ATTACHMENT, NEGATIVE SELF-SCHEMAS, AND

COPING WITH SEPARATION-INDIVIDUATION

DURING THE TRANSITION TO COLLEGE

By

STEVEN ANTHONY RORING II

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Durant, Oklahoma
2006

Master of Science in Counseling
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
2008

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2012

ATTACHMENT, NEGATIVE SELF-SCHEMAS, AND

COPING WITH SEPARATION-INDIVIDUATION

DURING THE TRANSITON TO COLLEGE

Dissertation Approved:

Dissertation Adviser's Name Here

Dr. Carrie Winterowd

Dissertation Adviser

Dr. Barbara Carlozzi

Dr. Julie Dorton-Clark

Dr. Steve Edwards

Dr. Janice Miller

Outside Committee Member

Dr. Sheryl A. Tucker

Dean of the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Attachment, Negative Self-Schemas, and Coping with Separation-Individuation during the

Transition to College

The first semester for college students can be a time to facilitate autonomy, develop

relationships with faculty and peers, and to learn more about the self. College can be a time of

intense stress, due to the increased amount of pressure students may feel to earn satisfactory

grades and to socialize. Researchers have conceptualized the experiences encountered by college

students as a stressful life event (Schroevers, Kraaij, & Garneski, 2007), a period of adjustment

(Crockett, Iturbide, Stone, & McGinley, et al., 2007; Wodka & Barakat, 2007), and as a college

transition (Brissette, Scheier, & Carver, 2002; Fisher & Hood, 1987; Larose & Boivin, 1998) that

is comparable to a second "strange situation" (Kenny, 1987). This transition period has resulted in

a number of difficulties associated with maladaptive adjustment, such as homesickness and social

anxiety (Urani, Miller, Johnson, & Petzel, 2003), increased use of alcohol (Economos,

Hildebrandt, & Hyatt, 2008), symptoms of depression (Schroevers, et al., 2007), and anxiety and

absent-mindedness (Fisher & Hood, 1987).

Attachment

Although the factors associated with transition to college can be quite broad, researchers

have attempted to specifically conceptualize this period of college as a time in which students are

experiencing changes within interpersonal relationships, and a variable that has often been

explored is attachment style (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Lapsley & Edgerton, 2002; Saferstein,

Neimeyer, & Hagans, 2005; Vivona, 2000). Attachment style has been defined as "the seeking

and maintaining proximity to another individual" (Bowlby, 1969, p. 194). Students who make the transition from high school to college are placed into a strange situation (Kenny, 1987) that entails a new living environment and the possibility of reorganizing new attachments with peers, professors, romantic partners, and other relationships.

Bowlby (1969) noted that the attachment to the caregiver is initiated early in life and allows for an individual to develop inner working models of the self and others that shapes how the child views relationships with other people during adolescence and adulthood. Ainsworth et al. (1978) derived different attachment styles (secure, anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant) based on her experimental study called the "strange situation". Different levels of distress were associated with differences in attachment style among the infants when the mother departed and returned to the experimental situation. Securely attached infants acted somewhat distressed when the mother left the room and were comforted by her return. Anxious-ambivalent babies acted distraught and protested when the mother left the room and when she returned, and avoidant babies showed actions of not being distressed when the mother left and when she returned.

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) later conceptualized the inner working models of self and others that transcends into adulthood as positive or negative. A positive inner working model of the self and others characterizes individuals who feel secure in their attachment to others and they tend to believe people are accepting and responsive to their needs. Preoccupied individuals have a negative working model of the self and a positive working model of others that is characterized by a tendency to define their sense of self worth according to acceptance by others. Individuals with a positive model of self and a negative model of others are considered to have a dismissive attachment that is characterized by independence and avoidance of relationships. Negative inner working models of self and others with a personal sense of unworthiness and expectation that others will be rejecting and untrustworthy characterizes individuals with a fearful attachment style (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Attachment has been linked to well-being (Love & Murdock, 2004), academic competency and adjustment (Aspelmeier & Kerns, 2003; Lapsley & Edgerton, 2002; Larose & Boivin, 1998), seeking support from others (Collins & Feeney, 2000), and depression (Wei, Russell, & Zakalik, 2005) in college students. In particular, college students with an avoidant romantic attachment style have been less likely to seek support during distress and to use indirect strategies, such as sulking, when seeking the support of others (Collins & Feeney, 2000), and have also expected other people to not be supportive when disclosing distressing feelings (Wei et al., 2005). Conversely, college students with secure attachment styles have experienced less conflict with friends (Saferstein, et al., 2005), have felt more competent on academic tasks (Aspelmeier & Kerns, 2003), and have experienced lower levels of anxiety, depression, and worry in comparison with students who had more insecure attachments with their parents (Vivona, 2000).

Coping

Aside from exploring how attachment styles relate to the adjustment and transition to college, another way to conceptualize how college students adapt to the transition to college is to explore the processes they use to increase their well-being or state of mind, such as coping styles. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping is defined as "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing and exceeding the resources of the person" (p. 141). Lazarus (1966) reported that individuals are more likely to use adaptive coping strategies when a threatening experience is interpreted to be mild, but pathological forms of coping are more evident when individuals are experiencing more severe, threatening situations. Coping strategies are shaped by early life experiences and are selected based upon social and personal consequences (Lazarus, 1966). Coping styles characterized by problem-solving and positive reappraisal have been associated with positive outcomes during stressful situations (Folkman & Lazarus, 1986).

Differences in coping styles for first-semester college students have been related to personal and emotional adjustment (Leong, Bonz, & Zachar, 1997), optimism (Brissette, et al., 2002), poor

physical health (Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2007) the use of alcohol (Pritchard, Wilson, & Yamnitz, 2007), and sadness (Vandervoort, 2001). Leong et al. (1997) found that personal and emotional adjustment was predicted by active coping among freshmen college students, while problem-solving coping has been found to be predictive of better health among freshmen college students (Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2007). Students have also identified alcohol intoxication as a coping mechanism to feel better during stressful events (Pritchard et al., 2007).

Researchers have also attempted to understand how attachment styles are related to coping styles and stress (Howard & Medway, 2004), sensory processing styles (Jerome & Liss, 2005), and the effects of physiological regulation on emotions (Diamond & Hicks, 2005). For example, Howard and Medway (2004) found that secure attachment styles were related to individuals seeking help from family members, while individuals with insecure attachments were found to be more likely to use drugs and alcohol. Jerome and Liss (2005) also found that secure attachment styles were more likely to be related to sensory seeking, such as attempting to access emotional support and reinterpreting experiences positively. Attachment anxiety has been related to reactive coping styles among undergraduate college students (Lopez et al., 2001), with perceived coping styles mediating the relationships between avoidant attachment styles and psychological distress (Wei, Heppner, & Mallinckrodt, 2003).

In summary, the coping styles that have led to positive outcomes for college students are seeking support from others (Howard & Medway, 2004), positive reappraisal (Jerome & Liss, 2005), and problem-solving (Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2007). Exploring the core beliefs or schemas associated with the use of different coping strategies may be vital to understanding the impact of early life experiences on the use of coping styles during the transition from high school to college.

Negative Self-Schemas

Another variable of interest that may influence the transition to college are core beliefs individuals have about themselves. Such cognitive lenses have often been called schemas, which are believed to be developed during infancy and childhood as a function of interactions with parents and

other significant individuals (Beck, 1964). Young (1999) noted that self-schemas are cognitive templates derived from childhood experiences with significant caregivers that are used by individuals to process interpersonal interactions and their subsequent reactions and that negative self-schemas can develop if core needs are not met.

Young (1999) theorized 15 negative self schemas that cut across five domains of experience. The first domain, Disconnection and Rejection, is characterized by expecting that personal needs will not be met in a predictable manner by significant others, and includes the schemas Emotional Deprivation (ED), Social Isolation/Alienation (SI), Abandonment/Instability (AB), Mistrust/Abuse (MA), and Defectiveness/Shame (DS). Impaired Autonomy and Performance (IAP), the second domain, refers to personal and worldly expectations that interfere with the ability to function independently or successfully. Enmeshment/Undeveloped Self (EM), Dependence/Incompetence (DI), Vulnerability to harm or illness (VH), and Failure (FA) are the negative self-schemas in the second domain. The third domain, Impaired Limits, refers to a deficiency in internal limits. Negative self-schemas in this domain include Insufficient Self-Control/Self-Discipline (IS) and Entitlement/Grandiosity (ET). Other-Directedness refers to an excessive focus on the needs, feelings, and responses of others at the expense of personal needs and is considered to be the fourth domain. Schemas in this domain include Subjugation (SB) and Self-Sacrifice (SS). The fifth domain, Overvigilance and Inhibition, refers to an excessively suppressing spontaneous feelings and impulses to adhere to personally rigid, internalized rules. Schemas in this domain include Emotional Inhibition (EI) and Unrelenting Standards/Hypercriticalness (US).

Negative self-schemas have been to be related to anxiety disorders and depression (Muris, 2006), negative appearance schemas (Ledoux, Winterowd, Richardson, & Dorton-Clark, 2010), bulimia (Waller, Meyer, & Ohanian, 2001), anger (Calvete, Estevez, Arroyabe, & Ruiz, 2005; McKee, Roring, Winterowd, & Porras, 2012), and paranoia (Welburn, Coristine, Dagg, Pontefract, & Jordan, 2002). Individuals with bulimia have viewed themselves as incompetent and dependent as a result of being deprived of emotional support (Waller, Meyer, & Ohanian, 2001). Others (Meyer,

Leung, Feary, & Mann, 2001) have found that borderline personality symptoms mediated the relationship between the core beliefs of defectiveness and shame and symptoms of bulimia. Of interest, undergraduate students with negative self-schemas centered on mistrust and insufficient self-control tend to have high levels of anger (Calevete et al., 2005), and men receiving court-mandated group therapy for domestic violence have been found to have trait anger and negative self-schemas associated with impaired limits (McKee et al., 2012).

       To date, few researchers have investigated the relationships between attachment styles and core beliefs, or negative self-schemas. Literature reviews (Platts, Tyson, & Mason, 2002) have been conducted exploring links between attachment styles and negative self-schemas. Platts et al. (2002) cited a stable attachment early in life is likely to encourage exploration of the environment and increase the development of cognitive schemas. Furthermore, differences in attachment style may be due to differences in the schemas or beliefs people hold about themselves and others (Platts et al., 2002), but also schemas that are used in threatening situations (Ein-Dor, Mikulincer, & Shaver, 2011).

       Researchers have also empirically explored other variables related to attachment styles and negative self-schemas, such as neuroticism (Muris, 2006), dissociation among sexual and violent individuals (Baker & Beech, 2004), and bulimia (Meyer & Gillings, 2004). For instance, Wearden, Peters, Berry, and Barrowclough et al. (2008) found that secure attachment was positively related to positive core beliefs and anxious attachment styles were moderately associated with negative core beliefs. Baker and Beech (2004) reported that violent and sexual offenders exhibited a greater amount of variation in schemas and higher levels of dissociation than a group of individuals who had no history of sexual and/or violent offenses. In summary, negative self-schemas have been related to anxiety disorders and depression (Muris, 2006), anger (Calvete, et al., 2005; McKee et al., 2012), and differences between and among attachment styles (Wearden et al., 2008). Although the theoretical (Platts et al., 2002) and empirical links (Wearden et al., 2008) have been investigated, research exploring the links between attachment style and negative self-schemas among undergraduate

6

freshmen students is nonexistent. Therefore, one purpose of this study was to empirically examine the relationships between and among attachment styles and negative self-schemas. Although attachment styles and negative self-schemas may be deeply embedded within individuals, the exploration of other behaviors among undergraduate students may add to the explanation of transition experiences. Investigating the process of separating and individuating from primary caregivers may provide a more in depth explanation into the variety of feelings college students experience in the transition to college.

Separation-Individuation

The process of separation and individuation from parent(s) or primary caregivers can elicit a variety of reactions among students. During this transition, adolescents may encounter a number of experiences that can shape their ability to individuate and develop into autonomous young adults. Separation-individuation has been defined as "a development process that begins with separation from parents, peers, and other significant persons, but that extends to individuation and the development of a coherent, autonomous self" (Mattanah, Hancock, & Brand, 2004, p. 213). The process of separation and individuation from parental figures among undergraduate students has been associated with college adjustment (Choi, 2002; Kalsner & Pistole, 2003), career indecision (Tokar, Withrow, Hall, & Moradi, 2003), and parental attachment (Mattanah et al., 2004; Rice, Fitzgerald, Whaley, & Gibbs, 1995). College students with greater levels of independence reported more goal commitment, adaptation to college, and less psychological distress (Kalsner & Pistole, 2003).

This process of separation and individuation during college has been positively impacted by college men and women who report more secure attachments with their parents, but the attachment style with their mother was more strongly associated with the process of separation and individuation than the attachment style with their father (Mattanah et al., 2004). In a similar vein, college students who endorsed psychological separation free of negative feelings toward their mother reported greater vocational self-concept and less career indecision (Tokar et al., 2003). Of interest, Rice et al. (1995) found that college students with a secure attachment style were more dependent on their parents and

reported less separation anxiety and less anger than college students with an insecure attachment style.

Statement of the problem

In summary, researchers have explored the relationships between attachment styles and negative self-schemas (Wearden, et al., 2008) and how attachment styles are related to coping styles (Howard & Medway, 2004; Jerome & Liss, 2005; Lopez et al, 2001; Wei, Heppner, & Mallinckrodt, 2003). Researchers have also explored the relationships between attachment styles and separation-individuation among college students (Mattanah et al., 2004; Rice et al., 1995; Tokar et al., 2003). More research is needed to understand how attachment styles, negative self-schemas, and coping styles may individually, and as a whole, be related to separation and individuation from parent(s) among first-semester college students. No researchers to date have explored these variables together among undergraduate freshman college students.

Because the transition to college has been considered to be analogous to a "strange situation" (Kenny, 1987), the tenets of attachment theory contend that these college students are in a stressful process of regulating their attachment system because they are away from their primary caregiver(s), similar to the landmark study conducted by Ainsworth et al. (1978). Students with a secure attachment to parents feel comfortable turning to them in times in which support is needed during stressful periods of college (Kenny, 1987). It is also believed that core beliefs or negative-self schemas are associated with differences in attachment style (Platts et al., 2002) and triggered by events within an environment with a high amount of emotion and tend to be self-perpetuating and difficult to change (Young & Gluhoski, 1997). Therefore, it is important to also explore their coping strategies in dealing with stressful events, including the transition to college.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to (1) examine the relationships between and among mother and father attachment styles, negative self-schema domains, coping styles, and feelings of separation-

individuation; (2) explore mother and father attachment style, negative self-schema domains, and coping styles as predictors of feelings of separation-individuation; and (3) explore attachment styles as predictors of negative self-schemas and coping as well as negative self-schema domains as predictors of coping.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that parental attachment, negative self-schemas, and coping would be significantly predictive of feelings of separation and individuation. Specifically, it was expected that negative self-schemas associated with disconnection and rejection and the use of avoidance coping strategies would be significantly predictive of higher levels of separation and individuation. Last, it was hypothesized that parental attachment would be significantly predictive of coping styles involving problem-solving.

Significance of the study

The results obtained from the study may help mental health practitioners to understand the difficulties that first-semester college students may encounter, which can help guide treatment services if undergraduate freshmen college students seek counseling services because of difficulties with adjustment. Understanding the relationships between attachment, negative self-schemas, coping styles, and separation-individuation can help the mental health practitioner with client conceptualization. For instance, if a client is deemed to be exhibiting a fearful attachment style, the practitioner may need to focus on rapport more extensively than if the client exhibited a secure attachment style. Wei et al. (2005) report that processing with the client how attachment styles relate to anxiety may help the client to understand the doubts they have about forming relationships with others.

With respect to negative self-schemas, if a client is exhibiting core beliefs that center on defectiveness and shame, the practitioner may need to focus on strength-based approaches with the client. Moreover, the client and practitioner could process how negative self-schemas relate to the amount of difficulty a client experiences in adjusting to college. The client may feel anxious and

doubtful of his or her abilities with adjusting to college, but it could also be a long-standing negative self-schema that is inhibiting adjustment. Exploring negative self-schemas may help the practitioner to understand the core beliefs that impeded his or her ability to relate to others, as well as the intensity of those core beliefs.

Exploring how the client has coped with the transition to college can help the practitioner to formulate a better treatment plan for undergraduate freshman college students. For instance, some college students may not have difficulty initiating new relationships, but other students may not be able to negotiate relationships with others easily. Wang, Heppner, and Berry (1997) reported that focusing on social support skills can help highly expressive individuals who are having problems with relationships. Also, processing coping styles may help the practitioner to explore with the client other ways of coping with adjustment.

Processing the degree to which undergraduate freshmen separate and individuate from their parents can help mental health practitioners explore healthy and unhealthy separation processes. For example, investigating the feelings college students experience regarding their transition to college can provide a forum in which mental health practitioners can normalize students' separation from parents and caregivers as a process of adolescent identity development (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). Moreover, emancipation from parents may involve coping with unfamiliar situations in which they feel ill-prepared, and mental health practitioners can explore the degree to which the student can confide in, and collaborate with, their parents to resolve their issues (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995).

Considering the variables collectively, the findings gleaned from this study may help future students, freshmen orientation staff and professors, and university counselors to be more aware of the adaptive and maladaptive coping styles that have been used during the transition to college to guide curriculum taught within the classrooms and to guide clinicians with treatment planning. Moreover, an understanding of college students' attachment styles, negative self-schemas, and feelings associated with separation and individuation from primary caregiver(s) can help future researchers and practitioners to be aware of long-standing behaviors that contribute to the coping styles college

students use during this stressful period of their life. A better recognition of the difficulty in modifying long-standing maladaptive behavior may allow the students to feel that other people are able to empathically resonate with the stresses and difficulties they have experienced.

CHAPTER III

Method

Attachment, Negative Self-Schemas, Coping and Separation-Individuation during the Transition

to College

Participants

One hundred fifty-six freshmen students originally participated in this study. Seven participants were removed from the study as a result of significant missing data, and one student was deleted because they were significantly older than the rest of the sample. The final sample of students consisted of 149 undergraduate college students with a mean age of 18.68 years (SD = 1.07) and a range of 18-25. Approximately 70.5% of the participants were female (n = 105) and 28.9% were male (n = 43). The majority of the participants identified themselves as Caucasian (82%, n = 122); 6% (n = 9) identified themselves as African American; 1.3% (n = 2) reported they were Hispanic; 3.3% (n = 5) reported they were Native American; 6.7% (n = 10) identified themselves as Biracial; and 0.7% (n =1) identified themselves as other race. In terms of marital status, 95.3% (n= 142) identified themselves as single, 1.3% (n = 2) reported themselves to be in a partnered relationship, and 3.4% (n = 10) identified themselves as divorced. In terms of sexual orientation, 98% of the participants identified themselves as heterosexual (n = 146), 0.7% as gay or lesbian (n = 1), and 0.7 % identified themselves as bisexual (n = 1).

Measures

Demographic page. On the first page of the on-line survey, participants completed questions related to their race, age, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, parental education, and living situation.

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1989).

The IPPA is a 75-item self-report measure of mother, father, and peer attachment. Each of the three scales is comprised of 25 items. For this study, only the mother and father subscales were used. Participants were asked to read each item and rate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (0 = never to 4 = very often) measuring the nature of their relationship with their mother or father. An example of an item from the father subscale includes "My father trusts my judgment." An example item from the mother subscale includes "I trust my mother." While there are subscales for mother, father, and peer attachment (i.e., trust, communication, and alienation), the total scores for attachments to mother and father will be used because of better psychometric support (Papini, Roggman, & Anderson, 1991).

The IPPA has been considered an attachment measure with great convergent validity because of positive correlations between parent attachment and psychological well-being, such as life satisfaction (.64) and self-esteem (.67; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Construct validity for parent attachment is supported through the correlations with family cohesion (.56) and family self-concept (.78; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). There is also good evidence for the internal consistency reliability of the IPPA. Papini et al. (1991) found evidence for good internal consistency coefficients for the maternal subscale (.89) and paternal subscale (.88), while others (McCarthy, Moller, & Fouladi, 2001) have found internal consistency coefficients to be much higher for the maternal subscale (.93) and paternal subscale (.95). Test-retest reliability estimates have been found to be high (r = .93; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Internal consistency reliability estimates for this sample were .96 for father attachment and .96 for mother attachment.

Young Schema Questionnaire-Second Edition, Short Form (YSQ-2; Young, 1998).

The YSQ-2 is composed of 75 items that assess participants' endorsement of 15 negative self-schemas. Each negative self-schema has five items in which participants were asked to respond to each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1= completely untrue of me, 6 = describes me perfectly). The negative self-schemas can be grouped into 5 domains: Disconnection and Rejection; Impaired

13

Autonomy and Performance; Impaired Limits; Overvigilance and Inhibition; and Other-Directedness. The domain scores are computed by adding the 5 negative self-schema statements included for each negative self-schema domain. For the purposes of the present study, the five negative self-schema domain scores were used.

There is considerable psychometric evidence to support to the use of the Young Schema Questionnaire. Welburn et al. (2002) reported internal consistency coefficients among the subscales to range from .76 to .93, and other researchers (Waller et al., 2001) have reported internal consistency coefficients to be higher among individuals with eating disorders (.96) and women who did not have eating disorders (.92). Waller et al. (2001) also found evidence for discriminant validity when a control group of women were compared to women with eating disorders. Other researchers have noted that the YSQ-Short Form (YSQ-2) demonstrated good construct validity in that 70 of the 75 items loaded appropriately according to theory, resulting in 5 schema domain scores (vulnerability to harm, abandonment, self-sacrifice, failure, and emotional inhibition) being related to anxiety and 4 schema domain scores (mistrust, insufficient self-control, self-sacrifice, and vulnerability to harm) being related to paranoia (Welburn et al., 2002). Internal consistency reliability estimates for the present study were .96 for the Disconnection and Rejection Domain; .93 for the Impaired Autonomy and Performance domain; .83 for the Impaired Limits domain; .81 for the Overvigilance and Inhibition domain; and .86 for the Other-Directedness domain.

Ways of Coping Questionnaire (WCQ; Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). The WCQ is a self-report measure of coping that consists of 66 items that asks respondents to indicate on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*does not apply or is not used*) to 3 (*used a great* deal) the extent to which they use certain strategies for coping. For this study, the WCQ was modified in which participants were asked to reflect on coping strategies used within the first month of the semester. For example, participants will be asked, "*take a few moments and think about the stress you experienced in your transition to college this semester.*"

The WCQ is composed of 8 different scales: Self-Controlling (personally managing emotions), Problem Solving (attempts to change situation), Distancing (withdrawing from situations), Accepting Responsibility (acceptance of role in situation), Escape Avoidance (escaping the situation), Confrontive Coping (attempts to change situation), Seeking Social Support (emotions and information from others), and Positive Reappraisal (a focus on personal growth as a result of experience in situation; Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). Although a total score has been used in research on coping strategies with college students (Mulligan & Winterowd, 2009), the subscale scores were used in this study.

Researchers (Lundqvist & Ahlstrom, 2006) have found high levels of internal consistency for the WCQ total score with patients ($r = .90$), next of kin ($r = .89$), and with college students ($r = .79$). Other researchers (Weyers, Ising, Reuter, & Janke, 2005) have noted the WCQ to exhibit internal consistency by using split-halves methods, resulting in correlations that ranged from .60-.80, with some coefficients as high as .90. Ising, Weyers, Reuter, and Janke (2006) reported split-half reliabilities to be .90 or higher, and re-test reliability over a time period of 4 weeks was found to range from .67-.74. The WCQ has been found to demonstrate good predictive validity with marital satisfaction (Bouchard, Sabourin, Lussier, & Wright et al., 1998). Internal consistency reliability estimates for the subscales in the current study are as follows: .75 for Confrontive Coping; .72 for Distancing; .71 for Self-Controlling; .75 for Seeking Social Support; .70 for Accepting Responsibility; .79 for Escape Avoidance; .78 for Planful Problem-Solving; and .79 for Positive Reappraisal.

Separation-Individuation Test of Adolescence (SITA; Levine, Green, & Millon, 1986). The Separation-Individuation Test of Adolescence is a 103-item measure used to assess the process of individuation and separation among adolescents. Participants responded to each item using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never true or strongly disagree with*) to 5 (*always true or strongly agree with*). The SITA is composed of 6 subscales: Separation Anxiety, Engulfment Anxiety, Rejection Expectancy, Nurturance-Symbiosis, Need Denial, Self-

Centeredness, and Healthy Separation. Consistent with previous research on the use of the SITA with undergraduate college students (Mattanah et al., 2004), only 3 subscale total scores were used: Separation Anxiety, Engulfment Anxiety, and Rejection Expectancy. The Separation Anxiety subscale measures a fear of losing physical or emotional connections with others; Engulfment Anxiety measures parental over control or being enveloped by a significant other that is viewed as threatening to independence and autonomy interfere; and Rejection Expectancy measures perceived emotional callousness or indifference from significant others (Levine et al., 1986; Levine & Saintonge, 1993). An example item from the Separation Anxiety subscale is "often I don't understand what people want out of a close relationship with me." An example of an item from the Engulfment Anxiety subscale is "I often feel rebellious toward things my parents tell me to do." An example of an item from the Rejection Expectancy subscale is "if I told someone about the troubles I have, they would probably not understand."

The SITA has been supported for use because of adequate psychometric support for convergent validity with validated measures of personality, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Hathaway & Mckinley, 1989) and college adjustment (Holmbeck & Leake, 1999). The SITA has been found to have adequate internal consistency reliability for the subscales, ranging from .64 to .88 (Levine & Saintonge, 1993). The SITA has also been found to have good construct validity (Levine et al., 1986; McClanahan & Holmbeck, 1992) in that factor analyses yielded a factor structure in which the subscales loaded in accord with the theory of separation-individuation. Internal consistency reliability estimates for the current sample ranged from .83 for Engulfment Anxiety to .91 for Rejection Expectancy and .86 for Separation Anxiety.

Procedure

The primary investigator sought the participation of approximately 160 undergraduate college students who are enrolled in introductory psychology courses at Oklahoma State University and who are required to participate in research. They were directed to view a list of research projects, including this one. Participants were recruited through the SONA on-line

research participant pool site and were invited to participate in a research study exploring experiences regarding their relationships with parents during the transition to college. If interested, they clicked on a URL which directed them to a website where they read the informed consent page that explained the purpose of the study, the benefits and risks of participation, and that their survey responses would be confidential and anonymous and that their names would not be included on any of the questionnaires. The participants were informed that the measures will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Students who participated clicked the "Agree to Participate" button which directed them to the surveys. Participants completed a demographic page and four questionnaires if they clicked the "Agree to Participate" button. For those who decided not to participate, they clicked the "Do Not Agree to Participate" button and were directed back to the SONA webpage. After participants completed the surveys, they clicked the "Submit Form" button that directed them to a webpage that thanked them for their participation and were offered information on counseling services resources if interested. Students participating in this study earned 1 unit of extra credit and were directed to a separate website to enter their name in order to earn credit for participation.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Attachment, Negative Self-Schemas, and Coping with Separation-Individuation during the

Transition to College

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to conducting the analyses to answer the research questions, preliminary t-tests were conducted to explore demographic group differences in the separation-individuation variables of engulfment anxiety, rejection expectancy, and separation anxiety, as well as parental attachment, negative self-schema domains, and the coping subscales.

There were no significant gender differences in all five negative self-schema domains: the disconnection and rejection domain, t (147) = .39, p =.70; impaired autonomy and performance, t (147) = -.40, p =.69; impaired limits, t (147) = -.28, p = .78; other-directedness, t (147) = 1.27, p = .21; and overvigilance and inhibition, t (147) = -.26, p = .80. There were significant gender differences in father attachment, t (147) = -2.00, p = .05, but not mother attachment, t (147) = .62, p = .54. Male freshmen college students reported significantly higher attachment levels with their father (m = 100, sd =16.03) than female freshmen college students (m = 91.3, sd = 25.72).

Student t-tests were also conducted to explore potential gender differences in feelings of separation-individuation. There were no significant gender differences in the experience of engulfment anxiety, t (147) = .01, p = .992, separation anxiety, t (147) = 1.60, p = .11, and rejection expectancy, t (147) = .71, p = .48.

T-tests results indicated statistically significant gender differences in the use of the following coping strategies: self-controlling, t (147) = 2.5, p = .01; seeking social support, t (147) = 2.8, p = .005; escape avoidance, t (147) = 2.7, p = .01; confrontive coping, t (147) = 2.0, p = .05; and positive reappraisal, t (147) = 2.5, p = .01. Female freshman college students tended to control their own emotions, seek support from others, avoid stressful situations, to change stressful situations, and viewed their stress during the transition to college as an opportunity for personal growth more than male freshmen college students. There were no statistically significant gender differences in the use of accepting responsibility, t (147) = 1.6, p = .11, distancing, t (147) = 1.2, p =.23, and planful problem-solving, t (147) = 1.9, p = .06 coping strategies.

Preliminary correlational analyses were conducted to explore the relationships of age and family income with engulfment anxiety, rejection expectancy, and separation anxiety. Age was not significantly correlated with engulfment anxiety (*r* = .05, p = .53), rejection expectancy (*r* = -.03, p = .70), and separation anxiety (*r* = -.10, p = .22). Family income was significantly and negatively related to rejection expectancy (*r* = -.30, p = .000) and separation anxiety, (*r* = - .25, p = .002), but not with engulfment anxiety (*r* = -.13, p = .11). College students who reported higher amounts of family income tended to expect less emotional rejection less separation anxiety with their caregivers during the transition to college.

Correlation Analyses

Pearson bivariate correlational analyses were conducted to explore the relationships between parental attachment styles, negative self-schema domains, coping strategies, and separation-individuation. Mother attachment was found to have low to moderate significant and negative relationships with all five negative self-schema domains: disconnection and rejection (*r* = -.45, p =.000); impaired autonomy and performance (*r* = -.29, p =.000); impaired limits (*r* = -.19, p =.02); other-directedness (*r* = -.33, p =.000); and overvigilance and inhibition (*r* = -.31, p =.000). Father attachment was also found to have low to moderate significant and negative relationships with all five negative self-schema domains: disconnection and rejection (*r* = -.39, p

=.000); impaired autonomy and performance (r = -.32, p =.000); impaired limits (r = -.25, p =.002); other-directedness (r = -.31, p =.000); and overvigilance and inhibition (r = -.31, p =.000). Mother and father attachment were found to have low to moderate significant and negative relationships with engulfment anxiety (r = -.35, p =.000; r = -.34, p = .000), rejection expectancy (r = -52, p =.000; r = -.38, p = .000), and separation anxiety (r = -.36, p =.000; r = -.28, p = .000), respectively.

All five negative self-schema domains were significantly and positively related to feelings of separation-individuation. The disconnection and rejection negative self-schema domain had a low to moderate significant relationship with engulfment anxiety (r = .37, p =.000), a highly significant relationship with rejection expectancy (r = .79, p =.000), and a moderate relationship with separation anxiety (r = .65, p =.000). The impaired autonomy and performance negative self-schema domain had a low, significant relationship with engulfment anxiety (r = .32, p =.000), a moderate relationship with rejection expectancy (r = .61, p =.000) and separation anxiety (r = .59, p =.000). The impaired limits negative self-schema domain was found to have low but significant relationships with engulfment anxiety (r = .24, p =.003), rejection expectancy (r = .33, p =.000), and separation anxiety (r = .34, p =.000). The other-directedness negative self-schema domain had low but significant relationships with engulfment anxiety (r = .31, p =.000), rejection expectancy (r = .44, p =.000), and a moderate relationship with separation anxiety (r = .54, p =.000). The overvigilance and inhibition negative self-schema domain had a low but significant relationship with engulfment anxiety (r = .33, p =.000), a moderate relationship with rejection expectancy (r = .50, p =.000) and separation anxiety (r = .46, p =.000). See Table 1 for the Correlation Matrix.

Regression Analyses

The main analyses were conducted with and without controlling for gender and family income and will be presented without controlling for gender and family income. Controlling for

gender and family income (1st block of regression model) did not produce statistically significant changes in R^2 values as well as in F values.

Parental Attachment and Negative Self-Schemas. Findings from the multiple regression analyses revealed that parental attachment was significantly and linearly related to all five negative self-schema domains: disconnection and rejection, $F (2, 145) = 29.11$, $p = .000$; impaired autonomy and performance, $F (2, 143) = 12.51$, $p = .000$; impaired limits, $F (2, 145) = 6.42$, $p = .002$; other-directedness, $F (2, 144) = 14.61$, $p = .000$; and the overvigilance and inhibition, $F (2, 145) = 13.30$, $p = .000$, and accounted for 28.6%, 14.9%, 8.1%, 16.9%, and 15.5 % of the variance, respectively. A review of the Beta weights indicated that both mother ($\beta = -.39$, $p < .001$) and father ($\beta = -.30$, $p < .001$) attachment were significant predictors of the disconnection and rejection domain. Mother ($\beta = -.23$ $p < .01$) and father ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$) attachment were significant predictors of impaired autonomy and performance. Father attachment ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .01$) was a significant predictor of impaired limits. Both mother ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .001$) and father ($\beta = -.25$, $p < .01$) attachment emerged as significant predictors of other-directedness. Mother ($\beta = -.25$, $p < .01$) and father ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .01$) attachment were also significant predictors of overvigilance and inhibition. In summary, college students who had more insecure attachments to their parents tended to endorse more negative schemas. See Table 2 for the Beta weights and regression findings.

Parental Attachment and Separation-Individuation. Results from the multiple regression analyses indicated that mother and father attachment were significantly and linearly related to engulfment anxiety, $F (2, 145) = 16.74$, $p = .000$, rejection expectancy, $F (2, 145) = 38.2$ $p = .000$, and separation anxiety, $F (2,145) = 15.1$, $p = .000$, and accounted for 19%, 35%, and 17% of the variance, respectively. A review of the Beta weights indicated that mother ($\beta = -.29$, $p < .001$) and father ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$) attachment emerged as significant predictors of engulfment anxiety. Mother ($\beta = -.46$, $p < .001$) and father ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .001$) attachment were significant predictors of rejection expectancy. Mother ($\beta = -.32$, $p < .001$) and father ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$)

attachment were also significant predictors of separation anxiety. College students who reported more insecure attachments to their parents tended to report more separation anxiety, expectations for rejection in relationships, and anxiety about enmeshment in relationships. See Table 3 for the Beta weights and regression findings.

Negative Self-Schemas and Separation-Individuation. Results also indicated negative self-schema domains were significantly and linearly related to separation anxiety, $F (5, 140) = 26.0$, $p = .000$, engulfment anxiety, $F (5, 140) = 5.9$, $p = .000$, and rejection expectancy, $F (5, 140) = 55.0$, $p = .000$ and accounted for 48%, 17%, and 66% of the variance, respectively. The disconnection and rejection ($\beta = .38$, $p < .01$) negative self-schema domain was a significant predictor of separation anxiety. There were no significant predictors of engulfment anxiety. Overvigilance and inhibition ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$) and the disconnection and rejection ($\beta = .81$, $p < .001$) negative self-schema domains were significant predictors of rejection expectancy. In summary, college students who tended to have more negative views of themselves, particularly in the areas of disconnection and rejection, reported more separation anxiety and expected rejection in their relationships with others. See Table 4 for the Beta weights and regression results.

Parental Attachment and Coping. The results from the multiple regression analyses indicated that parental attachment was a significant predictor of escape-avoidance coping strategies, $F (2, 145) = 7.61$, $p = .001$, and accounted for 9.5% of the variance. Parental attachment was not significantly and linearly related to confrontive coping, $F (2, 145) = .95$, $p = .39$; distancing, $F (2, 145) = .113$, $p = .89$; self-self-controlling, $F 2, 144) = 1.34$, $p = .27$; seeking social support, $F (2, 145) = 1.31$, $p = .27$; accepting responsibility, $F (2, 145) = 1.4$, $p = .25$; planful problem-solving, $F (2, 145) = .19$, $p = .83$; and positive reappraisal, $F (2, 143) = 1.35$, $p = .26$. Parental attachment accounted for approximately 1.3% of the variance in confrontive coping; 0% of the variance in distancing; 1.8% of the variance in self-controlling; 1.8% of the variance in seeking social support; 1.9% of the variance in accepting responsibility; 0% of the variance in planful problem solving; and 1.8% of the variance in positive reappraisal. College students who

had more insecure attachments to their parents tended to use escape-avoidance strategies to cope with their problems. See Table 5 for the Beta weights and regression findings.

Negative Self-Schemas and Coping. Results from the multiple regression analyses indicate that negative self-schema domains were significantly and linearly related to confrontive coping, $F(5, 140) = 4.35$, $p = .001$, self-controlling, $F(5, 139) = 6.25$, $p = .000$, seeking social support, $F(5, 140) = 3.89$, $p = .002$, accepting responsibility, $F(5, 140) = 3.14$, $p = .01$, escape-avoidance, $F(5, 140) = 10.23$, $p = .000$, positive reappraisal, $F(5, 138) = 9.89$, $p = .000$, and accounted for 13.4%, 18.4%, 12.2%, 10.1%, 26.8%, and 26.4% of the variance, respectively.

An examination of the Beta weights revealed that impaired limits was a significant predictor of confrontive coping ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$), distancing ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$), and the use of escape-avoidance strategies ($\beta = .28$, $p < .01$). The other-directedness ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$) negative self-schema domain was s significant predictor of seeking social support. The disconnection and rejection ($\beta = -.51$, $p < .001$), impaired limits ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$), and other-directedness ($\beta = .33$, $p < .01$) negative self-schema domains were also significant predictors of positive reappraisal. The other-directedness ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$) negative self-schema domain was a significant predictors of self-controlling coping strategies. There were no negative self-schema domain significant predictors of accepting responsibility coping strategies. Freshmen college students with higher levels of disconnection and rejection negative self-schemas tended to be less likely to use coping strategies associated with positive reappraisal. See Tables 6-13 for the Beta weights and regression findings.

Coping and Separation-Individuation. Coping strategies were significantly and linearly related to rejection expectancy, $F(8, 137) = 8.7$, $p = .000$, engulfment anxiety, $F(8, 137) = 3.8$, $p = .000$, and separation anxiety, $F(8, 137) = 5.1$, $p = .000$ and accounted for 34%, 18%, and 23% of the variance, respectively. There were no individual significant coping strategy predictors of engulfment anxiety. Confrontive coping ($\beta = .39$, $p < .01$), seeking social support ($\beta = -.37$, $p < .01$), and the use of escape-avoidance ($\beta = .33$, $p < .01$) coping strategies were significant

predictors of rejection expectancy. Only the use of escape-avoidance ($\beta = .43$, $p < .001$) coping strategies emerged as a significant predictor of separation anxiety. Freshmen college students with higher levels of rejection expectancy tended to be less likely to use coping strategies associated with seeking social support and tended to use escape-avoidance as a coping strategy. See Table 14 for the Beta weights and regression findings.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Attachment, Negative Self-Schemas, and Coping with Separation-Individuation during the

Transition to College

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between parental attachment, negative self-schemas, coping, and feelings of separation-individuation among freshmen college students during the transition to college. One hundred forty-nine freshmen college students completed parental attachment, negative self-schema, and separation-individuation measures online during the first two semesters of college, and were asked to report how they coped within the first month of the transition to college.

Parental Attachment and Negative Self-Schemas

Parental attachment was significantly related to all five negative self-schema domains. Freshmen college students with more secure attachments to their mother and father were less likely to endorse core beliefs associated with expectations that personal needs will not be met by significant others (i.e., disconnection and rejection), expectations that they cannot function independently (i.e., impaired autonomy and performance), personal deficiencies with internal limits (i.e., impaired limits), sacrificing personal needs to meet the needs of others (i.e., other-directedness), and excessively suppressing spontaneous feelings and impulses to adhere to rigid personal rules (i.e., overvigilance and inhibition). These results parallel the findings of Wearden et al. (2008) who found that positive caregiving was associated with less negative core beliefs, and is similar to previous research on the relationship between attachment anxiety and the use of schemas in threatening situations (Ein-Dor et al., 2011). For instance, Ein-Dor et al. (2011) found

that individuals with greater levels of attachment anxiety were able to detect threatening situations faster from the use of sentinel schemas, while individuals with an avoidant attachment style tended to use schemas associated with fight-or-flight responses.

The results also converge with the theories of the relationships between attachment and negative self-schemas (Dattilio, 2006; Platts et al., 2002; Young, Klosko, & Weishaar, 2003). For example, attachment styles (Platts et al., 2002) and the inability for caretakers to validate a child's feelings (Dattilio, 2006) can result in the development of maladaptive schemas. Young (1994) noted that if the basic needs of acceptance and unconditional love are not provided to children, then individuals may develop negative self-schema(s). A review of the Beta weights indicated that both mother and father attachment were significant predictors of disconnection and rejection, impaired autonomy and performance, other-directedness, and overvigilance and inhibition negative self-schemas domains. Father attachment was the only significant predictor of the impaired limits negative self-schema domain. Freshmen college students with more secure attachments to their father were less likely to endorse core beliefs associated with difficulty respecting the rights of others or not being able to cooperate with others.

Parental Attachment and Separation-Individuation

As hypothesized, freshmen college students with more secure attachments to their mother and father tended to believe their parents would provide emotional support and experienced fewer problems with rejection, separation anxiety, and engulfment anxiety during the transition to college. Freshmen college students who felt connected and trustworthy of their parents tended to believe their parents would understand them and be interested in their lives. They also were less likely to feel separation anxiety, or feel lonely, which parallel findings from other studies (Larose & Boivin, 1998; Rice et al., 1995). For instance, freshmen college students with higher levels of perceived security to their parents believed their parents supported them and experienced lower

levels of loneliness in comparison with students who had lower levels of perceived security to parents (Larose & Boivin, 1998).

Examination of beta weights revealed that mother attachment was significantly and inversely related to feelings of rejection expectancy and separation anxiety from parents, which confirms previous research on the relationship between attachment and feelings of separation-individuation during the transition to college (Mattanah et al., 2004) and parallels previous findings in which students reported stronger attachment to their mother than the attachment with their father (Larose & Boivin, 1998). The results also extend previous research which has indicated that college students with higher attachment security to their parents tend to believe they can depend on their parents (Rice et al., 1995) and feel comfortable relying on support from their parents during stressful periods of college (Kenny, 1987).

The findings confirm the tenets of attachment theory in that parental attachment is associated with separation-individuation feelings (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1969) and that the transition to college is another strange situation (Kenny, 1987) in which individuals are confronted with coping with feelings associated with attachments they have with their parent(s). Bowlby (1969) noted that the development of parental attachment allows for the development of inner working models of the self and others that shapes the nature of relationships people experience during childhood, and that the nature of attachment children have with their parents transitions to the attachment people have with other significant people during adolescence and adulthood. These inner working models of the self and others involve the degree to which people view themselves and others as positive or negative and contribute to the level of comfort people have with initiating and maintaining relationships with others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Moreover, the results also support the theoretical tenets of separation and individuation (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). The transition to college provides the opportunity for college students to feel comfortable confiding in, and collaborating with, their parents to resolve any issues they may experience. However, Kimmel and Weiner (1995) noted that individuals experience a

27

change in stability during a transition that involves growth, but also tension. Further, this change involves more self-reliance, individuation from parents and emancipation from situations in which adolescents are confronted with unfamiliar situations in which they feel incompetent to cope (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). Thus, freshmen college students with more secure attachment levels with their parents in this study reported significantly less difficulties with separation and individuation.

Negative Self-Schemas and Separation-Individuation

In line with the hypotheses of this study, negative self-schema domains were significantly predictive of rejection expectancy, separation anxiety, and engulfment anxiety. Freshmen college students who endorsed negative self-schemas in general tended to feel that their parents were enmeshed with them and restricted their personal freedom. Negative self-schemas associated with the disconnection and rejection and the overvigilance and inhibition domain were significantly predictive of rejection expectancy. Freshmen college students with negative self-schemas associated with a personal sense of defectiveness and the expectation that they will experience emotional deprivation (i.e., disconnection and rejection) and who are hypercritical of themselves and who suppress their emotions (i.e., overvigilance and inhibition) tended to feel they will be rejected by others. Of interest, no specific negative self-schema domains predicted engulfment anxiety.

The disconnection and rejection negative self-schema domain was a significant predictor of separation anxiety, as well as the other-directedness negative self-schema domain. Freshmen college students who expected to experience emotional deprivation (i.e., disconnection and rejection) from others and who have an excessive focus on the needs, feelings, and responses of others at the expense of their own personal needs (i.e., other-directedness) tended to feel lonely and less likely to be closer to their parents emotionally, which parallels previous research (Leary, 2001; Vivona, 2000; Wei et al., 2005). For example, individuals experience loneliness and sadness when they have deficits in social self-efficacy (Wei et al., 2005) or think they are rejected

28

by others (Leary, 2001). College students have also experienced guilt and resentment after separating from their parents during the transition to college (Lapsley & Edgerton, 2002) and have perceived less social support (Vivona, 2000).

The results of the current study also support the theory of negative self-schemas (Young, 1999), which is an area of research previously unexplored among freshmen college students during the transition to college. Young (1999) theorized that negative self-schemas are triggered by stressful environmental events and are associated with a high amount of emotion, and an increase in the severity of negative self-schemas results in an increase in the intensity of negative affect when schemas are triggered (Young et al., 2003).

Parental Attachment and Coping

As hypothesized, freshmen college students who reported lower levels of attachment with their mother and father tended to cope with the transition to college by escaping stressful situations, and reported significantly less use of healthier coping strategies (such as positive reappraisal, seeking social support, and planful problem-solving), which has been found to be linked to positive outcomes for college students (Howard & Medway, 2004; Jerome & Liss, 2005; (Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2007). For example, Howard and Medway (2004) found that an increase in stress among individuals with a secure attachment style was predictive of seeking support from family members while individuals who were more insecure tended to use alcohol and drugs as coping strategies. Sasaki and Yamasaki (2007) found that the use of problem-focused coping was a predictor of better health for freshmen college students than the students who used emotion-focused coping.

Considering the transition to college represents a novel experience, freshmen college students may have difficulty deciding on which health coping strategies to use during stressful situations, or even how to use healthier coping strategies. According to Lazarus (1966), early life experiences of trust and distrust may predispose individuals to perpetuate their levels of trust or distrust in future transactions, which closely parallel the tenets of attachment theory

29

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bowlby, 1969). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) noted that novel situations are unlikely to produce automatic and efficient coping, but that coping can become effective the more an individual encounters similar situations. Thus, according to the theory of coping (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), freshmen college students may be expected to have difficulty using healthy coping strategies during the transition to college. This seems to be true especially if college students have attachment problems with parents, as found in the present study.

Negative Self-Schemas and Coping

Negative self-schema domains were significantly and linearly predictive of all coping strategies except for coping strategies involving planful problem solving and distancing from others. Negative self-schemas associated with the impaired limits domain was a significant predictor of confrontive coping, distancing, self-controlling, seeking social support, escape-avoidance, and positive reappraisal. Other-directedness was also a significant predictor of self-controlling, seeking social support, and positive reappraisal. The disconnection and rejection domain was a significant predictor of positive reappraisal. There were no specific negative self-schema domains that emerged as a significant predictor of the coping strategy of accepting responsibility and planful problem solving. Freshmen college students with underlying core beliefs associated with difficulties in self-control, self-discipline, and entitlement (i.e., impaired limits) tended to cope with the transition to college by actively trying to change situations (i.e., confrontive coping), avoiding situations (i.e., escape avoidance), personally managing emotions (i.e., self-control), seeking information from others (i.e., seeking social support), and focusing on personal growth (i.e., positive reappraisal). College students with negative self-schemas associated with personally sacrificing personal needs through an excessive focus on the needs, feelings, and responses of others (i.e., other-directedness) tended to cope with the transition to college by seeking advice from others and focusing on personal growth from their experiences. Students with an expectation that personal needs will not be met by significant others (i.e.,

30

disconnection and rejection) tended to cope by focusing on personal growth from stressful situations.

These results are in line with the theory of negative self-schemas (Young & Gluhoski, 1997; Young et al., 2003), in that negative self-schemas, in particular, impaired limits and other-directedness, were associated with maladaptive coping styles. Young et al. (2003) noted that individuals who have negative self-schemas associated with impaired limits may difficulty respecting the rights of others and keeping commitments with others. Individuals who have negative self-schemas associated with other-directedness tend to sacrifice personal needs in order to gain approval from others and may have grown up in an environment characterized by conditional acceptance from parents (Young et al., 2003). Maladaptive coping styles are developed early in life to adapt to the intense emotions created by negative self-schemas and perpetuate the continuity of negative self-schemas (Young et al., 2003).

Coping and Separation-Individuation

Coping strategies were significantly predictive of rejection expectancy, separation anxiety, and engulfment anxiety. Confrontive coping, seeking social support, escape-avoidance, and positive re-appraisal were predictors of rejection expectancy, with seeking social support emerging as the strongest predictor. In line with the hypotheses of this study, freshmen college students who avoided social contact with others and who engaged in avoidance behavior associated with their emotions during the first month of college tended to expect to be rejected by others, which confirms previous research (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005; Wei et al., 2005). For instance, Wei et al. (2005) found that undergraduate students expected other people to not be supportive when disclosing distressing feelings, which may be similar to expecting rejection from others. In a similar vein, Mallinckrodt and Wei (2005) found that avoidance of relationships with others was positively related to psychological distress and negatively related to perceived social support. In the current study, coping attempts to change

31

situations of distress and the personal management of emotions were related to the expectation that others will not meet their emotional needs or that they will experience rejection from others.

The use of escape-avoidance coping strategies emerged as a significant predictor of separation anxiety from the examination of Beta weights. Attempts to engage in avoidance behavior associated with distress (i.e., escape-avoidance) during the first month of the semester were significantly associated with feeling lonely and a desire to be with others. The use of escape-avoidance coping strategies has been theorized to be related to alcohol use (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988) and has been empirically investigated among college students (Pritchard et al., 2007). For instance, Pritchard et al. (2007) found that perfectionism was a significant predictor of alcohol use, but optimism and self-esteem were predictors of psychological health at the end of the first semester.

The current findings clarify the nature of coping strategies freshmen college students use during the transition to college and exemplify the difficulties they experience with being apart from parents. The use of problem-solving and positive reappraisal coping strategies have been associated with positive outcomes during stressful situations (Folkman & Lazarus, 1986). College students in this study tended to not significantly rely on healthy coping strategies (i.e., problem-solving, positive reappraisal, and seeking social support) for separation-individuation feelings. Thus, it is possible that the significant use of other coping strategies may have not been effective or healthy, and may explain the level of distress they experienced with separation-individuation feelings.

The results from this study also converge with the theoretical tenets of coping (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) reported that coping is effective when utilized automatically and that the transition from coping to automatic behavior is gradual and that novel situations are unlikely to produce automatic and efficient coping. Pathological forms of coping are more evident than adaptive coping strategies when individuals are experiencing more severe situations (Lazarus, 1966). Given that the transition to college is a

32

stressful life event (Schroevers et al., 2007) it is plausible that freshmen college students may rely on more pathological forms of coping due to a lack of experience with major life transitions associated with being away from their parents for a significant amount of time.

Implications

The results from this study indicate that attachment styles and negative self-schemas are significantly related to feelings of separation-individuation and the use of coping strategies for freshmen college students during the transition to college. It is important for counselors and psychologists to explore the nature of attachment college students have with their parent(s). Considering the transition to college is another strange situation (Kenny, 1987), it is likely that first-semester college students may experience some intense feelings associated with being apart from their parents. It is during this time that college students are in the process of regulating the emotions they experience when thinking about their parents. The results of this study indicated that freshmen college students with more secure attachments with their parents were significantly less likely to experience difficulties with separation and individuation during the transition to college.

The findings of this study confirm the tenets of attachment theory (Ainsworth et al.,1978; Bowlby, 1969) and the theory of separation and individuation (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). The transition to college has been viewed as another strange situation (Kenny, 1987) and provides the opportunity for college students to feel comfortable confiding in, and collaborating with, their parents to resolve any issues they may experience (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). The foundation for the degree to which individuals feel a sense of trustworthiness with others is explained by the inner working models that are developed in childhood and are shaped by other attachment experiences (Bowlby, 1969). These inner working models of the self and others involve the degree to which people view themselves and others as positive or negative and contribute to the level of comfort people have with initiating and maintaining relationships with others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Yet, the transition to college represents a time in which there is a developmental need for individuals to become more self-reliant. Further, this change involves situations for practicing more self-reliance associated with individuation from parents and emancipation from situations in which adolescents are confronted with unfamiliar situations in which they feel incompetent to cope (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995).Counselors and psychologists may be able to help college students who present with difficulties adjusting to college by focusing on the relationships students have with their parents as well as developing new relationships with peers and professors. By focusing on parental attachment, counselors and psychologists may be able to normalize the feelings college students have about their parents and conflict they may experience with autonomy and interdependence, which may result in students becoming more comfortable with being apart from their parents.

Considering the relative importance of attachment to parent(s) and the concerns about rejection during the transition to college (Leary, 2001), the exploration of potential negative self-schemas among freshmen college students may be equally as important, particularly feelings associated with rejection expectancy and separation anxiety. Exploring how negative self-schemas can develop out of parental attachment style (Young, 1999; Young et al., 2003) may help freshmen college students to become aware of the impact of attachment on their core beliefs and the feelings they have about being away from their parents. Young et al. (2003) reported that negative self-schemas are triggered by environmental stress, and the use of schema therapy may help college students to become more aware of stressful environmental factors that trigger negative self-schemas, especially since the transition to college has been considered to be a stressful life event (Schroevers et al., 2007). Freshmen college students may be able to modify negative self-schemas into more positive core beliefs and be able to understand the possible source for their feelings of separation anxiety and rejection expectancy. For instance, college students who are having difficulties with separation anxiety and the expectation for rejection from their parents may be helped to explore how their beliefs of disconnection and rejection (i.e., a

34

sense of defectiveness and the belief that they will be hurt by others) may negatively reinforce their feelings, and thus perpetuate their problems. Perpetuation involves reinforcing schemas through thoughts and feelings that deters people from experiencing schema healing, and hence, become essentially self-fulfilling prophecies (Young et al., 2003). Exploring how cognitive distortions are related to misperceiving events and reinforcing negative self-schemas may help freshmen college students break the cycle of self-perpetuation.

However, the focus of clinical attention may require other aspects of helping freshmen college students during their transition to college, such as the exploration of coping strategies. Counselors and psychologists need to explore the coping strategies used by college students during the transition to college since the transition to college is a novel situation in which college students have expressed less positive attitudes toward exploring social situations (Aspelmeier & Kerns, 2003), given that novel situations may not likely produce efficient coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and unhealthy forms of coping may be used under severe stress situations (Lazarus, 1966). If college students have used unhealthy coping strategies, counselors and psychologists can help validate their feelings by normalizing their difficulty with coping effectively during the transition college. Considering that problem-solving, seeking social support, and positive re-appraisal have been deemed as healthy coping strategies (Folkman & Lazarus, 1986), counselors and psychologists can explore with freshmen college students the potential benefits of reframing problems (positive re-appraisal), seeking the support of friends and parents, and the use of problem-solving strategies associated with cognitive-behavioral therapy for difficulty with emotions related to being apart from parents. Being able to cope effectively may allow students to navigate the many developmental demands imposed upon them during the transition to college and to achieve satisfactorily in the classroom and to develop a healthy social support network.

The findings could also have implications for university retention. University administrators may be able to use the results to devise services that can be offered to freshmen

35

college students. These services may involve ways to make freshmen orientation more beneficial to students by providing them information of experiences students encounter with the transition to college, and effective coping strategies to help students manage the emotions they can experience with being apart from family members. University counseling services may also be able to impart results from this study with outreach presentations to freshmen classes during the first semester of college.

Last, the results of this study may have implications for high school students who are seniors and plan to attend college. High school counselors can help prepare high school students for the transition to college by imparting information on the importance of parental attachment on their potential feelings of separation-individuation. This, in turn, may allow high school students the opportunity to discuss with their caregiver(s) the nature of boundaries they may have with their caregiver(s) before they leave the home to attend college, as well as potential coping strategies for managing feelings of separation-individuation. High school students may also need to explore potential belief systems (i.e., negative self-schemas) before leaving home to attend college that may be triggered by stress during the transition to college.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The results from this study need to be interpreted in light of the limitations. The majority of participants in this sample were single, Caucasian, and female freshmen college students, and the results may not generalize to college students from more diverse cultural backgrounds. Future research is needed with more culturally diverse samples in order to confirm the findings of this. Another limitation is collecting data from an online research participant pool. It is possible that the participants in this study may have responded in socially desirable ways or have completed the self-report measures in multiple settings.

Considering that the purpose of this study was to explore variables during the transition to college, other research designs could have been used to explore the current variables. Future researchers may want to explore parental attachment and negative self-schemas among freshmen

college students before moving away from home, and then explore these variables again to detect possible differences as a function of time. Moreover, it is unclear the degree of distress associated with the transition to college in this study. Future researchers may need to include the use of perceived stress scales and the impact on coping strategies, as well as the degree to which freshmen college students believe they would seek counseling services or need to seek counseling services for problems encountered during the transition college.

In summary, the results from this study indicate that freshmen college students with more secure attachments to their parents are less likely to experience difficulty with rejection expectancy, engulfment anxiety, and separation and were significantly less likely to have negative self-schemas. Freshmen college students with higher levels of negative self-schemas associated with a personal sense of defectiveness and the expectation that they will experience emotional deprivation and who are hypercritical of themselves and who suppress their emotions (i.e., overvigilance and inhibition) tended to feel they will be rejected by others, while freshmen college students who expected to experience emotional deprivation from others and who meet the needs of others at the expense of their own personal needs tended to feel lonely and less likely to be closer to their parents emotionally. Freshmen college students tended to cope with feelings of separation anxiety by withdrawing from stressful situations, and they coped with feelings of rejection expectancy by actively attempting to change stressful situations, seeking advice from others, and focusing on personal growth from stressful situations. Interestingly, only the use of escape-avoidance coping strategies was significantly related to parental attachment. Freshmen college students with more insecure attachments to their mother and father tended to cope with the transition to college by escaping and avoiding stressful situations.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Armsden, G.C. & Greenberg, M.T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 427-454.

Armsden, G.C. & Greenberg, M.T. (1989). *The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Preliminary test manual.* (Available from G.C. Armsden, Department of Community Health Care Systems, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195).

Aspelmeier, J.E., & Kerns, K.A. (2003). Love and school: Attachment/exploration dynamics in college. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship, 20*, 5-30.

Bagby, R.M., Parker, J.D.A., & Taylor J.G. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale-I: Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38*, 23-32.

Baker, E. & Beech, A.R. (2004). Dissociation and variability of adult attachment dimensions and early maladaptive schemas in sexual and violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 1119-1136.

Baker, R.W., McNeill, O.V., & Siryk, B. (1985). Expectation and reality in freshman adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 94-103.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 179-189.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). *Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) Manual.* Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Barrett, T.C. Tinsley, H.E.A. (1977a). Measuring vocational self-concept crystallization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 11*, 305-313.

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

Beck, A.T. (1964). Thinking and depression II: Theory and therapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 10,* 561-571.

Beck, A. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. New York: Harper & Row.

Beck, A. T., Brown, G., Epstein, N., & Steer, R. A. (1988). An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: Psychometric properties. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 56,* 893-897.

Beck, A. T., Rial, W. Y., & Rickels, K. (1974). Short form of depression inventory: Cross-validation. *Psychological Reports, 34,* 1184-1186.

Beck, A. T., Rush, A. J., Shaw, B. F., & Emery, G. (1979). *Cognitive therapy of depression.* New York: Guilford Press.

Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., & Brown, G. (1995). *Beck Depression Inventory-II Manual*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Beck, A. T., Ward, C. M., Mendelson, M., Mock, J. E., & Erbaugh, J. K. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4,* 561-571.

Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measure of pessimism: The Hopelessness Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42,* 861-865.

Bekker, M. H. J. (1993). The development of an autonomy scale based on recent insights into gender identity. *European Journal of Personality,* 7, 177-194.

Berry, K., Band, R., Corcoran, R., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2007). Attachment styles, earlier relationships, and schizotypy in a non-clinical sample. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 80*, 563-576.

Borow, H. (1949). *Manual for the college inventory of academic adjustment*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bouchard, G., Sabourin, S., Lussier, Y., Wright, J., & Richer, C. (1998). Predictive validity of coping strategies on marital satisfaction: Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 112-131.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. I. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.

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

Brennan, K.A., Clark, C.L., & Shaver, P.R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J.A. Simpson & W.S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.

Brissette, I., Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (2002). The role of optimism in social network development, coping, and psychological adjustment during a life transition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 102-111.

Brown, C. & Dunn, W. (2002). *The adult sensory profile*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Bukowski, W., Hoza, B., & Boivin, M. (1994). Measuring friendship quality during pre- and early adolescence: The development and psychometric properties of the Friendship Qualities Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,* 11, 471-484.

Calvete, E., Estevez, A., Landin, C., Martinez, Y., Cardenoso, O., Villardon, L., & Villa, A.

(2003). Self-talk and affective disorders in youth: Valence of thinking and

cognitive content specificity. *Spanish Journal of Psychology.*

Calvete, E., Estevez, A., Lopez de Arroyabe, E., Ruiz, P. (2005). The schema

questionnaire-short form: Structure and relationship with automatic thoughts and

symptoms of affective disorders. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment,

21,* 90-99.

Carver C.S. (1997). You want to measure coping, but your protocol's too long: consider

the brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 92-100.

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A

theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,*

267-283.

Chartrand, J.M., Robbins, S.B., Morrill, W.H., Boggs, K. (1990). Development and

validation of the Career Factors Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*,

491-501.

Choi, K. (2002). Psychological separation-individuation and adjustment to college among

Korean American students: The roles of collectivism and individualism. *Journal

of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 468-475.

Cohen, S. & Hoberman, H.M. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of

life change stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13*, 99-125.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress.

Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 385-396.

Cohen, S., Mermelstein, R., Kamarck, T., & Hoberman, H.M. (1985). Measuring the

functional components of social support. In I.G. Sarason & B.R. Sarason (Eds.),

Social support: Theory, research, and application (pp.73-94). Boston: Martinus

Nijghoff.

Collins, N.L. & Feeney, B.C. (2000). A safe haven: An attachment perspective on

support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 1053-1073.

Collins, N.L. & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 644-663.

Constantinople, A. (1969). An Eriksonian measure of personality development in college students. *Developmental Psychology, 1,* 357-372.

Conte, H.R., Plutchik, R., Karasu, T.B., & Jerret, I. (1980). A self-report borderline scale: Discriminative validity and preliminary norms. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1*68, 428-435.

Crockett, L.J., Iturbide, M.I., Stone, R.A.T., McGinley, M., Raffaelli, M., & Carlo, G. (2007). Acculturative stress, social support, and coping: Relations to psychological adjustment among Mexican American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 347-355.

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. (1987). The provisions of social relationships and adaptation to stress. In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 1, pp. 37-67). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: Toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), *Social support: An interactive view* (pp. 319-366). New York: Wiley.

Dattilio, F.M. (2006). Restructuring schemata from family of origin in couple therapy. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly, 20*, 359-373.

Derogatis, L.R. (1993). *Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI): Administration, scoring and procedures manual* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Diamond, L.M. & Hicks, A.M. (2005). Attachment style, current relationship security, and negative emotions: The mediating role of physiological regulation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22,* 499-518.

Economos, C.D., Hildebrandt, M.L., Hyatt, R.R. (2008). College freshman stress and weight change: Differences by gender. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 32,* 16-25.

Ein-Dor, T. Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. (2011). Attachment insecurities and the processing of threat-related information: Studying the schemas involved in insecure people's coping strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 78-93. doi: 10.1037/a0022503

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Fisher, S. & Hood, B. (1987). The stress of the transition to university: A longitudinal study of psychological disturbance, absent-mindedness and vulnerability to homesickness. *British Journal of Psychology, 78*, 425-441.

Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R.S. (1988). *Manual for the ways of coping questionnaire: Research edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R.S. (1986). Stress processes and depressive symptomatology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95*, 107-113.

Fowler, D., Reeman, D., Smith, B., Kuipers, E., Bebbington, P., & Bashforth, H. et al. (2006). The brief core schema scales (BCSS): psychometric properties and associations with paranoia and grandiosity in non-clinical and psychosis samples. *Psychological Medicine, 36*, 749-759.

Garner D.M., Olmstead M.P., & Polivy, J. (1983). Development and validation of a multidimensional eating disorder inventory for anorexia nervosa and bulimia. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 2*, 15-34.

Gavazzi, S.M. & Sabatelli, R.M. (1988). *Differentiation and individuation in adolescence*

and early adulthood measured through multigenerational interconnectedness and family involvement. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Hathaway, S.R., & McKinley, J.C. (1989). *Manual for the administration and scoring of the MMPI-2*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1986). [Parental care-giving questionnaire]. Unpublished questionnaire as cited in Collins, N.L. & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment: Working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, (pp. 644-663).

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

Henderson, M. & Freeman, C.P.L. (1987). A self-rating scale for bulimia: The BITE. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 150*, 18-24.

Heppner, P. P. (1988). *The Problem-Solving Inventory: Manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Heppner, P. P., Cook, S. W., Wright, D. M., & Johnson, C. (1995). Progress in resolving problems: A problem-focused style of coping. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42,* 279-293.

Holmbeck, G.N., & Leake, C. (1999). Separation-individuation and psychological adjustment in late adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28*, 563-581.

Hoffman, J.A. (1984). Psychological separation of late adolescents from their parents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 170-178.

Hoffman, J.A. & Weiss, B. (1987). Family dynamics and presenting problems in college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 157-163.

Howard, M.S., & Medway, F.J. (2004). Adolescents' attachment and coping with stress.

Psychology in the Schools, 41, 391-402.

Ising, M., Weyers, P., Reuter, M., & Janke, W. (2006). Comparing two approaches for
the assessment of coping: Part ii, differences in stability in time. *Journal of
Individual Differences, 27*, 15-19.

Jerome, E.M. & Liss, M. (2005). Relationships between sensory processing style, adult
attachment, and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38,* 1341-1352.

Kahn, J.H. & Hessling, R.M. (2001). Measuring the tendency to conceal versus disclose
psychological distress. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 20*, 41-65.

Kalsner, L. & Pistole, M.C. (2003). College adjustment in a multiethnic sample:
Attachment, separation-individuation, and ethnic identity. *Journal of College
Student Development, 44*, 92-109.

Kendall, P.C. & Hollon, S.D. (1989). Anxious self-talk: Development of the Anxious
Self-Statements Questionnaire (ASSQ). *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4*, 383-
395.

Kendall, P.C., Howard, B.L., & Hays, R.C. (1989). Self-referent speech and
psychopathology: The balance of positive and negative thinking. *Cognitive
Therapy and Research, 13*, 583-598.

Kenny, M.E. (1987). The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year
college students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 17-27.

Kenny, M. E. (1990). College seniors' perceptions of parental attachments: The value and
stability of family ties. *Journal of College Student Development, 31,* 39-46.

Kimmel, D.C. & Weiner, I.B. (1995). *Adolescence: A developmental transition*. New
York, NY: Wiley.

Kohn, P.M., Lafreniere K., & Gurevhich, M. (1990). The inventory of college student's
recent life experiences: a decontaminated hassles scale for a special population.
Journal of Behavior Medicine, 13, 619-630.

Kohout, F.J., Berkman, L.F., Evans, D.A., & Cornoni-Huntley, J. (1993). Two shorter
forms of the CES-D Depression Symptoms Index. *Journal of Aging and Health,
5*, 179-193.

Koski, L.R. & Shaver, R.R. (1997). Attachment and relationship satisfaction across the
lifespan. In R.J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat (Eds.). *Satisfaction in close
relationships* (26-55) New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Lambert, M.J., Hansen, N.B., Umphress, V., Lunnen, K., Okiishi, J., Burlingame, G.M.,
& Reisinger, C.W. (1996). *Administration and scoring manual for the Dependent
Questionnaire (OQ-45.2)*. Stevenson, MD: American Professional Credentialing
Services.

Lapsley, D.K. & Edgerton, J. (2002). Separation-individuation, adult attachment
style, and college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*,
484-492.

Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (1998). Attachment to parents, social support expectations, and
socio-emotional adjustment during the high school-college transition. *Journal of
Research on Adolescence, 8*(1), 1-27.

Lazarus, R.S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York, NY:
McGraw-Hill.

Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY:
Spring Publishing Company.

Leary, M.R. (1983). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of
Personality Assessment, 47*, 66-75.

Leary, M.R. (2001). *Interpersonal rejection*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Ledoux, T, Winterowd, C., Richardson, T., & Dorton-Clark, J. (2010). Relationship of
negative self-schemas and attachment styles with appearance schemas. *Body

Image, 7, 213-217.

Leong, F.T., Bonz, M.H., & Zachar, P. (1997). Coping styles as predictors of college

adjustment among freshmen. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 10,* 211-220.

Levine, J.B., Green, C.J., & Millon, T. (1986). The separation-individuation test of

adolescence. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 50*, 123-127.

Levine, J.B., & Saintonge, S. (1993). Psychometric properties of the separation-

individuation test of adolescence within a clinical population. *Journal of Clinical

Psychology, 49*, 492-507.

Lopez, F.G., Mauricio, A.M., Gormley, B., Simko, T., & Berger, E. (2001). Adult

attachment orientations and college student distress: The mediating role of

problem coping styles. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79,* 459-464.

Love, K.M. & Murdock, T.B. (2004). Attachment to parents and psychological

well-being: An examination of young adult college students in intact families

and stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 600-608.

Lubin, B. (1965). Adjective checklists for measurement of depression. *Archives of

General Psychiatry, 12*, 57-62.

Lubin, B. (2001). *Brief Life Satisfaction Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of

Missouri-Kansas City.

Lubin, B., & Whitlock, R. (2000b). *Development of a comprehensive measure of

personality and affect for use in assessment and counseling of young adults.*

Unpublished manuscript, University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Lundqvist, L.O. & Ahlstrom, G. (2006). Psychometric evaluation of the ways of coping

questionnaire as applied to clinical and nonclinical groups. *Journal of

Psychosomatic Research, 60,* 485-493.

Mahler, M. (1968). *On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation*. New

York, NJ: International Universities Press.

Mallinckrodt, B. & Wei, M. (2005). Attachment, social competencies, social support,
and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* Vol. 52(3), 358-
367.

Mattanah, J.F., Hancock, G.R., & Brand, B.L. (2004). Parental attachment, separation-
individuation, and college student adjustment: A structural equation modeling
analysis of meditational effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 213-225.

McCarthy, C.J., Moller, N.P., & Fouladi, R.T. (2001). Continued attachment to parents:
Its relationship to affect regulation and perceived stress among college students.
Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33, 198-213.

McClanahan, G. & Holmbeck, G.N. (1992). Separation-individuation, family
functioning, and psychological adjustment in college students: A construct
validity study of the separation-individuation test of adolescence. *Journal of
Personality Assessment, 59*, 464-485.

McKee, M., Roring, S.A., Winterowd, C., & Porras, C.V. (In Press). The
relationship of negative self-schemas with partner attachment styles among male
batterers. Submitted to the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.*

McNair D.M., Lorr M., & Droppleman L.F. (1981). *Manual for the Profile of Mood
State*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service; 1981.

Meyer, C. & Gillings, K. (2004). Parental bonding and bulimic psychopathology: The
mediating role of mistrust/abuse beliefs. *International Journal of Eating
Disorders, 35,* 229-233.

Meyer, C., Leung, N., Feary, R., & Mann, B. (2001). Core beliefs and bulimic
symptomatology in non-eating-disordered women: The mediating role of
borderline characteristics. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 30,* 434-
440.

Meyer, T. J., Miller, M. L., Metzger, R. L., & Borkovec, T. D. (1990). Development and

    validation of the Penn State Worry Questionnaire. *Behavioral Research and*

    Therapy, 28, 487-495.

Moos, R. (1981). *Family Environment Scale.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists

    Press.

Muris, P. (2006). Maladaptive schemas in non-clinical adolescents: Relations to

    perceived parental rearing behaviours, big five personality factors and

    psychopathological symptoms. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 13*, 405-

    413.

Nakagawa, Y., & Daibo, I. (1985). *The Japanese version of the General Health*

    Questionnaire. Tokyo: Nihon Bunka Kagakusha. (In Japanese.).

Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1982).

    Family inventories. St Paul, MN: Family Social Science.

Osipow, S.H., Carney, C.G., Winer, J.L., Yanico, B., & Koshier, M.J. (1987). *The Career*

    Decision Scale (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Papini, D.R., Roggman, R.L., & Anderson, J. (1991). Early-adolescent perceptions of

    attachment to mother and father: A test of the emotional-distancing and buffering

    hypothesis. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 258-275.

Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British*

    Journal of Medical Psychology, 52, 1-10.

Perl, H.I. & Trickett, E.J. (1988). Social network formation of college freshmen: Personal

    and environmental determinants. *American Journal of Community Psychology,*

    16, 207-224.

Phinney, J.S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure. *Journal of Adolescent*

    Research, 7, 156-176.

Platts, H., Tyson, M., & Mason, O. (2002). Adult attachment style and core beliefs: Are

they linked? *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 9*, 332-348.

Pritchard, M.E., Wilson, G.S., & Yamnitz, B. (2007). What predicts adjustment among

college students? A longitudinal panel study. *Journal of American College*

Health, 56, 15-21.

Rice, K.G., Fitzgerald, D.P., Whaley, T.J., & Gibbs, C.L. (1995). Cross-sectional and

longitudinal examination of attachment, separation-individuation, and college

student adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 462-474.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton

University Press.

Russell, D.W. (1996). The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and

factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 20-40.

Russell, D., Peplau, L.A., & Cutrona, C.E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale:

Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 39, 472-480.

Russell, D., Peplau, L.A., & Ferguson, M.L. (1978). Developing a measure of loneliness.

Journal of Personality Assessment, 42, 290-294.

Saferstein, J.A., Neimeyer, G.J, & Hagans, C.L. (2005). Attachment as a

predictor of friendship qualities in youth. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*,

767-776.

Sasaki, M., & Yamasaki, K. (2002a). Development of a dispositional version of the

general coping questionnaire (GCQ) and examination of its reliability and

validity. *Japanese Journal of Public Health, 49*, 399-408. (In Japanese with

English abstract.)

Sasaki, M., & Yamasaki, K. (2004). Role of situational coping in the relationship

between hostility and health. *The Japanese Journal of Health Psychology, 17*, 1-

9. (In Japanese with English abstract.)

Sasaki, M. & Yamasaki, K. (2007). Stress coping and the adjustment process among university freshmen. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 20*, 51-67.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology, 4,* 219-247.

Schroevers, M., Kraaij, V., & Garnefski, N. (2007). Goal disturbance, cognitive coping strategies, and psychological adjustment, to different types of stressful life event. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43,* 413-423.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J.E., Mercadante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R.W. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.

Simmons, R.G., Rosenberg, F., & Rosenberg, M. (1973). Disturbance in the self-image at adolescence. *American Sociological Review, 38*, 553-568.

Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.P.S., & Gelfand, M.J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*, 240-275.

Soldz, S., Budman, S., Demby, A., & Merry, J. (1995). A short form of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems Circumplex scales. *Assessment, 2,* 53-63.

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the STAI.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Spielberger, C. D. (1988). *State–Trait Anger Expression Inventory.* Orlando, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Spielberger, C.D., Gorsuch, R.I., & Lushene, R.E. (1988). *STAI. Cuestionario de Ansiedad Estado-Rasgo: Manual* [Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory]. Madrid: TEA.

Spielberger, C.D., Miguel-Tobal, J.J., Casado, M.I., & Cano-Vindel, A. (2000).

    Inventario de Expresion de Ira Estado-Rasgo-STAXI [The State-Trait Anger

    Expression Inventory-STAXI-2]. Madrid: TEA.

Steinberg, L. & Silverberg, S.B. (1986). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early

    adolescence. Child Development, 57, 841-851.

Tallis, F., Eysenck, M., & Matthews, A. (1992). A questionnaire for the measurement of

    nonpathological worry. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18,* 161-168.

Tokar, D.M., Withrow, J.R., Hall, R.J., & Moradi, B. (2003). Psychological separation,

    attachment security, vocational self-concept crystallization, and career indecision:

    a structural equation analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 3-19.

Urani, M.A., Miller, S.A., Johnson, J.E., & Petzel, T.P. (2003). Homesickness in

    socially anxious first year college students. *College Student Journal, 37*, 302-

    399.

Vandervoort, D.J. (2001). Cross-cultural differences in coping with sadness. *Current*

    Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 20, 147-153.

Vivona, J.M. (2000). Parental attachment styles of late adolescents: Qualities of

    attachment relationships and consequences for adjustment. *Journal of*

    Counseling Psychology, 47, 316-329.

Wahler, H.J. (1969). The Physical Symptoms Inventory: Measuring levels of somatic

    complaining behavior. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 24*, 207-211.

Waller, G., Meyer, C., & Ohanian, V. (2001). Psychometric properties of the long and

    short versions of the young schema questionnaire: Core beliefs among bulimic

    and comparison women. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25,* 137-147.

Wang, L., Heppner, P.P., & Berry, T.R. (1997). Role of gender-related personality traits,

    problem-solving appraisal, and perceived social support in developing a

mediational model of psychological adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 245-255.

Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*4, 1063-1070.

Wearden, A., Peters, I., Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Liversidge, T. (2008). Adult attachment, parenting experiences, and core beliefs about self and others. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,* 1246-1257.

Wei, M., Heppner, P.P., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2003). Perceived coping as a mediator between attachment and psychological distress: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 438-447.

Wei, M., Russell, D.W., & Zakalik, R.A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness, and subsequent depression for freshman college students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 602-614.

Weintraub, J.K., Carver, C.S. & Scheier, M.F. (1986). *Development of a theoretically based measure of coping styles*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Welburn, K., Coristine, M., Dagg, P. Pontefract, A., & Jordan, S. (2002). The schema questionnaire-short form: Factor analysis and relationship between schemas and symptoms. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 26,* 519-530.

Weyers, P., Ising, M., Reuter, M, & Janke, W. (2005). Comparing two approaches for the assessment of coping: Part I, psychometric properties and intercorrelations. *Journal of Individual Differences, 26,* 207-212.

Wodka, E.L. & Barakat, L.P. (2007). An exploratory study of the relationship of family support and coping with adjustment: Implications for college students with a

chronic illness. *Journal of Adolescence, 30,* 365-376.

Young, J.E. (1994). *Young schema questionnaire*. (Cognitive Therapy Center, 120 East 56th Street, Suite 30, New York, NY, 10022).

Young, J.E. (1998). *Young schema questionnaire: Short form* (2nd ed.). New York: Cognitive Therapy Center.

Young, J. E. (1999). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach*. (3rded.). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.

Young, J.E. & Brown, G. (1994). *Young Schema Questionnaire-SF*. New York, NY: Cognitive Therapy Center.

Young, J.E. & Gluhoski, V. (1997). A schema-focused perspective on satisfaction in close relationships. In R.J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat (Eds.). *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp 356-381). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Young, J.E., Klosko, J.S., & Weishaar, M.E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

APPPENDICES

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1

Bivariate Correlations Between and Among Mother and Father Attachment, Negative

Self-Schema Domains, Coping Strategies, and Separation-Individuation

	M	F	DR	IAP	IL	OV	OD	CC	D	SC	SSS	AR	EA	PPS	PR	E	RE	SA
M	1	.22**	-.45**	-.29**	-.19*	-.31**	-.33**	-.10	.02	-.13	.13	-.05	-.24**	.05	.13	-.35**	-.52**	-.36**
F		1	-.39**	-.32**	-.25**	-.31**	-.31**	-.09	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.13	-.25**	.02	.05	-.34**	-.38**	-.28**
DR			1	.81**	.42**	.50**	.61**	.21*	.09	.20*	-.12	.24**	.42**	-.05	-.24**	.37**	.79**	.65**
IAP				1	.52**	.39**	.60**	.24**	.16	.20*	-.04	.26**	.44**	.01	-.15	.32**	.61**	.59**
IL					1	.38**	.48**	.34**	.29**	.32**	.15	.24**	.42**	.20*	.21**	.24**	.33**	.34**
OV						1	.51**	.17	.07	.28**	-.05	.14	.19*	.13	.07	.33**	.50**	.46**
OD							1	.23*	.18*	.36**	.14	.27**	.34**	.13	.13	.32**	.44**	.54**
CC								1	.54**	.59**	.66*	.54**	.66**	.69**	.52**	.34**	.23**	.20*
D									1	.60**	.35**	.46**	.51**	.54**	.41**	.17*	.11	.08
SC										1	.50**	.64**	.61**	.65**	.48**	.24**	.22**	.25**
SSS											1	.44**	.43**	.64**	.60**	.15	-.12	.04
AR												1	.60**	.56**	.37**	.27**	.17*	.20*
EA													1	.44**	.26**	.36**	.39**	.41**
PPS														1	.63**	.19*	.01	.06
PR															1	.16*	-.16*	-.05
E																1	.56**	.31**
RE																	1	.58**
SA																		1

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; M = Mother Attachment; F = Father Attachment; DR = Disconnection and Rejection; IAP = Impaired Autonomy and Performance; IL = Impaired Limits; OV = Overvigilance and Inhibition; OD = Other-Directedness; CC = Confrontive Coping; D = Distancing; SC = Self-Controlling; SSS = Seeking Social Support; AR = Accepting Responsibility EA = Escape-Avoidance; PPS = Planful Problem Solving; PR = Positive Reappraisal; E = Engulfment Anxiety; RE = Rejection Expectancy; SA = Separation-Anxiety

Table 2

Multiple Regression Findings for Parental Attachments as Predictors of Negative Self-Schemas

_____

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Disconnection and Rejection	Attachment	.535	.286	29.11**	
	Mother				-.39**
	Father				-.30**
Impaired Autonomy and Performance	Attachment	.386	.149	12.51**	
	Mother				-.23*
	Father				- .27*
Impaired Limits	Attachment	.285	.081	6.42**	
	Mother				-.14
	Father				-.22*
Overvigilance and Inhibition	Attachment	.394	.155	13.30**	
	Mother				-.25*
	Father				-.26*
Other-Directedness	Attachment	.411	.169	14.61**	
	Mother				-.28**
	Father				-.25*

* = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 3

Multiple Regression Findings for Parental Attachments as Predictors of Separation-

Individuation

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Rejection Expectancy	Attachment	.587	.345	38.18**	
	Mother				-.46**
	Father				-.27**
Separation Anxiety	Attachment	.416	.173	15.08**	
	Mother				-.32**
	Father				- .21*
Engulfment Anxiety	Attachment	.433	.188	16.74**	
	Mother				-.29**
	Father				-.27*

*= $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 4

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Separation-

Individuation

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Rejection Expectancy	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.813	.661	54.60**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.81**
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				-.05
	Impaired Limits				.01
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.18*
	Other-Directedness				-.12
Separation Anxiety	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.690	.477	25.50**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.38*
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				.15
	Impaired Limits				-.01
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.13
	Other-Directedness				.17
Engulfment Anxiety	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.417	.174	5.90**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.21
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				.00
	Impaired Limits				.06
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.17
	Other-Directedness				.08

$* = p < .05; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R\text{-Squared}; β = \text{Beta Weight}$

Table 5

Multiple Regression Findings for Parental Attachments as Predictors of Coping

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Confrontive Coping	Attachment	.114	.013	.95	
	Mother				-.09
	Father				-.06
Distancing	Attachment	.040	.002	.11	
	Mother				.03
	Father				-.03
Self-Controlling	Attachment	.135	.018	1.34	
	Mother				-.14
	Father				.01
Seeking Social Support	Attachment	.133	.018	1.31	
	Mother				.14
	Father				-.04
Accepting Responsibility	Attachment	.138	.019	1.40	
	Mother				-.02
	Father				-.13
Escape-Avoidance	Attachment	.308	.095	7.61**	
	Mother				-.19
	Father				-.20
Planful Problem-Solving	Attachment	.051	.003	.19	
	Mother				.05
	Father				.01
Positive Reappraisal	Attachment	.136	.018	1.35	
	Mother				.13
	Father				.02

$* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = \text{R-Squared}; β = \text{Beta Weight}$

Table 6

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Confrontive Coping

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Confrontive Coping	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.367	.134	4.35**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.05
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				.03
	Impaired Limits				.30*
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.08
	Other-Directedness				-.07

* = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 7

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Distancing

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Distancing	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.300	.090	2.78	
	Disconnection and Rejection				-.13
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				- 09
	Impaired Limits				.26*
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				-.04
	Other-Directedness				.10

* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 8

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Self-Controlling

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Self-Controlling	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.428	.184	6.25**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				-.04
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				-.10
	Impaired Limits				.21
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.11
	Other-Directedness				.30*

* = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 9

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Seeking Social Support

_____

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Seeking Social Support	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.349	.122	3.89*	
	Disconnection and Rejection				- .31
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				-.05
	Impaired Limits				.20
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				-.11
	Other-Directedness				.32*

* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 10

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Accepting

Responsibility

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Accepting Responsibility	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.317	.101	3.14*	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.07
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				.04
	Impaired Limits				.13
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				-.03
	Other-Directedness				.16

*= p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 11

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Escape-Avoidance

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Escape-Avoidance	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.517	.268	10.23**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				.22
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				.12
	Impaired Limits				.28*
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				-.07
	Other-Directedness				.05

* = $p < .01$; ** = $p < .001$; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 12

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Planful Problem-

Solving

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Planful Problem-Solving	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.300	.090	2.77	
	Disconnection and Rejection				-.27
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				-.02
	Impaired Limits				.20
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.14
	Other-Directedness				.14

* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Table 13

Multiple Regression Findings for Negative Self-Schemas as Predictors of Positive Reappraisal

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Positive Reappraisal	Negative Self-Schema Domains	.514	.264	9.89**	
	Disconnection and Rejection				-.51**
	Impaired Autonomy and Performance				-.13
	Impaired Limits				.32**
	Overvigilance and Inhibition				.09
	Other-Directedness				.33*

* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

68

Table 14

Multiple Regression Findings for Coping Strategies as Predictors of Separation-Individuation

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	R	R^2	F	β
Rejection Expectancy	Coping Strategies	.579	.336	8.65**	
	Confrontive Coping				.39*
	Distancing				-.12
	Self-Controlling				.25
	Seeking Social Support				-.37**
	Accepting Responsibility				-.04
	Escape-Avoidance				.33*
	Planful Problem-Solving				-.09
	Positive Reappraisal				-.23
Separation Anxiety	Coping Strategies	.482	.232	5.13**	
	Confrontive Coping				.09
	Distancing				-.19
	Self-Controlling				.24
	Seeking Social Support				-.10
	Accepting Responsibility				-.04
	Escape-Avoidance				.43**
	Planful Problem-Solving				-.08
	Positive Reappraisal				-.12
Engulfment Anxiety	Coping Strategies	.426	.182	3.80**	
	Confrontive Coping				.33
	Distancing				-.11
	Self-Controlling				.00
	Seeking Social Support				-.17
	Accepting Responsibility				.07
	Escape-Avoidance				.25
	Planful Problem-Solving				-.05
	Positive Reappraisal				.07

* = p < .01; ** = p < .001; R^2 = R-Squared; β = Beta Weight

Appendix B:

Literature Review

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will present the need for more research to explore the relationships between and among attachment, negative self-schemas, coping styles, and separation-individuation. The basic tenets of attachment, negative self-schemas, coping styles, and separation-individuation among college students will be reviewed.

Attachment Styles

Bowlby (1969) theorized attachment to be "the seeking and maintaining proximity to another individual," (p. 194). The development of an attachment style with a caregiver is conceptualized as a process that begins early in the life of an individual, resulting in the development of inner working models of the self and others that entail the beliefs of acceptance by attachment figures with hopes of gauging and receiving a supportive response (Bowlby, 1973). Bowlby (1969) noted that attachment behavior among infants at about two years of age can be activated by frightening circumstances.

The attachment style a child has with his or her caregiver is believed to be similar to the nature of attachment that exists with peers during childhood, and is also believed to continue to be directed toward other figures as development progresses into adolescence (Bowlby, 1969). Individuals' beliefs about the trustworthiness of others in difficult times can serve as a guide for whom they will contact for support if they grew up with affectionate parents (Bowlby, 1973). Yet, it may not just be the quality of the attachment that is a decisive factor as to whom individuals develop an attachment. Bowlby (1969) noted "the more experience of social interaction an infant has with a person the stronger his attachment to that person becomes" (Bowlby, 1969, p. 222).

Researchers, following the theoretical tenets espoused by Bowlby, sought to determine

and to delineate differences between attachment styles by conducting studies that focused on

parent-child interactions. Ainsworth et al. (1978) derived different attachment styles (secure,

anxious-ambivalent, and avoidant) with an experimental study called the "strange situation". A

baby and the caregiver were observed in an unfamiliar environment to assess the extent to which

the baby would play with novel toys with a stranger. The stranger approached the baby, and the

mother left the room for a few minutes. The mother returned to the room a few minutes later in

effort to. The second separation involved leaving the baby alone in which the stranger returned to

the room before the mother.

Different levels of distress exhibited by the baby existed with respect to attachment styles

when the mother departed and returned to the experimental situation. Securely attached infants

acted somewhat distressed when the mother left the room. Anxious-ambivalent babies acted

distraught and protested when the mother left the room and when she returned. Avoidant babies

showed actions of not being distressed when the mother left and when she returned.

Through time, the assessment of attachment styles transcended from studies focusing on

parent-child interactions to studies being conducted to assess the interactions among romantic

relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987) conducted such a study. They conceptualized romantic

feelings among partners as a function of an attachment process. They found that the attachment

styles in adulthood occurred as frequently as attachment styles that occurred during childhood. In

other words, there were parallels between the infant-caregiver attachment style and reports by

adults of their relationships with parents during childhood. They reported that attachment styles

differ with respect to the beliefs individuals have about trustworthiness, romantic love, and

personal worthiness to receive love.

Other researchers sought to examine if other types of attachment styles may exist, with

intentions of conceptualizing attachments as positive and negative inner working models

(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). For instance, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991)

72

conceptualized attachment as inner working models of self and others that carry over into adulthood, containing positive or negative structures in which individuals could be classified as having secure or insecure attachment styles. Secure individuals have a positive inner working model for the self and others, and tend to believe that others will be responsive. Preoccupied individuals have a negative working model of themselves and positive working model of others characterized by personal beliefs of unworthiness, with the attempt to gain personal acceptance through the relationships with others. Dismissing individuals have a positive model of self and negative model of others, and tend to strive for independence at the expense of relationships. Fearfully attached individuals have a negative inner working model of self and others, with beliefs of unworthiness. These individuals tend to believe that other people are rejecting and untrustworthy (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Correlates of Attachment Styles

Attachment theorists transcended from examining romantic attachment styles to exploring how attachment styles relate to variables associated with peers and non-romantic relationships among college students (Hagans, 2005; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005; Saferstein et al.; We et al., 2005). For instance, Saferstein et al. (2005) explored the relationships among attachment styles and non-romantic friendships. The sample consisted of three hundred thirty undergraduate students who had a mean age of 17.72 years. They completed the Adult Attachment Measure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and Friendship Qualities Scale (Bukowski et al., 1994). Results from the study indicate insecure attachment styles were associated with reporting lower levels of companionship and security with best friends. Anxious and avoidant attachment styles were associated with reporting higher levels of conflict with an opposite-sex best friend than participants with secure attachment styles. Women reported higher levels of companionship than men, and men tended to report greater aid and security with same-sex friends than opposite-sex friends in comparison with women. The combination of attachment style and the sex of the participant and his or her friend combined impacted the quality of friendships.

Wei et al. (2005) explored the relationships among attachment style, loneliness, self-disclosure, social self-efficacy, and experiences with depression in a sample of three hundred eight undergraduate freshmen college students with a mean age of 18 years. Participants completed the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998), Self-Efficacy Scale (Sherer et al., 1982), Distress Disclosure Index (Kahn & Hessling, 2001), Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression Scale (Kohout, Berkman, Evans, & Cornoni-Huntley, 1993), and the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, 1996) through the internet. Their results indicate that attachment anxiety, self-disclosure, and social self-efficacy accounted for 55% of the variance in loneliness, and the initial level of loneliness and depression accounted for 42% of the variance in depression. Furthermore, social self-efficacy mediated the relationship between attachment anxiety and loneliness, which may suggest that students with difficulties in social competence may perceive lower levels of support from others.

In a similar vein, Mallinckrodt and Wei (2005) also sought to explore the relationships between attachment styles, social competence, and social support. Their sample consisted of four hundred thirty undergraduate students with an average age of 19.72 years in which 258 of the participants were women and 164 were men. They completed the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Brennan et al., 1998), Self-Efficacy Scale (Sherer et al., 1982), Toronto Alexithymia Scale-20 (Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994), Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987, 1990), and the Outcome Questionnarie (Lambert et al., 1996) in groups of 10-40 students. The results indicated that attachment anxiety and avoidance were positively related to psychological distress and negatively related to perceived social support.

Love and Murdock (2004) were also interested in exploring various indices of support, but were more concerned with examining parental attachment in intact families and stepfamilies and the impact on psychological well-being. They hypothesized that attachment would mediate between step-family or biological family and psychological well-being in a young adult. The participants of the study were one hundred seventy-three college students selected from two

community colleges and one university in a large metropolitan city from the Midwest. They completed the Parental Bonding Inventory (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979), Comprehensive Affective Personality Scale (Lubin & Whitlock, 2000b), Brief Life Satisfaction Scale (Lubin, 2001), and the Family Environment Scale (Moos, 1981) within college classrooms. Sixty-nine percent of the sample was female, and Caucasians made up 64% of the sample. The mean age was approximately 19 years, and the average length of time participants spent with a step-family was 10.58, while participants from intact families spent an average of about eighteen years with the family. Results suggest a majority of the students in a step-family lived with their biological mother and step-father. Maternal care and paternal care were significant predictors of well-being. Effect sizes indicated small group differences in maternal care but moderate group differences in paternal care. Students who lived with a biological family had higher levels of well-being and reported more secure attachment relations to their parents than individuals from step-families. Attachment partially mediated the relationship between family type and psychological well-being.

Researchers have been interested in other types of college experiences that may be related to attachment styles, such as college adjustment and academic performance. Similar to the study by Love and Murdock (2004), Vivona (2000) investigated parental attachment styles, except she was also interested in the relationship between attachment styles and college adjustment. The sample was composed of one hundred seventy-three undergraduates with a mean age of 19.98 years in the first study, and 170 undergraduate students with a mean age of 18.12 years in the second study. Participants who were enrolled in psychology courses completed the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), Parental Attachment Questionnaire (Kenny, 1990), Penn State Worry Questionnaire (Meyer, Miller, Metzger, & Borkovec, 1990), Beck Depression Inventory, (Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979), and the Beck Anxiety Inventory (Beck, Brown, Epstein, & Steer, 1988), Worry Domains Questionnaire (Tallis, Eysenck, & Matthews, 1992), Autonomy Scale (Bekker, 1993), Student Adaptation to College

Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1989), and the Inventory of Psychosocial Development (Constantinople, 1969). The results indicated a difference in the use of parental support between ambivalent and avoidant attached individuals. Securely attached students perceived their parents as providing a more dependable and secure base than students with an ambivalent attachment style, and ambivalently attached students perceived their parents as providing a more dependable and secure base than students with an avoidant attachment style. Ambivalent students perceived their parents as generally supportive, but unsupportive of autonomy, while avoidant individuals perceived their parents as generally unsupportive and unsupportive of autonomy. Results from study two suggested that securely attached students showed low levels of anxiety, depression, and worry. Women with an insecure attachment (avoidant) had lower levels of intimacy and difficulties with diminished college adjustment. The predicted differences of attachment-related preoccupation between ambivalent and avoidant attached individuals, perceived parental support of autonomy, and autonomy development were not confirmed.

Lapsley and Edgerton (2002) also explored the relationships between attachment style and college adjustment. The sample consisted of one hundred fifty-six young adults (102 women and 54 men) who attended a small university in Midwest Canada. Forty-seven percent lived with their parents and 53% lived independently. Ninety-six percent of the sample was unmarried, and approximately 87% of the sample was Caucasian. The college students completed the Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984; Hoffman & Weiss, 1987), Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1989), and the Relationships Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) in small groups. They found that students with a secure attachment style were more likely to be more socially and emotionally adjusted to college than students with fearful and preoccupied attachment styles. In addition, in comparison with students who had secure attachment styles, students with fearful and preoccupied attachment styles had significantly higher levels of pathological separation from parents, meaning they are more likely to use self-splitting and to have difficulty with self-other differentiation.

Larose and Boivin (1998) were also interested in the relationships between parental attachment styles and adjustment, but they are also interested in the time period of the transition from high school to college. Their sample consisted of two hundred ninety-eight first semester college students with a mean age of 17 years. The students were contacted before college and then a follow-up was conducted in October of the first semester. Participants completed the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983), Adaptation of the Social Network Inventory (Perl & Trickett, 1988), Interaction Anxiousness Scale (Leary, 1983), UCLA Loneliness Scale- Revised (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980). Results extracted from the study indicate perceived security to parents remained stable during the 5 month transition. Mean level of perceived security to parents increased for those students who left home to attend college and their general perceptions of social support and feelings of social anxiety and loneliness decreased. Perceived security of parents predicted positive changes in expectations of support in that students who perceived security at the end of high school also had higher expectations of support in college. Students perceived the attachment to their mother as more secure than the attachment with their father.

Collins and Feeney (2000) also sought to explore support seeking, but among dating couples. The sample consisted of 93 dating couples from a northeastern university in the U.S. The member recruited for participation in the study was determined as the support seeker, and the partner was defined as the caregiver. The mean age of support seekers was nineteen years and the mean age of caregivers was 19.8 years. The procedure involved videotaping the participants playing a game together, in effort to help the couple relax in front of the camera. Couples discussed a problem for up to 10 minutes. The participants completed the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990), Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The results gleaned from the study indicate that individuals engaged in more direct support seeking behavior when they rated their problem as stressful, which was associated with their partner providing more effective caregiving responses. Attachment avoidance was associated with

77

ineffective support seeking behavior and attachment anxiety was related to ineffective caregiving from their partner. Partners reporting higher levels of anxiety attachment provided less instrumental support and displayed more negative support behaviors.

Aspelmeier and Kerns (2003) explored the relationships between attachment styles and the exploration of social domains and novel experiences in two studies among one thousand two-hundred undergraduate students with a mean age of 19.5 years and an age range of 17 to 35 years. The sample in the second study was composed of sixty-nine undergraduate college students with a mean age of 19.6 years and an age range of 17 to 43 years. The undergraduate students completed the Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) and a measure that assessed curiosity and information search (Aspelmeier & Kerns, 2003) in groups of 5-15. They found that adult close/romantic relationships were related to different patterns of exploration. Secure attachment styles were related to competence with academic tasks and having positive attitudes about exploring novel situations and dismissing attachment was associated with avoiding exploring social information. Preoccupied attachment styles were related to feelings of anxiety with respect to academic performance.

In sum, differences among attachment styles among undergraduate students have been found to be associated with college adjustment (Lapsley & Edgerton, 2002; Vivona, 2000), loneliness and depression (Wei et al., 2005), perceived and actual support from others (Collins & Feeney, 2000; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005), academic competence and attitudes about exploring novel situations (Aspelmeier & Kerns, 2003), and conflicts with best friends (Saferstein et al., 2005). The ways in which college students adapt to living away from their primary caregiver(s) may relate to how they cope. Although attachment research has also been investigated with coping, exploring more specific coping styles among undergraduate college students may serve as another method by which to understand how college students adjust to new life transitions, including their transition to college.

Coping

Arnold Lazarus has been considered a key figure within the research on coping. Lazarus (1966) noted that coping involves strategies to deal with threat, and that the cognitions associated with threatening experiences involve motivation properties. Coping involves two processes: primary appraisal and secondary appraisal (Lazarus, 1966). Primary appraisal involves individuals assessing degree of danger within certain situations, while secondary appraisal concerns the degree of danger in a situation with respect to the effectiveness of a coping strategy in reducing threat (Lazarus, 1966). Lazarus was also mindful of the severity of threat and the types of coping strategies people employ. For example, adaptive coping strategies are more likely to occur when threatening situations are perceived as mild, but under severely threatening situations pathological forms of coping are more prominent. Moreover, "general beliefs about the environment and his capacity to deal with it guide every specific interpretation" (Lazarus, 1966, p. 133).

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) reported that coping within an environment is effective when individuals can quickly utilize a coping mechanism automatically, and that the transition from coping to automatic behavior is gradual. The coping strategies that are selected by individuals are shaped by the social and personal consequences (Lazarus, 1966). However, coping strategies may also be impacted by early life experiences. Lazarus (1966) noted that early life experiences that generate trust or distrust may predispose individuals to generalize their trust or distrust views to future transactions. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) note that novel situations are unlikely to produce automatic and efficient coping, but that coping can become effective the more an individual encounters similar situations, resulting in learning. "The skills that humans need to get along must be learned through experience (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 130). The process of coping involves the actions of individuals, conditions of the environment, and how thoughts and acts change (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Correlates of Coping Styles

Coping has also been explored with respect to social networks and explanatory styles, such as optimism and pessimism. For instance, Brissette et al. (2002) examined optimism, social support, and psychological adjustment during the first semester of college. It was hypothesized that more extensive and supportive friendship networks would be associated with greater optimism. Eighty-nine first-year undergraduate students completed the initial assessment (the beginning of the semester) by responding to the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985), Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983), Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983), Beck Depression Inventory-Short Form (Beck, Rial, & Rickels, 1974) and the Cope (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989) at the end of the semester. The sample was composed of almost an equal representation of gender (46 women and 43 men), and the mean age was 17.9 years. The results suggest optimism was associated with larger friendship networks after first two weeks of college and smaller increases in stress and depression than pessimists. Optimists were found to use coping strategies characterized by greater use of positive reinterpretation and growth.

Pritchard et al. (2007) also explored how optimism would relate to adjustment and coping among freshmen undergraduate students. They hypothesized that extroversion, high self-esteem, and optimism would negatively influence health problems. The participants of the sample were two hundred and forty-two freshmen students with a mean age of 18.92 years, and 94.5% identified themselves as Caucasian. They completed the Inventory of College Student Life Recent Experiences (Kohn, Lefreniere, & Gurevhich, 1990), Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), Brief Cope (Carver, 1997), Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985), the Profile of Mood States (McNair, Lorr, & Droppleman, 1981), and the Eating Disorders Inventory (Garner, Olmstead, & Polivy, 1983). Negative coping and perfectionism were predictors of the use of alcohol, while optimism and self-esteem were found to be predictors of psychological and physical health at the end of the first semester.

Leong et al (1997) also conducted a study to assess coping among undergraduate freshmen students. They hypothesized that active coping styles would be positively related to higher levels of adjustment and emotional coping styles would be more related to adjustment difficulties. Lastly, they hypothesized that there would be a parallel between gender differences in coping styles and the adjustment that is related to certain coping styles. The sample consisted of 161 undergraduate students in which 56% of the sample was male and 44% was female. Seventy-five percent of the sample was 19 years of age, and 60% was Caucasian. Participants completed the Cope (Weintraub et al., 1986) and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1989). They found no significant gender differences with adjustment to college. Females tended to report higher levels of academic and social adjustment than males. There were significant gender differences noted with respect to coping style; females were more likely to use emotion-focused coping than males and used active-focused almost as often as males. A negative relationship existed between focusing on and venting emotions with emotional adjustment.

Similar to previous research on coping and adjustment among undergraduate students (Leong et al., 1997; Pritchard et al., 2007), Sasaki and Yamasaki (2007) were also interested in coping and college adjustment, but were also curious about the health of undergraduate students. Their sample consisted of 229 undergraduate freshmen college students in Japan with a mean age of 18.31 years for men and 18.19 years for women. Participants completed the dispositional and situational version of the General Coping Questionnaire (Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2002a; Sasaki & Yamasaki, 2004) and the General Health Questionnaire (Nakagawa & Daibo, 1985). The results indicate women believed that personal problems associated with mental health and physical problems are stressful, whereas men did not as frequently report these problems as stressful. Women were found to be more likely to use emotional support than men. Increased use of emotion-focused coping was a predictor of poor health, while problem-focused coping was a predictor of better health.

In another study involving cultural differences in coping, Vandervoort (2001) explored differences in coping for Asian undergraduate students and Caucasian undergraduate students. The sample consisted of one hundred forty undergraduate students with a mean age of 26.6 years. The ethnic background of the participants were Asian (31.2%), Caucasian (35.5%), and 33.3% reported a mixed ethnic background. Participants completed the Ways of Coping Questionnaire (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). The results indicate that individuals who identify as Asian or Caucasian tended to report using less positive reappraisal and confrontive coping strategies than multicultural individuals. Asians were less likely to use distancing coping strategies than individuals who identified themselves as multicultural.

Attachment styles and coping styles have also been explored among undergraduate students. For instance, Wei et al. (2003) explored how perceived coping mediated the relationship between attachment styles and distress among a sample of five hundred fifteen undergraduate students. Sixty-eight percent of the participants were women, 85% were Caucasian, and the average of the participants was 18.93 years. Participants completed the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990), Problem-Solving Inventory-Form B (Heppner, 1988), Problem-Focused Style of Coping (Heppner, Cook, Wright, & Johnson, 1995), Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, & Mock et al., 1961), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Anxiety Form (Spielberger, 1983), Trait Anger Scale (Spielberger, 1988), Hopelessness Scale (Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler, 1974), and the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems-Short Circumplex Form (Soldz, Budman, Demby, & Merry, 1995) in groups of 10-50. Attachment styles of anxiety and avoidance were significant predictors of psychological distress. Perceived coping fully mediated the relationship between attachment anxiety and distress, while partially mediating the relationship between attachment avoidance and psychological distress.

Jerome and Liss (2005) designed the study in effort to explore the relationships between coping styles, adult attachment, and sensory processing. They hypothesized that avoidance and low registration would be related to dismissive styles of coping. Sensory sensitivity was believed

to be positively related to coping styles in which individuals focus on internal emotional states. The sample was comprised of 133 individuals from introductory psychology classes and members of the community. The average age of the participants was 22.3 years. The participants completed the Adolescent/Adult Sensory Profile (Brown & Dunn, 2002), Experiences in Close Relationships (Brennan et al.,1998), and the Cope (Carver et al., 1989). They found that sensory sensitivity was related to relationship anxiety, which was partially mediated by coping styles characterized by the venting of emotions. Low registration was related to coping styles characterized by denial and mental disengagement, and the coping styles were partially mediated by low registration and relationship anxiety. Sensory seeking was not related to relationship anxiety as hypothesized.

Similarly, Diamond and Hicks (2005) investigated the relationships between attachment style and physiological regulation by utilizing laboratory inductions of anxiety and anger to produce an assessment of vagal tone which is an indicator of parasympathetic nervous system activity associated with respiration variability in heart rate. Approximately 75 men with a mean age of 21.69 years were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses for inclusion in the study. Participants completed the Experiences in Close Relationships (Brennan et al., 1998), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Anxiety Form (Spielberger, 1983), Trait Anger Scale (Spielberger, 1988), and use of an ECG to measure vagal tone. Vagal tone was positively associated with perceptions of security in current attachment relationships while negatively associated with attachment anxiety. The actual presence of romantic attachment figures was not related to recovery from anger. Men showed more effective recovery from anger if they felt secure in their romantic relationship.

Problem-solving coping has been explored as a possible variable that may relate to attachment styles (Lopez et al., 2001). Lopez et al. (2001) conducted a study in effort to explore the differences among attachment styles that may relate to the use of problem-solving as a coping mechanism. The sample was composed of 55 undergraduate college students in which the majority of the sample was Caucasian (76%) who had a mean age of 21.75 years. The

83

undergraduate students completed the Experiences in Close Relationships (Brennan et al., 1998), Problem-Focused Style of Coping (Heppner et al., 1995), Depression Adjective Checklist, Forms F and G (Lubin, 1965), and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Anxiety Form (Spielberger, 1983). The results obtained from the study indicate anxious attachment styles were related to reactive coping but not suppressive coping, meaning that the students had more difficulty controlling impulsivity rather than difficulty with avoiding or denying problems. Avoidant attachment styles were found to be related to suppressive and reactive coping. Problem coping styles mediated the relationship between insecure attachment styles and distress, suggesting that the more an individual does not engage in problem-solving coping the more he or she will experience distress if they have an insecure attachment style.

Howard and Medway (2004) were also interested in exploring the relationships between attachment, coping, and life stress, as well as the support system that the participants would seek in times of stress. Their sample was composed of 75 pairs of adolescents and one parent in which the mean age of adolescents was 16 years. Eighty percent of the parents who participated were mothers with a mean age of 44 years. Increases in stress among adolescents with a secure attachment style were found to be predictive of seeking communication with family members. They also tended to be less likely to use negative avoidance coping strategies, such as using alcohol and drugs. Conversely, adolescents who were more insecure tended to use alcohol and drugs as coping strategies.

The measurement of coping styles among college students has been utilized in many different ways, which can make the measurement of coping and its relationship with other variables more difficult. Some of the most common coping measures that have been used among undergraduate students have been the use of the Problem-Focused Style of Coping (Heppner et al., 1995), Ways of Coping Questionnaire (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988), and the Cope (Carver et al., 1989). In sum, coping styles among undergraduate students have been found to be related to optimism (Brissette et al., 2002; Pritchard et al., 2007), distress (Lopez et al., 2001), and insecure

84

attachment styles (Lopez et al., 2001; Wei et al., 2003). How college students develop beliefs about themselves and others from the attachment styles they have with significant others may provide more information into enduring core beliefs. Negative self-schemas may serve as the impetus by which to investigate long-standing beliefs college students have about themselves and others.

Negative Self-Schemas

Attachment theorists have acknowledged how inner working models of self and others reflect core beliefs in the understanding of relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Platts et al.,2002; Wearden et al., 2008). Beck (1964) noted that infants and children develop core beliefs about themselves or "self-schemas" in relation to the world through their interactions with parents and other significant people in their lives. Self-schemas can be considered as cognitive lenses in which individuals process interpersonal interactions and derive ways to interact with others in the future. If children's core needs are met, they will ideally develop positive, healthy beliefs about themselves and others, but if their needs are not met, then negative self-schema(s) may develop over time (Young, 1994). Attachment and schema theories are similar in that if basic needs are not met, such as acceptance and unconditional love, individuals will be influenced by how people behave and think about relationships with others (Bowlby, 1973; Koski & Shaver, 1997; Young & Gluhoski, 1997).

Young (1999) theorized 15 unique negative self-schemas individuals may develop during childhood that can continue into adulthood, which can be placed into 5 domains. The first negative self-schema domain is Disconnection and Rejection and includes the following negative self-schemas: Defectiveness/Shame, Social Isolation/Alienation, Abandonment/Instability, Emotional Deprivation, and Mistrust/Abuse. Schemas within this domain center on individuals believing that others will not be responsive to their needs (Young, 1999). The second negative-self schema domain is Impaired Autonomy and Performance, which includes Vulnerability to Harm and Illness, Enmeshment, Dependence/ Incompetence, and Failure. According to Young

85

(1999), these schemas entail expectations of the self and of the world, reflecting the ability of an individual to be successful and independent. The third negative self-schema domain, Impaired Limits, consists of the following negative self-schemas: Insufficient Self- Control/Self-Discipline and Entitlement. This domain is characterized by personal deficiencies with internal limits and responsibilities with other people (Young, 1999). The fourth negative self-schema domain is Other-Directedness and consists of Self-Sacrifice and Subjugation. The Other-Directedness domain consists of negative self-schemas entailing individuals meeting the needs of others to a greater extent than their own needs. The final negative self-schema domain is Overvigilance and Inhibition, and consists of Emotional Inhibition and Unrelenting Standards/Hypercriticalness. Young (1999) stated that suppressing spontaneous feelings in order to satisfy rigid personal internal rules are examples of the Overvigilance and Inhibition domain.

Young and Gluhoski (1997) cite that self-schemas are self-perpetuating and difficult to change, triggered by events within an environment, associated with a high amount of emotion when triggered, and are difficult to change. "Unfortunately, because schemas function primarily outside of awareness, individuals usually do not recognize when they are influencing interpersonal functioning in maladaptive ways" (Young & Gluhoski, 1997, p. 359). Negative self-schemas are also believed to continue into adulthood, influencing interactions with significant others. Possible stressful situations in which negative self-schemas may be triggered are changes that may occur in during adulthood, such as the transition to college.

Correlates of Negative Self-Schemas

One area of research that has been investigated with respect to negative self-schemas among college students is bulimia (Meyer et al., 2001; Meyer & Gillings, 2004; Waller et al., 2001). Meyer et al. (2001) conducted a study in effort to explore the relationships between core beliefs, borderline personality disorder symptoms, and bulimia. The authors hypothesized that certain borderline personality disorder symptoms would mediate the relationship between unhealthy core beliefs and bulimia. The participants of the sample were 61 female undergraduate

college students with a mean age of 20 years and average body mass index of 21.8. The college students completed the Bulimic Investigatory Test, Edinburgh (Henderson & Freeman, 1987), Borderline Syndrome Index (Conte, Plutchik, Karasu, & Jerret, 1980), Young Schema Questionnaire-Short version (Young, 1998). The results of the study indicate that symptoms of borderline personality disorder were associated with unhealthy core beliefs, and mediated the relationship between the core belief defectiveness/shame and bulimia symptoms.

Meyer and Gillings (2004) also explored the relationship between core beliefs and bulimia. The authors hypothesized that core beliefs would mediate the relationship between parental bonding, such as overprotection, and symptoms of bulimia. The participants of the sample consisted of 102 females with a mean age of 19.4 years and average body mass index of 21.5 who completed the Parental Bonding Instrument (Parker et al., 1979), Young Schema Questionnaire-Short version (Young, 1998), and the Bulimic Investigatory Test, Edinburgh (Henderson & Freeman, 1987). They found that core beliefs mistrust and abuse partially mediated the relationship between the overprotection by fathers and symptoms of bulimia.

A similar study was conducted by Waller et al. (2001). The authors explored the differences in core beliefs between women who had been diagnosed with bulimia and women who did not have bulimia. The sample was composed of sixty women who had bulimia and 60 women who did not have a clinical diagnosis of bulimia who completed the Young Schema Questionnaire (Young, 1994). The women with bulimia had a mean age of 25.3 years and mean body mass index of 24.8, while the women without bulimia had a mean age of 26.8 years and average body mass index of 23.7. The results extracted from analysis indicate that negative self-schemas, as a whole, were predictors of the severity of bingeing and vomiting. Women with bulimia were found to report significantly higher levels of negative self-schemas on 14 of the 15 subscales, with no statistically significant differences existing on the entitlement subscale.

Welburn et al. (2002) devised a study to examine the relationships between negative self-schemas and psychological symptoms. They hypothesized that certain maladaptive schemas

87

would be associated with anxiety, depression, and paranoia. The sample was comprised of one hundred ninety-six participants, in which 67% were female (n = 131), with mean age of 36.9 years and a range of 18 to 63 years. They completed the Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (Young, 1998) and the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, 1993). The results extracted from the study suggest that five maladaptive schemas were predictors of anxiety: vulnerability to harm, abandonment, failure, self-sacrifice, and emotional inhibition. The schemas of abandonment and insufficient self-control were related to symptoms of depression. The schemas of mistrust, vulnerability to harm, insufficient self-control, and self-sacrifice were found to be significant predictors of paranoia.

As time passed, the research on negative self-schemas continued to focus on symptoms associated with affective disorders (Calvete et al., 2005). Calvete et al. (2005) conducted a study in an effort to investigate the relationships between negative self-schemas and anxiety, depression, and anger. The sample consisted of 407 undergraduate students who had a mean age of 22.08 years. About eighty-one percent of the sample were women (n = 327). The undergraduate students completed the Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (Young & Brown, 1994), Beck Depression Inventory-II (Beck et al.,1995), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1988), State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (Spielberger, Miguel-Tobal, Casado, & Cano-Vindel, 2000), Automatic Thoughts Questionnaire-Revised (Kendall, Howard, & Hays, 1989), Anxious Self-Statement Questionnaire (Kendall & Hollon, 1989), Self-Talk Inventory (Calvete, Estevez, Landin, & Martinez et al., 2003). The negative self-schemas mistrust was found to be associated with anger, and anger was also found to be associated with the negative self-schemas insufficient control. Subjugation and abandonment/instability were found to be predictors of anxiety.

Research investigating a sample of undergraduate students was also the focus of the study conducted by Wearden et al. (2008). The authors explored the relationships between core beliefs, parenting experiences, and attachment styles. They hypothesized that core beliefs of the self

would be associated with anxious attachment, while core beliefs of others would be associated with an avoidant attachment style. The authors also hypothesized that attachment representations of parents would mediate the relationship between parental practices and core beliefs. The sample consisted of three hundred and eighty-nine participants with a mean age of 21.9 years. Three hundred and twelve participants were single (80%), and 283 were female (73%). The majority of the sample identified themselves as Caucasian (85%). The undergraduate students were solicited for participation through email and completed the Psychosis Attachment Measure (Berry, Band, Corcoran, & Barrowclough et al., 2007), Brief Core Schema Scales (Fowler, Reeman, Smith, & Kuipers, et al., 2006), Parent Care-giving Style Questionnaire (Hazan & Shaver, 1986), and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The results indicate anxious attachment styles were associated with negative core beliefs, and negative core beliefs were found to have a weaker relationship with inconsistent maternal care-giving. Warm, responsive care-giving practices were found to be associated with positive core beliefs.

Negative self-schemas have been found to be associated with bulimia (Meyer & Gillings, 2004; Waller et al., 2001) anger and anxiety (Calvete et al., 2005), and even paranoia (Welburn et al., 2001). Attachment styles have been explored with negative self-schemas or core beliefs (Wearden et al., 2008), and with coping styles among undergraduate college students (Lopez et al., 2001; Wei et al., 2003). No research has been conducted exploring how negative self-schemas are related to attachment styles and coping styles among undergraduate freshman college students. Exploring how attachment styles and negative self-schemas relate to coping styles may provide an index of how students cope with the transition from living at home with parent(s) to college, as well as the different coping strategies that are used. Yet, the process of separating and individuating from parental figures during the transition from high school to college may provide vital information into the relationships between attachment style, negative self-schemas, and coping styles among first-semester undergraduate students.

Separation-Individuation

89

The theoretical tenets of the field of separation-individuation are rooted in the works of Mahler (1968) and Erikson (1968), with later theorists (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995) emphasizing current experiences of transitional periods during late adolescence. Separation-individuation has been defined as "a development process that begins with separation from parents, peers, and other significant persons, but that extends to individuation and the development of a coherent, autonomous self" (Mattanah et al., 2004, p. 213). Mahler (1968) reported that the process of separation-individuation phases begins with the symbiotic relationship between mothers and infants that occur during the third month of life. This relationship is characterized by the child waiting and expecting to experience satisfaction in which inner sensations of the infant are deeply engrained as a core aspect. Mahler (1968) noted that during the symbiotic relationship, the child cannot attain homeostasis without the mother, and that if the mother is not present during this time the infant may experience negative consequences associated with neurobiological development. "At the height of symbiosis-at around four to five months-the facial expression of most infants becomes much more subtly differentiated, mobile, and expressive." (Mahler, 1968, p. 15)

As time progresses, infants begin to change their nature of focus with respect to their mothers. The outward focus is characterized by the child observing stimuli and redirecting attention toward the face of the mother, this process replaces the inward focus on the self and is referred to as hatching (Mahler, 1968). Mahler (1968) emphasized that differentiation and optimal symbiosis and subsequent expansion beyond the mother-child relationship are the result of stimulated outward attention and inner optimal level of pleasure. Thus, the infant seems to be gauging the levels of supportiveness from the mother. There is also a climactic period that occurs during the hatching phase. Mahler (1968) stated that "the peak point of the hatching process seems to coincide with the maturational spurt of active locomotion, which brings with it increased maturational pressure [for action], to practice locomotion and to explore wider segments of reality" (p. 18).

After the first year, the infant is motivated to separate from the mother and practice the process of separating and returning by gradually modifying his or her behavior, which is reflective of innate propensities and nuances associated with the relationship with the mother-it is this process that influences ego development in the future (Mahler, 1968). Mahler (1968) asserted that it is during the symbiotic phase in which identity formation begins. The process of separation-individuation reflects the degree to which the infant has obtained a certain level of achievement with respect to functioning autonomously within the reach of a mother who is there for emotional support (Mahler, 1968). Lastly, the height of the separation-individuation process is believed to occur around eighteen months of age, and it is during this period that the infant has internalized his or her levels of individuation from the parents through parental ego identification (Mahler, 1968).

Erikson (1968) painted a different path of separation and individuation by theorizing about the importance of psychosocial functioning during adolescence. Erikson (1968) theorized that if adolescents do not use their inner resources to seek and utilize intimate relationships, they may have a tendency to engage in stereotypical patterns of relationships, and thus, feel a sense of isolation. "The counterpart of intimacy is distantiation: the readiness to repudiate, isolate, and, if necessary, destroy those forces and people whose essence seems dangerous to one's own" (Erikson, 1968, p. 136). Yet, he was quick to point out the need for an integration or mutual utilization of separation and individuation from parental figures. In particular, a confirmation of individuality and community gives rise to ego strength, with interplay between society recognizing the individual as encompassing energy and the individual having an awareness or recognition of the living processes inherent within society.

Erikson (1968) also noted the impact of unsuccessful resolution during stages of psychosocial development on socioemotional development. With respect to young adulthood, he theorized that the crisis to be resolved is intimacy, and when this seeking of intimacy or the attempts to negotiate and develop meaningful friendships, romantic partners and group affiliation

91

does not come to fruition, a likely consequence is a sense of isolation (Erikson, 1968). Moreover, poor resolution of intimacy may increase the probability that individuals will experience difficulty with self-disclosure among others, fears of intimacy, or may see other people as prejudiced (Erikson, 1968). He also theorized examples of healthy resolution during this stage. Individuals with healthy amounts of intimacy are able to love others and have the ability to be intimate (Erikson, 1968).

Other theorists have attempted to explain the period of late adolescence as a period of adaptation during a transition. Kimmel and Weiner (1995) theorized that late adolescents and early adulthood is a time of transition, and that among college students, the most personal gains reaped between the age of 18 and 21 are positive changes in identity. Normal adolescent development and the process of individuation involve psychological independence from parental figures that is characterized by self-reliance (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). The emancipation that late adolescents experience involves coping with unfamiliar situations in which they feel ill-prepared, thinking for themselves, but also, having the ability to confide in and collaborate with parents to resolve their issues. Thus, it appears that late adolescents need to making decisions on their own but they may also need help with decisions with the input of their caregivers.

Correlates of Separation-Individuation in College Students

The process of separation and individuation among college students has been found to be related to college adjustment (Choi, 2002; McClanahan & Holmbeck, 1992) and parental attachment and security of attachment (Kalsner & Pistole, 2003; Rice et al., 1995; Mattanah et al., 2004; Tokar et al., 2003). Choi (2002) investigated the relationships between psychological separation and adjustment to college among a sample of Korean American students, but were also interested in exploring how collectivism and individualism related to college adjustment. The sample consisted of 170 undergraduate students with a mean age of 20.56 years, with 60% of the sample being born in Korea. Participants were recruited for participation through mail and they completed the Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984), Student Adaptation to

92

College Questionnaire (Baker et al., 1985), and the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995). They found that successfully adjusting to college was associated with conflictual independence from parents and also the ability to depend on parents. Higher amounts of collectivism were associated with more emotional and functional dependence on parents. There were no significant main effects for the influence of individualism on college adjustment.

Similar to the study by Choi (2002), Kalsner and Pistole (2003) were also interested in the relationships between ethnic identity, college adjustment, and separation-individuation. Two hundred fifty-two undergraduate college students with a mean age of 19.9 years with a majority of the sample being Asian (31.3%) and Black (22.2%). Participants completed the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (Kenny, 1987), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992), Multigenerational Interconnectedness Scales (Gavazzi & Sabatelli, 1988), and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1984, 1989) within classrooms and through email. They found that higher amounts of college adjustment were associated with greater independence and openness to other ethnic groups. Greater amounts of individuation were associated with more interpersonal adjustment and adaptation to college. Female college students reported more parental attachment and emotional support from caregivers than male college students and less dependence on their family was related to less psychological distress. Male college students were found to have lower psychological distress in relation to encouragement for autonomy from their parents.

McClanahan and Holmbeck (1992) were also interested in the investigation of the relationships between separation-individuation, attachment, and college adjustment, but were also interested in exploring the role of family functioning on college adjustment. Their sample consisted of 454 college students who completed the Separation-Individuation Test of Adolescence (Levine, Green, & Millon, 1986), Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, 1967), UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

93

(Spielberger, 1983), Wahler Physical Symptoms Inventory (Wahler, 1969), Rosenberg-Simmons Self-Esteem Scale (Simmons, Rosenberg, & Rosenberg, 1973), Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen, Mermelstein, Kamarck, & Hoberman, 1985), Emotional Autonomy Scale (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986), Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, & Larsen et al., 1982), and the Parental Relationship Questionnaire (Kenny, 1987). They found that seeking nurturance was not associated with college adjustment, but was associated with positive family functioning. Poor psychological adjustment and less attachment to parents were associated with engulfment anxiety and the denial of the need for closeness, with positive psychological adjustment being associated with healthy separation and positive family functioning.

Rice et al. (1995) were also interested in exploring the relationships between separation-individuation, attachment, and college adjustment. Their research involved two separate studies. In the first study, 130 freshmen college students with a mean age of 18.0 years completed the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), Separation-Individuation Test of Adolescence (Levine et al., 1986), Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984), Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1984), and the College Inventory of Academic Adjustment (Borow, 1949) and then completed the assessments again 2 years later as college juniors. The results suggest social and interpersonal adjustment and feelings of separation anxiety were more influenced by current parental attachment style than previous parental attachment style. Current and previous parental attachment was associated with emotional and academic adjustment. Secure attachments to parents in freshman year of college were found to be associated with college adjustment during the junior year of college.

In a similar vein, Tokar et al. (2003) examined the relationships between psychological separation and attachment, but were also interested in exploring the role of vocation self-concept and career indecision among a sample of 350 undergraduate college students. The mean age of the sample was 22.7 years and the majority of the sample was Caucasian (86%). Participants completed the Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984), Adult Attachment Scale

94

(Collins & Read, 1990), Vocational Rating Scale (Barrett & Tinsley, 1977a), Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, & Koschier, 1987), and the Career Factors Inventory (Chartrand, Robbins, Morrill, & Boggs, 1990) in classroom settings. Results indicated that students experienced less career indecision and more vocational self-concept with greater amounts of psychological separation and less negative feelings with their mother. Greater levels of attachment anxiety (i.e., abandonment) were associated with less vocational self-concept. Psychological separation from the father was associated with greater career indecision and less vocational self-concept.

Mattanah et al. (2004) explored the relationships between parental attachment, separation-individuation, and college adjustment among a sample of 404 college students with a mean age of 20.57 years. Participants were recruited for participation from mostly undergraduate psychology courses and completed the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), Separation Individuation Test of Adolescence (Levine et al., 1986), and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1984). The results suggest that a secure parental attachment was related to college adjustment, but the separation-individuation mediated the effects. The attachment with mothers was found to have the strongest relationship with the process of separation and individuation than the nature of attachment with fathers.

In summary, the majority of studies on separation-individuation with college students have focused on parental attachment issues and college adjustment. While the transition from high school to college can elicit a number of experiences related to comfort and security with peers and redefined relationships with parents; self-identity, including self-schemas; as well as college adjustment including coping strategies, no researchers to date have explored how attachments styles, negative self-schemas, and coping are related to separation-individuation issues for freshmen college students, which is the purpose of the present study. Exploring these relationships may help future college students, parents, freshmen orientation committees, and mental health practitioners in university counseling centers to become more aware of how long-

95

standing relationships and belief systems may contribute to how students experience and cope

with a variety of feelings during the process of separating and individuating from parents in the

first semester of college.

Appendix C: Assumptions, Limitations, and Definition of Terms

Assumptions

1. The sample of undergraduate college students will represent the general population of

undergraduate college students.

2. The participants will respond to the items on the questionnaires with how they honestly

feel.

3. The measures will accurately assess the participants' attachment styles, negative

self-schemas, and coping styles.

Limitations

1. Since the measurements are self-report, it is possible that participants may have

difficulty recalling their experiences or respond in socially desirable ways.

2. OSU college students may not be representative of the general population of college

students.

3. The results can only be generalized to undergraduate college students.

Definition of Terms

Attachment- Bowlby (1969) conceptualized attachment as "the seeking and maintaining

proximity to another individual", (p. 194).

Self-Schema- Young (1994) proclaims that self-schemas are cognitive templates derived during

childhood experiences with significant caregivers that are used by individuals to process

interpersonal interactions and their subsequent reactions.

Coping- According to Lazarus & Folkman (1984), coping is "constantly changing cognitive and

behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as

taxing and exceeding the resources of the person" (p. 141).

Separation-Individuation- Separation-individuation has been defined as "a development process

that begins with separation from parents, peers, and other significant persons, but that extends to

individuation and the development of a coherent, autonomous self" (Mattanah, Hancock, &

Brand, 2004, p. 213).

Appendix D: Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

Research Questions

1. What are the relationships among attachment styles?

2a. What are the relationships of attachment styles with negative self-schema domains?

2b. Which attachment styles are significant predictors of negative self-schema domains?

3a. What are the relationships between attachment styles and separation-individuation?

3b. Which attachment styles are significant predictors of separation-individuation?

4a. What are the relationships between negative self-schemas and separation-individuation?

4b. Which negative self-schema domains are significant predictors of separation-individuation?

5a. What is the relationship of attachment styles with coping styles??

5b. Which attachment styles are significant predictors of coping styles?

6a. What is the relationship of negative self-schemas with coping styles?

6b. Which negative self-schema domains are significant predictors of coping styles?

7a. What is the relationship of separation-individuation with coping styles?

7b. Which coping styles are significant predictors of separation-individuation?

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no statistically significant relationships between and among attachment styles.

2a. There will be not statistically significant relationships between attachment styles and negative self-schema domains.

2b. Attachment styles will not be statistically significant predictors of negative self-schema domains.

3a. There will be no statistically significant relationships between attachment styles and separation-individuation.

3b. Attachment styles will not be statistically significant predictors of separation-individuation.

4a. There will be no statistically significant relationships between negative self-schema domains and separation-individuation.

4b. Negative self-schema domains will not be statistically significant predictors of separation-individuation.

5a. There will be no statistically significant relationships between attachment styles and coping styles.

5b. Attachment styles will not be statistically significant predictors of coping styles?

6a. There will be no statistically significant relationships between negative self-schema domains and coping styles.

6b. Negative self-schema domains will not be statistically significant predictors of coping styles.

7a. There will be no statistically significant relationship between separation-individuation and coping styles.

7b. Coping styles will not be statistically significant predictors of separation-individuation.

Appendix E: Informed Consent

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study exploring freshman college students' experiences regarding their relationships with parents during the transition to college. Participation in this study involves the completion of five questionnaires and a demographic form, which should take approximately 30-45 minutes. The potential benefit of participating in this study is an increased awareness of how you feel about your relationships with your parents during the transition to college and the nature of coping strategies you have used during the transition to college. There are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate, please complete the questionnaires in this study. There is no penalty for not participating and you have the right to withdraw your consent and participation at any time. Participants will earn extra course credit for their participation. Most introductory and lower-level psychology and other courses offer students a small amount of course extra credit (usually less than 5% of their grade) for participation in the research process. In psychology courses, students are required to earn five "units" of research experience. This requirement may be fulfilled in one of three ways: 1) serving as a human participant in one or two current research project(s), 2) attending two Undergraduate Research Colloquia, or 3) researching and writing two 3-4 page papers on designated research topics. Each hour of participation in a research project as a participant is generally regarded as satisfying one "unit" of the requirement, students completing a half hour will receive .5 units. Students participating in this study will earn 1 unit of extra credit.

All information collected in this study is strictly confidential. No individual participants will be identified. The primary investigator and the advisor will have access to the data file, and the file will be stored for 3 years on a computer hard-drive and jump drive. The data file will have no information that could identify participants. Your instructor will not know your individual responses to the questionnaires. However, we will indicate that you have participated in this study by assigning you one research credit in the SONA database. Your participation in this study is

greatly appreciated. If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Shelia Kennison, IRB Chair, or Beth McTernan, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-33 or irb@okstate.edu. If you agree to participate, please click the "Agree to Participate" button. If you do not wish to participate, please click the "Decline to Participate" button. By clicking the "Agree to Participate" button, this will serve as your electronic signature for participation in this study.

We thank you for completing questionnaires for this study. We are very interested in how college students feel about their first semester of college and the feelings they have about their parents. Sometimes, when people participate in research studies, they may become aware of their own feelings and experiences that they may wish to discuss with others, including counseling professionals. We have provided you with a list of resources in case you become aware of your interest in seeking help to cope with your thoughts and feelings about yourself and/or your relationships with others. Please feel free to talk with counselors at one of these community resource agencies for assistance. You may also wish to contact the primary researcher of this study, Steven Roring, M.S. or Carrie Winterowd, Ph.D., 409 Willard Hall, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078 at 405-744-9446. We appreciate your participation in this study.

<center>Resource List</center>

This is a list of some centers that provide counseling services to college students.

Counseling Psychology Clinic

Oklahoma State University

111 PIO Building

(405) 744-6980

University Counseling Services

316 Student Union

405-744-5472

<center>104</center>

Reading and Math Center (counseling services are available here)

102 Willard Hall

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, OK 74078

405-744-7119

APPENDIX F: Demographics Sheet

Directions: Please answer each question by filling in the text box or clicking to select your response.

How old are you?	[ ]

Sex:	
○ Female	○ Male
○ Other	[ ]

Race: (Check all that apply)	
☐ African American/Black	☐ American Indian/Native American
☐ Asian/Asian American	☐ Hispanic/Latino(a)
☐ White/Non-Hispanic	☐ Other [ ]

Are you:	
○ Single	○ Partnered/Common Law
○ Married	○ Separated
○ Divorced	○ Widowed

What is your sexual orientation?
○ Heterosexual
○ Gay/Lesbian
○ Bisexual

What year are you in college?	
○	Freshman
○	Sophomore
○	Junior
○	Senior
○	Graduate student

Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?	
○	Yes
○	No

What is your current living situation?	
○	Residence Hall
○	Off-campus Housing
○	Sorority or Fraternity House
○	On-campus Apartment

Highest level of education for your mother or the person who acted as your mother.

_____ 1) Elementary school

_____ 2) Junior High School

_____ 3) Some High School

_____ 4) High School Diploma or GED

_____ 5) Vo-tech training

_____ 6) Some college

_____ 7) Undergraduate degree

_____ 8) Some graduate training

_____ 9) Graduate degree

Highest level of education for your father or the person who acted as your father.

_____ 1) Elementary school

_____ 2) Junior High School

_____ 3) Some High School

_____ 4) High School Diploma or GED

_____ 5) Vo-tech training

_____ 6) Some college

_____ 7) Undergraduate degree

_____ 8) Some graduate training

_____ 9) Graduate degree

What is your annual family income level? (Check One)			
○	Less than $10,000	○	$40,001 to 50,000
○	$10,001 to 15,000	○	$50,001 to 60,000
○	$15,001 to 20,000	○	$61,001 to 70,000
○	$20,001 to 25,000	○	$70,001 to 80,000
○	$25,001 to 30,000	○	$80,001 to 90,000
○	$30,001 to 40,000	○	$90,001 or more

How many people are supported in this income?

How many close friends do you have?

Appendix G: Instruments

This questionnaire asks about your relationships with important people in your life; your mother, your father, and your close friends. Please read the directions to each part carefully.

Part I

Some of the following statements asks about your feelings about your <u>mother</u> or the person who has acted as your mother. If you have more than one person acting as your mother (e.g. a natural mother and a step-mother) answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you. Please read each statement and circle the <u>ONE</u> number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Never Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Sometimes True	Often True	Almost Always or Almost Always <u>True</u>
1. My mother respects my feeling.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel my mother does a good job as my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wish I had a different mother.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My mother accepts me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5

8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.   1   2   3   4   5

9. My mother expects too much from me.   1   2   3   4   5

10. I get upset easily around my mother.   1   2   3   4   5

11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.   1   2   3   4   5

12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.   1   2   3   4   5

13. My mother trusts my judgment.   1   2   3   4   5

14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.   1   2   3   4   5

15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.   1   2   3   4   5

16. I tell my mother about my problems and troubles.   1   2   3   4   5

17. I feel angry with my mother.   1   2   3   4   5

18. I don't get much attention from my mother.   1   2   3   4   5

19. My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.   1   2   3   4   5

20. My mother understands me.   1   2   3   4   5

21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

22. I trust my mother.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off my chest.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

Part II

This part asks about your feelings about your <u>father</u> or the man who has acted as your father. If you have more than one person acting as your father (e.g. a natural father and a step-father) answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you.

Please read each statement and circle the <u>ONE</u> number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Never Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Sometimes True	Often True	Almost Always or Almost Always True
1. My father respects my feeling.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel my father does a good job as my father.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wish I had a different father.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My father accepts me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I like to get my father's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my father.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My father can tell when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Talking over my problems with my father makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My father expects too much from me.	1	2	3	4	5

10. I get upset easily around my father.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I get upset a lot more than my father knows about.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When we discuss things, my father cares about my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My father trusts my judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My father has his own problems, so I don't bother him with mine.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My father helps me to understand myself better.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I tell my father about my problems and troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel angry with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I don't get much attention from my father.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My father helps me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My father understands me.	1	2	3	4	5
21. When I am angry about something, my father tries to be understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I trust my father.	1	2	3	4	5
23. My father doesn't understand what I'm going through these	1	2	3	4	5

days.

24. I can count on my father when   1   2   3   4   5

     I need to get something off my

     chest.

25. If my father knows something   1   2   3   4   5

     is bothering me, he asks me about

     it.

Part III

This part asks about your feelings about your relationships with your close friends.

Please read each statement and circle the <u>ONE</u> number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Never Never or Never True	Not Very Often True	Sometimes True	Often True	Almost Always or Almost Always True
1. I like to get my friend's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My friends can tell when I'm upset about something.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When we discuss things, my friends care about my point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Talking over my problems with friends makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I wish I had different friends.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My friends understand me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My friends encourage me to talk about my difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My friends accept me as I am.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel the need to be in touch with my friends more often.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My friends don't understand what	1	2	3	4	5

I'm going through these days.

11. I feel alone or apart when I am   1   2   3   4   5

with my friends.

12. My friends listen to what I have   1   2   3   4   5

to say.

13. I feel my friends are good friends.   1   2   3   4   5

14. My friends are fairly easy to talk   1   2   3   4   5

to.

15. When I am angry about something,   1   2   3   4   5

my friends try to be understanding.

16. My friends help me to understand   1   2   3   4   5

myself better.

17. My friends care about how I am   1   2   3   4   5

feeling.

18. I feel angry with my friends.   1   2   3   4   5

19. I can count on my friends when I   1   2   3   4   5

need to get something off my chest.

20. I trust my friends.   1   2   3   4   5

21. My friends respect my feelings.   1   2   3   4   5

22. I get upset a lot more than my   1   2   3   4   5

friends know about.

23. It seems as if my friends are   1   2   3   4   5

irritated with me for no reason.

24. I can tell my friends about my   1   2   3   4   5

problems and troubles.

25. If my friends know something   1   2   3   4   5

is bothering me, they ask me about it.

Separation Individuation Test of Adolescence (SITA)

Attitude and Feelings Survey

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements which best describes various feelings, attitudes, and behaviors that people have. Read each statement and then select one option. Please answer all of the questions. If you have difficulty answering a particular question, choose the response which is closest to your feelings on that item, even though you may not feel strongly one way or another.

1. Sometimes my parents are so overprotective I feel smothered.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

2. I can't wait for the day I can live on my own and am free from my parents.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

3. Most parents are overcontrolling and don't really want their children to grow up.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

4. I often feel rebellious toward things my parents tell me to do.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

5. My parents keep close tabs on my whereabouts.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

6. I feel my parents' roles restrict my freedom too much.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

7. I am greatly looking forward to getting out from under the rule of my parents.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

8. Sometimes it seems that people really want to hurt me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

9. If I told someone about the troubles I have, they would probably not understand.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

10. My parents seem much more concerned about their own plans than they do about

mine.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

11. Even with my good friends I couldn't count on them to be there if I really needed

them.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

12. My parents seem very uninterested in what's going on with me.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

13. It sometimes seems that my parents wish they hadn't ever had me.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

14. It's hard for me to really trust anyone.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

15. No one seems to understand me.

| Never True | Hardly Ever | Sometimes True | Usually True | Always True |
| or | True or | or | or | or |

Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

16. If I let myself get close to someone else I would probably get burned.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

17. Sometimes it seems my parents really hate me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

18. As long as I don't depend anyone, I can't get hurt.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

19. At home, I seem to be "in the way" a lot.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

20. Being alone is a very scary idea for me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

21. I often don't understand what people want out of a close relationship with me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

22. I worry about death a lot.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

23. Sometimes I think how nice it was to be a young child when someone else took care

of my needs.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

24. I frequently worry about being rejected by my friends.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

25. I frequently worry about breaking up with my boyfriend/girlfriend.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

26. I am quite worried that there might be a nuclear war in the next decade that would

destroy much of this world.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

27. The teacher's opinion of me as a person is very important to me.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

28. I feel overpowered or controlled by people around me.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

29. When I think of the people that are most important to me I wish I could be with them

more and be closer to them emotionally.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

30. Before I go to sleep at night, I sometimes feel lonely and wish there were someone

around to talk to or just to be with.

Never True	Hardly Ever	Sometimes True	Usually True	Always True
or	True or	or	or	or
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Slightly Agree	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

31. The idea of going to a large party where I would not know anyone is a scary one for

me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

32. I worry about being disapproved of by my teachers.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

33. I would get upset if I found out my teacher was mad at me or disappointed in me.

Never True or Strongly Disagree	Hardly Ever True or Generally Disagree	Sometimes True or Slightly Agree	Usually True or Generally Agree	Always True or Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Young Schema Questionnaire-Second Edition, Short Form (YSQ-2)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Listed below are statements that a person might use to describe himself or herself. Please read each statement and decide how well it describes you. When there you are not sure, base your answer on what you emotionally **feel**, not on what you **think** to be true. Choose the **highest rating from 1 to 6** that describes you and write the number in the space before the statement.

RATING SCALE:

1 = Completely untrue of me

2 = Mostly untrue of me

3 = Slightly more true than untrue

4 = Moderately true of me

5 = Mostly true of me

6 = Describes me perfectly

1. _____ Most of the time, I haven't had someone to nurture me, share him/herself with me, or care deeply about everything that happens to me.

2. _____ In general, people have not been there to give me warmth, holding, and affection.

3. _____ For much of my life, I haven't felt that I am special to someone.

4. _____ For the most part, I have not had someone who really listens to me, understands me, or is tuned into my true needs and feelings.

5. _____ I have rarely had a strong person to give me sound advice or direction when I'm not sure what to do.

6. _____ I find myself clinging to people I'm close to, because I'm afraid they'll leave me.

7._____ I need other people so much that I worry about losing them.

8. _____ I worry that people I feel close to will leave me or abandon me.

9. _____ When I feel someone I care for pulling away from me, I get desperate.

10. _____ Sometimes I am so worried about people leaving me that I drive them away.

11. _____ I feel that people will take advantage of me.

12. _____ I feel that I cannot let my guard down in the presence of other people, or else they will intentionally hurt me.

13. _____ It is only a matter of time before someone betrays me.

14. _____ I am quite suspicious of other people's motives.

15. _____ I'm usually on the lookout for people's ulterior motives.

16. _____ I don't fit in.

17. _____ I'm fundamentally different from other people.

18. _____ I don't belong; I'm a loner.

19. _____ I feel alienated from other people.

20. _____ I always feel on the outside of groups.

21. _____ No man/woman I desire could love me one he/she saw my defects.

22. _____ No one I desire would want to stay close to me if he/she knew the real me.

23. _____ I'm unworthy of the love, attention, and respect of others.

24. _____ I feel that I'm not lovable.

25. _____ I am too unacceptable in very basic ways to reveal myself to other people.

26. _____ Almost nothing I do at work (or school) is as good as other people can do.

27. _____ I'm incompetent when it comes to achievement.

28. _____ Most other people are more capable than I am in areas of work and achievement.

29. _____ I'm not as talented as most people are at their work.

30. _____ I'm not as intelligent as most people when it comes to work (or school).

31. _____ I do not feel capable of getting by on my own in everyday life.

32. _____ I think of myself as a dependent person, when it comes to everyday functioning.

33. _____ I lack common sense.

34. _____ My judgment cannot be relied upon in everyday situations.

35. _____ I don't feel confident about my ability to solve everyday problems that come up.

36. _____ I can't seem to escape the feeling that something bad is about to happen.

37. _____ I feel that a disaster (natural, criminal, financial, or medical) could strike at any moment.

38. _____ I worry about being attacked.

39. _____ I worry that I'll lose all my money and become destitute.

40. _____ I worry that I'm developing a serious illness, even though nothing serious has been diagnosed by a physician.

41. _____ I have not been able to separate myself from my parent(s), the way other people my age seem to.

42. _____ My parent(s) and I tend to be overinvolved in each other's lives and problems.

43. _____ It is very difficult for my parent(s) and me to keep intimate details from each other, without feeling betrayed or guilty.

44. _____ I often feel as if my parent(s) are living through me--I don't have a life of my own.

45. _____ I often feel that I do not have a separate identity from my parent(s) or partner.

46. _____ I think that if I do what I want, I'm only asking for trouble.

47. _____ I feel that I have no choice but to give in to other people's wishes, or else they will retaliate or reject me in some way.

48. _____ In relationships, I let the other person have the upper hand.

49. _____ I've always let others make choices for me, so I really don't know what I want for myself.

50. _____ I have a lot of trouble demanding that my rights be respected and that my feelings be taken into account.

51. _____ I'm the one who usually ends up taking care of the people I'm close to.

52. _____ I am a good person because I think of others more than of myself.

53. _____ I'm so busy doing for the people that I care about, that I have little time for myself.

54. _____ I've always been the one who listens to everyone else's problems.

55. _____ Other people see me as doing too much for others and not enough for myself.

56. _____ I am too self-conscious to show positive feelings to others (e.g., affection, showing I care).

57. _____ I find it embarrassing to express my feelings to others.

58. _____ I find it hard to be warm and spontaneous.

59. _____ I control myself so much that people think I am unemotional.

60. _____ People see me as uptight emotionally.

61. _____ I must be the best at most of what I do; I can't accept second best.

62. _____ I try to do my best; I can't settle for "good enough."

63. _____ I must meet all my responsibilities.

64. _____ I feel there is constant pressure for me to achieve and get things done.

65. _____ I can't let myself off the hook easily or make excuses for my mistakes.

66. _____ I have a lot of trouble accepting "no" for an answer when I want something from other people.

67. _____ I'm special and shouldn't have to accept many of the restrictions placed on other people.

68. _____ I hate to be constrained or kept from doing what I want.

69. _____ I feel that I shouldn't have to follow the normal rules and conventions other people do.

70. _____ I feel that what I have to offer is of greater value than the contributions of others.

71. _____ I can't seem to discipline myself to complete routine or boring tasks.

72. _____ If I can't reach a goal, I become easily frustrated and give up.

73. _____ I have a very difficult time sacrificing immediate gratification to achieve a long-range goal.

74. _____ I can't force myself to do things I don't enjoy, even when I know it's for my own good.

75. _____ I have rarely been able to stick to my resolutions.

Ways of Coping Questionnaire (WCQ)

Take a few moments and think about the stress you experienced in your transition to college this semester. Please read each item below and indicate, by using the following rating scale, to what extent you used it within the first month of classes.

Not Used	Used Somewhat	Used Quite A Bit	Used A Great Deal
0	1	2	3

_____ 1. I just concentrated on what I had to do next – the next step.

_____ 2. I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better.

_____ 3. I turned to work or another activity to take my mind off things.

_____ 4. I felt that time would have made a difference – the only thing was to wait.

_____ 5. I bargained or compromised to get something positive from the situation.

_____ 6. I did something that I didn't think would work, but at least I was doing something.

_____ 7. I tried to get the person responsible to change his or her mind.

_____ 8. I talked to someone to find out more about the situation.

_____ 9. I criticized or lectured myself.

_____ 10. I tried not to burn my bridges, but leave things open somewhat.

_____ 11. I hoped for a miracle.

_____ 12. I went along with fate; sometimes I just have bad luck.

_____ 13. I went on as if nothing had happened.

_____ 14. I tried to keep my feelings to myself.

_____ 15. I looked for the silver lining, so to speak; I tried to look on the bright side of things.

_____ 16. I slept more than usual.

_____ 17. I expressed anger to the person(s) who caused the problem.

_____ 18. I accepted sympathy and understanding from someone.

_____ 19. I told myself things that helped me feel better.

_____ 20. I was inspired to do something creative about the problem.

_____ 21. I tried to forget the whole thing.

_____ 22. I got professional help.

_____ 23. I changed or grew as a person.

_____ 24. I waited to see what would happen before doing anything.

_____ 25. I apologized or did something to make up.

_____ 26. I made a plan of action and followed it.

_____ 27. I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted.

_____ 28. I let my feelings out somehow.

_____ 29. I realized that I had brought the problem on myself.

_____ 30. I came out of the experience better than when I went in.

_____ 31. I talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem.

_____ 32. I tried to get away from it for a while by resting or taking a vacation.

_____ 33. I tried to make myself feel better by eating, drinking, smoking, using drugs or medication, etc.

_____ 34. I took a big chance or did something very risky to solve the problem.

_____ 35. I tried not to act too hastily or follow my first hunch.

_____ 36. I found new faith.

_____ 37. I maintained my pride and kept a stiff upper lip.

_____ 38. I rediscovered what is important in life.

_____ 39. I changed something so things would turn out all right.

_____ 40. I generally avoided being with people.

_____ 41. I didn't let it get to me; I refused to think too much about it.

_____ 42. I asked advice from a relative or friend I respected.

_____ 43. I kept others from knowing how bad things were.

_____ 44. I made light of the situation; I refused to get too serious about it.

_____ 45. I talked to someone about how I was feeling.

_____ 46. I stood my ground and fought for what I wanted.

_____ 47. I took it out on other people.

_____ 48. I drew on my past experiences; I was in a similar situation before.

_____ 49. I knew what had to be done, so I doubled my efforts to make things work.

_____ 50. I refused to believe that it had happened.

_____ 51. I promised myself that things would be different next time.

_____ 52. I came up with a couple of different solutions to the problem.

_____ 53. I accepted the situation, since nothing could be done.

_____ 54. I tried to keep my feeling about the problem from interfering with other things.

_____ 55. I wished that I could change what had happened or how I felt.

_____ 56. I changed something about myself.

_____ 57. I daydreamed or imagined a better time or place than the one I was in.

_____ 58. I wished that the situation would go away or somehow be over with.

_____ 59. I had fantasies or wishes about how things might turn out.

_____ 60. I prayed.

_____ 61. I prepared myself for the worst.

_____ 62. I went over in my mind what I would say or do.

_____ 63. I thought about how a person I admire would handle this situation and used that as a model.

_____ 64. I tried to see things from the other person's point of view.

_____ 65. I reminded myself how much worse things could be.

_____ 66. I jogged or exercised.

Appendix H: Institutional Review Board Approval

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Thursday, October 28, 2010

IRB Application No: ED10130

Proposal Title: Attachment, Negative Self-Schemas, and Coping With Separation and Individuation During the Transition to College

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved   Protocol Expires: 10/27/2011

Principal Investigator(s):

Steven Roring
9714 East 73rd St. Apt. 206
Tulsa, OK 74133

Carrie Winterowd
409 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☒ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Steven Anthony Roring II

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: ATTACHMENT, NEGATIVE SELF-SCHEMAS, AND COPING WITH
          SEPARATION-INDIVIDUATION DURING THE TRANSITION TO
          COLLEGE

Major Field: Educational Psychology, Option in Counseling Psychology

Biographical:

    Education:

    Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational
    Psychology, Option Counseling Psychology at Oklahoma State University,
    Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2012

    Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Counseling at
    Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2008

    Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Psychology at
    Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Durant, Oklahoma in May, 2006.

    Experience: Wasatch Mental Health, Provo, UT, August 1, 2011-Present

                 Carl Albert Executive Fellow/Assessment Intern, May 2010-July
                  2011

                 Associated Centers for Therapy (ACT), Tulsa, OK, August 2009-
                 August 2010

                 Payne County Youth Services, Stillwater, OK, August 2008-July
                 2009

                 Oklahoma State University Student Counseling Center, Stillwater,
                 OK, June 2007-May 2008

    Professional Memberships: American Psychological Association; Southwestern
                              Psychological Association; ABCT

Name: Steven Anthony Roring II   Date of Degree: July, 2012

Institution: Oklahoma State University   Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: ATTACHMENT, NEGATIVE SELF-SCHEMAS, AND COPING WITH SEPARATION-INDIVIDUATION DURING THE TRANSITION TO COLLEGE

Pages in Study: 136 Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Educational Psychology, Option Counseling Psychology

Scope and Method of Study: This study examined the relationships between and among parental attachment, negative self-schemas, feelings of separation and individuation, and coping strategies among 149 freshmen college students.

Findings and Conclusions: Freshmen college students with more secure attachments to their parents are less likely to experience difficulty with rejection expectancy, engulfment anxiety, and separation anxiety and were significantly less likely to have negative self-schemas. Freshmen college students with higher levels of negative self-schemas associate with a personal sense of defectiveness and the expectation that they will experience emotional deprivation and who are hypercritical of themselves and who suppress their emotions tended to feel they will be rejected by others, while freshmen college students who expected to experience emotional deprivation from others and who met the needs of others at the expense of their own personal needs tended to feel lonely and less likely to be closer to their parents emotionally. Counselors and psychologists may be able to help college students who present with difficulties adjusting to college by focusing on the relationships students have with their parents. By focusing on parental attachment, counselors and psychologists may be able to normalize the feelings college students have about their parents, which may result in students becoming more comfortable with being apart from their parents. Counselors and psychologists may also help freshmen college students by exploring negative self-schemas that impact their ability to have secure attachments with their parents and to use positive coping strategies.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Dr. Carrie Winterowd _____