.

Despite the difficulties involved in defining the relationship and negotiating roles for the participants, many individuals do have cross sex friendships, especially among young adults (Fox et al., 1985). Among mid-life adults, employed women are found to have more cross sex friends than women not in the paid workforce, whereas the number of cross sex friends men have is unrelated to their employment status (Dickens & Perlman, 1981). Sapadin (1988) suggests that such relationships provide certain experiences that are not available in same sex friendships, in particular that of obtaining an "insider's perspective" on the other sex (p. 401).

The functions of cross sex and same sex relationships differ for women and men: men derive more emotional support and therapeutic value from their cross sex relationships than their same sex ones, whereas for women this pattern is reversed (Aukett et al., 1988). Women's same sex friendships are rated higher than their cross sex friends on measures of overall happiness,
quality, intimacy, and enjoyment, whereas men's cross sex relationships are rated higher on all these measures (Helgeson, Shaver & Dyer, 1987; Sapadin, 1988). For both women and men, as the percentage of interactions with women increases, loneliness scores decrease; in contrast, as the percentage of interactions with men increases, loneliness scores increase (Reis, 1986). Although women's cross sex friends provide less acceptance (i.e., approval and understanding) than do their same sex friends, women may tolerate less acceptance and intimacy from men in exchange for the greater status they might obtain from being with a male (Rose, 1985). This pattern has led Rose (1985) to conclude that "women's expectations for friendship do not seem to be fulfilled to the same extent by men friends as by women friends" (p. 72), and Bernard (1976) to remark that women in cross sex relationships may be at a "relational deficit" with potentially deleterious consequences for their well-being (p. 213).

**Romantic Relationships**

Committed love relationships, in which two individuals develop enduring sexual/romantic bonds and think of themselves as a couple are, for most people, the most significant relationships of adult life (Bartholomew, 1990). While archetypes of friendship and romantic relationships share important similarities such as enjoyment, acceptance, respect, understanding and intimacy, they also are characterized by significant differences (Davis & Todd, 1982). In particular romantic love is contrasted with friendship on dimensions of
passion and sexual attraction, and in the intensity of support, such as "giving the utmost" and "being a champion or advocate of the loved one" (Davis & Todd, 1982, p. 79).

Despite the prevailing stereotypes about women being the more romantic gender, the opposite appears to be true: men are more likely to hold romantic views such as true love only comes once and lasts forever, to believe in "love at first sight", and to enjoy the "game" of love, flirtation, and pursuit (Peplau, 1983). Men more so than women appear to hold traditional views about their preferred romantic partner: more men than women prefer the traditional pattern of employed husband and nonemployed wife, and more women than men prefer androgynous partners over sex-typed ones (Basow, 1992). Both women and men favor equality in romantic relationships, however when the relationship is not seen as egalitarian the balance of power is significantly more likely to be in favor of men than of women (Peplau, 1983).

Having a romantic partner doesn't affect women's loneliness significantly, whereas men who do not have a romantic partner are significantly more lonely than men who do. In terms of self-disclosure, married men disclose less to their friends than do unmarried men, or women married or not; women, on the other hand, do not differ in disclosure patterns with friends, whether married or not (Tschann, 1988). Such findings have prompted Reis (1986) to speculate that "a romantic relationship provides a considerable emotional benefit for males that does not have a counterpart for females" (p. 98). Tschann (1988) states that "in
some subtle but important way women’s intimacy needs are not met as completely by their spouses as men’s, so that women must maintain their friendships in order to assure that their intimacy needs are met" (p. 79).

But Gender is not the Whole Picture

The portrait of gender differences is reliable, yet it is undoubtedly painted with a broad brush. There is a central tendency for women and men to describe and behave in their relationships in predictable ways, yet there are also inconsistencies and exceptions "found with sufficient frequency to warrant serious attention" (Wright, 1988, p. 368). Women for example, are held to self-disclose more and to express greater interpersonal intimacy than men, yet some studies have found no gender difference in self-disclosure and expressed intimacy (Hill & Stull, 1986; Peplau, 1983). Further, women and men show considerable similarity in their rank ordering of what they value in close relationships, even when they differ significantly with respect to their behaviors in those relationships (Parker & de Vries, 1993). As well, as with all "average" results there is considerable within-group variability, and between-group overlap: not all women are expressive and empathic in their interactions, nor are all men task-focused in their interpersonal relationships (Reis, 1986). Gender is a most obvious group delineation and surely reflects important internalized tendencies and external realities, yet other dimensions likely interact with gender to influence the process of relating with others. Sex-role
orientation for example has been found to have an attenuating effect on gender differences in relationship depth and intimacy (e.g., Barth & Kinder, 1988; Berg & Peplau, 1982; Williams, 1985). Further, relationships of longer duration and greater closeness were found by Wright (1982) to have an emotional focus and be viewed holistically by both women and men.

This complexity has led some authors to call for the identification of moderator variables which may help clarify the picture of women’s and men’s relationships (Clark & Reis, 1988; Wright, 1988). Attachment style is uniquely suited to serve as a moderating variable of gender effects in close relationships, arising as it does out of a rich and comprehensive theory of human relatedness across the lifespan. Attachment style is of great heuristic value as an individual difference variable which “is likely to contribute significantly to our understanding of why close relationships vary in both their quality and their interpersonal nature” (Simpson, 1990, p. 972).

Attachment Theory

Overview of Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is "a way of conceptualizing the propensity of human beings to make strong affectional bonds to particular others" (Bowlby, 1977, p. 201) and suggests that social and personal development arises out of the bond that develops between children and their primary caretakers. Of central concern in this theory is how and why the infant-
caregiver bond develops, and why separation from the primary caregiver leads to emotional distress in infants (Bowlby, 1969; 1973). Observational studies of infant response to separation illustrate a predictable sequence of behaviors (Bowlby, 1973): initial protest (involving crying, searching for the caregiver, and resisting others' efforts at soothing); then despair (sad, passive behavior); and finally detachment (an active, defensive avoidance of the caregiver if s/he returns). The theory has been described as an evolutionary-ethological approach to development (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978), in that infant attachment behavior is viewed as serving the biological function of maintaining proximity to the caretaker, thereby ensuring protection from predators.

Attachment involves an organized behavioral system which is most prone to activation in the face of threat, evidenced in behaviors emitted by the child that are aimed at reducing the distance between the self and the caregiver (Bowlby, 1977). The attachment system is hypothesized to serve three basic functions (Shaver & Hazan, 1992): proximity-seeking (the desire to be close to the caregiver and positive feelings associated with such closeness); safe haven (the tendency to retreat to the caregiver for comfort when threatened); and secure base (a willingness to explore the environment as long as the caregiver is nearby). The notion of a secure base function has been broadened beyond the domain of physical protection to include the positively reinforcing experience of felt security (Bretherton, 1985; Sroufe & Waters, 1977).
The quality of the early child-caregiver relationship exerts a significant influence on the expectations individuals hold about themselves and others (Shaver & Hazan, 1992), and shapes the characteristic ways in which individuals come to modulate negative emotional experience (Mikulincer, Florian & Tolmacz, 1990) and relate to others (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991). Out of repeated experiences with primary caregivers, the child forms "on the one hand, expectations about the reliability of attachment, and, on the other hand, self-concepts about one’s ability to evoke attachment responses" (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1994, p. 51). Such internal working models of the self and others derive from the child’s continued interaction with the parent, whose emotional availability and responsiveness determine, over time, the extent to which the child will come to see the self as being worthy of care and others as being reliably caring (Collins & Read, 1990). The responsiveness and sensitivity of the parent to the child’s affective signals "provides a critical context within which the child organizes emotional experience and regulates felt security" (Kobak & Sceery, 1988, p. 135).

An individual who is confident of the availability of the attachment figure "will be less prone to either intense or chronic fear than will be an individual who for any reason has no such confidence" (Bowlby, 1973, p. 202). Such differences in the experience of negative emotions are based on the individual’s history of successful affect regulation with the primary caregiver: active support-seeking with a responsive caregiver is likely to elicit soothing behavior, thereby reducing negative
feelings; whereas the same behavior with an inconsistent, nonresponsive, or rejecting caregiver is less likely to be effective in reducing distress, requiring development of alternative modes of coping (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Internal working models of self and other come to organize cognition, affect, and behavior in relationships (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991), and provide the central components of personality (Shaver, Hazan & Bradshaw, 1988). It is hypothesized that these internal models are carried forward into new relationships, influencing behavior "by guiding the appraisal of social situations, as well as functioning to maintain a coherent world view and self image by guiding the assimilation of new experiences" (Bartholomew, 1990, p. 152).

Differences amongst infants in style of attachment have been found using an eight-stage laboratory procedure called the "Strange Situation" in which 12-15 month olds are first in contact with, then separated from, and then reunited with their caregivers (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Three patterns of interaction have been observed by Ainsworth and her colleagues: 1) secure infants use the caregiver as a base from which to explore the strange environment; they protest separation and react to the caregiver's return with pleasure and are easily consoled; 2) anxious/ambivalent infants are clingy and afraid to explore when the caregiver is present, become highly agitated and anxious upon separation, and seek contact when reunited, however they simultaneously resist the caregiver's attempts to soothe them; 3) avoidant infants explore without using the caregiver as
a base, do not appear distressed at the separation, and do not seek contact when reunited, yet they also show a pattern of elevated autonomic arousal (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). These reactions to separation illustrate the role of attachment style in the regulation of negative affect: secure attachment is associated with constructive efforts at attaining desired goals and an ability to display positive emotions, maximizing the likelihood of positive responses from others; anxious/ambivalent attachment is characterized by heightened focus of attention on the distress, with concurrent displays of anxiety and anger; and avoidant attachment involves actively cutting off emotional expression, using distraction and blunting to ward off the intolerable distress arising from having a rejecting caregiver (Kobak & Sceery, 1988).

Associations between child's attachment style and caregiver's behavior have been observed (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Typically, mothers of infants classified as secure were found to be sensitive to their children's cues and were reliably responsive to them, whereas mothers of avoidant infants rejected their infants' efforts at closeness, and mothers of anxious/ambivalent infants were inconsistent in their responses to the infant's signals, sometimes ignoring them and other times being intrusive. The association between a caregiver's attachment style and the attachment style of their child has been studied by Main and her colleagues using the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI; Main & Goldwyn, 1985; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). This interview assesses adults' internal representation
of childhood attachment experiences in their family of origin, and examines the congruence between individuals' general characterization of those experiences and their specific memories. Individuals who appear to value the importance of attachment experiences, whose recollections of childhood relationships are freely accessible and generally positive, and who can report them coherently to the interviewer, are labelled secure. Individuals are classified as dismissing of attachment if they tend to devalue the importance of close relationships, have repeated difficulty recalling specific memories, and evidence discrepancies between the specific (often negative) memories they do recall and their more global (often positive) characterization of their childhood. Individuals who are classified as preoccupied tend to be able to freely access memories of childhood attachment experiences, but they seem to have difficulty integrating their negative experiences into a coherent whole, and appear to be enmeshed with and somewhat ambivalent toward their parents. Main and Goldwyn (1985) found that in 73% of cases there was a match between parents' attachment style and that of their children (assessed 6 years earlier in the Strange Situation): secure parents tended to have had secure children; dismissing parents tended to have avoidant children; and preoccupied parents tended to have anxious/ambivalent children.

Links have been found between children's attachment style and other dimensions of social-emotional adjustment in childhood; for example, securely attached children are more self-reliant and
more emotionally open than are anxious/ambivalent or avoidant children (Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). When family circumstances do not change significantly, these patterns have been shown to persist over several years, throughout early childhood (Egeland & Farber, 1984; Main & Cassidy, 1988; Vaughn, Egeland, Sroufe & Waters, 1979; Waters, 1978).

Attachment theory proposes that the need for connection with others is a primary and fundamental human need throughout life (Ainsworth, 1982). Attachment processes are hypothesized to underlie "the later capacity to make affectional bonds" in adulthood (Bowlby, 1977, p. 206). That these models of self and other have been found to endure over time and distance in childhood has prompted investigators to examine the continuity of attachment patterns in significant relationships in adulthood.

Application of Attachment Theory to Adult Relationships

Conceptual analysis. In recent years attachment theory has been increasingly applied to the study of close personal relationships in adult life (e.g. Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Bowlby conceptualized attachment from a lifespan perspective, hypothesizing that it characterizes "human beings from the cradle to the grave" (1977, p. 129), and that "while attachment behavior is at its most obvious in early childhood, it can be observed throughout the life cycle, especially in emergencies" (1989, p. 238). A working definition of adult attachment has been provided by Berman and Sperling (1994) who
define it as "the stable tendency of an individual to make substantial efforts to seek and maintain proximity to and contact with one or a few specific individuals who provide the subjective potential for physical and/or psychological safety and security" (p. 8). The attachment system and its underlying functions of proximity-seeking/safe haven (desire for closeness and increased contact with the attachment figure when feeling threatened), secure base (feeling more able to take risks when confident that the attachment figure is available), and separation protest are hypothesized to operate throughout life. Individual differences in attachment patterns are also held to continue, maintained by the individual's internal working model of attachment.

Internal working models of self and other in adulthood are hypothesized to provide a set of heuristics which enable individuals "to predict the actions of others in order to plan or prepare for particular outcomes, and to interpret and explain the behavior of others" in order to understand their social world (Collins & Read, 1990, p. 661). The working model is thought to operate as a sort of cognitive-affective filter for attachment information (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1994) and as a motivational system (Berman & Sperling, 1994). Mental models are hypothesized to involve ongoing construction, revision, and integration "similar to the notion of scripts and schemas in cognitive-social psychology" (Hazan & Shaver, 1987, p. 523), and are "like all important affect-laden schemata, resistant though not impervious to change" (Rothbard & Shaver, 1994, p. 31).
Bartholomew (1990) has commented on the "decidedly cognitive bent" (p. 169) of some investigators and, while endorsing the importance of such a perspective, cautions that researchers should not overlook the styles of interpersonal interaction that the theory is designed to explain. Internal representations and interpersonal behavior may interact in mutually supportive ways, so that for example, avoidant individuals who are fearful of intimacy may have a bias toward perceiving others as overdependent and desirous of more intimacy than they would like "thereby activating self-fulfilling interaction patterns of withdrawal which elicits increased approach behavior in the other" (Bartholomew, 1990, p. 153). Individuals may in such a way "create social environments that sustain their initial dispositions" (Senchak & Leonard, 1990, p. 53). The combination of cognitive models which shape expectations and interaction patterns which support such mental models lends a coherence to attachment patterns of affect, cognition and behavior which, while not invariant, do show significant continuity over time (Mikulincer et al., 1990).

The attachment system then appears to function throughout the lifespan, although manifesting itself in different relationships and dynamics at different stages. Although attachment behavior is hypothesized to operate from infancy throughout adult life, clearly adult relationships differ in important ways from those of infancy and childhood (e.g., Hazan & Zeifman, 1994; Shaver et al., 1988). For example the complementarity that exists between the care-providing parent and
the care-receiving child is, in adulthood, transformed into reciprocity between adult peers who are each care-providers for and care-recipients of the other (Weiss, 1982). The role of caregiving is central in some conceptualizations of adult attachment, with some authors viewing adult attachment as being made up of the components of the childhood attachment system (i.e., care-seeking or proximity-seeking behaviors) plus a caregiving system (e.g., Berman & Sperling, 1994). In childhood, attachment relationships tend to be exclusively with parents or other primary caregivers, whereas in adulthood relationships with equals such as sexual partners, close friends and siblings may all function as attachment relationships over the lifespan (Ainsworth, 1982, 1989; Weiss, 1982). At the same time, the key features of infant-caregiver attachment, proximity-seeking, separation protest, safe haven, and secure base, are evident in adult attachment relationships (Bartholomew, 1990; Weiss, 1982), and preliminary measures are being developed to examine such functions in adulthood (West et al., 1987). Of course in adulthood the desire for closeness may involve sexuality (Hazan & Zeifman, 1994; Weiss, 1982), the experience of felt security may be obtained via thinking of the relationship with the other rather than by achieving physical proximity (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1994), the perception of threat may involve other dangers than physical ones, such as threats to self-concept and integrity (West & Sheldon, 1988), and exploration behavior may involve such activities as work (Hazan & Shaver, 1990). Important similarities between childhood and adult attachment do exist
however, such as the three stage response of protest, despair and detachment upon separation from the attachment figure observed among infants separated from their caregivers (Ainsworth et al., 1978), and which has been found among adults in bereavement (Parkes, 1972) and divorce (Weiss, 1974).

Attachment may be conceptualized as a state, which may be expected to vary at different times and under different circumstances, or as a trait, which may be expected to be reasonably stable across time and situation (Berman & Sperling, 1994). Research into attachment as a state examines the conditions which activate and deactivate different attachment functions at different times, for example when facing separation or loss (e.g., Weiss, 1975) or experiencing reunion after separation (Cafferty, Davis, Medway, O’Hearn & Chappell, 1994). Another state-based view of attachment is as a relational schema which may be elicited by a number of conditions such as situational factors, or the state of one’s current close relationship (e.g. Baldwin & Fehr, 1993). The more common conceptualization of attachment style is the trait model, in which individuals are thought of as having stable individual differences in the tendency to form close relationships and in the ways they feel about and respond to others in those relationships. Patterns of attachment are hypothesized to continue across time, and research with children has provided evidence for the temporal stability of attachment styles (e.g., Main et al., 1985). Research into attachment styles in adulthood indicates that there is fairly high reliability for periods of
several months up to a few years, although long-term stability studies are lacking (Rothbard & Shaver, 1994).

Empirical findings. The development by Hazan and Shaver (1987, 1990; Shaver & Hazan, 1988, 1992; Shaver et al., 1988) of an effective, efficient method for assessing attachment in adulthood has spawned a vast body of research into the correlates and dynamics of the construct. Bartholomew and Perlman (1994) for example, found in a computer search of Psychological Abstracts that in the period between 1980 and 1993, the number of items identified with the word attachment in the title was 1050. Hazan and Shaver developed a self-report measure to classify individuals into the three attachment styles found among infants, and have repeatedly found that the three styles (secure, avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent or preoccupied) are manifested in approximately the same proportions in the adult population.

Adult attachment styles have been found to be related to a number of factors involved in individual adaptation (note that no causality can be inferred on the basis of these data, as these are merely associations amongst variables). Individuals who are securely attached tend to have higher self-esteem and self-confidence (Collins & Read, 1990), be more extroverted (Shaver & Brennan, in press) and more ego-resilient (Kobak & Sceery, 1988) than are those who are insecure. Further, secure persons have a lower frequency of eating disorders and alcohol abuse (Brennan, Shaver & Tobey, 1991), and have less anxiety, depression, and physical symptoms (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) than do insecure persons. While being securely attached clearly appears to bode
well for the individual, the construct of attachment resides in the interpersonal domain, hence secure attachment is not hypothesized to simply relate to anything that is "good". For example, attachment style is not expected to correlate with variables such as intelligence or creativity. Attachment styles are expected to predict differences in the ways individuals understand, experience, and behave in relationships with others.

Of relevance to relationship researchers, investigators have found clear differences among attachment styles in adulthood with regard to early family background, mental models of relationships, love experiences, affect regulation, and interpersonal behavior (see Hazan & Shaver, 1992, for a review). Secure individuals report greater warmth in their childhood relationship with their parents and in their retrospective account of the relationship between their parents when they were children, than do those who are insecure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Different attachment styles are associated with different beliefs about the course of romantic love, the availability and trustworthiness of partners, and their own worth as love-partners. Secure individuals hold the most positive models of self and others, whereas preoccupied individuals' models of relationships are found to be idealized, obsessive and dependent, and avoidants' models of relationships are characterized by avoidance of intimacy (Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Internal models of one's own response to imagined others also show differences by attachment type: all subjects imagine feeling better with a secure other; secure individuals are more
optimistic in general about imagined relationships; and preoccupied subjects imagine feeling more jealous and anxious with the imagined other, regardless of the other's behavior (Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1992).

Such self-report findings are supported by "growing evidence that verbally assessed attachment styles are related to behavior" (Shaver & Hazan, 1992, p. 16). A number of researchers have found positive correlations between self-reported attachment style and the ratings of others (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Secure and preoccupied individuals have been found to self-disclose more than do those who are avoidant (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991). Women categorized as secure are more likely than avoidant women to reach out for emotional support from their romantic partner as their anxiety increases; secure men are more likely to offer emotional support to their anxious partner than are avoidant men (Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, in press). Caregiving behaviors in romantic relationships follow theoretically consistent patterns, with secure individuals being the most sensitive and avoidant individuals the least sensitive to the cues of the other, whereas preoccupied individuals are most likely to provide compulsive caregiving (Shaver & Hazan, 1991). In addition, there is some evidence that the duration and functioning of romantic relationships is related to attachment style, in that secure individuals tend to be in more stable relationships with other secure people (Collins & Read, 1990).
Of particular concern in this thesis is the process of intimacy. Attachment styles are evident in adulthood in the way individuals feel and behave in their close relationships. In romantic relationships, avoidant individuals are more likely to fear intimacy and strive for distance; those who are preoccupied are more likely to experience emotional highs and lows and to be jealous and obsess about their partner; those who are secure report more intimacy and closeness, and are less likely to be lonely (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In a longitudinal study of romantic couples, Simpson (1990) found differences among the attachment styles in individuals' descriptions of the nature of the relationship, the emotions experienced, and reactions to dissolution of the relationship. Secure persons reported greater relationship interdependence, commitment, trust and satisfaction, and more frequent positive emotions and less frequent negative emotions than did insecure individuals (Simpson, 1990). Further, when both members of a couple are secure, the relationship is more likely to have better overall adjustment and higher levels of intimacy than are relationships between couples where one or both partners is insecure (Kobak & Hazan, 1991; Senchak & Leonard, 1992).

A second core concern of this thesis is the use of influence strategies in close relationships. Secure attachment is associated with greater use of compromising and integrating tactics; preoccupied and avoidant attachment styles are negatively associated with compromise and integration, and preoccupied attachment is positively associated with dominating
and obliging strategies (Levy & Davis, 1988; Pistole, 1989; for a further discussion of these studies refer to the section on attachment styles and influence strategies below). In an examination of married couples using a two-dimensional assessment of attachment (Comfort with Closeness; Anxiety about Abandonment), attachment dimensions were found to be differentially related to influence strategies for women versus men (Feeney, Noller & Callan, 1994a). For husbands but not for wives, mutual strategies (such as mutual discussion, understanding, expression) were positively associated with Comfort with Closeness, and were negatively associated with Anxiety about Abandonment (Feeney et al., 1994a). Anxiety predicted wives' coercive strategies and destructive process, and predicted husbands' coercive strategies and post-conflict distress (Feeney et al., 1994a).

Relational processes of intimacy and influence are central to the experience of being in close relationships (e.g., Clark & Reis, 1988). Further, intimacy and influence processes capture in meaningful ways the differences among individuals with different attachment styles.

**Bartholomew's Four Category Model**

A conceptual expansion of the three attachment styles observed among children (i.e., secure, anxious-resistant, and avoidant) has been advanced by Bartholomew (1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) as a result of both theoretical and empirical concerns. Individuals' working models are viewed in terms of two
dimensions, the subject of the internal representation (self vs. other) and the valence of each (positive vs. negative), to produce a two by two matrix with four categories. Another way in which these dimensions may be mapped is in terms of "dependence" (i.e., reliance on oneself vs. others for positive self-regard) and "avoidance" (i.e., the extent to which the individual avoids or desires intimacy with others). Individuals with positive representations of both self and other (or, using the second set of dimensions, those who rely internally for self-worth and who desire intimacy with others) are labelled "secure". Those with positive views of others (i.e., those who desire intimacy) and negative views of self (i.e., those who rely on others for positive self-regard) are labelled "preoccupied". This group has also been labelled anxious/ambivalent (e.g., Shaver & Hazan, 1988), and it has recently been suggested that the latter term better captures the core interpersonal dynamic of these individuals, that is, their ambivalence regarding intimacy (Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan, 1994). Research conducted by Feeney et. al. (1994b) indicates that, although these individuals are highly preoccupied with relationships and need approval from others (reflecting negative attitudes toward the self), they are also uncomfortable with closeness. This suggests that they are not as "eager for intimacy, wanting extreme closeness in relationships, and being as unreservedly positive in their attitudes toward others" as has been previously hypothesized (p. 143). Those with negative views of others (i.e., those who avoid intimacy) and positive views of self (i.e., those who rely on the
self rather than on others for self-worth) are "dismissing". Those with negative representations of both self and other (i.e., those who avoid others and yet who need others for positive self-regard) are categorized as "fearful".

Theoretically this conceptualization is closer to the original work of Bowlby (1977), which suggests that internal working models comprise two key features: a) "whether or not the attachment figure is judged to be the sort of person who in general responds to calls for support and protection" and b) "whether or not the self is judged to be the sort of person towards whom anyone, and the attachment figure in particular, is likely to respond in a helpful way" (p. 204). The first component is equivalent to a model of the other, the second to a model of the self.

From an empirical point of view, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) noted that the use of the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, George, Kaplan & Main, 1984) characterizes avoidant individuals differently than does the Shaver and Hazan (1987) self-report measure. Avoidant adults are characterized via the AAI as defensively self-assertive people who deny experiencing negative affect or vulnerability, and who minimize the importance of attachment needs, whereas avoidant individuals as classified by the Shaver and Hazan (1987) self-report measure are persons who describe themselves as lacking in self-esteem, and who feel subjective distress and discomfort when they become too close to others. Avoidance in the first instance is a case of detachment and lack of motivation to engage with others, whereas in the
second instance is the result of an active fear of closeness (Bartholomew, 1990). This discordance led Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) to speculate that "a single avoidant-detached category may obscure conceptually separable patterns of avoidance in adulthood" (p. 227). The two distinct patterns of avoidance delineated by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) reflect both the defensive avoidant type found via the AAI (labelled in the 4-category model "dismissing"), and the more distressed avoidant type identified by the self-report measure (labelled "fearful"). Examination of multidimensional scalings of attachment-style ratings by subjects, their friends, and independent raters reveals that the expected four-category structure is reproduced (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Secure individuals score uniquely high on the coherence of their interviews and the level of intimacy in their friendships; as well they obtain high ratings on warmth, balance of control, and level of involvement. Dismissing individuals receive uniquely high ratings of self confidence and uniquely low on emotional expressiveness, crying, and warmth; they have lower scores than secure or preoccupied individuals on all measures of relationship closeness (e.g., self-disclosure, intimacy, capacity to rely on others). Those who are preoccupied show a pattern opposite to the dismissing group in almost every respect, with uniquely high scores on elaboration, self-disclosure, emotional expressiveness, romantic involvement, crying, and caregiving. Fearful individuals have uniquely low scores on self confidence, and have significantly lower scores than those who are secure or preoccupied on self-
disclosure, intimacy, level of romantic involvement, reliance on others, and use of others as a safe haven when upset.

In addition, self-concept measures were found to differentiate groups with positive versus negative models of self, and sociability measures were found to differentiate groups with positive versus negative models of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The types of interpersonal problems which characterize each of the four attachment styles also reflect distinct patterns which are related in meaningful ways to the internal model of self and other: fearful individuals show interpersonal problems in passivity; dismissing persons show problems related to a lack of warmth; and those who are preoccupied show problems in the area of dominance and excessive emotional expression (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The results of this examination "confirm that the valence of both self-models and models of others are separate, important dimensions of an adult's orientation to close relationships and that the two dimensions can vary independently" (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991, p. 240).

In recent research (Feeney et. al, 1994b), the four-category model was strongly supported via a cluster analysis conducted on five scales (Confidence, Discomfort with closeness, Need for approval, Preoccupation with relationships, and Relationships as secondary) from a new measure assessing attachment patterns (the Attachment Style Questionnaire). Four groups were formed out of the cluster analysis, each with a profile on the five scales that corresponded remarkably well with the four groups hypothesized by
Bartholomew. Additional support for a fourth category comes from Collins and Read (1990), who proposed a four-cluster solution in an analysis of three continuous dimensions of adult attachment, and suggested that there may be value in differentiating between two types of anxious attachment: "those who were anxious but comfortable with closeness (anxious-secure), and those who were anxious and uncomfortable with closeness (anxious-avoidant)" (p. 649). Evidence for the validity of a fourth attachment category is further supported by findings in the study of the attachment styles of young children, in which a fourth category has recently been identified even in infancy, involving a combination of avoidant and preoccupied characteristics (Main & Solomon, 1990).

In an examination of adult children of alcoholics using both the Shaver and Hazan three-category and Bartholomew four-category models, Brennan et al., (1991) note that the two overlap considerably (i.e., those who are secure or preoccupied in one system are the same in the other). However, a fairly large number of preoccupied individuals in the three-category model fall into the fearful group using Bartholomew and Horowitz's approach "suggesting that the lack of a fearful alternative in Hazan and Shaver's (1987) measure - one indicating both a desire for a close relationship and fear, or avoidance, of intimacy - forces some fearful subjects to categorize themselves misleadingly" as preoccupied (Brennan et al., 1991, p. 462). In the same vein, some individuals who categorized themselves as secure in the three-category model classified themselves as dismissing in the four-category model "suggesting that some
avoidant people with high self-esteem are forced by the three category measure to misclassify themselves as secure" (Brennan et al., 1991, p. 462).

Pietromonaco and Carnelley (1992) suggest that it is important to consider the recent distinction between fearful and dismissing avoidant persons in that this elaboration may help to clarify the relationships among patterns of depression and low self-esteem for insecure women and men. Utilizing the four category method, Carnelley, Pietromonaco, and Jaffe (1992) find that the two avoidant categories distinguish between mildly and severely depressed women: women who are mildly depressed tend to have either preoccupied or fearful attachment styles, reflecting a negative model of self but an either negative or positive view of others; however, those who are severely depressed are significantly more likely to be fearful, holding negative views of both self and others, and are more likely than preoccupied individuals to have experienced verbal and physical abuse from their parents when they were children.

An important finding in the research using the four-category model is that of gender differences in the distribution of the attachment styles: women received higher ratings than did men on preoccupied and fearful; men received significantly higher ratings than did women on dismissing (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan et al., 1991). More recent research has also found proportionally more men classifying themselves as dismissing, and more women classifying themselves as fearful (Cafferty et al., 1994). Using the three-category approach, "in all of the studies
published to date there were no reliable gender differences in the distribution of subjects across the three categories" (Shaver & Hazan, 1992, p. 10). The three-category approach is insensitive to the distinction between fearful and dismissing styles, and therefore perhaps to certain gender differences; hence the three-category model "may mask meaningful gender differences important to relationship quality" (Brennan et al., 1991, p. 454). Bartholomew's four-category model appears more useful in illuminating these differences.

Gender and Attachment: Findings to Date

Gender has generally been a neglected variable in attachment research, possibly due in part to the origins of the theory in observations of infant behavior, and to the predominant use of the three-category model of attachment styles described above. In some studies the effect of gender is not examined at all (e.g., Mikulincer et al., 1990; Pistole, 1989). When gender has been examined, researchers have tended to test for main effects, such as differences in the distribution of women and men across the categories (e.g., Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991), or main effects of gender on dependent variables such as, for example, optimism about relationships, or descriptions of parents (e.g., Carnelley & Janoff-Bulman, 1992; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; 1990). When gender differences are found in distributions of attachment style, gender is used as a covariate in subsequent analyses (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Kobak & Sceery, 1988). When main effects for gender in the distributions or on dependent
measures are not found, the sample is often lumped together and gender is not treated as an independent variable, thereby obscuring possible differences between women and men within attachment styles, or differences within each gender across attachment styles (i.e., interaction effects).

When gender and attachment have been studied, interesting findings have emerged regarding the relationship of gender-role orientation (instrumentality/expressiveness) and attachment style to relationship functioning (Shaver & Hazan, 1992). Preoccupied women and avoidant men may be considered "better" exemplars of the cultural stereotypes for women and men than anxious men and avoidant women (Shaver & Hazan, 1992). In support of this notion, secure attachment is correlated with both masculinity and femininity, avoidant attachment is negatively correlated with femininity, and preoccupied attachment is negatively correlated with masculinity (Papalia & Shaver, 1991). Secure individuals are most likely to report stable and satisfying romantic relationships regardless of gender; preoccupied women and avoidant men however, do not differ in relationship stability from their secure counterparts, even though they report comparatively lower levels of relationship satisfaction (Davis & Kirkpatrick, in press).

The consequences of being avoidant or preoccupied appear to vary for women and men: avoidant men and preoccupied women reported the lowest levels of self esteem and the highest depression scores of all individuals following an experimental task of imagining themselves in a romantic relationship.
The consequences of being with an avoidant or preoccupied partner also appears to vary for women and men: in romantic relationships, greater partner anxiety about relationships is related to lower satisfaction for men but not for women, whereas greater partner comfort with closeness is related to higher satisfaction for women but not for men (Collins & Read, 1990; Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1992; Simpson, 1990).

Examination of the correspondence between reports of parents' attachment style and current partner's attachment style reveals further gender differences in the role of anxiety and comfort with closeness for women and men in relationships (Collins & Read, 1990). Descriptions of opposite-sex parents have been found to predict different attachment dimensions for women's and men's current romantic relationships. Men's ratings of their mother's attachment style predict whether the men's current partner is worried about abandonment (preoccupied), whereas women's ratings of their father's attachment style predict whether the women's current partner is comfortable with closeness (secure) (Collins & Read, 1990).

The joint effects of gender and attachment style are rarely hypothesized and explicitly tested. There appears to be good reason to speculate that gender and attachment style may mutually shape the terrain of close relationships with others. Secure attachment may attenuate the strength of a gender effect for both women and men; preoccupied attachment may strengthen a gender effect for female respondents; and avoidant (especially dismissing) attachment may strengthen a gender effect for male
respondents. For example, avoidant men have been found to be significantly less distressed than avoidant women following dissolution of a relationship (Simpson, 1990). Males' greater inclination to avoid conflict and suppress negative affect in combination with the tendency of avoidant individuals to defensively inhibit negative emotions has been hypothesized to account for this gender effect (Simpson, 1990). In contrast, the tendency of avoidant women to suppress negative feelings is "at odds with the propensity of women to express strong affect [and] may account for the lack of relation between the avoidant attachment style and the extent of postdissolution distress within women" (Simpson, 1990, p. 979).

Limitations in Attachment Research to Date

Three limitations are evident in the foregoing literature review of attachment research: 1) the role of gender is generally overlooked; 2) close relationships other than parent-child and romantic relationships are generally overlooked; and 3) there has been only a limited focus on variables that assess relational processes and attachment style.

Although gender has been shown to be an important determinant of relationship process, it has not been consistently examined in attachment research. Investigators do not always test for gender effects nor do they always find out the gender of the close others that are reported upon. A more systematic examination of the effects of gender and attachment style would be fruitful at this point, separately enhancing our understanding
of each of the two areas, as well as elucidating their mutual influence. Complexities and inconsistencies in the field of gender and close relationships may be clarified through the use of attachment as a moderating variable; an enrichment of attachment theory may be expected with an understanding of the role of gender; and an examination of the intersection of these two broad areas is likely to significantly benefit our understanding of close personal relationships.

Attachment research has focused almost exclusively on parent-child and romantic relationships (Bartholomew, 1990), despite the fact that the majority of our close relationships do not fall in these categories (e.g., de Vries, 1989). Other relationships may be influenced by attachment dynamics, such as friendships, work relationships, mentoring, and therapeutic relationships (e.g., Bartholomew & Perlman, 1994), and even individuals' relationship with God (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 1994). Feeney and Noller (1990) note that attachment style likely influences a range of relationships with others, because it "reflects general views about the rewards and dangers of interpersonal relationships" (p. 286). Ainsworth (1989) notes that friendships can be characterized as attachment relationships, and suggests that different types of relationships "differ from one another in regard to the role played by the attachment system" (p. 709). There may be meaningful differences in attachment-related behavior between romantic relationships and non-romantic relationships. From an attachment-theoretical perspective, romantic relationships share in common with close
friendship the activation of the behavioral systems of attachment and caregiving, and may be distinguished from friendships via the activation of the sexual system (Shaver & Hazan, 1988). Further, the functions of romantic relationships and friendships vary for women and men. Men get fewer intimacy needs met in same sex friendships, and have more of their needs for intimacy met within their romantic relationships and cross sex friendships, in contrast to women who get intimacy needs met in both romantic relationships and same sex friendships, and less so in cross sex friendships (e.g., Rose, 1985). An investigation spanning these types of relationships would offer an illumination of "the potency of relationship type for influencing answers to questions about close relationships" (Berscheid et al., 1989, p. 804).

The majority of attachment studies have examined the relationship between attachment styles and intrapersonal dimensions (e.g., self esteem, fear of death) or between attachment style and global interpersonal variables (e.g., beliefs about human nature, general styles of loving) (see Shaver & Hazan, 1992 for a review). The relationship between attachment styles and interpersonal processes in specific, ongoing relationships has been considerably less studied. Process-type variables, such as how and what one discloses to another, how one feels after disclosing to another, or how one tries to get one's way, are more likely to inform us about the ways in which attachment style shapes relations with others than are more static or summary variables, such as amount of disclosure or how often one "wins" a conflict. For example, Pietromonaco and
Carnelley (1992) found that more static dependent measures such as amount of liking for partner and degree of conflict were not significantly related to individuals' working models of attachment. They suggest that more refined measures that include assessments of the intimacy process "may be more likely to reveal differences among people who hold different models of attachment" (Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1992, p. 32).

A more comprehensive study of attachment is called for. Such a study would entail an explicit examination of the intersecting roles of gender and type of relationship in the context of ongoing, real-world relationships. Further, this examination would assess the independent and interactive effects of gender, relationship type, and attachment style on important relationship processes such as intimacy and influence.

Intimacy as a Core Relational Process

The Nature of Intimacy in Relationships

Intimacy is a construct that is central to an understanding of close relationships, yet defining the concept is an elusive process (Perlman & Fehr, 1984). The multifaceted nature of intimacy has prompted some authors to liken it to the proverbial elephant, examined by blind men who come up with quite different conclusions about the nature of the beast, depending upon where they stand (Acitelli & Duck, 1987). Reis and Shaver (1988) have outlined a systematic theoretical framework for examining the concept of intimacy, which involves the intertwined roles of
motives, behavior, cognitive processes, and affect. Intimacy is framed as a multi-step process of emotional communication, "a process in which one person expresses important self-relevant feelings and information to another and as a result of the other's response comes to feel known, validated (i.e., obtains confirmation of his or her world view and personal worth), and cared for" (Clark & Reis, 1988, p. 628). Such a model is consistent with the notion of mutuality put forth in self-in-relation theory (e.g. Genero, Miller, Surrey & Baldwin, 1991; Jordan, 1987; Surrey, 1986), which involves a bidirectional movement of thoughts, feelings and behavior in which it is as important to understand the other and reflect that back to her/him as it is to be and feel understood by the other. Attachment and intimacy are linked in important ways. As Reis and Shaver note:

It is of interest that the process Bowlby delineated involving a young child's security (or insecurity) produced in relationships with caregivers who are (or are not) emotionally available, sensitive, and responsive, is compatible in spirit with the theories and observations of Sullivan and Rogers, who used concepts such as validation, sensitive listening, and positive regard. This similarity suggests that central components of intimacy appear, perhaps in somewhat different forms, across the lifespan. (1988, p. 372).
The Intimacy Process

Like the internal working model of attachment theory, intimacy involves motivational, behavioral, cognitive, and affective components. The desire for intimacy (approach motivation) and the fear of intimacy (avoidance motivation) exert independent influences upon interpersonal behavior (Reis & Shaver, 1988). Individuals vary in the extent to which their interactions with others are, in general, shaped by intimacy-seeking or -avoiding, and it has been hypothesized that "the roots of these desires and fears can be traced to earlier relational experiences, some reaching as far back as childhood" (Reis & Shaver, 1988, p. 376).

Some disclosure of personally relevant information or feelings is an essential condition for intimacy (Reis & Shaver, 1988). Self disclosure which reveals personal feelings is more highly associated with relationship closeness than is the disclosure of personal facts (Morton, 1978; Waring & Chelune, 1983). It is this verbal or nonverbal revelation which provides the other person with an opportunity to respond in ways that indicate understanding and caring for the discloser. Expressivity is highly associated with relationship satisfaction for both women and men (Frazier & Esterly, 1990), and in particular, received disclosure from one's partner is more predictive of feelings of affection and closeness for the other than is the amount of disclosure given to one's partner (Sprecher, 1987).
The listener's role is at least as important in the intimacy process as the discloser's, since "appropriate responses enhance feelings of connectedness, whereas inappropriate responses or deliberate nonresponsiveness keep interactants at a distance" (Reis & Shaver, 1988, p. 379). Amount of self disclosure is a function of both the speaker's and the listener's predispositions, such that low disclosers will disclose more when interacting with an "opener" or a person who tends to elicit intimate self-disclosure in others (Miller, Berg & Archer, 1983, p. 1234). Behaviorally then, intimacy involves A's disclosure and B's responsiveness to that disclosure.

While disclosing and responsive behavior may be a necessary condition for intimacy, it is not a sufficient condition. Cognitive and emotional components are also crucial. Perlman and Fehr (1987) note that the term intimacy is derived from the Latin "intimus" which means "inmost", suggesting that the word reflects a sense of being deeply understood and appreciated at a core level of oneself. It is individuals' cognitive appraisal of the meaning of disclosure and other responsive behaviors that "evolves into shared, reciprocal understandings" which foster intimacy (Clark & Reis, 1988, p. 630). In addition to intellectual rapport, the affective component of intimacy, particularly the discloser's feelings of being understood, validated, and cared for, is central to the intimacy process. Unfortunately, as Clark and Reis (1988) note, these affective characteristics "have received less attention than self-disclosure in studies of intimacy" (p. 630).
Attachment and Intimacy

The bidirectional nature of intimacy behavior (i.e., the importance of both disclosing self-relevant material and listening responsively) echoes the parent-child interactions which so powerfully shape the development of attachment style. The caregiver's consistent awareness of and responsiveness to the infant's cues produce feelings of trust and reliance upon the caregiver, developing into an intimate bond, whereas inconsistent and nonresponsive caregiving leads to feelings of alienation, confusion, and withdrawal (Bowlby, 1969).

Secure individuals expect that others will be responsive and supportive in stressful situations, and feel generally cared for, hence they are likely to believe that intimacy is rewarding, and have an interaction goal of achieving intimacy with others. Avoidant individuals on the other hand have more negative expectations about interactions with others, and have an interaction goal of maintaining distance (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991). Bartholomew (1990) points out that "adults differ on both their motivation to become attached to others, a given in infancy, and their motivation to not become attached. Avoidance may therefore stem from either a fear of intimacy or a lack of interest or motivation to become intimate with others" (p. 149). Hence, secure and preoccupied individuals will tend to approach others, whereas those who are dismissing and fearful will avoid, but for different reasons: the dismissing person because he/she does not want to be intimate, versus the fearful person who wants
but is at the same time afraid of intimacy (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Attachment style is most evident to others in the behavioral domain. Secure and preoccupied individuals who desire intimacy are more likely to self-disclose than are dismissing individuals who do not want intimacy, or fearful individuals who are afraid of intimacy (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Individuals who are secure are more likely than those who are insecure to use self-disclosure when appropriate and are most sensitive and responsive to the other's self-disclosure (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991). Avoidant individuals tend not to self-disclose, are less likely to reciprocate another's disclosure, and do not report liking others who disclose to them; the disclosure pattern of preoccupied individuals is more complex, reflecting a high willingness to disclose and to reciprocate disclosure, but they do not adjust disclosure levels to match the closeness of the target, nor are they particularly responsive to the content of the other's disclosure (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991).

Like a schema, the internal working model of attachment operates to direct the individual to expect particular interpersonal patterns and attend to information which conforms to the model, thereby reinforcing the pre-existing view of relationships (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1985). Hence, secure individuals are more likely to expect that others will be warm, reliable and supportive, whereas those who are preoccupied tend to expect that others will be reluctant to commit to the relationship, and avoidant individuals are more likely to doubt
that others are well-intentioned and good-hearted (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Affect is hypothesized to play a central role in the attachment process such that "many of the most intense emotions arise during the formation, the maintenance, the disruption, and the renewal of attachments" (Bowlby, 1979, p. 130). From an attachment point of view, positive feelings of affection increase the likelihood of proximity-seeking behaviors in the infant, and enhance nurturing behavior in the caregiver, thereby improving the infant's chances of survival (Bowlby, 1969). Feelings of mutual affection and caring are most likely to occur in secure adult relationships, where they may function to deepen the relationship through increasing individuals' disclosure of vulnerabilities, fears, and regrets, and enhancing the personal development of the interactants as they come to feel known and validated at their affective core (Reis & Shaver, 1988).

Further, different attachment styles may be conceptualized as reflecting differences in the ways individuals regulate the intensity of emotional experience and in the methods used to cope with distress (Mikulincer et al., 1990; Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Secure individuals are more likely to cope effectively with negative affect and to experience greater positive affect than those who are insecure (Simpson, 1990). Secure attachment allows for constructive modulation of negative feelings, leading secure persons to use negative affect as part of their communication process, promoting effective responses from others (Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Individuals who are preoccupied manage negative
feelings by focusing attention upon the distress in a hypervigilant way, worrying about abandonment and rejection, and displaying heightened levels of affect; those who are avoidant restrict their awareness of distress, inhibit their expression of negative feelings, and maintain emotional distance from others (Mikulincer et al., 1990). The dysfunctional ways in which insecure individuals tend to cope with distress (by minimizing it or escalating it) lead to a greater likelihood of negative responses from others (Kobak & Hazan, 1991).

**Hypotheses: Attachment and Intimacy**

From the foregoing review it is clear that secure individuals are likely to have greater motivation for intimacy in relationships, to have greater responsivity to others' self-disclosures, to interpret others' intimacy behaviors in positive ways, and be less likely to express inappropriate negative affect than are those who are insecurely attached. All of these factors lead to the hypothesis that individuals who are securely attached will, on average, score higher on intimacy measures than will insecure respondents, on average.

**Gender Differences in Intimacy**

Although men and women define intimacy in similar ways, Caldwell and Peplau (1982) have found men's interactions to be less personal, less concerned with their partner's feelings, and lower in self-disclosure. In addition, in their close relationships women have been found to attach significantly
greater importance than do men to self-disclosure, appreciation of the other, empathic understanding, deepening the other's self-awareness, authenticity, and connectedness (Parker & de Vries, 1993). In short, men's relationships appear less intimate.

An equal proportion of women and men report feeling affection and appreciation in their intimate relationships, but men are less likely than women to express those feelings to the other (Helgeson et al., 1987). Further, men may be less likely to convey an affective sense of understanding of the other person's perspective than are women (Franzoi, Davis, & Young, 1985). Women's perspective-taking exerts a stronger effect on men's satisfaction than does men's perspective-taking on women's satisfaction, leading investigators to speculate that men's perspective-taking is primarily a cognitive experience, whereas when women take the perspective of another they interweave empathic concern and a cognitive understanding, thereby leading to greater satisfaction for the recipient of such multidimensional empathy (Franzoi et al., 1985).

Women more than men are likely to self-disclose about feelings and vulnerabilities (Aries & Johnson, 1983; Bell, 1981; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982; Fox et al., 1985; Woolsey, 1987). The generalization regarding women's greater disclosure than men's must be qualified to reflect the complexity in self-disclosure patterns of women and men. Men self-disclose less than women in same sex friendships, but the difference decreases in cross sex friendships (Wright, 1982), and in marriage equal disclosure is common (Peplau, 1983). The amount of men's and women's
disclosure varies by its content: men disclose more about political views and ideas, women disclose more about personal information and feelings (Hendrick, 1988); and while most women and men reveal both strengths and weaknesses to one another, no women but one third of men reveal only strengths, whereas no men but one third of women reveal only weaknesses (Hacker, 1981). Further, women rate themselves higher than do men in eliciting self-disclosure from others (Hendrick, 1988). Despite these qualifications, it is clear that disclosure of feelings and vulnerabilities offers a greater opportunity for intimacy than disclosure of information and strengths, and the ability to elicit disclosure from others is an important intimacy skill, both of which women more than men tend to exhibit.

In terms of the cognitive aspect of intimacy, Acitelli and Duck (1987) have developed the concept of "relationship awareness" to describe the mutual metacognitive process involved in both members of the dyad reflecting upon, analyzing, and acknowledging the "behavioral, cognitive, and affective interaction patterns that describe a relationship" (p. 305). Relationship awareness is correlated with relationship satisfaction for both women and men if they are single (Frazier & Esterly, 1990). Among married individuals however, women's satisfaction is significantly affected by their partner's level of relationship awareness, whereas men's satisfaction is not (Acitelli, in press).

The possibility that men may be using the label of intimacy differently from women was tested by Reis (1986), who reports on
a set of experiments which rule out this alternative. He suggests therefore that "we may have greater confidence that the content of males' interactions with each other actually differs from those of females" (Reis, 1986, p. 102).

Hacker (1981) speculates that men's lower intimacy level is attributable to a lesser capacity for intimacy. Bell (1981) notes that even when men recognize how they feel "they may be unable to do anything about it. They may have been so effectively socialized that they can't confide in their wives or friends" (p. 405). Other authors however, report that most men are capable of intimacy behavior given specific motivational or situational cues (Brody, 1985; Reis, Senchak, & Solomon, 1985). For example, if men expect future interactions with someone who is a prospective romantic partner they may be even more invested in self-disclosure than women (Hendrick, 1988), illustrating the strategic use of disclosure to achieve ends. This suggests that a motivational rather than an ability deficit may account for men's lower disclosure (Sattel, 1976).

Some investigators have suggested that the difference between women's and men's disclosure is less one of capacity and more one of roles and fears (Lewis, 1984). Men, more so than women, are likely to perceive intimate situations negatively (Mark & Alper, 1985), or as potentially dangerous (Pollak & Gilligan, 1982, 1983), perhaps because they receive mixed messages about closeness in relationships such as "get close but not too close" (Basow, 1992, p. 203). Men who self-disclose personal information may be judged as less likable and less well-
adjusted than women who disclose an equivalent amount (Chelune, 1976; Derlega & Chaikin, 1976). Other investigators view men's lesser intimacy as a function of power motivation (Sattel, 1976), and suggest that men intentionally use inexpressiveness to maintain control, particularly in situations where they perceive a threat to their position (see "influence strategies" below).

In a key study which includes a subset of the variables (and levels of variables) of interest to this proposal, Fischer and Narus (1981) examined the moderating influence of gender-role orientation (masculinity-femininity) on the association between gender of respondent and type of relationship (same sex vs. cross sex) as they relate to intimacy levels. Women scored significantly higher on intimacy overall than did men. Feminine and androgynous women scored higher on intimacy than their male counterparts, and whereas women's same sex relationships had the highest intimacy scores, men's same sex relationships had the lowest (Fischer & Narus, 1981). Fischer and Narus (1981) conclude that "being male or female, but particularly being male, may be more related to how one acts and feels in a close relationship than being feminine, or masculine, or androgynous" (p. 453). On the other hand, in another study examining the effect of sex-role orientation on intimacy, Williams (1985) noted that although there was an overall gender difference in reported intimacy, with women scoring higher than men, "males and females who reported high levels of femininity, regardless of whether they were high or low on masculinity, reported higher levels of intimacy in their friendships" (p. 599). Psychological
femininity has been found in a number of other studies to be associated with higher levels of intimacy for both women and men (Berg & Peplau, 1982; Burda, Vaux & Schill, 1984). Men, however, are less likely to have been encouraged to develop "feminine" expressive traits than are women, and in fact have probably been sanctioned against expressing them (Basow, 1992).

Despite the central tendency for women and men to describe and experience intimacy in different ways, it is important to keep in mind that there is also much overlap between the sexes and much within-gender variability (e.g. Wright, 1988). There is more similarity than difference between women and men in the way they define intimacy (Monsour, 1992). The central dimension in everyday conceptions of intimacy for both women and men involves feelings of closeness, appreciation, and affection (Helgeson et al., 1987). Parker and de Vries (1993) found that trust and authenticity were the two most highly rated values in close relationships for both women and men. Importantly, the modal gender pattern of an affective, expressive focus for women in contrast to an instrumental focus for men diminishes "markedly as the strength and duration of the friendships increases" (Wright, 1982, p. 19).

Hypotheses: Gender and Intimacy

From the foregoing review it may be hypothesized that women respondents, on average, will score higher on intimacy measures than will men respondents, overall.
Hypotheses: Gender x Relationship Type - Intimacy

Following from the above review a gender of respondent by relationship type interaction effect on intimacy is hypothesized. Comparing within gender, women respondents will report, on average, higher intimacy in their same sex friendships than in their cross sex friendships; men respondents will report, on average, lower intimacy in their same sex friendships than in their cross sex friendships. Comparing between the genders, women in same sex friendships will, on average, report higher intimacy than will men in same sex friendships.

Gender and Attachment Intersect: Intimacy Processes

The concept of intimacy is at the heart of gender differences in close relationships, and at the same time captures the core dimensions of attachment bonds. It is evident that gender plays a role in patterns of motivation to approach or avoid intimacy, in intimacy behaviors such as disclosure and responsiveness, in cognitive aspects of intimacy such as relationship awareness and perspective-taking, and in the affective experience of intimacy. Attachment style too is expected to influence intimacy patterns in particular ways, since working models of self and other shape motivational, affective, and behavioral components of individuals' intimacy process.

Gender and attachment style together may be expected to more completely capture the nature of the intimacy process among women and men in their close relationships than either construct on its own. Secure attachment style, with its positive views of both
self and other, may be associated with less difference between the genders than insecure attachment styles. Securely attached men, being comfortable with closeness, may be less likely than insecure men to show the male gender-typed pattern of avoidance of intimacy. Securely attached women and men are not expected to differ in intimacy levels.

Dismissing individuals may be seen as defensively self-assertive people who hold a negative model of others and a positive model of self. They are not particularly motivated to approach and get close to others. At the same time, they do not feel that they need others to validate their self-image. These individuals may be expected to have lower levels of intimacy in their relationships, yet their tendency to deny negative affect or vulnerability may lead them to report moderately high intimacy levels. The interpersonal pattern associated with being dismissing runs counter to traditional gender expectations for women, and matches the traditional gender pattern for men.

Fearful women and men hold negative views of both self and others, and are therefore likely to avoid close relationships and to report low intimacy levels. Since women tend not to be expected to initiate cross sex contact in the same way that men stereotypically are, fearful women, while unlikely to initiate cross sex contact, may be approached by others (especially others of the opposite sex) more frequently than fearful men (Garcia, Stinson, Ickes, Bissonette & Briggs, 1991). Such a dynamic may be expected to lead to greater opportunities for intimacy for fearful women than for fearful men.
The preoccupied style is more characteristic of the traditional feminine role (i.e., affective expressiveness), and as such may be viewed as more predictable and appropriate for women than for men. Men who are preoccupied may be expected to report higher intimacy levels than fearful or dismissing men, yet they may report lower intimacy levels than preoccupied women. Such a finding might be due to the fact that "while a preoccupied woman fits the prescribed gender role, the same behavior in a man may appear quite inappropriate and hence unacceptable" (Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1992, p. 34). On the other hand, preoccupied men may show higher intimacy levels than preoccupied women. If the partners of preoccupied men perceive their attempts at engagement (such as self disclosures and emotional expression) as opportunities for intimacy, the partner may respond with reciprocal behavior, thereby increasing the likelihood of intimacy.

Hypotheses: Gender x Attachment on Intimacy

From the foregoing discussion a gender by attachment style interaction effect on intimacy is hypothesized. Among those who are secure, gender differences in intimacy will be suppressed, but among those who are preoccupied and fearful, women, on average, are expected to have higher intimacy levels than are men.

Three-way Interaction: Gender, Type of Relationship, and Attachment Style on Intimacy
The simultaneous consideration of three independent variables proposed for this study is a novel approach, hence hypotheses made at this level of complexity are, by necessity, somewhat speculative and there is less justification for precise predictions. However, one possible scenario might entail men scoring higher than women in intimacy when comparing within the preoccupied attachment style and within cross sex friendships. Such a finding might reflect the different meanings of expressive behavior for men and women. As Feeney et al. (1994a) note, "men's willingness to be close to relationship partners may be particularly valued, given the sex-role stereotype of low male comfort with intimacy" (p. 26). Hence the cross sex friends of preoccupied men (i.e., women) may be more likely than the cross sex friends of preoccupied women (i.e., men) to regard expressivity and disclosure attempts as opportunities to increase the intimacy level in the relationship.

In another example of this complexity, at the two-way level (sex of respondent x attachment style) fearful women are expected to have higher intimacy levels than are fearful men, due to different gender-role expectations about approaching others, especially those of the opposite sex. However, this effect may vary by type of relationship such that in romantic relationships fearful women may report greater intimacy than fearful men, but in friendships fearful women and fearful men may not differ. Such an effect might be due to the larger role of sexual dynamics and expectations in romantic relationships as compared with friendships.
Such complexity, while admittedly speculative, can only be examined when all the relevant variables are taken into account, as is the case in this study.

**Hypotheses: Gender x Attachment x Relationship Type - Intimacy**

From the above discussion it may be hypothesized that in cross sex friendships, preoccupied men may score higher on intimacy than will preoccupied women. In addition, in romantic relationships, fearful women may score higher on intimacy than will fearful men.

**Influence Strategies**

**The Nature of Influence in Relationships**

As noted earlier, process-type variables which assess how individuals feel and behave may be more informative about the roles of attachment style and gender in relationships than static variables. Influence is a relational process of primary importance. Influence refers to "instances in which events in one partner's chain [of thoughts, feelings and behaviors] are causally connected to events in the other's chain" (Huston, 1983, p. 170). Unless each person has some impact on the other, the relationship between them cannot be considered close (Berscheid et al., 1989). There are numerous areas in which individuals in relationships have an impact on the other and deal with the task of trying to get their way, either by convincing the other to agree to their desire, or by preventing the other from interfering with them (Peterson, 1983). Inevitably in close
relationships there are circumstances in which the individuals involved do not both want the same thing. The ability to achieve one's ends through influence over another reflects one's interpersonal power (Huston, 1983). The question of interpersonal power or "who wins" has been considerably more studied than has been the question of how individuals attempt to influence close others (Howard, Bluinstein, & Schwartz, 1986). Important dynamics in relationships, such as the experience of intimacy, can be affected for better or for worse by the manner and tactics used to handle differences (Reis & Shaver, 1988).

A consequence of the limited research focus on styles of influence is that investigator-generated scales dominate the field, many of which "include similar strategies and identify similar underlying dimensions, but none is absolutely consistent with any other...and none of the classifications schemes has acquired wide acceptance" (Steil & Weltman, 1992, p. 73). One measure of styles of influence which has received reasonable replication and evidences acceptable reliability and validity is the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI; Rahim, 1983).

The ROCI was designed to differentiate among influence strategies used by executives in organizations, on the basis of two dimensions: concern for self and concern for other. Five specific styles are assessed: high concern for both self and other is reflected in an integrating style, a "win-win" process which addresses the needs of both partners; low concern for both self and other is represented by an avoiding style; high concern for self and low concern for others leads to a dominating style;
low concern for self and high concern for others is illustrated by an obliging style, or a tendency to give in; and the fifth style identified is compromising which is hypothesized to fall in the middle of the other four strategies, and involves both individuals giving up something in order to solve the problem (Rahim, 1983).

Empirical examination of the five influence styles shows that they fall into five independent and reasonably pure factors, and that the measure discriminates among the styles of influence most likely to be used by respondents when with their bosses, peers, and subordinates (Rahim, 1983). Gender patterns also emerged in the use of strategies. While dominating strategies did not distinguish among women and men, the other four strategies did: women executives were more likely than their male counterparts to use integrating, compromising and avoidant strategies, and were less likely to use obliging strategies (Rahim, 1983). The representativeness of this sample of women is questionable however, since the women in the study were all fairly high-level executives, and comprised only 50 of the 1,219 respondents.

Attachment Styles and Influence Strategies

Although the ROCI was originally developed for use in organizations, it has since been successfully used to examine influence strategies in a variety of interpersonal relationships, including romantic relationship, parent, sibling, friend, professor, and generalized other (Hammock, Richardson,
Pilkington, & Utley, 1987; Levy & Davis, 1988; Pistole, 1989; Richardson, Hammock, Lubben, & Mickler, 1988). Factor analyses using the population of executives confirmed the five-factor solution (Rahim, 1983); in studies of other interpersonal relationships however, factor analyses have consistently yielded four factors, with integrating and compromising loading on the same factor (Hammock et al., 1987; Richardson et al., 1988). The two-dimensional conceptualization of the ROCI as reflecting concern for the self and concern for the other is compatible with the attachment theoretical perspective of internal working models of self and other (Bowlby, 1979) and maps neatly onto the four-category attachment model proposed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991).

In an examination of the characteristics of ongoing romantic relationships Levy and Davis (1988), found that adult attachment styles (as assessed by the Hazan & Shaver, 1987, 3-category measure) are related in meaningful ways to styles of influence. Compromising and integrating strategies were positively correlated with secure attachment and were negatively correlated with preoccupied and avoidant attachment; additionally, preoccupied attachment was positively correlated with dominating strategies (Levy & Davis, 1988). Similar findings were reported by Pistole (1989): those who were identified as securely attached were most likely to use integrating and compromising strategies, and those who were preoccupied were more likely than avoidant persons to use obliging strategies. Integrating and compromising strategies are considered to be mutually focused strategies,
reflecting the positive view of self and other characteristic of the secure style (Shaver & Hazan, 1992).

Interestingly, the avoidant attachment style did not correlate with avoidant influence strategies in the Levy and Davis (1988) study. Such a finding may relate to the problems identified earlier regarding the need to pull apart two types of avoidance: dismissing, which has a positive view of self and a negative view of others, and fearful, with a negative view of both self and others (cf Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Dismissing individuals with their defensive self-assertiveness are likely to employ dominant influence strategies, whereas fearful individuals may be more likely to use avoidant or obliging strategies.

The combination of both dominant and obliging strategies found in preoccupied individuals may relate to their high level of emotional arousal, motivating them to try to make their partner do what they want (dominance), or motivating them in a martyr-like way to oblige the other's wishes (Levy & Davis, 1988). This pattern corresponds to the excessive dominance/warmth kinds of interpersonal problems most likely to be experienced by preoccupied individuals (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Hypotheses: Attachment and Influence Strategies

From the foregoing discussion it may be hypothesized that secure respondents, on average, will be more likely to use compromising and integrating influence strategies than will insecure respondents, on average. Dismissing individuals will be
likely to use dominating strategies than will individuals from the other three attachment styles. Fearful individuals will be more likely to use avoidant strategies than will individuals from the other three groups.

**Gender Patterns in Influence Strategies**

As noted earlier, researchers using attachment theory have often overlooked the role of gender, and the abovementioned two studies of attachment style and influence strategies are no exception. The three-category approach to attachment styles may further obscure the role of gender in patterns of using influence strategies. Gender has been shown in other studies to play a role in the kinds of influence tactics used in close relationships.

In an examination of expectations about which strategies are likely to be used by the two genders, Johnson (1976) found that men more than women are expected to use coercive and direct reward forms of influence, in comparison to women who are expected to use helplessness and personal rewards more than are men. Gender differences also have been found in the actual use of influence strategies. Peplau (1983) reviews literature on male and female tactics, and finds that women and men report that their behavior is consistent with gender stereotypes: women tend to cry, sulk, and criticize the male partner's insensitivity, whereas men tend to show anger, call for a logical approach to the problem, and try to delay the discussion. Despite gender differences in the use of influence strategies, women and men
hold similar views on which strategies they would prefer to use; given the choice, both genders rank the use of rational strategies, such as stating one's desires and using reason, most highly (White & Roufail, 1989).

Men, uncomfortable with the expression and display of emotion, may give in (oblige) or use avoidant strategies more than women, who are more likely to be frustrated by avoidance, to confront differences, and to want to discuss problems and consider feelings than are men (Kelley, Cunningham, Grisham, Lefebvre, Sink, & Yablon 1978). Men, for example, are less likely to bring up a problem for discussion in a strained relationship than are women, and are more likely than women to terminate a strained relationship without ever bringing up the difficulty (Wright, 1982). Women, in contrast to men, are likely to engage friends in discussions of things that disturb them, and report that they value the importance of expressing authentic feelings, even at the risk of losing the friendship (Fox et al., 1985).

A frequently noted pattern of interaction among distressed couples is the demand/withdraw dynamic (Christensen, 1988), in which one individual "pressures the other with demands, complaints and criticisms, while the other partner withdraws with defensiveness and passive inaction" (Christensen & Shenk, 1991, p. 458). Women more than men have been found to take the demand role, and men more than women have been shown to withdraw (e.g., Christensen & Shenk, 1991). It has been hypothesized that these gender effects are a result of sex-role conditioning in which
women are socialized to seek closeness and to fear rejection in relationships, whereas men are socialized to seek distance and fear engulfment in relationships (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). The consequences of avoidance versus engagement are not clearly understood (Peterson, 1983). For example, the demand/withdraw pattern has been found to be associated with greater marital distress (Christensen & Shenk, 1991). On the other hand, women and men are equally likely to terminate a problematic relationship, despite the fact that women are more likely to have confronted the source of strain in the relationship prior to terminating than are men (Wright, 1982). Engaging strategies are commonly held to be more likely to lead to greater couple satisfaction than is avoidance (Peterson, 1983), and have been found to be associated with higher levels of shared spousal understanding (Knudson, Sommers, & Golding, 1980).

Despite persistent stereotypes and research findings regarding the characteristic ways in which women and men get what they want, gender differences in strategies of influence may involve a more complex picture (Lips, 1991). Some authors have pointed to the importance of studying variables which are gender-linked and which may underlie the differences found between women and men, such as gender-role orientation, access to resources, perceptions of personal power, and self-confidence (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard et al., 1986; Steil & Weltman, 1992). Greater femininity, less access to resources, less perceived personal power and less self-confidence all predict greater use of the indirect or "manipulative" strategies generally associated
with women (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard et al., 1986; Steil & Weltman, 1992). In addition, based on the findings in the area of intimacy, the gender composition and type of relationship (i.e., same sex vs. cross sex friendship, romantic relationship) may also play a role in the use of influence strategies.

**Hypotheses: Gender and Influence Strategies**

Men respondents, on average, may be expected to use avoiding strategies more than will women respondents, on average.

**Hypotheses: Gender x Relationship Type - Influence Strategies**

There is little in the literature to direct precise hypotheses at the two-way level, hence the following hypotheses must be considered speculative. They are based on the notion that the gender composition of the dyad may predict the use of influence strategies (as a result of gender-linked variables of, for women, greater psychological femininity and less perceived access to personal power and resources), leading to women’s greater use of indirect strategies in relationships with men. Women, on average, may use more obliging strategies than will men, on average, in their cross sex friendships and romantic relationships. Men, on average, may be expected to report more use of dominating strategies than will women on average, in their cross sex friendships and romantic relationships. Men, on average, will report using more avoiding strategies than will women, on average, in their same sex friendships.
Gender and Attachment Intersect: Influence Strategies

Attachment style may be expected to interact with gender to affect individuals' use of influence tactics. Secure attachment style, with its positive views of both self and other, may be associated with less difference between the genders than insecure attachment styles. Securely attached men, being comfortable with closeness, may be less likely than insecure men to show the male gender-typed pattern of avoidance. Securely attached women, with their reliance on the self for approval and acceptance, may be less likely than insecurely attached women to use obliging strategies.

Fearful individuals who hold a negative view of both the self and the other, are more likely than others to use avoidant strategies, limiting contact with others in order to minimize the chances of being rejected. Fearful women may however be more likely than fearful men to use obliging strategies (i.e., giving in) as a way of ending the interaction, as such a pattern is more traditionally gender-congruent for women than for men.

Preoccupied individuals see others in a more positive light than the self, and therefore view others as being able to provide approval that the preoccupied individual cannot give to the self. Such an individual is highly invested in the relationship and is desperately fearful of being abandoned by the other. Such individuals have been found to use both obliging and dominating strategies of influence (Levy & Davis, 1988; Pistole, 1989). In terms of influence strategies, it is possible that the dominance strategies will be used more by preoccupied men than preoccupied
women, and the obliging strategies will be used more by preoccupied women than by preoccupied men.

Dismissing individuals have a positive view of the self and a negative view of others. They do not acknowledge a need for others and therefore may be more likely to use strategies that are dominating, since they do not feel that they have much investment in the relationship. The dismissing style is more characteristic of the traditional male role, as is the tendency to use dominant strategies, hence dismissing men may be more likely to use dominating strategies than dismissing women. Further, dismissing men may be more likely to use dominating strategies than will men in the other three groups.

Hypotheses: Gender x Attachment on Influence Strategies

As the literature in this area is limited, the hypotheses made here are considered exploratory. It may be hypothesized that dominating strategies will be used more by dismissing and preoccupied men, on average, than by dismissing and preoccupied women. Further, preoccupied and fearful men, on average, may be more likely to use avoidant strategies than will preoccupied and fearful women, on average. In addition, preoccupied and fearful women, on average, may be more likely to use obliging strategies than will preoccupied and fearful men, on average.

Summary of Hypotheses

A. Intimacy
   i) in their closest cross sex friendships, preoccupied men will report higher intimacy than will preoccupied women
   ii) in romantic relationships, fearful women will report higher intimacy than will fearful men

   i) preoccupied women will report higher intimacy than will preoccupied men
   ii) fearful women will report higher intimacy than will fearful men

A3. Two-way interaction: gender by relationship type
   i) in their closest same sex friendship, women will report higher intimacy than will men
   ii) women will report higher intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship
   iii) men will report lower intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship

A4. Main effect: gender
   i) women will report higher intimacy than will men

A5. Main effect: attachment style
   i) secure participants will report higher intimacy than will insecure participants
B. Influence

B1. Two-way interaction: gender by attachment style

   i) dismissing and preoccupied men will report more use of the dominating strategy than will dismissing and preoccupied women

   ii) preoccupied and fearful women will report more use of the obliging strategy than will preoccupied and fearful men

   iii) preoccupied and fearful men will report more use of the avoiding strategy than will preoccupied and fearful women

B2. Two-way interaction: gender by relationship type

   i) men will report more use of the dominating strategy than will women in their closest cross sex friendships

   ii) men will report more use of the dominating strategy than will women in their romantic relationships

   iii) women will report more use of the obliging strategy than will men in their closest cross sex friendships

   iv) women will report more use of the obliging strategy than will men in their romantic relationships

   v) in their closest same sex friendships, men will report more use of the avoiding strategy than will women

B3. Main effect: gender

   i) men, on average, will report greater use of avoiding strategies than will women, on average
B4. Main effect: attachment style

i) Secure participants will report greater use of the compromising/integrating strategy than will insecure participants.

ii) Fearful respondents will report using avoidant strategies more than respondents in the other three groups.

iii) Dismissing individuals will report greater use of dominating strategies than will individuals in the other three groups.
Methods

Issues in the Measurement of Attachment

There is no single agreed-upon method for assessing adult attachment. Indeed, "approaches to the measurement of adult attachment reveal a diversity of content and assumptions" (Feeney et al., 1994b, p. 128). Such diversity has been the source of some debate, and has illuminated the basic but sometimes overlooked association between the measurement of a construct and its conceptualization. As Griffin and Bartholomew (1994, p. 3) note, "the choice of a measurement procedure carries with it implicit theoretical assumptions about the nature of the phenomenon under study". The construct of attachment has been characterized as a number of discrete categories with nonoverlapping group membership (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987), as a set of prototypes or ideal exemplars of categories, with category members varying in the extent to which they correspond to the ideal (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), and as a number of continuous dimensions (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990). Each approach comes with assumptions, strengths, and limitations (see Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994, for a review).

The vast proportion of research that has been carried out on infant and adult attachment has employed the first approach, that of assigning individuals to a single category. The groundbreaking work of Shaver and Hazan (1988, 1992) in developing an effective, easy to administer self-report measure for grouping individuals opened the way for a flourishing field
of research into a typology of adult attachment. Their approach uses a single-item forced-choice measure in which respondents select the one attachment style that best describes them. An important assumption in this approach is that any individual within a group may be substituted for another within that group, and that therefore between group error is important but within group error is random. A grouping approach is advantageous in several ways: it provides labels which summarize and organize complex patterns of individual differences; it makes for ease in communication; and it is compatible with analysis of variance models for statistical analyses. At the same time, this convenience has disadvantages, in that researchers and consumers of research may be tempted to think in overly simplistic ways about group membership, overlooking differences and exaggerating similarities within groups (and doing the converse between groups, that is, exaggerating differences and ignoring similarities), and thinking in causal terms about the associations between group membership and other variables. As well, categorical approaches inevitably lead to some loss of information as compared with dimensional ones. In contrast, dimensional approaches to attachment retain its rich complexity, are statistically more sensitive, and do not lend themselves easily to stereotyping and mistaken causal inference, but nor do they facilitate an appreciation of the gestalt that arises out of the pattern of results.

The prototype approach to conceptualizing attachment groups takes into account the notion of within group difference,
acknowledging that while it is possible to define types on the basis of complex patterns of individual differences, not all group members are equally good representatives of that type. In this approach, typicality ratings (e.g., 1 = "not at all like me"; 7 = "very much like me") are taken for each participant on each of the attachment patterns, and a profile of the individual is produced which allows for an evaluation of how closely that person matches each type (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Another way of incorporating a prototype approach to grouping is to use the highest of the four typicality ratings to place individuals into their best-fitting attachment category (e.g., Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994).

In this study, attachment was viewed as categorical (rather than dimensional), and participants were placed into groups on the basis of their best-fitting category. That is, discrete groups were used in this study, but with the understanding that few people are ideal exemplars of a single attachment style, and that instead there are "better" or "poorer" representatives of a category. Participants' category assignment was based on multiple measurement: 1) both forced choice categorization and separate ratings on each attachment type; and 2) globally over all close relationships at Time One, and specifically within three separate relationship types at Time Two. To be assigned to a category, individuals must have: 1) at Time One rated typicality highest (or tied for highest) on the same category as they chose in the forced choice question; and 2) at Time Two chosen the same forced choice category as they chose at Time One.
and rated it as highest (or tied for highest), for at least one of the three relationship types.

This typicality rating approach "overcomes the problem of assuming that the... attachment styles are mutually exclusive" (Feeney et al., 1994b, p. 130). It is important therefore to keep in mind that despite having grouped participants into discrete categories for the reasons given above, the view in this research is that few individuals are likely to correspond perfectly to a single attachment pattern. This research examines the pattern of results for individuals characterized as having a particular attachment style on the basis of their best fitting style. The expectation is that there will be a significant amount of within group variability, and that variability is meaningful, but that it will be largely unexamined in this work.

**Subjects**

Participants were 80 female and 80 male university undergraduates, currently in heterosexual romantic relationships of 6 months or longer, recruited from the volunteer subject pool. Lesbian and gay romantic relationships were not included in the data analyses, due to the expectation of insufficient numbers in these groups (estimated at 10% of the population, cf. Basow, 1992).

The expected distribution of the four attachment styles in the general population of university students is: secure 48%; dismissing 19%; preoccupied 15%; and fearful 19% (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). By including only individuals who were
currently in a romantic relationship however, secure individuals were likely to be significantly overrepresented in the sample (Davis & Kirkpatrick, in press; Kobak & Hazan, 1991; Shaver & Hazan, 1992). Further, the distribution of the four types has been shown to differ by gender, with fewer dismissing women than dismissing men, and fewer preoccupied men than preoccupied women (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan, et al., 1991; Carnelley, et al., 1992).

Given that uneven distributions were expected across the groups, with an overrepresentation of secure individuals, a screening test was administered prior to the main questionnaire, and sampling continued until an n of 20 was obtained for women and men for each attachment style (e.g., Brennan & Shaver, 1991). A power calculation was conducted for the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (using data from Genero et al., 1991), and revealed that in order to detect a standard effect size difference of .852 with a power of .8, a minimum n of 11 is sufficient. A power calculation conducted on the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (using data from Miller & Lefcourt, 1982) indicated that in order to detect a standard effect size difference of .831 with a power of .8, a minimum n of 11 is also sufficient. These power calculations are based on a one-factor ANOVA design, whereas this study involved a multifactorial design. The inclusion of additional factors tends to increase the power of the test for the main effects (Glass & Hopkins, 1984, pp. 443-4); however the power of the test of interactions in factorial designs tends to be lower than for the main effects
(Cohen, 1988). This results from the fact that it is the cell \( n \) which governs the power of the interaction analysis, whereas it is some multiple of that number which is used in tests for the main effects (Cohen, 1988). Hence an \( n \) of 20 individuals per cell was obtained, in order to take this relative weakness in the interaction tests into account.

**Measures** (see Appendix A for copies of all measures used)

1. **Attachment style.** The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ), (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), is a self-report measure of attachment style. This measure was used both in the pretest screening procedure and, in a modified form, in the main questionnaire. The RQ consists of four paragraphs representing the four attachment styles, and individuals are asked to identify the one style that best reflects how they feel. This method is commonly used in adult attachment research (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987, 1990; Shaver & Hazan, 1988), and has been found to produce results almost identical to dimensional measures of attachment (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Validity is evidenced in the different patterns of results for each type in terms of adaptational variables, family background, affect regulation, representational processes, behaviors, and relationship history reported upon earlier in this paper. Test-retest reliability of the RQ has been found to be satisfactory at 8 months post-test, with a test-retest correlation of .60 (Scharfe, 1992).

On both the screening measure and the main questionnaire, participants were asked to select the **one** attachment style that
best reflects the way they usually feel in close relationships (a forced choice approach). As well, they were asked on both the screening measure and the main questionnaire to indicate the extent to which each of the four attachment styles corresponds to their usual style in relationships, using a 7 point scale (with 1 "not at all like me", 4 "somewhat like me", and 7 "very much like me"). On the screening measure, participants were asked to respond to the attachment questions on the basis of all their close relationships. On the main questionnaire, participants completed the RQ three times, once on the basis of all their close same sex friendships, once on the basis of all their close opposite sex friendships, and once on the basis of all their romantic relationships. Respondents on the main questionnaire both answered the forced choice question for each type of relationship, and also rated each attachment style on the extent to which it corresponds with their usual style for each relationship type.

2. Demographics. The Demographics Questionnaire included information on respondents' age, sex, and ethnic identification. The question on ethnicity was open-ended, allowing participants to generate their own ethnic label. As well, respondents were asked to rate on a 5-point scale the extent to which they feel their ethnic background influences their close relationships with others (1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = moderately; 4 = very much; 5 = completely). The demographics section also asked participants to provide the ages of their closest same sex friend, closest cross sex friend, and romantic partner, and to
indicate the duration, frequency of contact (number of times the participant sees or speaks to the target person), and degree of closeness (on a 5-point scale, with 5 representing extreme closeness) in each of the three relationships. In addition, since many individuals include kin in their friendship networks (e.g., Dickens & Perlman, 1981), respondents were asked if their friend is a relative by blood or marriage, and if so, what the specific kin relationship is with that person. Respondents were asked not to nominate parents as closest friends, as the focus in this study is on peer relationships.

3. Intimacy. Intimacy was assessed in this study with two separate measures, the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (MPDQ; Genero, Miller, Surrey & Baldwin, 1991) and the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (MSIS; Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). Multiple measurement of a construct is generally regarded as superior to assessment via a single measure. In this case, the MSIS is the more well-established measure of the two, however both measures illustrate reasonable levels of reliability and validity. Both measures can be adapted for use with different types of relationships, and are sensitive to gender differences. The MPDQ asks the respondent to report on the intimacy process from the dual perspectives of the self and the other, in contrast to the MSIS, which has the respondent report for the self only.

a) The Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (Genero, Miller, Surrey & Baldwin, 1991) was completed three times, once for each relationship (closest same sex friendship,
closest opposite sex friendship, and romantic relationship). It assesses perceived intimacy in close relationships, with two perspectives provided by the respondent: the respondent's own point of view, and her or his perception of the other individual's point of view.

To elicit information about these two perspectives, respondents rated items using each of the following frames: "When we talk about things that matter to me, [the other person] is likely to..." and "When we talk about things that matter to [the other person], I am likely to...". The scale is made up of two equivalent sets of 11 items, one for the self-ratings and one for the other-ratings. Examples of items include: "be receptive", "get impatient", "keep an open mind", "feel moved", "keep feelings inside", "share similar experiences".

Ratings are made on a 6 point scale (from 1 = never to 6 = all the time). Negative items are reverse scored, the scores are summed and then averaged by the total 22 items. Thus, scale scores could range from 1 to 6 with higher scores reflecting greater intimacy. The measure has been shown to have high inter-item reliability, ranging from .89 to .92, and satisfactory test-retest reliability, ranging from .72 to .84 over a two-week period. Construct and concurrent validity have been demonstrated: the measure correlates positively with adequacy of social support, relationship satisfaction, and cohesion, and correlates negatively with self-reported depression (Genero et al., 1992).
b) the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (Miller & Lefcourt 1982) was completed three times, once for each relationship. Seventeen intimacy items were rated on a 10 point scale, with six items requiring frequency ratings (anchored by "very rarely", "some of the time", and "almost always"), and 11 items requiring intensity ratings (anchored by "not much", "a little", and "a great deal"). Items include: "How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her?", "How often are you able to understand his/her feelings?", "How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her?", "How affectionate do you feel toward him/her?".

Internal consistency assessed via Cronbach's alpha is within the range of .86 to .91, and test-retest reliability over a two-month period is .96. Convergent validity has been illustrated via positive correlations with other measures of trust and intimacy, and negative correlations with measures of loneliness. Discriminant validity has been shown in comparisons between closest friend and acquaintance, and between distressed and nondistressed couples (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982; Touliatos, Perlmutter & Strauss, 1990). The MSIS is a well-established measure which "has utility for a variety of research purposes" (Perlman & Fehr, 1987, p. 18).

5. Influence strategies. The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI), (Rahim, 1983) is a 28-item Likert-type measure constructed around two dimensions: 1) concern for self; and 2) concern for others. It is designed to tap five strategies of
influence: integrating, compromising, obliging, dominating, and avoiding. Respondents were asked to think about how they typically handle things when they want to get their way, and to use the 5-point scale to indicate the extent to which the use of each influence strategy is characteristic of them, from 1 ("not at all like me") to 3 ("somewhat like me") to 5 ("very much like me"). The ROCI was completed three times by each participant, once for the romantic relationship, once for the closest same sex friendship, and once for the closest opposite sex friendship.

Examples of items include: 1) integrating: "I collaborate with my ______ to come up with decisions acceptable to us"; 2) compromising: "I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks"; 3) obliging: "I usually allow concessions to my ______"; 4) dominating: "I use my authority to make a decision in my favour"; and 5) avoiding: "I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my ______".

As previously noted, factor analyses using a population of executives have confirmed the five-factor solution with eigen values as follows: 1) integrating = 4.10; 2) avoiding = 3.00; 3) dominating = 2.26; 4) obliging = 1.52; and 5) compromising = 1.09 (Rahim, 1983). In subsequent studies of other interpersonal relationships (including parent, sibling, friend, generalized other), factor analyses have consistently yielded four factors, with integrating and compromising loading on the same factor (Hammock et al., 1987; Richardson et al., 1988).

The measure shows 1 week test-retest reliabilities ranging from .60 (compromising scale) to .83 (integrating scale) (Rahim,
1983). Internal consistency as assessed by Cronbach's alpha is acceptable, ranging from .72 (for the compromising, dominating and obliging scales) to .77 (for the integrating scale) (Rahim, 1983). Validity was assessed via known groups procedure; stepwise multiple discriminant analyses reveal that the measure distinguishes between influence styles used by respondents with their bosses, peers, and subordinates (Rahim, 1983).

Procedures

In order to obtain equal distributions of romantically-involved individuals across attachment styles, a first step in this study was to administer a screening questionnaire to potential participants. Screening questionnaires were distributed in undergraduate classes eligible for bonus course points. The response to the screening questionnaires was very positive, with a large number of students taking an apparent interest in participating in the study. The completed questionnaires were picked up 1 week later and bonus points were given. Participants who fit the study criteria were telephoned within 2 weeks of returning the screening questionnaire, and invited to take part in the larger questionnaire study. Screening continued until the minimum cell number of 20 men and 20 women was reached for each attachment style.

Attachment style screening. The first aspect of the screening process involved identifying sufficient numbers of individuals for each attachment category. The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), a measure of
the four attachment styles consisting of four short paragraphs was used as a screening device. As well, the RQ was administered (in a modified form) as part of the main questionnaire, so that a check on the stability of the category assignment would be possible. Both a forced choice format and a 7-point rating scale were used to assess attachment style. On the screening test, respondents were first asked to choose the one paragraph that best describes the way they typically feel in close relationships with others. In addition, participants were asked to rate, on a scale of one to seven, the extent to which each of the four attachment styles corresponds to their usual style in relationships. Participants who assigned a higher rating to an attachment style other than the one they endorsed on the forced choice question were excluded from the study, as they were considered less adequate representatives of a category than were those whose forced choice responses corresponded with their highest rating on that category.

A total of 592 screening questionnaires were returned, out of which only five individuals had given a higher rating to a category other than the one endorsed on the forced choice question. More women (n = 363) than men (n = 229) completed the screening questionnaires. The distribution of the screening questionnaires across attachment styles approximated expected proportions: secure women 62.3%, secure men 65.9%; fearful women 14.6%, fearful men 10.9%; preoccupied women 14.9%, preoccupied men 11.8%; dismissing women 8.3%, dismissing men 11.4%. 
The Relationship Questionnaire was administered again on the main questionnaire in a modified form as noted above, in order to assess the reliability of the category assignment between the time of screening and completing the main questionnaire. Attachment style was assessed on the main questionnaire by type of relationship; that is, rather than a global judgement across all close relationships, the RQ was completed three times, once for each type of relationship. Respondents were asked to think about their typical style of relating separately for their close same sex friendships, their close cross sex friendships, and their romantic relationships. Both the forced choice format and 7-point rating scale approach were used on the main questionnaire for each relationship type. Participants who, on the forced choice attachment question on the main questionnaire, did not choose the same category they selected on the forced choice screening measure for at least one of the three relationship types, were discarded from the study as poor exemplars of the category. A total of 10 individuals, equally divided among women and men, met this condition and were replaced: two fearful, four preoccupied, and four dismissing.

Relationship screening. The second aspect of the screening process involved gathering information about participants' romantic relationships and friendships. Five questions were asked about the romantic relationship, assessing: 1) duration of the relationship; 2) whether the relationship is viewed by the participant and others as a "couple" relationship; 3) whether they cohabit; 4) whether this is the participant's only current
romantic relationship; and 5) the sex of the romantic partner. Potential participants were screened out if: 1) the duration of their romantic relationship was less than six months, or if it had ended by the time they were contacted for participation (n=7); or 2) they were not viewed by themselves and others as a "couple" (n=1); or 3) this was not their only current romantic relationship (n=5); or 4) the romantic partner was the same sex as the participant (n=7). In order to ensure that participants had at least one close friend of each sex they were asked "Among your closest friends, what number are women and what number are men?". Only participants who identified at least one woman and one man friend among their closest friends were followed up for inclusion in the study.

Of the 592 respondents screened, 56 did not have a cross sex friend among their closest friends, and two did not have a same sex friend among their closest friends. Considering all the relationship screening questions, and examining the pattern of results across attachment styles, it was clear that there was a differential rate of exclusion by attachment style. Among those who were secure, approximately 10% (38/377) were excluded on the basis of the relationship criteria; for those who were fearful the rate was approximately 28% (22/78); for preoccupied individuals the rate was approximately 15% (12/81); and for dismissing participants the rate was approximately 11% (6/56). A Chi-square test was conducted on the proportion of individuals excluded on the basis of relationship screening criteria, by attachment style. The test was significant ($\chi^2 = 12.26$, d.f. =
Pairwise Chi-square post hoc comparisons were undertaken which revealed that the only significant difference in the proportion of those who were excluded was between those who were fearful and those who were secure ($X^2 = 11.58$, d.f. = 1, $p < .009$). The greater rate of exclusion for fearful as compared to secure individuals raises a question regarding the relative representativeness of participants in the different attachment groups.

On the basis of these results a subset of respondents was randomly telephoned within 2 weeks of returning the screening measure, and invited to take part in the questionnaire study. The total number of individuals contacted by telephone was 193, of whom twelve (6.2%) chose not to participate. Students agreeing to participate in the main phase of data collection were then given a set of measures to complete on their own and return within 1 week for bonus course points. Individuals who did not return their questionnaires within 1 week were given a reminder telephone call. The number of participants who did not return the completed questionnaire following the reminder phone call was 11 out of the total 181 who received questionnaires (6.1%). Participants were instructed (verbally and in writing) not to consult with others while filling out the measure, and not to write their names on the questionnaires, which were coded by number to ensure anonymity.

Respondents were asked to report on intimacy and influence strategies in their relationship with their closest same sex friend, their relationship with their closest cross sex friend
(other than their romantic partner), and their romantic relationship. The ordering of relationship type was not counterbalanced in the questionnaires because of the expectation that the romantic relationship would be likely to prime individuals most strongly and thereby influence their ratings in other relationships. For that reason, the romantic relationship was rated after the two friendships. Respondents were asked to exclude from consideration either of their parents as their closest same sex or cross sex friend, in order to assess the role of attachment in reciprocal peer relationships. In 25 instances there were missing data for a particular item on respondents' questionnaires. In these cases a mean was calculated from the remaining items for that individual on that particular scale. The mean was rounded to the nearest whole number, and that number was then entered into the dataset.
Results

Description of Sample

Participants were 80 women and 80 men university students, all of whom were currently in heterosexual romantic relationships and counted among their closest friends at least one person of the same sex and one person of the opposite sex. (See Table 1 for more detailed descriptive information about the sample). The age of participants ranged from 17 to 38 years, with a mean age of 20.46 years and standard deviation of 3.69. A majority of participants were first year (n=38; 23.8%) and second year students (n=69; 42.1%), although 33.1% of the sample were upper level students. Twenty-one participants (13.1%) were currently cohabiting with their romantic partner. In response to the question "Among your closest friends how many are women and how many are men?" women participants nominated a mean of 4.45 women friends and 2.48 men friends; men participants nominated a mean of 2.84 women friends and 5.01 men friends. Women reported a significantly higher number of women among their closest friends than did men \( (t = 4.51, \, df = 1, \, p < .05) \); and men reported a significantly higher number of men among their closest friends than did women \( (t = 6.25, \, df = 1, \, p < .05) \). This result reflects the pattern of homosociality, that is, a predominance of friendships with others of the same sex, a common finding in the literature on close relationships.
### Table 1

**Sample Descriptives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of women friends</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of men friends</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic partner</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same sex friend</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (in months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic partner</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>23.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same sex friend</td>
<td>76.18</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>74.84</td>
<td>50.41</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>56.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sex friend</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>59.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic partner</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>57.92</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>51.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same sex friend</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sex friend</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness (5 = extremely)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic partner</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same sex friend</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sex friend</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants reported on the duration of the three specific relationships under examination (i.e., romantic relationship, closest same sex friend, and closest cross sex friend). The mean duration of participants' romantic relationships was 23.15 months (or approximately 1 year and 11 months) and ranged from 6 months to 15 years. For participants' closest same sex friendships, the mean duration was 75.51 months (or approximately 6 years and 4 months), and for closest cross sex friendships the mean duration was 51.61 months (or approximately 4 years and 4 months). Women and men did not differ in the reported duration of any of the three close relationships (romantic relationship $t = 1.159$, n.s.; closest same sex friendship $t = .151$, n.s.; closest cross sex friendship $t = .39$, n.s.). In order to examine for possible differences in duration of relationships as a function of relationship type, a one-way within-subjects ANOVA was conducted. The effect of relationship type was significant ($F = 57.71$; df = 2, 318; $p = .000$). The significant univariate result was followed up with Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple comparisons at nominal alpha of .05. Participants' closest same sex friendships were of significantly longer duration than both their closest cross sex friendships and their romantic relationships; their same sex friendships were also of longer duration than their cross sex friendships. It is to be expected that, among a sample of young adults such as this, romantic relationships would be of shorter duration than would their closest friendships. Same sex friendships would be expected to be of longer duration than cross sex ones, as they are the predominant relationship for most
people throughout the lifespan (e.g., Dickens & Perlman, 1981), and such differences in relationship duration have been found in previous research (e.g., Parker, 1990). Longer duration of participants' closest same sex as opposed to cross sex friendships reflects the norm of homosociality, and may be considered a naturally occurring and meaningful effect in within-subjects research into relationships.

Frequency of contact (number of times per month the participant sees or speaks to the target person) was: in romantic relationships 51.04 (SD = 51.97); in closest same sex friendships 13.71 (SD = 15.32); and in closest cross sex friendships 11.12 (SD = 16.23). Women and men did not differ in the reported frequency of contact in any of the three relationships (romantic relationship t = .84, n.s.; closest same sex friendship t = .92, n.s.; closest cross sex friendship t = .42, n.s.). Participants' mean ratings of closeness on a 5-point scale were: romantic relationships 4.35 (SD = .67); closest same sex friendships 3.89 (SD = .68); and closest cross sex friendships 3.35 (SD = .80). Women and men did not differ significantly in their reported closeness in their romantic relationship (t = 1.14, n.s.), nor in their closest same sex friendship (t = 1.21, n.s.). In closest cross sex friendships however, men reported greater closeness than did women (t = 4.96, p < .01).

Participants were asked to identify any individuals who were nominated as a closest friend who were also relatives either by blood or marriage. (Note that respondents were asked not to nominate their parents as friends for the purposes of this
study). Twelve participants (7.5% of the sample) nominated relatives as their closest cross sex friends; six participants (3.8%) identified relatives as their closest same sex friends. The most common relative identified was a sibling, with four nominated as closest same sex friends and eight as closest cross sex friends. The remainder of the relatives identified by participants as closest friends were in-laws, cousins, and aunts or uncles.

The distribution of ethnicity in the sample was 49.4% European descent (n=79), 32.5% Asian descent (n=52), 11.9% "Canadian" (n=19), and 6.2% "Other". These groupings were created by the investigator on the basis of respondents' self-reported ethnic background. Table 2 contains additional information regarding the specific ethnic identification of the individuals in the sample. Participants were also asked to rate on a 5-point scale the extent to which their ethnic background influences their close relationships with others (with 1 = not at all, 5 = completely). The mean reported influence of ethnicity on relationships was 2.24 (SD = 1.15) for the sample as a whole. For participants of European descent the mean reported influence of ethnicity on relationships was 1.77 (SD = .94); for participants of Asian descent the mean was 2.77 (SD = 1.13); for those who identified themselves as "Canadian" the mean was 2.11 (SD = 1.20); for those in the "Other" category the mean was 3.33 (SD = .71). On the basis of these data it appeared that individuals who identified themselves as being of European descent or "Canadian" gave lower ratings for the influence of
their ethnicity on their relationships than did individuals in the other two groups.

In order to determine whether the distribution across attachment styles of Europeans and "Canadians" as compared to participants from other ethnic backgrounds was proportionate to what would be expected, a Pearson Chi-square test was conducted. One category was created which included those individuals who identified themselves as being of European descent and those who identified themselves as "Canadian". The remaining respondents were grouped together and labelled as "ethnically-identified". The result of the Chi-square test was nonsignificant at .94799 (df = 3), p > .05, indicating that people who identified themselves as coming from an ethnic background other than European or "Canadian" were not disproportionately distributed across the four attachment styles. In order to determine whether the distribution of ethnically-identified individuals across gender was proportionate to what would be expected, a Pearson Chi-square test was conducted for women versus men. The result of the Chi-square test was nonsignificant at 2.633 (df = 1, p > .05), indicating that ethnically-identified persons were not disproportionately distributed across women and men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Described Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>^aEthnic Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bEuropean descent</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>M = 1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish-European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukranian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish-Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bAsian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>M = 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont’d)

Ethnic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Described Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>aEthnic Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Canadian&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>$M = 2.11$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>$M = 3.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian-Portugese-German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$M = 2.24$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Ethnic Influence was assessed via asking participants to rate on a 5 point scale the extent to which they felt their ethnic background influences their close relationships with others (1 = not at all; 5 = completely).

b These headings were created by the investigator.
Reliability of Attachment Style Category Assignment

Attachment style serves as an independent grouping variable in this study design. Participants were assigned to attachment style groups on the basis of their response to the forced choice question on the Relationship Questionnaire, which was administered as part of the screening procedure. Prior to undertaking statistical analyses testing the study hypotheses, a check was conducted on the stability of participants' attachment style between the Time One screening and the Time Two questionnaire.

Category assignment at Time One screening was found to be reliable at Time Two on the main questionnaire. At Time One participants chose the one attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, or dismissing) that best described them across all their close relationships, and then rated themselves on a 7-point scale for each of the four styles. At Time Two the forced choice and rating of attachment styles was obtained separately for each relationship type (romantic relationships, cross sex friendships, and same sex friendships).

A one-way multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with forced choice attachment style category at Time One as the independent variable (see Table 3). The four dependent variables were the four ratings of attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing) at Time Two. The four dependent variables were created by averaging the Time Two attachment style ratings across the three relationship types, to get an overall attachment style which would serve as an
appropriate comparison with the Time One measure. The MANOVA was significant (Pillais = 1.61; df = 12,465; F = 44.78; p = .000). The MANOVA was followed by four univariate ANOVAs, for Time One attachment style category on each of the four averaged Time Two ratings of attachment style. All four ANOVAs were significant. Follow-up Tukey multiple comparisons indicated that Time One attachment style category predicted Time Two attachment style ratings for each of the four styles. Participants who endorsed secure on the Time One forced choice question had significantly higher ratings at Time Two on the secure attachment style than did participants who endorsed fearful, preoccupied, or dismissing at Time One. Parallel findings were evident for each of the other three attachment style categories.

Category Assignment by Relationship Type

Attachment style category assignment was also assessed by comparing the Time One forced choice category with the Time Two forced choice category for each relationship type. The question under consideration here is, does the Time One attachment category, obtained across close relationships overall, correspond with the Time Two attachment category obtained separately for each type of relationship? Recall that in order to be included in the study, participants must have endorsed at Time Two the same category on at least one of the three types of close relationships as they endorsed globally at Time One. Therefore,
### Table 3

One Way MANOVA and follow-up ANOVAs on Reliability of Category Assignment

#### Cell Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate test of significance: (S = 3, M = 0, N = 75 1/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Hypoth DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>465.00</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Univariate F-tests with (3, 156) DF:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating on Secure</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating on Fearful</td>
<td>61.27</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating on Preoccupied</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>77.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating on Dismissing</td>
<td>65.16</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** IV = Attachment style forced choice category - Time One  
DV = Dimensional ratings on 4 attachment styles - Time Two
Table 4
Crosstabulation: Attachment style category at Time One (over all 3 relationship types) by Time Two (by separate relationship types)

Same Sex Friendship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Two</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>Preocc</th>
<th>Dismiss</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time One</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>34 85.0</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>2 5.0</td>
<td>3 7.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>20 50.0</td>
<td>2 5.0</td>
<td>5 12.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preocc</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>6 15.0</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss</td>
<td>19 47.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>21 52.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>79 49.4</td>
<td>27 16.9</td>
<td>17 10.6</td>
<td>37 23.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Sex Friendship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Two</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>Preocc</th>
<th>Dismiss</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time One</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>33 82.5</td>
<td>2 5.0</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>25 62.5</td>
<td>2 5.0</td>
<td>5 12.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preocc</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>5 12.5</td>
<td>24 60.0</td>
<td>3 7.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss</td>
<td>12 30.0</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>26 65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>61 38.1</td>
<td>33 20.6</td>
<td>28 17.5</td>
<td>38 23.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

Crosstabulation: Attachment style category at Time One 
(over all 3 relationship types) by Time Two 
(by separate relationship types)

Romantic Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time One</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preocc</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for any single relationship type, respondents may or may not have endorsed the same category as they did on the global measure at Time One.

A crosstabulation procedure was undertaken for Time One category by Time Two category for each relationship type. For individuals who were secure at Time One, 85% were secure in their same sex friendships, 82.5% were secure in their cross sex friendships, and 95% were secure in their romantic relationships. For respondents who were fearful at Time One, 50% were fearful in their same sex friendships, 62.5% were fearful in their cross sex friendships, and 85% were fearful in their romantic relationships. For those who identified themselves as preoccupied at Time One, 32.5% were preoccupied in their same sex friendships, 60% were preoccupied in their cross sex friendships, and 85% were preoccupied in their romantic relationships. For participants who were dismissing at Time One, 52.5% were dismissing in their same sex friendships, 65% were dismissing in their cross sex friendships, and 75% were dismissing in their romantic relationships.

While there was a substantial association between the global and relationship-specific measures of attachment style, the two assessments were not identical. There were a number of individuals in each attachment group who, when rating the specific relationship type at Time Two, endorsed a different attachment category than the one they chose on the global assessment. This change in attachment category varied both with
attachment style and type of relationship. In terms of attachment style, the smallest variability occurred among those in the secure group; the largest change occurred among those in the preoccupied group. In terms of relationship type, the smallest variability occurred in ratings for the romantic relationship; the greatest variability occurred in ratings for same sex friendships. When insecure individuals changed categories at Time Two, they were most likely to classify themselves as secure at the second assessment.

**Study Design and Analyses**

The study involved a 2 (sex of respondent: male vs. female) by 4 (attachment style: secure vs. preoccupied vs. dismissing vs. fearful) by 3 (relationship type: same sex friend vs. cross sex friend vs. romantic partner) fixed effects model multiple analysis of variance for repeated measures (MANOVAR) design. (See Figure 1). Between group factors were gender and attachment style. The repeated measures or within-subjects factor was relationship type. Pillais' criterion was used consistently as the test for the multivariate analyses in this study, as it is held to be more robust than Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's trace, and Roy's gcr criterion, particularly for smaller sample sizes and in cases where the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices may be violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989, p. 399). Post hoc multiple comparisons were undertaken with the Newman-Keuls method. Newman-Keuls uses a contrast-based alpha level, as opposed to the family-wise alpha used in the Tukey method,
**Figure 1**

**Study Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship-type (within-group)</th>
<th>Female (n=80)</th>
<th>Male (n=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>csf ssf rom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style (between group)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variables:**

1) **Intimacy:**
   a) MPDQ
   b) MSIS

2) **Influence:**
   a) compromising/integrating
   b) dominating
   c) obliging
   d) avoiding
rendering Newman-Keuls more powerful, (except in the initial pairwise comparison, in which the two tests are identical) but with a greater risk of Type I error. The issue of Type I error may be of greater concern in confirmatory research than in an exploratory study such as this one. As well, the overall F-test already provides omnibus protection from Type I errors. Newman-Keuls is the method of choice cited by Glass and Hopkins (1984, p. 376), as it is held to provide a high degree of protection for the entire null hypothesis without the overconservatism caused by using a single critical value, as in the case of the Tukey test.

A balanced factorial ANOVA design was used in this study (i.e., equal numbers in all cells). Unequal cell frequencies in factorial designs lead to complications in the analysis of such data because "the sums of squares associated with the various effects [are] not orthogonal. This nonorthogonality leads to F-tests for confounded effects" (Glass & Hopkins, 1984, p. 444). Although there are certain adjustments that can be made, Glass and Hopkins (1984) recommend equal numbers in factorial designs.

The dependent variables were intimacy (assessed via the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire or MPDQ and the Miller Social Intimacy Scale or MSIS), and influence strategies (avoiding, dominating, integrating/compromising, and obliging; assessed via the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory or ROCI). An examination of the intercorrelation between the MPDQ and the MSIS revealed that the two intimacy measures were highly correlated but were not identical: for romantic relationships the Pearson correlation between the MPDQ and the MSIS was $r = .5869$;
for closest same sex friendship $r = .6063$; and for closest cross sex friendship $r = .6165$.

On the basis of conceptual distinctness, two separate MANOVAs were undertaken. One MANOVAR was conducted using the two intimacy measures (MPDQ, MSIS) as dependent variables. The other MANOVAR was conducted using the four factors of the ROCI (integrating/compromising, obliging, dominating, avoiding) as dependent measures. Where significance was obtained, the multivariate tests were followed up with univariate ANOVAs or ANOVARS for each dependent measure. Simple effects analyses and multiple comparisons were conducted on significant results where appropriate. The following section is ordered by dependent variable, with the results for intimacy first, then for influence strategies. The results of the analyses are presented with overall MANOVA results first, then the univariate tests, which are followed by multiple comparison results.

Intimacy

**MANOVA results.** A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted on the two measures of intimacy (MPDQ and MSIS). (See Table 5). The MANOVA was a 2-between-subjects factors and 1-within-subjects factor design. The two between-subjects factors were sex and attachment style. The within-subjects factor was relationship type. The result of the 3-way test (sex by attachment style by relationship type) was nonsignificant, Pillais = .11, $F(12,453) = 1.41$, $p = .157$ The two-way interaction of sex by attachment style was significant, Pillais =
The two-way interaction of sex by relationship type was significant, Pillais = .19, F(4, 149) = 8.88, p = .000. The two-way interaction of attachment style by relationship type was not significant, Pillais = .10, F(12, 453) = 1.32, p = .201. The main effect for sex was not significant, Pillais = .02, F(2, 151) = 1.46, p = .236. The main effect for attachment style was significant, Pillais = .17, F(6, 304) = 4.75, p = .000. The main effect for relationship type was significant, Pillais = .72, F(4, 149) = 95.05, p = .000. The multivariate analysis of variance was followed up with appropriate univariate analyses.

**Sex by attachment style interaction.** A 2-between-subjects factors ANOVA (sex by attachment style) was conducted for each of the intimacy measures (MPDQ and MSIS). (See Table 6). The sex by attachment style interaction was significant for the MPDQ, F(3, 152) = 5.67, p = .001, but not for the MSIS, F(3, 152) = 1.83, p > .05. Sex was not significant for either the MPDQ, F(1, 152) = .17, p > .05, or the MSIS, F(1, 152) = 2.55, p > .05. Attachment style was significant for both the MPDQ, F(3, 152) = 4.42, p = .005, and for the MSIS, F(3, 152) = 8.59, p = .000.
Table 5

MANOVA results: Intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>S, M, N</th>
<th>Pillais</th>
<th>Hypoth DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1, 0, 74 1/2</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2, 0, 74 1/2</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>4.751</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1, 1, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>95.051</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>2, 0, 74 1/2</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>1, 1, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8.882</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>3, 0, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>3, 0, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Intimacy was measured via the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire and the Miller Social Intimacy Scale.

A = Sex of respondent (female, male)
B = Attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing)
C = Relationship type (same sex friendship, cross sex friendship, romantic relationship)
S, M, N = Multivariate degrees of freedom; they are the values of the parameters used to find significance levels in tables of the exact distributions of the statistics.

* = significant at p < .05
Simple effects analyses were conducted on MPDQ results for sex at each level of attachment style (i.e., women vs. men within each of the four attachment styles) and also for attachment style at sex (i.e., secure vs. fearful vs. preoccupied vs. dismissing within women and within men). The sex at attachment style analyses were nonsignificant for secure, fearful, and preoccupied participants (see Table 6). For participants with a dismissing attachment style, sex was significant, $F(1,152) = 13.24, p = .000$. These simple effects results revealed that dismissing women reported greater intimacy on the MPDQ than did dismissing men (See Table 7 for cell means). Results are graphically displayed in Figure 2.

The attachment style at sex analyses revealed that attachment style was significant both for women, $F(3,152) = 4.94, p = .003$, and for men, $F(3,152) = 6.12, p = .001$. Multiple comparisons were conducted for attachment style at each level of sex. Results based on Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses (at nominal alpha of .05) indicated that for women, those with a secure attachment style and those with a dismissing attachment style reported greater intimacy levels than did those with a fearful attachment style. Further, women with a dismissing style reported higher levels of intimacy than did preoccupied women. No other pairwise comparisons obtained significance. Newman-Keuls analyses for men showed that men with a secure attachment style and men with a preoccupied attachment style both reported greater intimacy than did men with a dismissing attachment style. No other pairwise comparisons yielded significant differences.
Table 6
Two between-subjects factors (sex, attachment style)
ANOVA results: Intimacy (MPDO, MSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at Secure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at Fearful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at Preoccupied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at Dismissing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment style at women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment style at men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>355.018</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1194.516</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253.764</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Cell Means: Intimacy
Sex by Attachment style

Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure mean (SD)</th>
<th>Fearful mean (SD)</th>
<th>Preoccupied mean (SD)</th>
<th>Dismissing mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.686&lt;sub&gt;a,c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.440&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.484&lt;sub&gt;b,c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.672&lt;sub&gt;a,l&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.350)</td>
<td>(.246)</td>
<td>(.191)</td>
<td>(.283)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4.701&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.520&lt;sub&gt;a,b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.643&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.344&lt;sub&gt;b,2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.303)</td>
<td>(.330)</td>
<td>(.270)</td>
<td>(.276)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.694&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.480&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.564&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.508&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.305)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Attachment style at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Attachment style (columns). Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$. Row-wise differences are identified by alphabetic subscripts; column-wise differences are identified by numeric subscripts.
### Table 7 (cont’d)
**Cell Means: Intimacy**
**Sex by Attachment style**

**Miller Social Intimacy Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure mean (SD)</th>
<th>Fearful mean (SD)</th>
<th>Preoccupied mean (SD)</th>
<th>Dismissing mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>129.017 (15.255)</td>
<td>117.233 (9.069)</td>
<td>123.217 (10.129)</td>
<td>120.333 (10.336)</td>
<td>122.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column total</strong></td>
<td>126.808&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>116.975&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>124.375&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>115.683&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>115.683 (12.746)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The two-way interaction was not significant. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05.
Figure 2

Intimacy as Function of Gender and Attachment

![Graph showing intimacy levels for different attachment styles and genders.](image)
Attachment style main effect. The significant main effect for attachment style was followed up with Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple comparisons (at nominal alpha of .05) on both intimacy measures (MPDQ and MSIS). It is important to note that this significant main effect can only be properly understood in the context of the significant higher order interaction of sex by attachment style reported above. On the MPDQ, participants with a secure attachment style reported significantly greater intimacy than did participants from any of the other three attachment styles. No other pairwise comparisons attained significance. On the MSIS, participants with a secure attachment style and those with a preoccupied attachment style both reported greater intimacy than did participants with a dismissing attachment style and than did those with a fearful attachment style. No other pairwise comparisons yielded significant results.

Sex by relationship interaction. A 2-factor ANOVA with one between-subjects factor (sex) and one within-subjects factor (relationship type) was conducted for each of the intimacy measures (see Table 8). Sex by relationship type was significant for both the MPDQ, $F(2,316) = 13.10, p = .000$, and the MSIS $F(2,316) = 16.93, p = .000$.

Simple effects analyses were conducted for sex at each level of relationship type (i.e., women vs. men within each of the three relationship types), and also for relationship type at sex
(i.e., romantic relationship vs. closest same sex friendship vs. closest cross sex friendship within women and within men) for both the MPDQ and the MSIS. (See Table 9 for cell means). On the MPDQ, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for each relationship type: romantic relationship, \( F(1,316) = 2.13, p > .05 \); closest same sex friendship, \( F(1,316) = 3.16, p > .05 \); closest cross sex friendship, \( F(1, 316) = .10, p > .05 \). That is, women and men when compared within each separate relationship type did not differ significantly in intimacy as measured by the MPDQ. On the MSIS, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for romantic relationship, \( F(1,316) = .31, p > .05 \), and for closest cross sex friendship, \( F(1,316) = .17, p > .05 \). Significant results were obtained for sex at relationship type on closest same sex friendship, \( F(1,316) = 6.56, p = .011 \). On the MSIS, women reported significantly greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendships than did men in their closest same sex friendships (see Figure 3).
Figure 3

Intimacy as Function of Gender and Relationship Type

MPDQ

![Bar chart showing intimacy levels for different gender and relationship types.](image1)

Intimacy as Function of Gender and Relationship Type

MSIS

![Bar chart showing intimacy levels for different gender and relationship types.](image2)
The relationship type at sex analyses were significant both for women and for men on the MPDQ: for women, $F(2,316) = 12.63$, $p = .000$; for men, $F(2,316) = 13.10$, $p = .000$. Similarly, on the MSIS, the relationship at sex analyses were significant both for women and for men: for women, $F(2,316) = 65.82$, $p = .000$; for men, $F(2, 316) = 94.84$, $p = .000$. Multiple comparisons were conducted for relationship type at each level of sex for both the MPDQ and the MSIS (see Figure 3). On the MPDQ, Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses (at nominal alpha of .05) indicated that women's reported intimacy was significantly greater in their closest same sex friendship than in both their romantic relationship and their closest cross sex friendship. No other pairwise comparisons were significant. For men, reported intimacy on the MPDQ was significantly greater in their romantic relationship than in both their closest same sex friendship and their closest cross sex friendship. No other pairwise comparisons attained significance. On the MSIS, Newman-Keuls analyses (at nominal alpha of .05) indicated that women reported greater intimacy in their romantic relationship than in both their closest same sex friendship and their closest cross sex friendship. Further, women reported significantly greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship. For men, significantly greater intimacy was reported in their romantic relationship than in both their closest cross sex friendship and their closest same sex friendship. No other pairwise comparisons reached significance.
Table 8

One between-subjects factor, one within-subjects factor
(sex, relationship type) ANOVA results: Intimacy (MPDQ, MSIS)

**Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at romantic relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at same sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at cross sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miller Social Intimacy Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1065.05</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at romantic relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.91</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at same sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2066.12</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at cross sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>483.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33120.69</td>
<td>143.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3791.92</td>
<td>65.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21853.71</td>
<td>94.84</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3902.15</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>230.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

**Cell Means: Intimacy**  
**Sex by Relationship Type**

**Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.506&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (.418)</td>
<td>4.721&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (.391)</td>
<td>4.485&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (.406)</td>
<td>4.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4.639&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (.399)</td>
<td>4.492&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (.392)</td>
<td>4.525&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (.436)</td>
<td>4.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column total</strong></td>
<td>4.572&lt;sub&gt;a,b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.607&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.505&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Relationship type at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Relationship type (columns). There were no significant differences for Sex at Relationship type. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05.
Miller Social Intimacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>135.437&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>123.900&lt;sub&gt;b,1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>108.013&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>122.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.817)</td>
<td>(17.394)</td>
<td>(17.822)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>138.550&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>109.525&lt;sub&gt;b,2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>110.338&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>119.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.426)</td>
<td>(17.985)</td>
<td>(19.753)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>136.994&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>116.713&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>109.175&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>120.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Relationship type at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Relationship type (columns). Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05. Row-wise differences are identified with alphabetic subscripts; column-wise differences are identified with numeric subscripts.
Relationship type main effect. This significant main effect can only be fully understood in the context of the significant higher order interaction of sex by relationship type, reported above. The significant main effect for relationship type was followed up with Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple comparisons (at nominal alpha of .05) on both intimacy measures (MPDQ and MSIS). On the MPDQ, participants reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship. No other pairwise comparisons yielded significant differences. On the MSIS, participants reported greater intimacy in their romantic relationship than in both their closest same sex friendship and their closest cross sex friendship. Further, reported intimacy was greater in participants' closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship.

Influence

MANOVA results. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted on the four influence strategies of the ROCI (integrating/compromising; avoiding; dominating; and obliging). (See Table 10). The MANOVA was again set up as a 2-between-subjects factors and 1-within-subjects factor design. Of the possible two- and three-way interaction effects, only the two-way interaction of sex by relationship type was significant, Pillais = .25, F(8,145) = 6.18, p = .000. All three possible main effects were significant: for sex, Pillais = .08, F(4,149) = 3.38, p = .011; for attachment style, Pillais = .48, F(12,453) = 7.17, p = .000; and for relationship type, Pillais = .29,
Table 10

MANOVA results: Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>S, M, N</th>
<th>Pillais</th>
<th>Hypoth DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1, 1, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3, 0, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>7.172</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1, 3, 71 1/2</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7.520</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>3, 0, 73 1/2</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>1, 3, 71 1/2</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6.178</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>3, 2, 71 1/2</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>3, 2, 71 1/2</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Influence was measured via the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI). The four dependent variables are the four influence strategies measured on the ROCI: integrating, compromising; avoiding; dominating; and obliging.

A = Sex of respondent (female, male)
B = Attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing)
C = Relationship type (same sex friendship, cross sex friendship, romantic relationship)

* = significant at p < .05
F(8,145) = 7.52, p = .000. The multivariate analysis of variance was followed up with appropriate univariate analyses.

Attachment style main effect: The significant main effect for attachment style was followed up with four one-way between-subjects ANOVAs for attachment style on each of the influence strategies (see Table 11). Significant results were obtained for all four ANOVAs: integrating/compromising, F(3,156) = 5.11, p = .002; avoiding, F(3,156) = 9.83, p = .000; dominating, F(3,156) = 7.67, p = .000; and obliging, F(3,156) = 14.17, p = .000. These significant univariate results were followed up with Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple comparisons (at nominal alpha of .05) on each of the four influence strategies. (See Table 12 for cell means.)

Newman-Keuls pairwise results revealed that on the integrating/compromising strategy, secure respondents had significantly higher scores than did individuals in the other three attachment styles (i.e., compared with dismissing, fearful, or preoccupied individuals). Results are graphically displayed in Figure 4. No other pairwise comparisons were significant. On the avoiding strategy, fearful individuals had significantly higher scores than did individuals in the other three attachment styles (secure, dismissing, or preoccupied). No other pairwise comparisons on the avoiding strategy attained significance (see Figure 4). On the dominating strategy, dismissing individuals scored significantly higher than did individuals in the other three groups (fearful, secure, or preoccupied). Further,
Table 11

One between-subjects factor (attachment style)
ANOVA results: Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliging</td>
<td>Attachment style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Cell Means: Influence
Attachment Style Main Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secure mean (SD)</th>
<th>Fearful mean (SD)</th>
<th>Preoccupied mean (SD)</th>
<th>Dismissing mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>3.840&lt;sub&gt;a,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.475)</td>
<td>3.468&lt;sub&gt;b,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.553)</td>
<td>3.580&lt;sub&gt;b,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.463)</td>
<td>3.464&lt;sub&gt;b,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.479)</td>
<td>3.588 (.512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>2.599&lt;sub&gt;a,3&lt;/sub&gt; (.718)</td>
<td>3.426&lt;sub&gt;b,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.766)</td>
<td>2.879&lt;sub&gt;a,2,3&lt;/sub&gt; (.737)</td>
<td>2.744&lt;sub&gt;a,2,3&lt;/sub&gt; (.694)</td>
<td>2.912 (.787)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominate</td>
<td>2.727&lt;sub&gt;a,b,2,3&lt;/sub&gt; (.864)</td>
<td>2.513&lt;sub&gt;a,2&lt;/sub&gt; (.585)</td>
<td>2.937&lt;sub&gt;b,2&lt;/sub&gt; (.706)</td>
<td>3.290&lt;sub&gt;c,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.836)</td>
<td>2.867 (.802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblige</td>
<td>3.107&lt;sub&gt;a,2&lt;/sub&gt; (.455)</td>
<td>3.503&lt;sub&gt;b,c,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.586)</td>
<td>3.464&lt;sub&gt;b,c,1&lt;/sub&gt; (.431)</td>
<td>2.878&lt;sub&gt;c,2&lt;/sub&gt; (.524)</td>
<td>3.238 (.561)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Newman Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted within influence strategy across attachment styles (rows) and within attachment style across influence strategies. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05. Row-wise differences are identified by alphabetic subscripts; column-wise differences are identified by numeric subscripts.
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Dominating Influence as a Function of Attachment

Obliging Influence as a Function of Attachment
preoccupied individuals report significantly greater use of the dominating strategy than did fearful individuals. No other pairwise comparisons yielded significant results (see Figure 5). Fearful and preoccupied individuals reported significantly greater use of the obliging strategy than did either secure or dismissing individuals. Further, secure individuals reported significantly greater use of the obliging strategy than did dismissing individuals. Preoccupied and secure individuals did not differ significantly in reported use of the obliging strategy (see Figure 5).

It is important to note that, when looking within attachment styles across the four different influence strategies (i.e., column-wise differences on Table 12), scores on the integrating/compromising strategy were among the highest for individuals in all attachment groups. Those who were securely attached were characterized by their uniquely high score on integration/compromise, moderately high reported use of the obliging strategy, and were least likely to use avoidance (see Figure 6). Fearful individuals were characterized by their uniquely low score on domination (see Figure 6). Preoccupied respondents’ reported using integrating/compromising and obliging strategies most, followed by domination, which was significantly higher than their reported use of avoidance (see Figure 7). The pattern for those who were dismissing indicated high scores on integrating/compromising and dominating strategies, and significantly lower scores on obliging and avoiding (see Figure 7).
Figure 6

Influence Profile: Secure

Influence Profile: Fearful
Influence Profile: Preoccupied

Influence Profile: Dismissing
Sex by relationship type interaction. The significant multivariate analysis of variance result was followed up with appropriate univariate analyses. A 2-factor ANOVA with one between-subjects factor (sex) and one within-subjects factor (relationship type) was conducted for each of the influence strategies. (See Table 13). The sex by relationship type interaction was nonsignificant for the integrating/compromising strategy, $F(2,316) = 2.83, p > .05$. The sex by relationship type interaction was significant for the remaining three influence strategies: avoiding, $F(2,316) = 3.31, p = .038$; dominating, $F(2,316) = 14.82, p = .000$; and obliging, $F(2,316) = 12.61, p = .000$. Sex was nonsignificant for integrating/compromising, $F(1,158) = .59, p > .05$, and for dominating, $F(1,158) = .50, p > .05$. Sex was significant for avoiding, $F(1,158) = 8.09, p = .005$, and for obliging, $F(1,158) = 5.45, p = .016$. Relationship type was nonsignificant for integrating/compromising, $F(2,316) = 2.84, p > .05$, and for dominating, $F(2,316) = 1.32, p > .05$. Relationship type was significant for avoiding, $F(2,316) = 9.26, p = .000$, and for obliging, $F(2,316) = 17.80, p = .000$.

Simple effects analyses were conducted for sex at each level of relationship type (i.e., women vs. men within each of the three relationship types), and also for each relationship type at sex (i.e., romantic relationship vs. closest same sex friendship vs. closest cross sex friendship within women and within men) for avoiding, dominating, and obliging influence strategies.

On the avoiding strategy, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for each relationship type: romantic
relationship, \( F(1,158) = 3.03, \ p > .05 \); closest same sex friendship, \( F(1,158) = .34, \ p > .05 \); and closest cross sex friendship, \( F(1,158) = 1.72, \ p > .05 \). That is, women and men did not differ significantly from each other in their reported use of avoiding strategies when compared within each separate relationship type. The relationship at sex analyses for the avoiding strategy revealed significant results for women, \( F(2,316) = 10.86, \ p = .000 \), but not for men, \( F(2,316) = 1.68, \ p > .05 \). Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons (at nominal alpha of .05) were conducted for relationship at women on the avoiding strategy. Women reported greater use of avoiding strategies in their closest same sex friendship and in their closest cross sex friendship than in their romantic relationship. No other pairwise comparisons obtained significance (see Table 14). Results are graphically displayed in Figure 8.

On the dominating strategy, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for each relationship type: romantic relationship, \( F(1,158) = 3.26, \ p > .05 \); closest same sex friendship, \( F(1,158) = .88, \ p > .05 \); closest cross sex friendship, \( F(1,158) = .36, \ p > .05 \). That is, women and men did not differ significantly from each other in their reported use of the dominating strategy when compared within each separate relationship type. The relationship type at sex analyses for the dominating strategy revealed significant results both for women, \( F(2,316) = 4.74, \ p = .009 \), and for men, \( F(2,316) = 11.51, \ p = .000 \). Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for
Avoidant Influence by Relationship Type

Figure 8
### Table 13
One between-subjects factor, one within-subjects factor
(sex, relationship type) ANOVA results: Influence

#### Integrating/compromising strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Avoiding strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at romantic relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at same sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at cross sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

One between-subjects factor, one within-subjects factor
(sex, relationship type) ANOVA results: Influence

**Dominating strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at romantic relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at same sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at cross sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obliging strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at romantic relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at same sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at cross sex friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within sex</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type at men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex by relationship type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type by subjects within sex</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Cell Means: Influence*

*Sex by Relationship Type*

**Integrating/Compromising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.597 (.567)</td>
<td>3.715 (.557)</td>
<td>3.547 (.610)</td>
<td>3.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.607 (.641)</td>
<td>3.542 (.594)</td>
<td>3.522 (.587)</td>
<td>3.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>4.572</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>4.505</td>
<td>4.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The two-way interaction was not significant for integrating/compromising.
Table 14 (continued)
Cell Means: Influence
Sex by Relationship Type

Avoiding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.502&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.921&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.794&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.739&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.936)</td>
<td>(.877)</td>
<td>(.849)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>3.085&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.958)</td>
<td>(.901)</td>
<td>(.906)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>2.751&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.004&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.985&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Relationship type at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Relationship type (columns). Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05. Row-wise differences are identified with alphabetic subscripts; column-wise differences are identified with numeric subscripts.
### Table 14 (continued)

**Cell Means: Influence Sex by Relationship Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.045\textsubscript{a} (.911)</td>
<td>2.783\textsubscript{b} (.895)</td>
<td>2.908\textsubscript{a,b} (.925)</td>
<td>2.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.675\textsubscript{a} (1.036)</td>
<td>3.055\textsubscript{b} (.856)</td>
<td>2.735\textsubscript{a} (.866)</td>
<td>2.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column total</strong></td>
<td>2.860</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>2.822</td>
<td>2.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Relationship type at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Relationship type (columns). There were no significant differences for Sex at Relationship type. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$. 

Table 14 (continued)
Cell Means: Influence
Sex by Relationship Type

Obliging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Romantic mean (SD)</th>
<th>Same sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Cross Sex mean (SD)</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.171&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.129</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>3.131&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.750)</td>
<td>(.630)</td>
<td>(.602)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.638&lt;sub&gt;a,2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.085&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.310&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.344&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.733)</td>
<td>(.608)</td>
<td>(.656)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column total</strong></td>
<td>3.404&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.107&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.202&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were conducted for Relationship type at Sex (rows) and for Sex at Relationship type (columns). Means with different subscripts differ significantly at p < .05. Row-wise differences are identified by alphabetic subscripts; column-wise differences are identified by numeric subscripts.
relationship type at women and for relationship type at men on the dominating strategy. Women reported greater use of the dominating strategy in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex friendship. No other pairwise comparisons yielded significant results. Men reported significantly greater use of the dominating strategy in their closest same sex friendship than they did in their closest cross sex friendship and than in their romantic relationship. No other pairwise comparisons obtained significance (see Table 14). Results are graphically displayed in Figure 9.

On obliging, the sex at relationship type analysis was significant for romantic relationship, $F(1,158) = 4.92, p = .028$, but was not significant for closest same sex friendship, $F(1,158) = .04, p > .05$, nor for closest cross sex friendship, $F(1,158) = 1.05, p > .05$. The simple effects analyses for sex at romantic relationship revealed that men reported significantly greater use of the obliging strategy than did women, in their romantic relationships. Women and men did not differ significantly in their reported use of the obliging strategy when compared within their closest same sex friendship and within their closest cross sex friendship. The relationship type at sex analyses of the
Figure 9

Dominating Influence by Relationship Type

![Bar chart showing dominating influence by relationship type. The x-axis represents different relationship types: Romantic, Same Sex, Cross Sex. The y-axis represents influence scores ranging from 2.3 to 3.1. The chart compares influence between men and women.](image-url)
Obliging Influence by Relationship Type

Figure 10
obliging strategy revealed significant results for men, \( F(2,316) = 29.46, p = .000 \), but not for women, \( F(2,316) = .57, p > .05 \). Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons (with nominal alpha of .05) were conducted for relationship type at men on the obliging strategy (see Table 14). Men reported significantly greater use of the obliging strategy in their romantic relationship than in both their closest same sex friendship and their closest cross sex friendship. Further, men reported more use of the obliging strategy in their closest cross sex friendship than in their closest same sex friendship. Results are graphically displayed in Figure 10.

**Sex main effect.** The main effect for sex attained significance for two of the four influence strategies. (See Table 14). Note that these results can only be appropriately understood within the context of the significant higher order interaction of sex by relationship type. Sex was significant for avoiding, \( F(1.158) = 8.09, p = .005 \), and for obliging, \( F(1,158) = 5.95, p = .016 \), but was not significant for integrating/compromising, \( F(1,158) = .59, p > .05 \), nor for dominating, \( F(1,158) = .50, p > .05 \). Men, overall, reported greater use of both the avoiding and the obliging strategy than did women, overall.

**Relationship type main effect.** The main effect for relationship type attained significance for two of the four influence strategies. These results must be understood in the context of the significant higher order interaction of sex by relationship type. Relationship type was significant for
avoiding, $F(2,316) = 9.26, p = .000$, and for obliging, $F(2,316) = 17.80, p = .000$, but was not significant for integrating/compromising, $F(2,316) = .59, p > .05$, nor for dominating, $F(2,316) = 1.32, p > .05$. The significant main effect for relationship type on the avoiding and obliging strategies was followed up with Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons. Participants reported greater use of the avoiding strategy in their closest same sex friendship and in their closest cross sex friendship than in their romantic relationship. Participants reported greater use of the obliging strategy in their romantic relationship than in their closest cross sex friendship and than in their closest same sex friendship.

Summary of Results

Two separate MANOVAs were conducted, one for the two intimacy measures (NPDQ, MSIS) and one for the four influence strategies (integrating/compromising, avoiding, dominating, obliging). Both MANOVAs were 2-between-subjects (sex, attachment style) and 1-within-subjects (relationship type) analyses. The 3-way interaction was nonsignificant for both intimacy and influence. The 2-way interaction of attachment style by relationship type was also nonsignificant for both intimacy and influence. The sex by attachment style interaction was significant for intimacy but not for influence. The sex by relationship type interaction was significant for both intimacy and influence. The main effect for sex was nonsignificant for both intimacy and influence. The main effect for attachment
style was significant for both intimacy and influence, but was qualified for intimacy (by the higher order interaction of sex by attachment style). The main effect for relationship type was significant for both intimacy and influence, qualified for both by the higher order interaction of sex by relationship type.

Univariate ANOVAs were conducted on significant multivariate results. For intimacy two 2-between-subjects ANOVA's (sex, attachment style) and two 1-between, 1-within subjects ANOVAs (sex, relationship type) were conducted, one each for the MPDQ and for the MSIS. For influence, four 1-between-subjects ANOVAs (attachment style) and four 1-between, 1-within subjects ANOVAs (sex, relationship type) were undertaken (one for each of the influence strategies). Simple effects analyses and Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons were carried out on significant ANOVA results where appropriate.

Intimacy. The 3-way interaction was not significant. On the 2-between-subjects ANOVA (sex, attachment style), significant results were obtained on the MPDQ but not on the MSIS. Simple effects analyses were carried out for sex at attachment style, and for attachment style at sex on the MPDQ. The sex at attachment style analyses were significant only for dismissing participants, and revealed that dismissing women reported higher levels of intimacy than did dismissing men. The prediction that preoccupied and fearful women would report higher levels of intimacy than would preoccupied and fearful men was not significant. The attachment style at sex analyses were significant for both women and men. Secure and dismissing women
had higher reported intimacy than did fearful women, and dismissing women reported higher intimacy than did preoccupied women. Secure and preoccupied men reported greater intimacy than did dismissing men.

The main effect for sex was not significant. The main effect for attachment style was significant and was followed up with multiple comparisons. As predicted, on the MPDQ, secure participants reported higher levels of intimacy than did participants in any of the other three attachment groups; on the MSIS, both secure and preoccupied individuals had higher intimacy scores than did those who were fearful.

The 1-between-subjects, 1-within-subjects ANOVA (sex, relationship type) yielded significant results for both the MPDQ and the MSIS. On the MPDQ, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for all relationship types; on the MSIS, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for romantic relationship and for closest cross sex friendship, but the analysis was significant for closest same sex friendship. As predicted, women reported significantly higher intimacy than did men in their closest same sex friendships. The relationship type at sex analyses were significant for both women and men on both the MPDQ and the MSIS. On the MPDQ women reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in either their romantic relationship or their closest cross sex friendship, consistent with the prediction; on the MSIS however, women's reported intimacy was higher in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex or cross sex
friendships. On both the MPDQ and the MSIS men reported greater intimacy in their romantic relationship than in either their closest same sex or cross sex friendships. The prediction that men would report lower intimacy in their same sex friendship than in their cross sex friendship was not supported.

The significant main effect for relationship type (qualified by the significant higher order interaction reported above) was followed with multiple comparisons on both the MPDQ and the MSIS. On the MPDQ, participants reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship. On the MSIS, respondents reported higher intimacy in their romantic relationship than in either their closest same sex or cross sex friendships; also, intimacy was higher in their closest same sex friendship than in their closest cross sex friendship.

Influence. The 2-between subjects interaction (sex, attachment style) was nonsignificant. On the four 1-between subjects ANOVA's (attachment style) significant results were obtained for all four influence strategies. As predicted, multiple comparisons revealed that secure participants had higher scores on integrating/compromising than did participants in any of the other three attachment style groups. As predicted, fearful individuals reported higher levels of avoidance than did individuals in the other three groups. Also as predicted, dismissing participants had significantly higher scores on dominating than did participants in any of the other three groups; further, preoccupied individuals reported significantly
greater use of domination than did fearful participants. Fearful and preoccupied individuals reported significantly greater use of the obliging strategy than did secure or dismissing individuals; further, secure participants reported greater use of obliging than did dismissing participants.

On the four 1-between, 1-within subjects ANOVA's (sex, relationship type), significant results were obtained for the avoiding, dominating and obliging strategies, but not for the integrating/compromising strategy. On avoidance, simple effects analyses for sex at relationship type were nonsignificant for each relationship type. Hence, the prediction that men would use greater avoidance in their same sex friendships than would women was not confirmed. Relationship at sex analyses revealed significant results for women but not for men. Women reported greater use of avoidance in their closest same sex and cross sex friendships than in their romantic relationships. On dominating, the sex at relationship type analyses were nonsignificant for each relationship type. Hence, the prediction that men would report greater use of dominating strategies than would women in their romantic relationship and in their cross sex friendship was not confirmed. The relationship type at sex analyses were significant for both women and men. Women reported greater use of the dominating strategy in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex friendship. Men reported greater use of domination in their closest same sex friendship than in either their romantic relationship or in their closest cross sex friendship. On obliging, the sex at relationship type analyses
were significant for romantic relationship, but not for closest same sex or cross sex friendships. Hence the prediction that women would report greater use of the obliging strategy in their cross sex friendships than would men was not confirmed. Men reported greater use of the obliging strategy in romantic relationships than did women, contrary to what was predicted. The relationship type at sex analyses were significant for men but not for women. Men reported greater use of the obliging strategy in their romantic relationship than in either their closest same sex or closest cross sex friendships; further, men reported greater use of obliging in their closest cross sex friendship than in their closest same sex friendship.

The main effect for sex (qualified by the significant higher order interaction reported above) was significant for avoiding and obliging, but not for integrating/compromising nor for dominating. As predicted men, overall, reported greater use of the avoiding strategies than did women, overall. Further, men reported greater use of obliging strategies than did women overall.

The main effect for relationship type (qualified by the significant interaction reported above) was significant for avoiding and obliging, but not for integrating/compromising nor for dominating. Participants reported greater avoidance in the closest same sex and cross sex friendships than in their romantic relationship; and participants reported greater use of the obliging strategy in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex or cross sex friendships.
Discussion

The goal of this research was to address the broad question of how relational processes of intimacy and influence vary as a function of gender, attachment style, and type of relationship. The study was aimed at identifying the independent and intersecting roles of those variables in participants' specific ongoing peer relationships. The results of this research indicate that gender, attachment style, and relationship type each are associated with participants' reported experience of intimacy and their reported use of various influence strategies. In some instances the variables are associated at the level of a main effect, and in other cases, they interact to produce a more complex picture of women's and men's close relationships.

The ensuing discussion begins by reviewing significant findings, relating them to theory and previous data, and exploring possible interpretations and implications. A review of nonsignificant results follows, with possible explanations as to why significance was not obtained on specific hypotheses. This leads into a more general discussion of the adequacy of the study as a test of the hypotheses. Next, an explication of the broader implications of this research for the fields of attachment and gender in close relationships is followed by a discussion of possible clinical implications of the findings. Finally some suggestions for future research are presented, for improving the test of the hypotheses under examination, and for extending one of the more intriguing results uncovered in this study.
Discussion of Significant Findings

Attachment style, gender and intimacy. Attachment style was significantly associated with reported intimacy levels. As a main effect, secure respondents reported greater intimacy in their close relationships than did those who were insecure, as has been hypothesized (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and shown in previous research (e.g., Kobak & Hazan, 1991; Simpson, 1990). Intimacy is a complex process involving multiple components: motivational (approach/avoidance), behavioral (expressivity, responsiveness), cognitive (appraisal of meaning), and affective (feeling understood, cared for). Theoretically, secure individuals are motivated to approach intimacy as they expect that others will, in general, be responsive and supportive. They have been found to self-disclose appropriately and to respond sensitively to the disclosures of others (Mikulincer & Nachson, 1991). They are inclined to expect that others will be warm and reliable, and to have positive feelings about closeness with others. All these factors likely contribute to the finding that secure individuals report greater levels of intimacy in their close relationships than do individuals who are insecure.

Attachment style interacted with gender in some cases to produce different patterns for women and men. At the two-way level, secure and dismissing women reported greater intimacy than did fearful women, and dismissing women reported greater intimacy than preoccupied women. Secure and preoccupied men reported greater intimacy than men who were dismissing. It is interesting
to speculate on why, for women, being dismissing is associated with higher reported intimacy than being preoccupied, whereas for men the reverse is true (i.e., preoccupied men report higher intimacy than dismissing men). This may be related to the response of the other person to the disclosures and other intimacy behaviors of the preoccupied respondent. Individuals who are preoccupied approach intimacy but are at the same time anxious about abandonment, hence they are expressive and disclosing, but may also be less sensitive to the appropriateness of their disclosure, and to the responses of others. Preoccupied men's expressivity, regardless of its sensitivity to the recipient, may be regarded as rare and therefore more valuable. As well, particularly when the recipient of this disclosure is a woman, preoccupied men's intimacy behavior may be responded to in ways that further enhance feelings of closeness (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990). On the other hand, preoccupied women's anxiety-driven intimacy efforts may be perceived by (particularly male) relationship partners as intrusive, and possibly as a threat to their freedom (e.g., Feeney et al., 1994). Such a perception might then lead the relationship partner to withdraw, which would lead to lower levels of reported intimacy for preoccupied women.

Although hypothesized to do so, women and men did not differ in reported intimacy at the level of a main effect for gender. This result is probably due to the fact that participants were reporting on only their very closest relationships which, as Wright (1982, 1988) has noted, tends to reduce the likelihood that gender differences in the relationships will be apparent.
Nor did men and women differ in reported intimacy when the two-way interaction (gender, relationship type) was examined in three of the four attachment styles, but among respondents who were dismissing, women reported greater intimacy than did men.

Dismissing individuals are not emotionally expressive, not particularly motivated to get close to others, and do not consciously feel they need others to validate their self worth. Other research has indicated that femininity (or affective expressiveness) is predictive of intimacy for both women and men, with greater femininity associated with greater intimacy (Williams, 1985). Men however are less likely than women to have been encouraged to develop expressivity, and may in fact have been sanctioned against developing such feminine traits (Basow, 1992). The dismissing pattern is more common among men than women (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), and its characteristic suppression of emotionality is consistent with the masculine gender role, which again is expected more for men than for women.

The results from this study suggest that when the respondent’s gender and attachment style correspond in terms of socialized gender expectations, it may produce heightened gender effects, in this case with men reporting lower intimacy than women, when comparing within the dismissing attachment style. These findings extend our understanding of both gender effects and attachment on intimacy.

**Attachment style and influence strategies.** This research provides new and substantial support for hypothesized profiles of influence strategies for each attachment style. Secure
participants were more likely to use an integrating/compromising strategy of influence than those who were insecure; fearful participants were more likely than all others to report using avoidance; and dismissing individuals were more likely than all others to use domination to get their way. Those who were preoccupied were moderately high on both domination and obliging strategies; they had significantly lower scores on dominating than dismissing participants, but significantly higher scores than those who were secure or fearful; their scores on obliging strategies did not differ from those of the fearful group, both of which were significantly higher than those of secure or dismissing participants. The pattern of associations found in this research between the reported use of various interpersonal influence strategies and different attachment styles is consistent with theory, and provides additional new support for Bartholomew's (1990) model.

Secure individuals' greater use of mutually focused strategies such as integration and compromise reflect a positive view of both self and other which is consistent with the internal model hypothesized for secure individuals. Use of the integrating/compromising strategies has been found to be associated with greater relationship satisfaction (Pistole, 1989), and likely contributes to secure individuals' experience of greater intimacy.

The greater use of avoidance strategies by fearful persons is congruent with their hypothesized interpersonal distrust and hypersensitivity to rejection, leading them to avoid situations
which may lead to such rejection. As Bartholomew has noted, this avoidance leads to the unfortunate consequence of undermining "the possibility of establishing satisfying personal relations which could serve to modify early attachment representations" (1990, p. 164).

Dismissing individuals hold a positive model of self and a negative model of others. Their defensive self-assurance and devaluing of the importance of close relationships may lead to their greater use of interpersonal dominance as a way of influencing others, and may also contribute to perceptions of them by others as hostile or arrogant (e.g., Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Such perceptions would limit others' inclination to approach dismissing individuals, thereby allowing them to passively maintain their interaction goal of interpersonal distance.

Preoccupied individuals' pattern of reported influence use, that is being both moderately dominant and obliging, may reflect their ambivalence about closeness with others. Motivated by a strong need for others' approval and high levels of emotional arousal, preoccupied individuals may engage in obliging behaviors in a martyr-like way. Compulsive caregiving, which involves placing the needs of the other first, having feelings of self sacrifice, and providing care whether or not it is requested (West & Sheldon-Keller, 1994) has been found to characterize preoccupied individuals (Shaver & Hazan, 1992). At the same time such a style inhibits the likelihood of reciprocity, which may lead those who are preoccupied to feel angry with their
relationship partner. Their anger at the lack of reciprocity and their tendency to focus on their emotional distress may prompt them to try to obtain their interaction goal without taking the needs of the other into account (i.e., dominance behaviors). This might then lead to fears of rejection and disapproval, motivating the preoccupied person into again trying to oblige the other.

When looking within attachment style across the four different influence strategies the integrating/compromising strategy was highly endorsed among individuals from all attachment groups. Those who were securely attached were characterized by their uniquely high score on integration/compromise, moderately high reported use of the obliging strategy, and were least likely to use avoidance. Fearful individuals were characterized by their uniquely low score on domination. Preoccupied respondents' reported using integrating/compromising and obliging strategies most, followed by domination, which was significantly higher than their reported use of avoidance. The pattern for those who were dismissing indicated high scores on integrating/compromising and dominating strategies, and significantly lower scores on obliging and avoiding.

The ways in which those who are insecurely attached attempt to get their way may lead to a cycle of escalating difficulties for each of the three insecure styles. As Kobak and Hazan note: "when working models forecast a lack of psychological availability from a partner, anger that normally serves to
protest a partner’s inaccessibility may become exaggerated in the form of attacking behaviors, or may become inhibited through withdrawal...[increasing] the likelihood of defensive responses" which then perpetuate the negative expectations for self and other (1991, p. 862). Such cycles would be expected to diminish opportunities for intimacy and reduce relationship satisfaction.

Relational context and intimacy. A central finding in this study is the importance of individuals' relational context to their experience of intimacy and use of influence strategies. Comparing at the main effect level women and men did not differ in reported intimacy levels, but when examining the interacting effect of relationship type, a gender difference emerged on same sex friendships. Women reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than did men in their closest same sex friendship. This finding is consistent with other research on gender effects in same sex friendships (e.g., Parker & de Vries, 1993) which suggest that men's relationships with other men may be characterized by shared activity and a relatively greater avoidance of emotionality, in contrast to women's more affectively-focused relationships with other women.

Comparing within genders, men reported greater intimacy in their romantic relationship than in either their closest cross sex or same sex friendship on both intimacy measures. Women's reported intimacy across relationship type however was more variable; on one measure, (MPDQ), women reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their romantic relationship, whereas on the other measure, (MSIS), they reported
greater intimacy in their romantic relationship than in either of their closest friendships. The more consistent finding for men than for women that the romantic relationship is the most intimate raises interesting questions about what women and men give and receive in close relationships. Women have been found to offer more than men to relationships, evidenced both in ratings of what women report giving (in comparison to men respondents), and in terms of what both genders report receiving from women versus men (Parker & de Vries, 1993). These findings provide some support for Tschann’s (1988) contention that heterosexual romantic relationships may meet men’s intimacy needs more completely than women’s, and that therefore "women must maintain their friendships in order to assure that their intimacy needs are met" (p. 79).

**Relational context and influence strategies.** There was a significant main effect for gender on influence, with men reporting greater use of avoidance, as has been demonstrated in previous research (e.g., Wright, 1982) and greater use of the obliging strategy overall than did women. The main effect for gender needs to be considered in the context of the higher order interaction with type of relationship. It is worthwhile to draw attention to the fact that there was no main effect for gender, nor a significant interaction between relationship type and gender on the integrating/compromising strategy. In fact, not only do women and men not differ in reported use of integration and compromise, but both genders score higher on these strategies than on all other strategies. That is, both genders are more
likely to report using such mutually focused influence behaviors as exchanging accurate information, integrating ideas with those of the others, and working together for a proper understanding of the problem. This is consistent with prior research which suggests that women and men hold similar views on which strategies they would prefer to use, given the choice (White & Roufail, 1989).

Comparing between the genders within relationship types there was only one significant difference which emerged: in romantic relationships men reported greater use of the obliging strategy than did women. When looking within gender across relationship types, women and men differed in whether relationship type was a significant factor in their use of the obliging strategy. Being obliging did not vary by relationship type for women, but did for men such that men reported greater use of the obliging strategy in their romantic relationship than in their closest cross sex friendship, which in turn was rated higher on obliging than their closest same sex friendship.

The items which make up the obliging factor include such things as "accommodating to the other's wishes", "allowing concessions", and "going along with the other's suggestions". Being obliging involves choosing to allow the other to get their way in an exchange, and might be reflective of the individual feeling sufficiently privileged or comfortable in their relationship that such an outcome would not be threatening. It may even be construed as a kind of chivalry in which individuals
who can afford to be gallant are ones who either have, or perceive themselves to have, greater power.

The finding that men say they oblige more than do women in romantic relationships may stem from women being less likely than men to desire or perceive themselves as having greater power in their close relationships (e.g., Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Parker, 1990) hence they would not perceive themselves to be in a position to enact such chivalry. Men’s greater reported use of the obliging strategy in relationships with women may reflect a greater generalized sense of comfort in relationships with women than in relationships with men. Men’s same sex friendships have been found to be marked by high levels of competition across multiple domains, leading to ongoing comparisons and feelings of distrust (e.g., Basow, 1986).

Looking within gender across relationship types, women and men also differed in whether relationship type was a significant factor in their use of avoidance. Men’s avoidance, while higher than women’s overall at the main effect level, is nonetheless indiscriminant across type of relationship. Women however reported greater use of the avoiding strategy in both of their closest friendships than in their romantic relationship.

Women may be less likely to avoid as a combined result of their greater felt responsibility for the work of maintaining connection in relationships (e.g., Fishman, 1978; Surrey, 1986), their fear of loss of relationships, and male avoidance. Males’ tendency to avoid or withdraw has been found to be associated with female partners’ escalation of engagement strategies in an
effort to draw the other party out (e.g., Christensen & Shenk, 1991). Women in romantic relationships, feeling greater responsibility for maintaining connection and fearing the loss of the relationship, may be more motivated by their partner's avoidance to behave in ways that reduce distance, and therefore would themselves be less likely to avoid. In their relationships with other women, both parties are likely to take responsibility for maintaining the relationship and therefore to use engaging strategies to solve differences (e.g., Wright, 1982). Because the relational work is more equally shared, avoidance behavior may not represent as great a risk for distance, and therefore women in same sex friendships may feel more comfortable using avoidance. In friendships with men, male avoidance is presumably less likely to trigger women's fear of losing the relationship when the man is a friend as opposed to a romantic partner. Women therefore may be more comfortable also using avoidance and risking the distance which might ensue.

The pattern of results on the dominating strategy revealed interesting gender differences by relationship type. For both women and men relationship type played a role in the reported use of domination: women reported greater use of domination in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex friendship, whereas men reported greater use of domination in their same sex friendship than in either their romantic relationship or cross sex friendship. Women's greater reported use of dominating strategies in their romantic relationship as compared to their closest same sex friendship is consistent with the analysis above
regarding women's response to withdrawal by their male romantic partner, that is, female escalation of engagement. Intrusive behavior such as dominance strategies may not be as likely in situations where both parties are prepared to confront problems, as tends to be the case in women's friendships with other women. For men, dominance is reportedly used more in same sex friendships than in their relationships with women. As with the pattern on the use of obliging strategies where men are least likely to report being obliging with other men, men's greater dominance efforts with other men may be a function of male competition.

These findings extend our understanding of women's and men's use of influence strategies, illustrating a more complex picture than has previously been uncovered, and underscoring the importance of taking individuals' relational contexts into account when examining patterns of influence.

Discussion of Nonsignificant Findings

While there were a number of significant findings in this study, there were also a number of hypotheses that were not supported. The next section entails a broad evaluation of the adequacy of the study as a test of the hypotheses, whereas this section discusses hypotheses that did not turn out as predicted, and explores possible explanations at a more specific level.

The three-way interaction of gender, attachment style and relationship type was nonsignificant (i.e., preoccupied men did not report higher intimacy than preoccupied women in cross sex
friendships; nor did fearful women report higher intimacy than fearful men in romantic relationships). A possible explanation for this lack of significance could be an insufficient $n$ for power. Power calculations were conducted which indicated that there was likely adequate power to detect main effect differences in standard effect sizes of .85 with a power of .8 (see Methods section). However, the issue here is that the power needed to detect differences at the level of complexity predicted with three interacting independent variables, is likely greater than the power needed to detect differences at the main effect level (Cohen, 1988). There was likely the greatest power to detect main effects, then to detect two-way interactions, and then least power to detect the three-way interaction.

Although the three-way interaction did not prove to be significant it is interesting to note that for women, being dismissing was associated with higher reported intimacy than being preoccupied, whereas for men the reverse was true (i.e., preoccupied men report higher intimacy than dismissing men). As noted earlier, this may be related to the response of the other person to the disclosures and other intimacy behaviors of the preoccupied respondent. The prediction at the three-way level for preoccupied individuals was based on just such a rationale, such that the cross sex friends of preoccupied men (i.e., women) would value and enhance those men’s intimacy efforts, whereas the cross sex friends of preoccupied women (i.e., men) may be more likely to experience their intimacy behaviors as intrusive, lowering reported intimacy. Although the multivariate test was
nonsignificant, the means were in the hypothesized direction on both the MPDQ and the MSIS (i.e., the intimacy scores of preoccupied men were higher than were those of preoccupied women, when reporting on their cross sex friendships). The hypotheses at the three-way level were admittedly speculative, but these exploratory findings are intriguing and invite closer examination.

The two-way interaction of gender by attachment style on intimacy was significant, but the two specific predictions did not turn out as hypothesized. Preoccupied women were hypothesized to report greater intimacy than preoccupied men (hypothesis A2i). This hypothesis was based on the notion that when the gender of the participant and their insecure attachment style are matched in terms of traditional gender socialization (i.e., preoccupied for women, dismissing for men), then the usual gender findings would be strengthened, in this case showing greater reported intimacy for women (e.g., Simpson, 1990). The recent findings of Feeney et al., (1994b) may help to explain why this is not so in the case of preoccupied women's intimacy. On the basis of research conducted on five attachment scales those authors have observed that the key feature of the preoccupied group may not be unambiguous intimacy striving, but is instead their ambivalence about intimacy, as seen in the conflict between their desire for closeness and their lack of trust that others will be there for them (Feeney et al., 1994b). Hence the more general desire for and comfort with closeness that tends (in broad terms) to characterize women's relational experience is not
entirely parallel to the preoccupied style. The preoccupied style does involve desire for closeness, but it is in combination with anxiety and discomfort regarding such closeness. The expected synergy of gender-congruent attachment style and respondent's gender in increasing reported intimacy levels would be less evident as a result of such ambivalence.

The other hypothesis regarding gender and attachment style on intimacy, that fearful women would report greater intimacy than would fearful men (hypothesis A2ii), was based on the idea that gender expectations regarding the initiation of relationships continue to weigh more heavily upon men than women. This dynamic may be especially evident for fearful men in cross sex interactions, and would not be expected to play as significant a role in same sex friendships for women or men (e.g., Garcia et al., 1991). A shy or fearful woman may have more opportunities for intimacy in cross sex interactions because she is not expected to "make the first move" in the same way that a shy man would be (Garcia et al., 1991). While this may be true amongst fearful individuals in general, the design of this study included only those individuals who are currently in a romantic relationship, and who count at least one woman friend and one man friend among their closest friends. By setting the inclusion criteria thus, the more general pattern regarding relationship initiation and resultant intimacy among fearful people could not be assessed. The results do suggest however that among those fearful individuals who are in romantic relationships and do have
close friends of both sexes, there do not appear to be significant gender differences in intimacy.

The two-way interaction of gender by relationship type on influence strategies was significant, and revealed a number of interesting findings. Four out of five of the specific hypotheses made were not significantly supported however, and the data relevant to the fifth hypothesis came out opposite to what was predicted. Such results have understandably encouraged a rethinking of the rationales used to formulate the hypotheses.

The first factor to be considered is that the majority of significant results were obtained at the level of relationship type at gender (i.e., within gender across relationship types) rather than for gender at relationship type. The predictions, however, were made exclusively between women and men within a particular relationship type (see hypotheses B2i-v). In other words, when conceptualizing possible gender differences, the hypotheses were made at the more simple level of women versus men within a particular relationship type. Yet the results in this study illustrate that often gender differences may not be apparent in simple comparisons of women and men within a relationship type, but instead they appear when looking at different patterns of results across different types of relationships for women in comparison to men. The gender differences tend to show up in patterns of relative differences among the relationship types rather than relative to the other gender within a single relationship type. In effect, these
results suggest that individuals are "doing gender" in a more complex way than may often be conceptualized.

The one exception to significant findings being obtained only within gender across relationship type was on the prediction that women would report greater use of the obliging strategy than would men in their romantic relationships. In fact, in romantic relationships men reported using the obliging strategy more than did women. This brings us to the second reconsideration, that of founding the influence hypotheses on research that indicates that gender-linked variables would predict women's greater use of indirect strategies (i.e., obliging), in comparison to men's greater use of direct strategies (i.e., dominating). In previous research, greater femininity, less access to resources, and less perceived power have predicted greater use of indirect strategies usually associated with women (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard et al., 1986; Steil & Weltman, 1992). Extending these results to include relationship type, predictions were made such that women were expected to be more obliging with men, who would be more dominant with women. The results of this study however, indicate that men were more dominant and less obliging with other men than with women. Further, women were more dominant with romantic partners than with other women, and were less avoidant with romantic partners than with friends. These results tend to conform to the demand/withdraw pattern identified by Christensen (1988; Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Christensen & Shenk, 1991), in which women are found more often to be in the role of demander, and men are more often found to withdraw. This pattern is
hypothesized to be a function of a number of gender-linked variables, most notably socialization toward intimacy-seeking for women and distance-seeking for men (Christensen & Heavey, 1990).

This raises the question of why the gender pattern in the use of influence strategies found in this study does not correspond with the Falbo and Peplau (1980) power/resource analysis (men more direct and dominant), and does seem congruent with the Christensen demand/withdraw pattern (women dominant, men using indirect strategies). The answer may lie in the difference between influence and conflict, and a lack of clarity in the influence measure used in this study in distinguishing between the two kinds of processes.

Two people cannot be considered close unless they have some influence on each other (Huston, 1983). Influence may be construed as having an effect on another person, such that something that one person does has some bearing, in a causal way, upon the other person. Influence is not necessarily intentional or conscious, and may be symmetrical or asymmetrical in any given relationship. If influence is asymmetrical, the relationship may be considered to be structured hierarchically with one partner having dominance due in part to greater power. Such an asymmetrical situation can produce adjustments in partners' behaviors and attitudes such that the more powerful person may not need to make overt attempts at influence because the subordinate one may tend to comply spontaneously (Huston, 1983), possibly without the awareness of either relationship partner. It has been found that men are perceived as the more dominant
gender, generally wielding more power than women in heterosexual relationships and having greater access to resources (e.g., Huston, 1983; Peplau, 1983).

Conflict, on the other hand, is something individuals are likely to be aware of, and may be defined as "an interpersonal process that occurs whenever the actions of one person interfere with the actions of another" (Peterson, 1983, p. 365). It has been suggested that men have been socialized to be conflict-avoiding people who find the emotional intensity of verbal conflict (particularly with women) difficult to tolerate, whereas women are conflict-confronting people who tend to be frustrated by avoidance (e.g., Kelley et al., 1978). It has been further hypothesized that men may be more physiologically vigilant to conflict, reacting with heightened autonomic arousal which may be experienced as aversive (e.g., Markman, Silvern, Clements & Kraft-Hanak, 1993). Social conditioning may lead men to respond differently in different situations; it may be that when in conflict with women, men have learned to withdraw in order to terminate the aversive interaction.

In situations of conflict then, men may tend to give in or go along with their partner more than women, who tend to confront problems directly, especially in cross gender relationships. In contrast, more general (and possibly less visible) situations of general influence may reveal that men, more than women, perceive themselves to have the balance of power or control in their favour (e.g., Parker, 1990), and hence may tend to use direct strategies such as stating a preference or using authority.
Unfortunately, in this study, the wording of the influence question ("think about how you typically handle things when you want to get your way with that person") was not adequate to determine whether or not participants were responding to it as a question on general strategies of influence, or on strategies employed in situations of conflict. In essence, it would be necessary to determine whether or not the participant was imagining situations in which the relationship partner was interfering with his or her influence attempts. In any event, the pattern of results found on the influence measure has raised provocative questions regarding the role of conflict in women's and men's use of different influence strategies.

Adequacy of the Study as a Test of the Hypotheses

There are a number of factors to consider in the evaluation of this study's adequacy as a test of the hypotheses: sampling and design issues; adequacy of measures and classification; and replication of previous findings.

Sampling issues. Among the conditions that may limit the findings of this research are sampling restraints. First, study participants were undergraduate students in psychology courses. They were for the most part young and therefore may have had less experience in relationships, and held more idealized and less complex views of relationships than individuals in a more mature sample. Although these individuals' reports may not reflect the views of a more mature sample, it is notable that there was broad interest in the study among students, as indicated by the good
response to the initial screening questionnaire. Second, the men who took part in the study may not represent male university students in general. The explicitly stated focus of this research was an examination of participants' feelings and thoughts in their close relationships. This may have set up a self-selection bias toward men who tend to be more aware and interested than the average male university student about the nature and meaning of their close relationships, thereby reducing possible gender differences. Third, some participants may not have been typical representatives of the attachment styles, thereby reducing possible differences across groups in attachment style. For example, dismissing individuals tend to minimize the importance of close relationships, so those dismissing persons who chose to participate in a study expressly examining their views on close relationships may be atypical. Similarly, fearful individuals who are currently in an ongoing romantic relationship of at least 6 months duration, and have at least one woman and one man among their closest friends, may not be "average" representatives of that group. In fact, it is apparent that there were differential rates of exclusion from the study by attachment style on the basis of relationship criteria, at least when comparing between fearful and secure participants.

**Design issues: Target relationship.** One issue in the choice of target relationships is that only participants' very closest relationships were assessed. As has been noted previously, the greater the closeness of the relationships under examination, the less likelihood there is of observing gender differences (Wright,
Further, the restriction of the relationship ratings to a single example of each relationship type may mean that the idiosyncrasies of that specific relationship lead to greater within-group variability, reducing the likelihood of uncovering between group differences.

Setting relationship type as a within group variable may have affected respondents' tendency to report differences. On the one hand, rating their three closest relationships one after the other might lead participants to suppress reporting differences. When set up one after the other, substantial differences by relationship type in relationships identified as "closest" might be a source of discomfort for respondents. On the other hand, some might argue that such a design might enhance the reporting of differences by relationship type. Such findings have been found in cognitive research (e.g., Ward, 1975), where individuals have been shown to report greater difference in within-subjects than between-subjects designs. It seems possible that the cognitive tendency to see difference when making comparisons may be offset by the affectively laden task in this study (i.e., evaluating three close relationships on important variables such as intimacy and influence).

Design issues: Power. Power calculations for the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire and the Miller Social Intimacy Scale revealed that in order to detect a standard effect size difference in the .84 range with a power of .8, a minimum n of 11 is sufficient. These power calculations were based on a one-factor ANOVA design, whereas this study involved a
multifactorial design. As noted in the Methods section sampling continued until an $n$ of 20 was obtained for women and men for each attachment style. This larger number was chosen in order to take the relative weakness of the interaction tests into account. There clearly was adequate power to detect main effects, and to detect effects on three of the four predicted two-way interactions, however the power of the test for the three-way interaction was likely lower, making Type II errors more possible (Cohen, 1988).

The probability level on the nonsignificant three-way interaction was .157. On one of the two predictions, the pattern of means was consistent with the hypothesis (preoccupied men were expected to report higher intimacy than preoccupied women in their cross sex friendship, and scores reflected that trend). On the other prediction the pattern of means was reversed (fearful women were expected to report greater intimacy than fearful men, but men scored higher). It is possible then that had there been a larger number of participants, the first hypothesis may have been confirmed, whereas the second may have been disconfirmed.

**Adequacy of measures.** The measures chosen for this study (Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire, MPDQ; Miller Social Intimacy Scale, MSIS; and Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory, ROCI) all have been shown to have adequate reliability and validity and, with the exception of the MPDQ, have been widely used in relationship research.

It is notable that while the two intimacy measures (MPDQ and MSIS) were fairly highly correlated in this study ($r = .57$ for
romantic relationships; \( r = .61 \) for same sex friendships; \( r = .62 \) for cross sex friendships) the measures produced different patterns for women and men in some instances. For example, on the MPDQ women reported greater intimacy in their closest same sex friendship than in their romantic relationship, but on the MSIS the pattern was reversed with greater reported intimacy in women’s romantic relationship than in their closest same sex friendship. For men, intimacy was highest in romantic relationships on both measures. As well, the MPDQ revealed a significant two-way interaction of gender by attachment style whereas the MSIS did not.

The MPDQ was developed out of self-in-relation theory which attempts to explain women’s development in the context of close relationships, and employs a construct called mutuality to describe the bidirectional nature of the intimacy process (e.g., Surrey, 1986). This construct is centred on the notion that intimacy involves "both affecting the other and being affected by the other" (Jordan, 1986, p. 1). This balance of initiative and receptivity is hypothesized to underlie the depth and richness of close relationships. The MPDQ attempts to assess what is given and what is received in relationships with others. Other research (e.g., Parker & de Vries, 1993) has found that bidirectional assessment of central dimensions of close relationships reveals a tendency for women to report giving more than men in relationships, and for relationships with women to be rated as providing more than relationships with men. Such findings might be obscured if assessed at a more global level of
overall feelings of closeness or satisfaction (such as with the MSIS). Further research on the MPDQ is needed to determine the ways in which mutuality compares with more established conceptualizations and measures of intimacy.

**Adequacy of classification.** The classification of the participants in terms of the independent variables was quite straightforward, based on participants' self-reported gender, their self-reported attachment style, and their nomination of closest relationships. Participants were restricted in their selection of relationships. They were not to nominate their romantic partner nor a parent as their closest friend. Individuals' conceptions of friendship and kinship often have blurred boundaries (e.g., de Vries, in press), and one common pattern is to identify a spouse or romantic partner as a best friend (West & Keller, 1994). By asking participants to exclude parents and romantic partners, some may have chosen other relationships which are less close. While this allowed for an assessment of three different relationships, it may have obscured the results for some participants who might otherwise have selected their romantic partner or parent as closest friend.

Attachment style was checked in a number of ways (see Attachment Style Screening in the Methods section). As noted in the Methods section, this research has taken a categorical (rather than dimensional) approach to attachment styles, in which discrete attachment groups were created. One consequence of such an approach is that there is an inevitable loss of information for categories as compared to dimensions. Grouping approaches
have the advantage of conveying patterns in the results more clearly, but are not as statistically sensitive as dimensional ones.

The groups in this study were created on the basis of participants' "best-fitting" category. That is, a prototype view was assumed in which all members of a category were not considered to be interchangeable. In fact, it was assumed that there will be some individuals who will be "better" exemplars of the category, and others who will be "poorer" representatives. This within-group variability is expected and meaningful, but causes difficulties for detecting group differences with the analysis of variance model, which regards such within-group difference as "noise".

Attachment style classification was based on a short form of measurement, and involved a self-report measure rather than an interview approach. While the vast majority of research into adult attachment has taken this approach, it is important to note that interview and self-report measures do not yield identical results (e.g., Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) and some investigators believe that self-report measures allow respondents to present as secure when in fact they are not. Dismissing individuals may be the most difficult to accurately classify via self report (Rothbard & Shaver, 1994). The defensive self assertion of dismissing individuals may prompt them to classify themselves as secure on a short questionnaire, whereas in an interview the incongruence between their positive presentation of attachment experiences and their more negative specific examples would
better reveal their dismissive interpersonal style. Hence in this study it is possible that the attachment categories (particularly the secure group) were more heterogeneous than if an interview approach was used.

Attachment style assignment appeared to be reliable, at least for the short span of time between screening and questionnaire. As a further check on the classification of attachment, participants' global attachment categories were found to be reasonably highly associated with investigator-averaged ratings of separate relationship types. Additionally, only those participants who were found to be reliable category members on the screening and on the main questionnaire were included in the study.

Replication of previous findings. This study evidenced a number of results which are consistent with existing theory or with previous research. For example, secure individuals were found to report significantly higher levels of intimacy and were more likely to use integrating/compromising strategies than were insecure individuals. Men's reported intimacy was found to be consistently greatest in their romantic relationship; women's reported intimacy was higher in their closest same sex than in their closest cross sex friendship. Women reported higher intimacy than did men in their same sex friendships. Men reported using avoidance overall more than women. These findings indicate that at the level of main effects and two-way interactions, this study was sufficient to obtain results which would be expected on the basis of prior research.
New findings consistent with theory. This study provided new evidence to support the partitioning of avoidant individuals into two groups: fearful and dismissing (Bartholomew, 1990). The pattern of influence strategies found in this study is consistent with hypothesized patterns and underlying dynamics. Fearful individuals were more likely than individuals in all other groups to report using avoidance, reflecting negative models of both self and other, whereas dismissing individuals were more likely to use dominance than all others, reflecting a positive self model and negative other model. Another theoretically-consistent finding which is new in this research is the higher correspondence between individuals' global attachment categorization and their attachment style category for their romantic relationship as compared with either their closest same sex or closest cross sex friendship. The primary attachment relationship in adulthood is hypothesized to be the romantic relationship, which would be expected to most strongly characterize individuals' attachment style. This study permitted a comparison among close relationships which revealed just such a finding.

Summary. Overall then, the study had a number of strengths. The measures appear reliable and valid. Multiple measurement of one of the two major constructs (i.e., intimacy) was undertaken, and found to be productive. The classification of the participants in terms of the independent variables appears adequate overall. Calculations and significant results indicate that there was sufficient power to detect differences for main
effects and two-way interactions, although power may have been insufficient for the three-way interaction. A number of the findings are theoretically and empirically consistent with the extant literature.

At the same time, a number of limitations were noted which may have reduced the likelihood of finding significant results. Gender differences may have been suppressed as a result of: 1) sampling young university students with limited experience in relationships; 2) a self selection bias toward males with a greater than average interest in close relationships; and 3) having respondents rate only their very closest relationships. Relationship type differences may have been suppressed as a result of: 1) having participants rate only one exemplar for each relationship type, increasing possible variability from idiosyncrasies of the particular relationship. Attachment style differences may have been suppressed as a result of: 1) taking a categorical rather than a dimensional approach to attachment; 2) the expected and meaningful within-group variability implicit in a prototype model of attachment; 3) heterogeneity within groups (particularly the secure group) resulting from the use of a short self-report measure of attachment; and 4) atypical group members, especially among the dismissing and fearful.

The study may have provided a conservative test for detecting some differences between genders, among attachment styles, and among relationship types. Despite these conservative conditions significant results were obtained via this research.
It would therefore seem that the study is an adequate, although not ideal, test of the hypotheses.

Implications of This Research

Attachment. This research draws attention to the importance of considering the role of gender when examining the effect of attachment style on relational processes. There were significant differences both between genders and within gender across attachment styles. Gender has been a neglected variable in attachment research, and this study provides support for its inclusion in future studies.

This study provides new support for Bartholomew's (1990) four-category model of attachment. The model splits apart the insecure avoidant category (e.g., Shaver & Hazan, 1988, 1992) into two groups: dismissing (positive view of self, negative view of others) and fearful (negative view of both self and others). In this study the distinction between the two categories seemed fruitful, with dismissing women reporting higher levels of intimacy than either dismissing men or fearful women. This study also unravelled the earlier paradoxical finding in the use of influence strategies, in which avoidant individuals were not more likely than others to employ avoidant strategies (e.g., Levy & Davis, 1988). By using the four-category model it became apparent that dismissing individuals use dominance more than individuals from all other groups, and fearful persons use avoidance more than all others. While consistent with the
theory, this is the first empirical support for these unique patterns of influence for the two groups.

The inclusion in this study of relationships other than the parent-child bond and romantic partners helps to extend attachment into the broader realm of close relationships. When comparing individuals' global (over all close relationships) forced choice attachment style with their forced choice attachment style by separate relationship type it is clear that, for the most part, the global categories hold. This repeated measurement served to provide a check on the classification of participants into attachment groups, and demonstrated reasonable temporal stability of the classification. Importantly, it also provided evidence consistent with the view that attachment dynamics work in close friendships, and suggests that attachment style probably does reflect a generalized influence upon most individuals' close relationships.

At the same time, a number of people do discriminate between the global and relationship-specific measures. The match between global attachment category and relationship specific attachment category varies both by relationship type, and by attachment style. In terms of attachment style, the secure category shows the least amount of change between the global and specific assessments; next are the fearful and dismissing categories; and the most variable is the preoccupied category. Other research has suggested that the secure category is the most stable across assessments, and the preoccupied the least stable (e.g., Baldwin & Fehr, 1993). However, such examination has not in the past
included a comparison between global versus relationship-specific measurement of attachment.

In terms of relationship type, the best match between global attachment category and relationship-specific category occurs when rating the romantic relationship, consistent with theory. The romantic relationship is held to be the primary attachment relationship in adulthood and would therefore be expected to most strongly characterize respondents' global attachment style.

The next best match between global and relationship-specific attachment categories is for closest cross sex friendship. It has been noted that cross sex friendships are fraught with a number of difficulties, including their unscripted nature (McWilliams & Howard, 1994), and the tension of sexual dynamics (O'Meara, 1989). Either of these challenges might play a role in eliciting working models of attachment. For example, the vague boundaries and lack of guidelines for close cross sex friendships may constitute a kind of blank screen against which attachment-related expectations may be projected. On the other hand, sexual attraction is often held to play a covert role in close cross sex friendships, and such attraction has been hypothesized to be the motivating force behind the formation and maintenance of attachment bonds in adulthood (e.g., Hazan & Zeifman, 1994). This research has uncovered interesting findings regarding the role of attachment in close cross sex friendships, and invites speculation as to what features of this relationship activate attachment dynamics.
The most variable relationship (i.e., least likely to match the global attachment category) is closest same sex friendship. Individuals who categorized themselves as insecure on the global rating are more likely, in same sex friendships, to choose the secure category to describe themselves. Most noticeably, of the 40 individuals who rated themselves as dismissing on the global assessment, 19 rated themselves as dismissing in their closest same sex friendship, and the remainder (i.e., 21 people) classified themselves as secure. For those who grouped themselves globally as preoccupied, when classifying themselves in their closest same sex friendship an equal number chose the secure category as chose the preoccupied one (n = 13). The processes by which this shift occurs are open to conjecture. Security is characterized by a positive model of the self (low anxiety about abandonment) and a positive view of others (high comfort with closeness). It may be that close same sex friendships involve greater feelings of acceptance in the mirroring of oneself in a same sex other, enhancing one's self model. Perhaps same sex friendships are lower in anxiety, thereby ameliorating the other model and increasing comfort with closeness. Heightened activation of attachment dynamics is hypothesized to occur in conditions of stress. When not under such anxiety-inducing situations, the role of attachment is expected to be less salient, and people may tend to feel and behave in a more secure fashion. The results of this study indicate that certain facets of closest same sex friendships may play a special role in enhancing feelings of security,
particularly for those who would be classified globally across all their close relationships as insecure.

**Gender differences in relationships.** This study establishes the principle that attachment style moderates the influence of gender on patterns of intimacy in relationships. Dismissing women were found to report higher levels of intimacy in their closest relationships than did dismissing men. As well, women and men reported significantly different levels of intimacy depending on their attachment style. The results for gender and attachment on influence were nonsignificant at the multivariate level ($p = .067$), hence were not formally reported in this thesis. An exploratory look at the results, however, evidences significant results for domination ($p = .016$), and multiple comparisons reveal that fearful women reported more use of domination than did fearful men, and dismissing men reported greater use of domination than did dismissing women. These results provide an enticing glimpse of the possibilities inherent in exploring the intersection of attachment and gender, and are worth examining further. Although the results across the two outcome variables are not completely consistent, the significant gender by attachment style interaction for intimacy indicates that the two variables mutually shape the terrain of close relationships.

An important finding in this study is the significance of individuals' relational context to their experience of intimacy and use of influence strategies. This research provides solid evidence that, in order to understand the ways in which women and
men differ or are alike in their interpersonal relations, we need to examine with whom they are relating. Type of relationship was a significant factor which interacted with gender to produce differing patterns in reported intimacy and use of strategies of influence, and points to the complexity of gender differences in relationships.

This research also indicates that there is much that women and men have in common in their close relationships. Some interesting significant differences were obtained, but there were also many instances where no differences between women and men were evident. For example, both women and men report using integrating and compromising strategies more than all other strategies, and do not differ in their use by type of relationship. It is appropriate to heed the "plea for caution" called for by Wright (1988, p. 367), who notes that social scientists are particularly attuned to identifying between group differences, sometimes at the expense of ignoring within group variability and between group similarity.

Clinical implications. Attachment theory was originally formulated by John Bowlby, a clinician with an interest in understanding and intervening with emotionally troubled patients and families. While acknowledging the significant volume of research his theory has generated in developmental and social psychology, he also noted his disappointment "that clinicians have been so slow to test the theory's uses" (1988, p. x). This study was not clinical in orientation, yet its findings may have some potential implications for clinicians. In particular, the
finding that gender and attachment style interact to influence reported intimacy levels suggests that, for those clients experiencing deficits in close relationships, it may be valuable to consider the mutual roles of gender socialization and attachment style. In couples therapy for example, an assessment of the effect of gender socialization for women to seek intimacy/fear rejection and men to seek distance/fear engulfment, combined with the basic differences in desire for closeness versus distance inherent in the different attachment styles, may enhance an understanding of important underlying difficulties for distressed couples (e.g., Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994a). As well, the use of different strategies of influence in close relationships for individuals with different attachment styles (fearful persons using avoidance, dismissing using dominance, and preoccupied high on both dominance and obliging strategies) may also play a role in their interpersonal difficulties, especially if such use is inflexible. The finding that men tend to avoid and/or oblige when in their closest relationships with women as compared to their closest relationship with another man, whereas women tend to avoid less in their romantic relationship than in their closest same sex friendship may open up avenues for exploration in therapy for clients to learn from their own experience what strategies have been most (and least) productive for enhancing intimacy.

An intriguing finding in this study which may have clinical implications is that individuals who consider themselves insecurely attached when aggregating across all close
relationships are likely to change their self reported category
to secure when referring to their closest same sex friendship. For some reason closest same sex friends appear to provide an opportunity for insecure individuals to reframe their sense of themselves and others in a more secure way. The mechanism by which this occurs is unclear, but uncovering it may be valuable for therapists interested in facilitating such change at a broader level.

Future Research

Following from the results of this study it may be of interest to explore more closely the significant sex by attachment style interaction. It was hypothesized that both intimacy and influence strategies would be mutually associated with gender and attachment style, but significance was obtained only for intimacy at the multivariate level. The multivariate results for influence were nonsignificant, but suggestive (p = .067), and warrant closer examination. The other facet of this study which invites closer examination is the central role of individuals' relational context in their reports of intimacy and use of influence strategies.

Improvements to this study. In order to improve this research, a future study might be undertaken with a larger, community-based sample who have been in their relationships a minimum of 2 years or longer. Such individuals would be older, and their relationships more established, and they may therefore have more complex views and may better reflect the larger
population than do psychology undergraduates. As well there are
data to suggest that romantic relationships of 2 years or longer
are more likely than shorter ones to fulfill all the functions of
attachment (Hazan & Zeifman, 1994). A between-subjects design
might provide a less conservative test of the effect of
relationship type; participants would only report on one
relationship (either romantic, or closest same sex friendship, or
closest cross sex friendship), avoiding the possibility of being
influenced by simultaneously rating multiple relationships. As
well, a between subjects design would reduce the problem of
differential screening out (of particular concern with the
fearful group), since the exclusionary criteria would be less
stringent (i.e., participants would only need to be currently in
one of the three kinds of relationship).

The importance of the relational context (as indicated by
the significant role of relationship type in this study) could be
further elaborated by assessing the attachment style of the other
individual in the dyad. Other research has indicated that
partners' attachment exerts a significant influence on
respondents' reports of relationship variables (e.g., Collins &
Read, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994a). In addition to the dependent
measures of intimacy and influence, it might be of value to
obtain a measure of the quality of the relationship (e.g., Dyadic
Adjustment Scale, Spanier, 1976), in order to determine the roles
of intimacy and influence strategies for women and men with
different attachment styles on overall relationship quality.
Extending the findings. A clarification of why the use of influence strategies by women and men corresponds more closely to the demand/withdraw pattern (Christensen, 1988) than to the power/resource analysis (Falbo & Peplau, 1980) might be a valuable extension of this study’s findings. As noted earlier, the key factor may be the role of conflict, and the extent to which participants in this study were imagining their relationship partner to be interfering with their influence attempts, that is, were imagining a situation of conflict.

In the research conducted by Falbo and Peplau (1980), men were more likely than women to report using direct strategies which required the other person to participate. The use of such strategies also was associated with a de-emphasis on equal power in the relationship, a preference for greater personal influence, and perceptions of having greater power, all of which men more than women endorsed. Other research has also indicated that men value and report having greater power/control in their close relationships more than do women (e.g., Parker, 1990). Such values and perceptions reflect what may be considered to be a position of privilege in the relationship; as Falbo & Peplau note: "men perceived themselves to be influencing their partner from a position of relative strength" and therefore expected compliance. The subordinate partner may conform spontaneously to such direct strategies as requests so that the dominant one does not need to resort to more aversive methods (Huston, 1983). It is important to note that this discussion refers to subjective judgements of power, rather than an objective assessment of who
actually has what kinds of power in a relationship. Perceptions about power are likely to play a causal role in the use of power and influence (Huston, 1983).

On the other hand, in situations of conflict men may not feel that they are in a position of strength, and in fact may feel at a significant disadvantage, leading them to use indirect strategies such as avoiding and giving in. Male withdrawal in situations of conflict is found to be met with female pursuit, and attempts at escalation. This pattern has been evident in distressed relationships (e.g., Christensen, 1988), but more recent research suggests that nondistressed relationships also demonstrate some of these features. Markman et. al, (1993) found on self report measures of complaints about partner pursuit, that men scored higher than did women, indicating a greater withdrawing stance for men than for women. In another study, nondistressed, clinic, and divorcing couples were compared on the extent to which the demand/withdraw pattern characterized their response to conflict (Christensen & Shenk, 1991). The clinic and divorcing couples scored significantly higher than did the nondistressed couples, but the pattern of woman demanding and man withdrawing was more likely than the reverse pattern in all three groups. In the Christensen research (1988; Christensen & Shenk, 1991), the situation that participants responded to on the questionnaire was defined as a "problem in the relationship". This makes conflict more salient than in the item used in the Falbo and Peplau (1980) study (i.e., "how I get my way"). In the current study, the question was worded in terms of getting one's
way, but with no way of knowing whether respondents were imagining interference by the other, it is not possible to determine whether or not conflict can explain the different pattern of results.

To confirm the role of conflict versus a generalized perception of power in the relationship as contributing to women's and men's use of various influence strategies, a study might be undertaken comparing women and men in same sex, cross sex, and romantic relationships across two conditions: high versus low conflict. Conflict would be a between-groups variable, manipulated such that participants in the high conflict condition would be asked to rehash an unresolved argument about something important to them, and in the low conflict condition to solve a more neutral problem, such as a puzzle. The interaction could be videotaped and coded for use of influence strategies. Self report measures of influence in situations of high conflict versus low conflict could also be obtained. Participants could be asked to recall and describe specific influence attempts in which the partner either did or did not interfere with their efforts. In addition, assessments could be taken of subjects' perceptions of the amount of power generally held by the relationship partners, its importance to each of them, and the circumstances in which they feel most and least powerful in the relationship. It may be that men feel least as though they are in a position of strength (and women most so) in situations of conflict and confrontation. Such a study might illuminate the processes underlying the findings in this study on women's and
men's different (and unexpected) use of influence strategies in close relationships.

Conclusions

This research was designed to address the broad question of how relational processes vary as a function of three variables: gender, attachment style and type of relationship. There are compelling reasons for examining the mutual influences of these three variables in close relationships. Intimacy and influence strategies are core relational processes, each of which is strongly affected as a consequence of variations in gender, attachment style, and type of relationship. Further, attachment styles themselves are founded upon interpersonal patterns which have clear parallels with gender- and relationship type-patterns of interaction. For example, the dismissing category is somewhat typical of the gender stereotyped masculine pattern of avoidance of intimacy and inhibited expression of need for relationships; the preoccupied category captures the stereotypic feminine pattern of intimacy striving; and the secure category encompasses both "feminine" comfort with closeness and "masculine" reliance on self rather than others for approval.

The results of this study illustrate the separate and joint effects of gender, attachment style and relationship type on respondents' reports of intimacy and use of influence strategies in their closest relationships. This study revealed a number of new and intriguing results, and also replicated several findings from the attachment literature and from the area of close
relationships and gender. The study offers new support for Bartholomew’s (1990) four-category model of attachment styles, with fearful and dismissing participants evidencing uniquely high scores on avoidance and dominance respectively. Friendships play an important and meaningful role in most people’s lives, and this research helps extend our understanding of these valuable connections in the context of attachment dynamics. This research extends our understanding of both gender effects and attachment by establishing the principle that attachment style interacts with gender to produce different patterns of intimacy. It also draws attention to the centrality of relationship type in understanding women’s and men’s experience of intimacy and influence. Importantly, these results underscore the need to think in more complex ways about the intricacies of gender in close relationships. In addition to simply mapping main effects, or even two-way interactions examined at the level of between gender comparisons, it is clear that a topography of gender and relationships requires standing back from the terrain and viewing the varying patterns of its landscape for women and for men.

This research is unique in its explicit focus on the intersecting roles of gender and attachment style in three different peer relationships in adulthood. This more integrative and theory driven approach guided the questions and the research, and was found to be productive, offering insights into the complex workings of how individuals "do gender" and "do attachment" in the context of their ongoing relationships with others.
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Appendix A
CONCEPTIONS OF SELF AND RELATIONSHIPS

The purpose of this study is to examine how people understand and experience their relationships with others. If you are currently in a romantic relationship of at least three months duration you are eligible to participate in this study. The questionnaire that follows asks you to provide some information about your feelings about being in relationships with close others. The questionnaire should take about 5 minutes to complete.

On the basis of this questionnaire, we will select some people to participate in a larger study of close relationships, involving a two-hour questionnaire. Therefore, we ask that you provide your first name and last initial, your sex, and a telephone number where you may be contacted for possible further participation in this study.

This study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for Sandra Parker's Ph.D. thesis. Everything that you write will be kept completely confidential. Individuals eligible for participation in the next part of the study will be contacted within three months of submitting their questionnaires. The responses of those individuals who are not contacted within three months will be destroyed.

You may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without jeopardizing your class standing. If you complete the questionnaire it will be assumed that your consent to participate in this study has been given.

Thank you for your time and participation. The benefits which you may gain from taking part in this study include an increased awareness of your views and experience of relationships with others. If you have any questions or would like further information, you are welcome to contact the investigators at the numbers given below. In addition, the following articles may be of interest to you if you wish to learn more about this area:


Sandra Parker 822-5581 Dr. Daniel Perlman 822-6138
Relationship Questionnaire

Please think about the way you usually feel in your close relationships with others. Think about all of your close relationships - not just how you usually feel in your romantic relationships, or your friendships, or your family relationships, but how you feel in general, across all of your relationships that you consider to be close.

Below are descriptions of four general relationship styles that people often report.

Please read the four following descriptions (A, B, C, and D) and CIRCLE the one letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you generally are in your close relationships.

A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don’t value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Referring to the four descriptions on the previous page, please use the scales below to rate each of the relationship styles (A, B, C, & D) according to the extent to which you think each description corresponds to your usual relationship style across all of your close relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style C</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style D</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please tell us a little about your current romantic relationship:

1. How long have you been in this relationship? (in months) ________________

2. Do you and others consider you and your partner to be a "couple"? Yes No

3. Do you live with your romantic partner? Yes No

4. Is this your only current romantic relationship? Yes No

5. Is your romantic partner male or female? Male Female

Now, think about your closest friends (not including your romantic partner, your mother, or your father). Among your closest friends, what number are women? _______. Among your closest friends, what number are men? _______.

I am (circle one): Male Female

So that one of the investigators may contact you for future participation in our study, we ask that you provide the following information:

First name and initial of last name: __________________________

Telephone number where I can be reached is: ________________
(please indicate good/bad times to call, if any).

Thank you for your participation.
The purpose of this study is to examine how people understand and experience their current relationships with others. We are interested in your current romantic relationship, closest same-sex friendship, and closest opposite-sex friendship (other than your romantic partner).

It is very important that you complete this questionnaire on your own, without consulting with others. Your unique point of view is very valuable to us, since you are the expert on your experience. Even though you might want to talk about some of the items in the questionnaire, please wait until after you have completed it on your own before discussing it with others. Please set aside enough privacy and time to reflect carefully on your close relationships, and tell us what it feels like for you to be in those relationships.

The questionnaire that follows asks you to provide some information about yourself and about each of the three relationships. For each relationship, you are asked to complete a set of questions about what you generally feel and do when you are with each of those persons. The questionnaire should take about 2 hours to complete.

This study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for Sandra Parker’s Ph.D. thesis. All answers that you provide will be kept completely confidential. Please do not write your name or student identification on this questionnaire. We will create an anonymous identification number for each respondent. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without jeopardizing your class standing. If you complete the questionnaire it will be assumed that your consent to participate in this study has been given.

Thank you for your time and participation. The benefits you may gain from taking part in this study include an opportunity to reflect on and share your experience of being in relationships, and an increased awareness of your views of relationships with others. If you have any questions or would like further information, you are welcome to contact the investigators at the numbers given below. In addition, we invite you to contact the investigators for information about the results and findings of this study, which will be available to you approximately one year from now. Also, the following articles may be of interest to you if you wish to learn more about this area:


Sandra Parker 822-5581    Dr. Daniel Perlman 822-6138
Part 1: Background Information. Please write your answers in the right-hand column below.

Please tell us about yourself:

1. What is your sex? Female = 1 Male = 2
2. What is your age? (in years)
3. What year are you in university? (choose one)
   1 2 3 4 5 (= grad student)
4. a) What is your ethnic identification? _______________________
   b) If you provided us with your ethnic identification, please use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you feel your ethnic identification influences your close relationships with others: (Circle one).

   1 2 3 4 5
   not at all  a little  moderately  very much  completely

Please tell us about your romantic partner:

1. What is her/his sex? Female = 1 Male = 2
2. What is her/his age? (in years)
3. How long have you been in this relationship? _____ years and _____ months
4. How often, on average, do you see/speak to this person? Number of times _____ per (check one) _____ day, _____ week, or _____ month
5. How close are you to this person? (use the scale below for your answer) __________

   1 2 3 4 5
   a little  somewhat  moderately  very  extremely

Please tell us about your closest same-sex friend: The only exceptions are: do not describe your romantic partner again, and do not describe your mother or father.

1. What is her/his sex? Female = 1 Male = 2
2. What is her/his age? (in years)
3. How long have you been in this relationship? _____ years and _____ months
4. How often, on average, do you see/speak to this person? Number of times _____ per (check one) _____ day, _____ week, or _____ month
5. Is this person a relative by blood or marriage? __________
   (if so, please state the relationship)

6. How close are you to this person? (use the scale below for your answer) __________

   1 2 3 4 5
   a little  somewhat  fairly  very  extremely

Please turn over...
Please tell us about your closest opposite-sex friend: The only exceptions are: do not describe your romantic partner again, and do not describe your mother or father.

1. What is her/his sex? Female = 1 Male = 2
2. What is her/his age? (in years)
3. How long have you been in this relationship? ____ years and ____ months
4. How often, on average, do you see/speak to this person? Number of times ____ per (check one) ____ day, ____ week, or ____ month
5. Is this person a relative by blood or marriage? (if so, please state the kin relationship)
6. How close are you to this person? (use the scale below for your answer)

1. a little
2. somewhat
3. fairly
4. very
5. extremely

Part 2: Romantic partner

The next few pages will focus on your relationship with your romantic partner. Please think about that relationship and, using the scales provided below, give your best estimate of how often or how much the following things are experienced in your relationship.

MPDQ:

When you talk about things that matter to you, how often does your romantic partner ...(answer using the scale below):

1. never
2. rarely
3. occasionally
4. more often than not
5. most of the time
6. always

1. pick up on your feelings
2. feel like you’re not getting anywhere
3. show an interest
4. get frustrated
5. change the subject
6. share similar experiences
7. keep feelings inside
8. respect my point of view
9. see the humour in things
10. feel down
11. express an opinion clearly
When you talk about things that matter to your romantic partner, how often do you... (answer using the scale below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 never</th>
<th>2 rarely</th>
<th>3 occasionally</th>
<th>4 more often than not</th>
<th>5 most of the time</th>
<th>6 always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. become receptive |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
2. get impatient |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
3. try to understand |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
4. feel moved |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
5. avoid being honest |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
6. get discouraged |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
7. have difficulty listening |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
8. get involved |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
9. feel energized |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
10. get bored |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |
11. keep an open mind |         |         |                |                      |                   |         |

MSIS:

Keeping in mind your relationship with your romantic partner, please use the scale below to tell us how often you experience the following:

|   | 1 Very rarely | 2 Some of the time | 3 Almost always |
1. When you have leisure time how often do you choose to spend it with him/her alone? |         |         |         |
2. How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her? |         |         |         |
3. How often do you show him/her affection? |         |         |         |
4. How often do you confide very personal information to him/her? |         |         |         |
5. How often are you able to understand his/her feelings? |         |         |         |
6. How often do you feel close to him/her? |         |         |         |
7. How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her? |         |         |         |
8. How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy? |         |         |         |
9. How close do you feel to him/her most of the time? |         |         |         |
10. How important is it to you to listen to his/her very personal disclosures? |         |         |         |

Please turn over...
Keeping in mind your relationship with your romantic partner, please use the scale below to tell us how much you experience the following:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How satisfying is your relationship with him/her?  
12. How affectionate do you feel towards him/her?  
13. How important is it to you that he/she understands your feelings?  
14. How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with him/her?  
15. How important is it to you that he/she be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy?  
16. How important is it to you that he/she show you affection?  
17. How important is your relationship with him/her in your life?  

ROCI:

Keeping in mind your relationship with your romantic partner, think about how you typically handle things when you want to get your way with that person. Please use the scale below to tell us how characteristic of you are the following statements:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all like me</td>
<td>Somewhat like me</td>
<td>Very much like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I try to investigate an issue with my romantic partner to find a solution acceptable to us.  
2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of my romantic partner.  
3. I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my romantic partner to myself.  
4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of my romantic partner to come up with a decision jointly.  
5. I try to work with my romantic partner to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.
Keeping in mind your relationship with your romantic partner, think about how you typically handle things when you want to get your way. Please use the scale below to tell us how characteristic of you are the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Not at all like me</th>
<th>2 Somewhat like me</th>
<th>3 Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my romantic partner.  
7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.  
8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.  
9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favour.  
10. I usually accommodate to the wishes of my romantic partner.  
11. I give in to the wishes of my romantic partner.  
12. I exchange accurate information with my romantic partner to solve a problem together.  
13. I usually allow concessions to my romantic partner.  
14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.  
15. I negotiate with my romantic partner so that a compromise can be reached.  
16. I try to stay away from disagreement with my romantic partner.  
17. I avoid an encounter with my romantic partner.  
18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favour.  
19. I often go along with the suggestions of my romantic partner.  
20. I use “give and take” so that a compromise can be made.  
21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue with my romantic partner.  
22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.  
23. I collaborate with my romantic partner to come up with decisions acceptable to us.  
24. I try to satisfy the expectations of my romantic partner.  
25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation with my romantic partner.  
26. I try to keep my disagreement with my romantic partner to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.  
27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my romantic partner.  
28. I try to work with my romantic partner for a proper understanding of a problem.  

Please turn over...
Part 3: Same-sex Friend

The next few pages will focus on your relationship with the person you identified at the beginning of this questionnaire as your closest same-sex friend. Please think about that relationship and, using the scales provided below, give your best estimate of how often or how much the following things are experienced in your closest same-sex friendship.

When you talk about things that matter to you, how often does your closest same-sex friend...(answer using the scale below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>more often than not</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. pick up on your feelings
2. feel like you're not getting anywhere
3. show an interest
4. get frustrated
5. change the subject
6. share similar experiences
7. keep feelings inside
8. respect my point of view
9. see the humour in things
10. feel down
11. express an opinion clearly

When you talk about things that matter to your closest same-sex friend, how often do you...(answer using the scale below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>more often than not</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. become receptive
2. get impatient
3. try to understand
4. feel moved
5. avoid being honest
6. get discouraged
7. have difficulty listening
8. get involved
9. feel energized
10. get bored
11. keep an open mind
Keeping in mind your relationship with your closest same-sex friend, please use the scale below
to tell us how often you experience the following:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Very rarely    Some of the time   Almost always

1. When you have leisure time how often do you choose to spend it with him/her alone? _____
2. How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her? _____
3. How often do you show him/her affection? _____
4. How often do you confide very personal information to him/her? _____
5. How often are you able to understand his/ her feelings? _____
6. How often do you feel close to him/her? _____
7. How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her? _____
8. How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy? _____
9. How close do you feel to him/her most of the time? _____
10. How important is it to you to listen to his/her very personal disclosures? _____
11. How satisfying is your relationship with him/her? _____
12. How affectionate do you feel towards him/her? _____
13. How important is it to you that he/she understands your feelings? _____
14. How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with him/her? _____
15. How important is it to you that he/she be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy? _____
16. How important is it to you that he/she show you affection? _____
17. How important is your relationship with him/her in your life? _____

ROCI:

Keeping in mind your relationship with your closest same-sex friend, think about how you typically handle things when you want to get your way with that person. Please use the scale below to tell us how characteristic of you are the following statements:

1  2  3  4  5
Not at all  Somewhat  Very much
like me      like me      like me

1. I try to investigate an issue with my friend to find a solution acceptable to us. _____
2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of my friend. _____
3. I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my friend to myself. _____
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Not at all like me</th>
<th>2 Somewhat like me</th>
<th>3 Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I try to integrate my ideas with those of my friend to come up with a decision jointly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I try to work with my friend to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I use my authority to make a decision in my favour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I usually accommodate to the wishes of my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I give in to the wishes of my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I exchange accurate information with my friend to solve a problem together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I usually allow concessions to my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I negotiate with my friend so that a compromise can be reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I try to stay away from disagreement with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I avoid an encounter with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I use my expertise to make a decision in my favour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I often go along with the suggestions of my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I use &quot;give and take&quot; so that a compromise can be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I collaborate with my friend to come up with decisions acceptable to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I try to satisfy the expectations of my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I try to keep my disagreement with my friend to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I try to work with my friend for a proper understanding of a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Opposite-sex Friend

The next few pages will focus on your relationship with the person you identified at the beginning of this questionnaire as your closest opposite-sex friend. Please think about that relationship and, using the scales provided below, give your best estimate of how often or how much the following things are experienced in your closest opposite-sex friendship.

When you talk about things that matter to you, how often does your friend ...(answer using the scale below):

1. pick up on your feelings
2. feel like you’re not getting anywhere
3. show an interest
4. get frustrated
5. change the subject
6. share similar experiences
7. keep feelings inside
8. respect my point of view
9. see the humour in things
10. feel down
11. express an opinion clearly

When you talk about things that matter to your closest opposite-sex friend, how often do you...(answer using the scale below):

1. become receptive
2. get impatient
3. try to understand
4. feel moved
5. avoid being honest
6. get discouraged
7. have difficulty listening
8. get involved
9. feel energized
10. get bored
11. keep an open mind

Please turn over...
Keeping in mind your relationship with your closest opposite-sex friend, please use the scale below to tell us how often you experience the following:

1. 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Very rarely  Some of the time  Almost always

1. When you have leisure time how often do you choose to spend it with him/her alone? ______
2. How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her? ______
3. How often do you show him/her affection? ______
4. How often do you confide very personal information to him/her? ______
5. How often are you able to understand his her feelings? ______
6. How often do you feel close to him/her? ______
7. How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her? ______
8. How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy? ______
9. How close do you feel to him/her most of the time? ______
10. How important is it to you to listen to his/her very personal disclosures? ______
11. How satisfying is your relationship with him/her? ______
12. How affectionate do you feel towards him/her? ______
13. How important is it to you that he/she understands your feelings? ______
14. How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with him/her? ______
15. How important is it to you that he/she be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy? ______
16. How important is it to you that he/she show you affection? ______
17. How important is your relationship with him/her in your life? ______

ROCI:

Keeping in mind your relationship with your closest opposite-sex friend, think about how you typically handle things when you want to get your way with that person. Please use the scale below to tell us how characteristic of you are the following statements:

1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Somewhat Very much like me like me like me

1. I try to investigate an issue with my friend to find a solution acceptable to us. ______
2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of my friend. ______
3. I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my friend to myself. ______
4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of my friend to come up with a decision jointly.

5. I try to work with my friend to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.

6. I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my friend.

7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.

8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.

9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favour.

10. I usually accommodate to the wishes of my friend.

11. I give in to the wishes of my friend.

12. I exchange accurate information with my friend to solve a problem together.

13. I usually allow concessions to my friend.

14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.

15. I negotiate with my friend so that a compromise can be reached.

16. I try to stay away from disagreement with my friend.

17. I avoid an encounter with my friend.

18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favour.

19. I often go along with the suggestions of my friend.

20. I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.

21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue with my friend.

22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.

23. I collaborate with my friend to come up with decisions acceptable to us.

24. I try to satisfy the expectations of my friend.

25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation with my friend.

26. I try to keep my disagreement with my friend to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.

27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my friend.

28. I try to work with my friend for a proper understanding of a problem.

Please turn over...
Part 6: ROSS

Now, please think specifically about your close same-sex friendships. Think about how you usually feel, and CIRCLE the letter which best corresponds to the way you generally are in your close same-sex friendships.

A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others of the same sex. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others of the same sex not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others of the same sex. I want emotionally close relationships with others of the same sex but I find it difficult to trust others of the same sex completely. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others of the same sex.

C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others of the same sex, but I often feel that they are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close same-sex friendships, but I sometimes worry that others of the same sex don't value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without close emotional friendships with others of the same sex. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others of the same sex, or to have others of the same sex depend on me.

Referring to the four descriptions above, please use the scales below to rate each of the relationship styles (A, B, C, & D) according to the extent to which you think each description corresponds to your usual relationship style across your close same-sex friendships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 7: ROOS

Now, please think specifically about your close opposite-sex friendships (not including your romantic partner). Think about how you usually feel, and CIRCLE the letter which best corresponds to the way you generally are in your close opposite-sex friendships.

A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others of the opposite sex. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t worry about being alone or having others of the opposite sex not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others of the opposite sex. I want emotionally close relationships with others of the opposite sex but I find it difficult to trust them completely. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others of the opposite sex.

C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others of the opposite sex, but I often feel that they are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close opposite-sex friendships, but I sometimes worry that others of the opposite sex don’t value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without close emotional friendships with others of the opposite sex. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others of the opposite sex, or to have others of the opposite sex depend on me.

Referring to the four descriptions above, please use the scales below to rate each of the relationship styles (A, B, C, & D) according to the extent to which you think each description corresponds to your usual relationship style across your close opposite-sex friendships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn over...
Part 8: RORR

Now, please think specifically about your romantic relationships. Think about how you usually feel, and CIRCLE the letter which best corresponds to the way you generally are in your romantic relationships.

A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to a romantic partner. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having a romantic partner not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to a romantic partner. I want an emotionally close relationship with a romantic partner but I find it difficult to trust romantic partners completely. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to a romantic partner.

C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with a romantic partner, but I often feel that they are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without a romantic partner, but I sometimes worry that they don't value me as much as I value them.

D. I am comfortable without a close emotional relationship with a romantic partner. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on a romantic partner, or to have a romantic partner depend on me.

Referring to the four descriptions above, please use the scales below to rate each of the relationship styles (A, B, C, & D) according to the extent to which you think each description corresponds to your usual relationship style in your romantic relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style C</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style D</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking part in our study of personal relationships. We appreciate your contribution of time and energy, and we value your unique perspective on your relationships.