

# Attachment Theory, Psychoanalysis, Personality Development, and Psychopathology

SIDNEY J. BLATT, PH.D.  
KENNETH N. LEVY, PH.D.

Blatt and Levy place attachment theory and research in a broad theoretical matrix by considering the relationship of attachment patterns to personality development and to different types of psychopathology in adults. Thus Blatt and Levy construct conceptual bridges between the two configurations of personality development and psychopathology that Blatt and colleagues have developed over the past quarter century (e.g., Behrends and Blatt, 1985; Blatt, 1974, 1995; Blatt and Behrends, 1987; Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Blatt and Shichman, 1983) and attachment theory and research. Blatt and Levy identify a polarity that is central to attachment theory and research, the polarity of attachment and separation, and they note that this polarity has also been central in much of classic psychoanalytic theory (e.g., Freud, 1930; Loewald, 1962). This polarity is expressed in attachment theory and research in the differences between avoidant and anxious-preoccupied insecure attachment patterns as well in the distinction between two types of disorganized attachment, helplessness-withdrawn and negative intrusive, identified by Lyons-Ruth (1999, 2001). This polarity of attachment and separation, or relatedness and self-definition is also fundamental to personality development that occurs in the

---

Sidney J. Blatt, Ph.D. is Head, Division of Psychology in Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New York City.

Kenneth N. Levy, Ph.D. is **AUTHOR, YOUR TITLE GOES HERE**, Hunter College, City University of New York.

We are indebted to John S. Auerbach for his contributions to this paper.

hierarchical dialectic transaction of two basic developmental lines—interpersonal relatedness and self-definition (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996). This polarity is also inherent in the conception of two fundamental configurations of psychopathology—anaclitic psychopathology, the dependent (or infantile) and hysterical personality disorders—that are preoccupied with issues of interpersonal relatedness, and introjective psychopathology, the paranoid, obsessive-compulsive and depressive personality disorders, in which issues of self-definition and self-worth are dominant (Blatt, 1974, 1995; Blatt and Shichman, 1983). Thus, the identification of this fundamental polarity provides the basis for establishing links between attachment patterns, personality development, and adult psychopathology. Blatt and Levy also attempt to integrate psychoanalytic concepts of the representational world (e.g., Sandler and Rosenblatt, 1965)—the development of concepts of self and significant others—with the internal working models of (IWMs) of attachment relationships. This integration enabled Blatt and Levy to bring a fuller developmental perspective to the IWMs of attachment theory and to note that, based on differences in the content and structural organization of the IWMs or mental representation of self and significant others, several developmental levels can be identified in both avoidant and anxious preoccupied attachment. These developmental levels within each attachment style also identifies less and more adaptive forms of both types of insecure attachment. Thus, the integration of the psychoanalytic concepts of mental representation with concepts of the IWM of attachment theory and research enables Blatt and Levy to create a fuller developmental perspective in the study of insecure attachment patterns.

**A**TTACHMENT THEORY AND CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY have both emerged from an object-relations tradition in which psychological development is viewed as occurring in an interpersonal matrix. Despite its historical links with psychoanalysis, especially an object relations perspective, attachment theory has been pursued primarily by investigators in developmental psychology concerned about normal development, influenced by concepts from ethology, rather than from psychoanalytic theory. Additionally, until recently psychoanalytic clinicians have neglected attachment theory and its implications for clinical phenomena. The seminal theoretical and empirical work of Mary Main and colleagues (e.g., George, Kaplan, and Main, 1985; Main and Cassidy, 1988; Main and Goldwyn, 1984; Main, Kaplan, and Cassidy, 1985) elaborating the nature of internal working models of attachment,

however, has led to an increasing rapprochement between attachment theory and research and psychoanalysis.

John Bowlby's attachment theory, and the large body of research his theory has generated, has considerable potential for contributing to psychoanalysis. Attachment theory and research provide a powerful heuristic that can facilitate psychoanalytic research and the testing of psychoanalytic hypotheses, as well as enriching the therapeutic work of psychoanalytic clinicians. Mary Ainsworth's landmark research on the relationship of maternal sensitivity to the infant's development of attachment patterns, and the subsequent research by Alan Sroufe, Claire Hamilton, and Everett Waters on the continuity of these patterns of infant attachment into adolescence and young adulthood, for example, have provided strong empirical evidence for several basic psychoanalytic assumptions, such as the vital role of early life experiences in the development of subsequent interpersonal relationships.

Attachment theory has also greatly enriched psychoanalytic understanding of the representational world. Early psychoanalytic conceptions of mental representation often had a somewhat static quality, focusing primarily on representational images of significant individuals. As Loewald (1962) noted, however, relationships, rather than individuals, are internalized. The concept of representational processes in Bowlby and subsequent attachment theorists, consistent with Loewald, has been more dynamic than the more traditional psychoanalytic formulations of mental representation. Attachment theorists have stressed both the relational aspects of what is represented and the evolving nature (i.e., the working aspect) of representations. As Bretherton (1999) notes, the bold move of stressing the role of mental models in attachment theory in the late 1960s was congruent with the emergence of both the cognitive revolution and social constructivism that now dominates psychological science. And this emphasis on working model of attachment relationships is consistent with more recent psychoanalytic investigations of the representational world (e.g., Blatt, Kernberg, Loewald, and Stern).

Although attachment theorists have applied developmental principles to an understanding of internal working models (IWMs), ironically they generally have failed to integrate cognitive-developmental principles into this aspect of their work, particularly when considering the development of IWMs. Attachment theorists have long been interested in developmental progressions and they view the move from behavior to representation as propelled by cognitive development (Marvin and

Britner, 1999). Attachment theorists have noted, for example, that the shift in adolescents to formal operational thinking facilitates their integration of multiple models of attachment and the reorganization of states of mind with respect to attachment. Nevertheless, attachment theorists have not fully applied cognitive-developmental principles to their investigations of internal working models (IWMs). Other than a few studies (e.g., Marvin, 1977; Marvin and Greenberg, 1982), developmental differences in IWMs are acknowledged in attachment research only by the fact that different measures of IWMs are used at different ages. An exception is the work of Inge Bretherton, who describes internal working models as a “developing set of multiply interconnected schema hierarchies” that exist at varying levels of abstraction (Bretherton, 1995, p. 237).<sup>1</sup> We (Blatt, 1995; Levy, Blatt, and Shaver, 1998; Levy and Blatt, 1999) and Bretherton (1999) have noted that the psychoanalytic and social cognitive literature on the development of mental representations could be helpful in articulating a more developmental perspective for understanding internal working models. Mental representation in psychoanalytic theory, for example, is now conceptualized as proceeding through a developmental sequence, becoming increasingly complex, abstract, and symbolic (e.g., Blatt, 1974, 1995; Bruner, 1964; Horowitz, 1972). The application of this cognitive-developmental perspective to attachment theory could provide a basis for differentiating various levels of interpersonal functioning within each of the insecure attachment styles. Thus, psychoanalytic formulations about the development of mental representations has much to contribute to elaborating the fundamental role of IWMs in attachment theory and research—the cognitive-affective organization that attachment theory assumes provides continuity in interpersonal functioning from infancy to adulthood.

This essay elaborates these synergistic relationships between psychoanalysis and attachment theory and research, especially for understanding the nature of psychological disturbances. We consider how the

---

<sup>1</sup>Another exception is the work of Crittenden (e.g., 1995) who has proposed a “dynamic-maturation perspective” that stresses that maturation and experience enable children to construct increasingly sophisticated attachment strategies. Crittenden focuses on developmental differences in memory systems for understanding the increasing complexity of attachment strategies. Although this perspective is important, it does not address questions about developmental differences in representation for understanding dimensions of the IWMs that underlie attachment strategies.

fundamental distinctions between the anxious resistant or enmeshed—preoccupied<sup>2</sup> and dismissing avoidant attachment patterns define a basic psychological polarity that is central both in psychoanalytic theory and personality theory more generally. The identification of this fundamental polarity of anxious and avoidant attachment enables us, in the first section of this essay, to elaborate potential continuities between early attachment patterns and the subsequent development of both personality style and disturbed functioning in adults. Our second section considers the potential contributions of psychoanalytic formulations of the development of mental representations to the identification of different levels of IWMs in secure and the various insecure attachment patterns. We demonstrate that a basic distinction within attachment theory between insecure-avoidant and insecure-anxious-preoccupied can occur at several developmental levels and that these levels derive from the content and structure of mental representations (or IWMs) of self and other. The systematic assessment of aspects of mental representations of self and of others, and of their actual or potential interaction, can provide a reliable and valid basis for evaluating levels of psychological development within each attachment pattern.

### *Attachment and Psychopathology*

In formulating attachment theory, Bowlby stressed the centrality of attachment in understanding both normal and psychopathological development. He (1977) contended that working models of attachment help

---

<sup>2</sup>Various terms are used in the attachment literature to describe this insecure pattern. In the infant a developmental research, the term anxious-resistant is used to describe this insecure type, whereas in the adult developmental research based on the adult attachment interview, the term enmeshed-preoccupied is used. The social psychological research uses the terms anxious-ambivalent and preoccupied depending on whether the Hazan and Shaver three-category or the Bartholomew four-category based measures are employed. In this essay, we use the term anxious-preoccupied when discussing conceptual issues related to this attachment pattern. We believe that this term best captures the negative affect (represented by anxiety, ambivalence, and resistance) and the intense longing (represented by enmeshed and preoccupied dynamics) central to both the infant and adult literature and the developmental and social psychological literature. However, when discussing research findings or discussing other theorists comments, we use the terminology employed by the investigators or theorists we are citing.

explain “the many forms of emotional distress and personality disturbances, including anxiety, anger, depression, and emotional detachment, to which unwilling separations and loss give rise” (p. 201). Bowlby (1977, p. 206) held that childhood attachment underlies the “later capacity to make affectional bonds as well as a whole range of adult dysfunctions” including “marital problems and trouble with children as well as . . . neurotic symptoms and personality disorders.” Thus, Bowlby postulated that early attachment experiences have long-lasting effects that tend to persist across the lifespan and are among the major determinates of personality organization and psychological disturbance.

Bowlby postulated that insecure attachment lies at the center of disordered personality traits, and he linked the overt expression of felt insecurity to specific characterological disorders. For instance, he (1973) connected anxious-ambivalent or resistant attachment to “a tendency to make excessive demands on others and to be anxious and clingy when they are not met, such as in dependent and hysterical personalities” and avoidant attachment to “a blockage in the capacity to make deep relationships, such as is present in affectionless and psychopathic personalities” (p. 14). Avoidant attachment, Bowlby proposed, results from the individuals constantly being rebuffed in his or her appraisals for comfort or protection and “may later be diagnosed as narcissistic” (p. 124). He (1979) believed that attachment difficulties increase the vulnerability to psychopathology and that different types of insecure attachment patterns are linked to specific types of difficulties that may arise later in development. But relatively little research or theory has examined the relationship between early attachment patterns and the subsequent development of psychopathology.

Attachment theory and research emphasizes two fundamental types of insecure attachment—a resistant or preoccupied attachment style on the one hand and an avoidant or dismissive attachment style on the other. The identification of resistance (or an anxious preoccupation) and avoidance as two fundamental dimensions in defining insecure attachment is consistent with formulations in several theories, including psychoanalysis, on interpersonal relatedness and self-definition as fundamental coordinates in personality development and organization (Blatt, 1995; Blatt and Blass, 1996). Thus, the basic insecure attachment paradigms of either desperately seeking to maintain contact or avoiding contact is consistent with the two fundamental developmental processes, relatedness and self-definition, that lead to the formation of normal character

or personality, traits, as well as with a propensity toward certain types of psychopathology.

### *A Fundamental Polarity in Insecure Attachment Style*

Relatedness and self-definition, or communion and agency, define a fundamental polarity in psychoanalytic theory that is similar to the resistant (preoccupied) and avoidant distinction in insecure attachment patterns. Resistant attachment involves an intense preoccupation with maintaining contact with the need-gratifying figure and is accompanied by considerable anxiety in response to separation and loss. Avoidant attachment involves intense efforts at maintaining an aloofness and detachment to deal with loss; these efforts are defensive expressions of exaggerated autonomy and independence to deal with loss.

A large body of attachment research supports the identification of these two categories, resistance and avoidance, in infants, adolescents, and adults. These two underlying types of insecure attachment patterns have been identified in infants through Ainsworth's Strange Situation, and in adolescents and adults through AAI interviews, as well as through the various self-report measures used by Hazan and Shaver and Bartholomew. Results from these investigations indicate that types of insecure attachment, across a wide range of ages, can be conceptualized in terms of these two basic categories of resistance and avoidance.

Ainsworth et al. (1978) conducted a discriminate function analysis, identifying attachment types in infants on the basis of their behavior in the Strange Situation. In addition to identifying secure attachment in a substantial portion of their sample (60%), they identified two basic patterns of insecure attachment, resistant and avoidant. The behavior characteristic of avoidance was a failure to maintain contact with the mother—not seeking proximity with her upon reunion, but engaging in exploratory behavior primarily in more distance interactions with a stranger. All these behaviors indicate an avoidance of, and a lack of closeness to, the mother and a relative lack of apparent distress during mother's absence. Ainsworth also identified behaviors most characteristic of anxious resistance, such as the infant's crying when left alone, greater angry resistance to mother during reunions, and when a stranger tried to comfort or plays with the infant, and reduced exploration when the infant was with a stranger. Thus, Ainsworth's two types of insecure

attachment (resistant or avoidant) were conceptualized along the dimensions of avoidance (discomfort with closeness and dependency) and anxiety (crying, failing to explore confidently in the absence of mother, and angry protest directed at mother during reunions after what was probably experienced as abandonment).

Relying on the work of Main and Goldwyn (1984–1998), Kobak (1989; Kobak et al., 1993) developed a Q-set to obtain continuous scores of attachment dimensions when rating Adult Attachment Interviews (AAI), a procedure developed by Main to assess attachment patterns in adults. Kobak identified two dimensions of attachment: secure/insecure (corresponding to an avoidance dimension) and hyperactive/deactive strategies (corresponding to a resistance dimension) (see also Brennan, Clark, and Shaver, 1998). Research using self-report measures of attachment style (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; Brennan et al., 1998; Collins and Read, 1990; Simpson, Rholes, and Nelligan, 1992) also indicate that attachment variables can be aligned along the dimensions of resistance and avoidance (see Fraley and Waller, 1998). The identification of these two dimensions in the findings of Hazan and Shaver's (1987, 1990) as well as in Kobak's Q-sort scoring system for the AAI (Kobak et al., 1993; see also Shaver and Hazan, 1993), are conceptually similar to those assessed by Ainsworth in her infant–mother research using the Strange Situation (Ainsworth et al., 1978). They are also similar to Bowlby's theoretical formulations of working models of self and others in insecure attachment. These two dimensions of anxiety resistance and avoidance have been differentially linked to a number of theoretically relevant variables in recent research.

### *A Fundamental Polarity in Personality Theory*

Blatt (1999) noted the same basic polarity of relatedness and self-sufficiency is a fundamental paradigm in classic psychoanalytic theory. Freud (1930), for example, observed in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, that “the development of the individual seems . . . to be a product of the interaction between two urges, the urge toward happiness, which we usually call ‘egoistic,’ and the urge toward union with others in the community, which we call ‘altruistic’ [p. 140]. . . . The man who is predominantly erotic will give the first preference to his emotional relationship to other people; the narcissistic man, who inclines to be

self-sufficient, will seek his main satisfactions in his internal mental processes” (pp. 83–84). Freud (1915, 1926) also distinguished between object and ego libido and between libidinal instincts in the service of attachment and aggressive instincts necessary for autonomy, mastery, and self-definition. Loewald (1962, p. 490) noted that the exploration of “these various modes of separation and union . . . [identify a] polarity inherent in individual existence of individuation and ‘primary narcissistic union’—a polarity that Freud attempted to conceptualize by various approaches but that he recognized and insisted upon from beginning to end by his dualistic conception of instincts, of human nature, and of life itself.” Michael Balint (1959), from an object relations perspective, also discussed these two fundamental dimensions in personality development—a clinging or connectedness (an ocnophilic tendency) as opposed to self-sufficiency (a philobatic tendency). Shor and Sanville (1978), relying on Balint’s formulations, discussed psychological development as involving a fundamental oscillation between “necessary connectedness” and “inevitable separations” or between “intimacy and autonomy.” Personality development involves “a dialectical spiral or helix which interweaves [these] two dimensions of development.” Adler (1951) discussed the balance between social interest and self-perfection, and viewed neurosis as the consequence of a distorted overemphasis on self-enhancement in the absence of sufficient social interest. Pampering (overprotection, indulgence, and domination) or rejection leads to feelings of inadequacy and selfishness, as well as to a lack of independence. Rank (1929) discussed both self- and other-directedness and their relationship to creative and adaptive personality organization. Horney (1945, 1950) characterized personality organization as either moving toward, moving against, or moving away from interpersonal contact.

Blatt (1999) also noted that a wide range of more general personality theorists (e.g., Angyal, 1951; Bakan, 1966; McAdams, 1985; McClelland, 1986; Wiggins, 1991) has also discussed relatedness and self-definition as two primary dimensions of personality development. Thus, these two fundamental themes of relatedness and self-definition, initially articulated by Freud, have also been central to the formulations of a wide range of nonpsychoanalytic personality theorists. Angyal (1941, 1951), for example, discussed surrender and autonomy as two basic personality dispositions. Surrender for Angyal is the desire to seek a home, to become part of something greater than oneself, while autonomy represents a “striving basically to assert and to expand . . . self determination, [to be]

an autonomous being, a self governing entity that asserts itself actively instead of reacting passively. . . . This tendency . . . expresses itself in spontaneity, self assertiveness, and striving for freedom and for mastery” (pp. 131–132). Bakan (1966), in a conceptualization similar to Angyal, defined communion and agency as two fundamental dimensions in personality development. Communion for Bakan (1966) is a loss of self and self-consciousness in a merging and blending with others and the world. Communion involves feeling a part of and participating in a larger social entity, being at one with others, feeling in contact or union and experiencing a sense of openness, cooperation, love, and eros. Agency, in contrast, defines a pressure toward individuation that Bakan believed permeates all living matter. Agency emphasizes being a separate individual and being able to tolerate isolation, alienation, and aloneness. The predominant themes in agency are self-protection, self-assertion, self-expansion, and an urge to master the environment and make it one’s own. The basic issues in agency are separation and mastery.

Bakan’s communion and Angyal’s surrender define a fundamental desire for union in which the person seeks to merge or join with other people and with the inanimate environment in order to achieve a greater sense of participation and belonging, as well as a greater sense of synthesis within oneself. Communion and surrender refer to a stable dimension of personality organization directed toward interdependent relationships with others. Themes of dependency, mutuality, and unity define this basic dimension in life. Bakan’s agency and Angyal’s autonomy define a basic striving toward individuation—a seeking of separation from others and a detachment from the environment, as well as a fuller differentiation within oneself. Agency and autonomy both refer to a stable dimension of functioning that emphasizes separation, individuation, control, self-definition, autonomy, and achievement—the striving for uniqueness and the expression of one’s own capacities and self-interests (Friedman and Booth-Kewey, 1987). Communion (or surrender), the emphasis on connectedness, attachment, and a movement toward a sense of belonging to and sharing with others (another person, group, or society), serves as a counterforce to experiences of loneliness and alienation that can occur in agency and autonomy. And, conversely, uniqueness and self-definition serve as a counterforce to experiences of a loss of individuality that can occur in surrender and communion (Blatt, 1999).

Research investigators from a variety of theoretical perspectives have also found these two fundamental dimensions of value in studies of

personality organization. McAdams (e.g., 1980, 1985) and others (e.g., McClelland, 1980, 1986; McClelland et al., 1953; Winter, 1973), in studies of life narratives, found that themes of intimacy (such as feeling close, warm, and in communication with others) and themes of power (such as feeling strong and of having a significant impact on one's environment) were pivotal in understanding personality organization. Narratives of individuals high on intimacy motivation speak frequently of reciprocal, harmonious, interpersonal interactions and participation in social groups, and express a "recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of warmth, closeness and communicative exchange" (McAdams, 1985, p. 76). These individuals portrayed themselves as a helper, lover, counselor, caregiver, and friend. Narratives of people high on power motivation, in contrast, speak frequently of self-protection, self-assertion, and self-expansion; they separate themselves from a context and express needs for mastery, achievement, movement, force, and action. This power motive indicates "a recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of having impact and feeling strong and potent vis-à-vis the environment." Individuals high on the power motive often speak of themselves as a traveler, master, father, authority, or sage.

Gilligan (1982), in a similar fashion, stresses the importance of including issues of interpersonal responsibility in addition to an emphasis on investment in rights and principles of justice in studies of moral development. Wiggins (1991), a personality researcher, argues that agency and communion are the primary conceptual coordinates for the measurement of interpersonal behavior and for describing personality functioning. Wiggins noted that circumplex and five-factor models of personality that have been useful in the conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal acts, traits, affects, problems, and personality disorders are "derived from the meta-concepts of agency and communion." While Wiggins noted that agency and communion may not, by themselves, capture the broad spectrum of individual differences that characterize human transactions, he (1991) concluded that they "are propaedeutic to the study of [the] . . . determinants of interpersonal behavior." Spiegel and Spiegel (1978) also discuss the importance of these two dimensions of relatedness and self-definition in personality organization and they drew a parallel between these two dimensions and two basic forces in nature—fusion and fission, integration and differentiation. Thus, both psychoanalytic and nonpsychoanalytic investigators have identified these two fundamental dimensions of relatedness and

self-definition as central for understanding personality organization and personality development.

Most theorists consider relatedness and self-definition as two independent processes, and some theorists, such as Freud (e.g., 1930), sometimes consider these processes as antagonistic or contradictory forces. Actually, these two processes are synergistically interdependent in normal development. Personality development throughout life, from infancy to senescence, occurs as the result of a complex dialectic transaction between these two fundamental developmental forces. The development of an increasingly differentiated, integrated, essentially realistic, and positive, mature sense of self is contingent upon establishing satisfying interpersonal relationships. Conversely, the development of increasingly mature, reciprocal, and satisfying interpersonal relationships depends on the development of a more mature self-definition or identity (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Blatt and Shichman, 1983). The dialectic synergistic interaction between the development of relationships with others and the development of self-definition probably can best be illustrated by an elaboration of Erikson's epigenetic model of psychosocial development.

Erikson's (1950) epigenetic model, although presented basically as a linear developmental process, implicitly provides support for the view that normal personality development involves the simultaneous and mutually facilitating development of self-definition and interpersonal relatedness, particularly if one includes in Erikson's model an additional stage of cooperation versus alienation (occurring around the time of the development of cooperative peer play and the initial resolution of the oedipal crisis at about four to six years of age), and places this stage at the appropriate point in the developmental sequence, between Erikson's phallic-uterine stage of "initiative versus guilt" and his "industry versus inferiority" of latency (Blatt and Shichman, 1983). Then, Erikson's epigenetic model of psychosocial development illustrates the complex transaction between interpersonal relatedness and self-definition in normal development throughout the life cycle (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996).

Erikson initially emphasized interpersonal relatedness in his discussion of trust versus mistrust, followed by two stages of self-definition, autonomy versus shame and initiative versus guilt. This is followed by the additional stage of interpersonal relatedness, cooperation versus alienation, and then by two stages of self-definition, industry versus inferiority and identity versus role diffusion. The following stage,

intimacy versus isolation, is again clearly a stage of interpersonal relatedness, followed by two more stages of self-definition, generativity versus stagnation and integrity versus despair. This reformulation of Erikson's model (Blatt and Shichman, 1983) corrects the deficiency noted by a number of theorists (e.g., Franz and White, 1985) that Erikson's model tends to neglect the development of interpersonal attachment. The articulation of an attachment developmental line broadens Erikson's model and enables us to note more clearly the dialectic developmental transaction between relatedness and self-definition implicit in Erikson's developmental model. Relatedness and individuality (attachment and separation) both evolve through a complex interactive developmental process. The evolving capacities for autonomy, initiative, industry, and identity in the individuality developmental line, emerge in parallel mode with the development of a capacity for relatedness—for example, to engage with and trust another, to cooperate and collaborate in activities with peers (e.g., play), to develop a close friendship with a same-sex chum, and to eventually experience and express feelings of mutuality, intimacy and reciprocity in an intimate, mature relationship. The evolving capacities along these two developmental lines are coordinated in normal development. For example, one needs a sense of basic trust to venture in opposition to the need-gratifying other in asserting one's autonomy and independence, and later one needs a sense of autonomy and initiative to establish cooperative and collaborative relationships, first with parents and later with peers.

Thus, Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, 1991, 1995; Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Blatt and Shichman, 1983) conceptualized personality development as involving two fundamental parallel developmental lines—(a) an anaclitic or relatedness line that involves the development of the capacity to establish increasingly mature and mutually satisfying interpersonal relationships and (b) an introjective or self-definitional line that involves the development of a consolidated, realistic, essentially positive, differentiated, and integrated self-identity. These two developmental lines normally evolve throughout life in a reciprocal or dialectic transaction. An increasingly differentiated, integrated, and mature sense of self is contingent on establishing satisfying interpersonal relationships, and, conversely, the continued development of increasingly mature and satisfying interpersonal relationships is contingent on the development of a more mature self-concept and identity. In normal personality development, these two developmental processes evolve in an interactive,

reciprocally balanced, mutually facilitating fashion from birth through senescence. Feldman and Blatt (1996) investigated some of the early antecedents of the development of relatedness and self-definition in infant–mother interactions, but further longitudinal research should be directed to studying infants and children who eventually develop extreme anxious and avoidant insecure attachment patterns. Attachment research indicates that secure attachment involves both a capacity to establish affective bonds and to tolerate and benefit from separation. Secure attachment involves increasingly mature levels of both interpersonal relatedness and self-definition, as expressed in the capacity both to love and to work (Hazan and Shaver, 1990). Thus, secure attachment represents an integration of the two fundamental developmental lines of relatedness and self definition in a coordinated development of the capacity for establishing mature levels of interpersonal relatedness and an essentially positive, realistic, differentiated, and integrated identity.

#### *A Fundamental Polarity in Psychopathology*

Blatt (1974, 1990, 1995) and colleagues (e.g., Blatt and Shichman, 1983) conceptualize various forms of psychopathology as an overemphasis and exaggeration of one of these developmental lines (relatedness or self-definition) at the expense of the development of the other line. This overemphasis defines two distinctly different configurations of psychopathology, each containing several types of disordered behavior that range from relatively severe to relatively mild. Anaclitic psychopathologies are those disorders in which patients are primarily preoccupied with issues of relatedness, and who use primarily avoidant defenses (e.g., withdrawal, denial, repression) to cope with psychological conflict and stress. Anaclitic disorders involve a primary preoccupation with interpersonal relations and issues of trust, caring, intimacy, and sexuality, ranging developmentally from more to less disturbed, and include non-paranoid-undifferentiated schizophrenia, borderline personality disorder, infantile (or dependent) character disorder, anaclitic depression, and hysterical disorders. In contrast, introjective psychopathology includes disorders in which the patients are primarily concerned with establishing and maintaining a viable sense of self, with issues ranging from a basic sense of separateness, through concerns about autonomy and control, to

more complex and internalized issues of self-worth. These patients use primarily counteractive defenses (projection, rationalization, intellectualization, doing and undoing, reaction formation, overcompensation) to cope with conflict and stress. Introjective patients are more ideational and concerned with establishing, protecting, and maintaining a viable self-concept than they are with the quality of their interpersonal relations and with achieving feelings of trust, warmth, and affection. Issues of anger and aggression, directed toward the self or others, are usually central to their difficulties. Introjective disorders, ranging developmentally from more to less severely disturbed, include paranoid schizophrenia; overrideational borderline, paranoia, obsessive-compulsive personality disorders; introjective (guilt-ridden) depression; and phallic narcissism. These two primary dimensions of personality development, relatedness and self-definition, and the two primary configurations of psychopathology, anaclitic and introjective, have continuity with the two fundamental structures observed in attachment research—*anxiety (resistance) and avoidance.*

Recent theorizing has related the introjective and anaclitic developmental lines to resistant and avoidant insecure attachment patterns, respectively (Blatt and Homann, 1992; Blatt and Maroudas, 1992; Levine and Tuber, 1993; Levy et al., 1998; Pilkonis, 1988; Zuroff and Fitzpatrick, 1995). For example, disturbance in the interpersonal (or anaclitic) developmental line, characterized by exaggerated attempts to establish interpersonal relationships, is much like the anxious-resistant attachment style with its fears of abandonment and compulsive care-seeking. Several studies have shown that anxious-resistant attachment is associated with an anaclitic/dependent type of depression (Blatt, 1974), characterized by concerns with disruptions of interpersonal relations and fears of abandonment and loneliness. Avoidant attachment has been associated with an introjective/self-critical type of depression (Blatt, 1974), characterized by concerns about self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness, blame, and guilt (see reviews in Blatt and Homann, 1992; Zuroff et al., 1995).

Although the anxious and avoidant insecure attachment patterns are certainly less adaptive than secure attachment, they at least represent a consolidated or organized maladaptive mode of dealing with difficult interpersonal situations (Shahar, Blatt, and Ford, 2003). The disorganized insecure attachment style, however, may reflect a less consolidated mode of dealing with difficult interpersonal situations and thus may be

related to more severe forms of psychopathology. The disorganized style of attachment was identified about 15 years ago (e.g., Main and Hesse, 1990, 1992). Hesse and Main (2000) discuss disorganized attachment as related to parental unresolved fear—a fear that is transmitted through parental behavior that appears as frightened or frightening to the infant. The arousal of fear by the parent creates an unresolvable paradox for the infant because the parent is the source of both fear and safety and security. Lyons-Ruth (2001) and colleagues (e.g., Lyons-Ruth and Block, 1996; Lyons-Ruth, Bronfman, and Atwood, 1999; Lyons-Ruth, Bronfman, and Parsons, 1999; Lyons-Ruth and Jacobvitz, 1999) examined the hypothesis that in disorganized attachment the parents' difficulty in the regulation of the infant's fearful arousal is as important as the parent's own frightened or frightening behavior. Lyons-Ruth et al. assumed, for example, that parental withdrawal or role confusing behavior is disorganizing because it leaves the infant without parental regulation of fearful affect. They examined five types of disruption of parental regulation: parental withdrawal, negative intrusion, role confusion, disoriented responses, and failure to respond to the infant's affective signals. Thus, they assumed that the frightened or frightening disruptive behavior associated with the disorganized insecure attachment style was embedded in a broader context of disrupted affective communication between mother and infant. Even after controlling for the presence of parental frightened or frightening behavior, they found that the extent of disrupted affective communication between mother and infant still distinguished mothers of disorganized infants from mothers of organized infants. Disrupted parental affective communication (e.g., speaking soothingly but moving out of reach or laughing at the infant's distress while picking up the infant) was strongly related to the infant's disorganized behavior.

Lyons-Ruth and colleagues (e.g., Lyons-Ruth, 2001) were able to distinguish two types of disorganized infants that they labeled as Disorganized Approach (D-Approach) and Disorganized Avoidant (D-Avoid). Substantial differences were found in the behavior of mothers of D-Approach and D-Avoid infants. The mothers of these two types of disorganized infants differed more from each other than they differed from mothers of nondisorganized infants. Mothers of D-Avoid infants had higher rates of role confusion and negative intrusive behavior, as well as a greater contradictory mix of rejecting and attention-seeking behaviors. Lyons-Ruth et al. described these mothers as hostile and self-referential regarding attachment. Mothers of D-Approach infants, in

contrast, had higher rates of withdrawal from their infants. These mothers were more fearful, withdrawn, and inhibited, sometimes appearing as “sweet or fragile.” They were very unlikely to be overtly hostile or intrusive, but they often either failed to initiate contact or instead approached the infant with hesitation. Initially, they often would move away or try to deflect the infant’s requests before eventually giving in to infant’s concerted effort to establish contact. Lyons-Ruth and colleagues described these mothers as “helpless/fearful regarding attachment.”

Different forms of early trauma were associated with D-Avoid and D-Approach mothers. D-Avoid mothers more frequently reported a history of physical abuse or witnessing violence, and they seemed to handle their underlying fear of assault by identifying with an aggressive hostile style of interaction. D-Approach mothers more frequently reported sexual abuse or parental loss (but not physical abuse) and were more likely to withdraw from interaction with their infant (Lyons-Ruth and Block, 1996).

D-Approach and D-Avoid infants are at equal risk for a variety of negative outcomes like elevated hostile-aggressive behavior toward peers in kindergarten and in the early primary grades. They also have elevated rates of controlling attachment patterns toward parents by age six. D-Approach infants sought contact with mother but displayed signs of conflict, apprehension, uncertainty, helplessness, or dysphoria as well as disorganized behavior like freezing, huddling on the floor, and apprehension. Lyons-Ruth (2001) speculates that these two infant subgroups (D-Avoid and D-Approach) are the precursors of punitive and caregiving stances that disorganized children use to establish control of others. These punitive hostile or solicitous caregiving-controlling behaviors become increasingly differentiated during the preschool years. The punitive-aggressive children exhibit more chaotic play with themes of unresolved danger while caregiving children tend to inhibit fantasy play. Lyons-Ruth speculates these behavioral manifestations in childhood eventually become consolidated in the parental caregiving styles that she has termed, respectively “hostile” and “helpless.”

Thus, Lyons-Ruth has identified two very different behavioral profiles within disorganized attachment: (1) a *hostile-avoidant* subtype in which the parent is identified with a malevolent punitive caregiver from childhood and her hostile distant interactions seem to be an attempt to

deny her vulnerability by suppressing emotions and constantly controlling others (these mothers discipline their children by coercion, suppression of the child's anger, and prematurely encouraging the child's autonomy) and (2) a *helpless/fearful* subtype in which the mother adopts a lifelong caregiving style of attending to the needs of others, often at the expense of her own needs, resulting in a repression of their own affect life. These mothers tend to be fearful and easily overwhelmed by the demands of others. They therefore feel powerless to control their children, especially when the child's affects are aroused.

As Lyons-Ruth (2001) notes, these two very different behavioral profiles represent two poles of a hostile/avoidant or a helpless/approach dyadic relationship. Both these profiles or models of caregiving are imbued with traumatic affect, often deriving from different kinds of early traumatic experiences. The tendencies to use exaggerated expressions of either the hostile (avoidant) or helpless (attached) defensive styles makes it difficult for these mothers to move toward a more integrated, flexible, and balanced relational style.

Following low-risk middle-class families, Main and colleagues (Kaplan, 1987; Main and Cassidy, 1988) found that infants with disorganized attachment expressed disorganized behavior at age six, including role inversion with parents, response inhibition, disorganized and dysfluent discourse, and catastrophic fantasies. Main and colleagues distinguished between *Controlling-punitive* behavioral responses and *Controlling-caregiving* responses. Controlling punitive children tended to order the parent around harshly or even attempt to humiliate the parent. Controlling-caregiving responses were characterized by being excessively solicitous. The development of D-Controlling behavior at age six in children previously judged to be disorganized during infancy has been replicated in three additional studies (Wartner et al., 1994; Jacobson et al., 1997; Steele, Steele, and Fonagy, 1996).

These analyses of Lyons-Ruth and Main and their respective colleagues regarding subtypes of the disorganized attachment status are highly consistent with the formulations in this article about the role of a similar polarity, either seeking or avoiding contact, as the fundamental dimension in the two major types of more organized insecure attachment, the avoidant and the preoccupied styles, as well as with the formulations of the centrality of the two basic psychological dimensions, self-definition and relatedness, in normal and abnormal personality development.

*Assessment of the Content and Structure of Mental  
Representations and of Internal Mental Models*

Psychoanalytic formulations about the development of mental representations can facilitate a further differentiation of the internal mental models (IWMs) assumed to underlie attachment styles. According to psychoanalytic theory, mental representations evolve through a developmental sequence from enactive, to imagistic, to becoming increasingly complex, abstract, and symbolic (Blatt, 1974, 1995; Bruner, 1964; Horowitz, 1972). Recent developments in the psychoanalytic understanding of mental representations emphasize the relational aspects of these representations and how they develop epigenetically. Distinctions among various dimensions in IWMs may facilitate further differentiation within each attachment style, enabling us to distinguish less and more mature forms of resistant and avoidant insecure attachment patterns. Thus, further differentiation of aspects of IWMs could facilitate articulating more fully developmental psychological dimensions that are inherent in each of these various patterns of insecure attachment.

*Representation from a Psychoanalytic Perspective*

Mental representations are enduring cognitive-affective psychological structures that provide templates for processing and organizing information so that new experiences are assimilated to existing mental structures. These cognitive-affective schemas guide an individual's behavior, particularly in interpersonal relationships (Blatt and Lerner, 1983). These cognitive-affective schemas of self and other develop over the life cycle and have conscious and unconscious cognitive, affective, and experiential components that derive from significant early interpersonal experiences. These cognitive-affective schemas can involve veridical representations of consensual reality, idiosyncratic and unique constructions, or primitive and pathological distortions that suggest psychopathology (Blatt, 1990, 1995). They also reflect the individual's developmental level and such important aspects of psychic life as impulses, affects, drives, and fantasies (Beres and Joseph, 1970; Blatt, 1974; Blatt and Lerner, 1983; Sandler and Rosenblatt, 1962).

The shift to an object relations perspective within psychoanalysis is consistent with, and strongly influenced by research in infant

development (e.g., Emde, 1983; Lichtenberg, 1985; Stern, 1985) as well as by attachment theory (e.g., Ainsworth, 1967; Bowlby, 1973, 1980, 1982; Main and Cassidy, 1988; Main et al., 1985; Sroufe, 1983). The theoretical and empirical work of Mary Main and her colleagues (George et al., 1985; Main and Cassidy, 1988; Main and Goldwyn, 1984; Main et al., 1985) elaborating the nature of IWMs of attachment provides further opportunity to integrate attachment theory and research with psychoanalytic object relational theories of mental representations.

Mental representations in object relations theory are generally analogous to the IWMs discussed in attachment theory. Both attachment theory (e.g., Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1980; Bretherton, 1985) and object relations theory (e.g., Blatt, 1974; Fairbairn, 1952; Jacobson, 1964; Kernberg, 1976; Winnicott, 1960) postulate that IWMs or mental representations of self and others emerge from early relationships with caregivers and then act as heuristic guides for subsequent interpersonal relationships influencing expectations, feelings, and general patterns of behavior (Diamond and Blatt, 1994; Levy et al., 1998; Slade and Aber, 1992). Psychoanalytic concepts of mental representations and concepts of IWMs in attachment theory have emphasized different aspects of the representational process. In contrast to the IWMs of attachment theory, the concept of object representations in object relations theory has a more epigenetic developmental orientation (Blatt, 1974; Diamond and Blatt, 1994; Levy et al., 1998). The application of this cognitive developmental perspective to attachment theory could enable us to differentiate different levels of interpersonal functioning within each of the insecure types, thus giving attachment theory broader application to both nonclinical and clinical populations (Levy and Blatt, 1999).

### *Developmental Levels of Representation*

Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, 1974, 1995; Blatt and Auerbach, 2001; Blatt and Lerner, 1983), integrating psychoanalytic theory and the cognitive developmental perspective of Piaget (1950) and Werner (1948), suggest that the cognitive and affective components of representations of self and other develop epigenetically, becoming increasingly accurate, articulated, and conceptually complex. According to this approach, higher levels of representation evolve from and extend lower levels; thus, new representational modes are increasingly more comprehensive and

effective than earlier modes of representation. According to these epigenetic principles, representations of self and others can range from global, diffuse, fragmentary, and inflexible to increasingly differentiated, flexible, and hierarchically organized.

These formulations are consistent with Kernberg's view that representations derive from relationships to primary caregivers through the process of internalization. Kernberg (1975, 1976) proposes that early interpersonal experiences are stored in memory (internalized) and that these memories consist of three parts: (a) representation of self; (b) representation of others; and (c) the affective tone characteristic of these relationships between self and other. For Kernberg, the degree of differentiation and integration of these representations of self and other, along with their affective valence, defines important aspects of the individual's personality structure. Development proceeds as representations of self and others become increasingly differentiated and integrated. More mature representations allow for the integration of positive and negative elements and for the tolerance of ambivalence and contradiction in feelings about self and others. More integrated and mature representations have greater diversity and complexity.

Because the IWMs of attachment research are limited to several prototypic attachment transactions, they lack the potential intricacy, complexity, and detail of psychoanalytic concepts of the representational world. In addition, IWMs in attachment theory focus primarily on the content (i.e., positive vs. negative) of representations of self and others and their behavioral consequence and not on the structural organization of the cognitive schema. Although attachment theorists have forged links between the Piagetian stage of object permanence and the consolidation of IWMs of attachment (Bretherton, 1985; Main et al., 1985), they have not explored the implication of this link for understanding aspects of the process of internalization in secure and insecure IWMs of attachment relationships. Different patterns of attachment involve differences in the content and structure of IWMs (e.g., degree of articulation, differentiation, and integration) may be important for evaluating the potential for adaptation. Thus, within specific attachment patterns, IWMs may vary in the degree of differentiation, integration, and internalization (Diamond and Blatt, 1994; Levy et al., 1998). Even the concept of narrative coherence from the AAI scoring system, based on discourse analysis could be linked to developmental processes, thereby further facilitating the identification of differences in the structure of representation.

*Assessment of Mental Representations.*

The emphasis on mental representation in psychoanalytic object-relations theory, in attachment theory and research, in developmental psychology, and in social cognition has had a major impact on personality assessment (Blatt, 1990; Leichtman, 1996a, b). Emphasis on the centrality of the development of mental representation in personality organization has led to the development of important new approaches for evaluating responses given to projective techniques like the Rorschach and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), as well as for evaluating reports of early memories and of dreams (e.g., Blatt, 1990; Blatt and Auerbach, 1988; Blatt, Brenneis, et al., 1976; Blatt and Lerner, 1983; Blatt and Ritzler, 1974; Krohn and Mayman, 1974; Mayman, 1967; Ryan and Bell, 1984; Urist, 1977; Westen et al., 1990). These various studies have provided new ways of understanding forms of psychopathology like schizophrenia (Auerbach and Blatt, 1996, 1997; Blatt, Schimek, and Brenneis, 1980; Blatt and Wild, 1976; Blatt, Wild, and Ritzler, 1975), borderline pathology (Auerbach and Blatt, 1996; Blatt, 1990; Blatt and Auerbach, 1988; Diamond et al., 1990; Gruen and Blatt, 1990; Nigg et al., 1992; Westen et al., 1990), and depression (Blatt, 1974; Blatt and Homann, 1992; Blatt and Maroudas, 1992; Cicchetti and Aber, 1986; Homann, 1991; Zuroff and Fitzpatrick, 1995).

Blatt and colleagues at Yale and Mayman and colleagues at the University of Michigan, developed methods to operationalize and systematically assess the development and impairment of self and object representations. The early research on mental representations applied new methods to standard psychological assessment procedures (i.e., Rorschach, TAT, dream reports and early memories) (Blatt, Brenneis, et al., 1976; Hatcher and Krohn, 1980; Krohn and Mayman, 1974; Mayman, 1967; Mayman and Faris, 1969; Ryan and Bell, 1984; Urist, 1977; Westen et al., 1990). The groups at Michigan and at Yale both used projective assessment methods in accordance with the premise that responses to ambiguous stimuli are shaped by the organizing characteristics of the individual's representational world (Blatt and Lerner, 1983, p. 195). Mayman and his colleagues examined primarily the thematic content of representations of projective test data. This research group developed the Early Memories Test, the Object Representation Scale for Dreams, and methods for evaluating the content or thematic dimensions of representations on the Rorschach. Blatt and his colleagues,

focusing more on structural dimensions of object representation, developed a scale to assess the structural organization in human responses given to the Rorschach. Subsequently, Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, Bers, and Schaffer, 1992; Blatt et al., 1988; Blatt et al., 1979; Diamond et al., 1991) developed methods for assessing the content and structure of cognitive-affective schema by evaluating open-ended descriptions of self and significant others (e.g., parents, therapist, romantic partners). Using concepts from developmental cognitive and psychoanalytic theories, they developed methods for assessing the degree of differentiation and relatedness (Diamond et al., 1991), the degree of cognitive organization (conceptual level), and qualitative dimensions in descriptions of self and of significant others (Blatt et al., 1979, 1988). The qualitative or thematic dimensions of the descriptions are scored for 12 specified traits or personal characteristics (e.g., benevolent, punitive) and the subject's degree of ambivalence about the person being described. In addition, the descriptions are scored for structural dimensions, including the degree of articulation (number of personal characteristics described), conceptual complexity, and self–other differentiation.

*Differentiation-Relatedness Scale.* Drawing from theoretical formulations and clinical observations about very early processes of boundary articulation (Blatt and Wild, 1976; Blatt et al., 1975; Jacobson, 1964; Kernberg, 1975, 1976), processes of separation-individuation (Coonerty, 1986; Mahler, Pine, and Bergman, 1975), the formation of the sense of self (Stern, 1985), and the development of increasingly mature levels of interpersonal relatedness (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996), Blatt and colleagues identified two fundamental dimensions of self and object representation: (a) the differentiation of self from other and (b) the establishment of increasingly mature levels of interpersonal relatedness. To assess the degree of differentiation and relatedness in descriptions of self and significant others, Diamond et al. (1991) developed the Differentiation-Relatedness Scale, a 10-point scale on which to rate the following points: a lack of basic differentiation between self and other (Levels 1 and 2); the use of mirroring (Level 3), self–other idealization or denigration (Level 4), and an oscillation between polarized negative and positive attributes (Level 5) as maneuvers to consolidate and stabilize representations; an emergent differentiated, constant, and integrated representation of self and other, with increasing tolerance for ambiguity (Levels 6 and 7); representations of self and others as empathically

interrelated (Level 8); representations of self and other in reciprocal and mutually facilitating interactions (Level 9); and reflectively constructed integrated representations of self and others in reciprocal and mutual relationships (Level 10). In general, higher ratings of differentiation relatedness in descriptions of self and other are based on increased articulation and stabilization of interpersonal schemas and an increased appreciation of mutual and empathically attuned relatedness.

This scale, summarized in Table 1, is based therefore on the assumption that psychological development moves toward the emergence of (a) a consolidated, integrated, and individuated sense of self-definition and (b) empathically attuned, mutual relatedness with significant others (Aron, 1996; Benjamin, 1995; Blatt, 1991; Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Jordan, 1986; Miller, 1984; Mitchell, 1988; Stern, 1985; Surrey, 1985). Differentiation and relatedness are interactive dimensions (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Blatt and Shichman, 1983; Sander, 1984) that unfold throughout development (see also Kegan, 1982; Mitchell, 1988; Ogden, 1986). The dialectical interaction between these two developmental dimensions facilitates the emergence and consolidation of increasingly mature levels of both self-organization and intersubjectively attuned, empathic relatedness (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996; Blatt and Shichman, 1983). The scale assumes that, with psychological development, representations of self and other become increasingly differentiated and integrated and begin to reflect an increased appreciation of mutual relatedness.

As regards the dimension of differentiation, the scale reflects, at the lowest levels, the compromise of boundaries with regards to basic body awareness, emotions, and thoughts. Subsequent scale levels reflect a unitary, unmodulated view of self and of the other as extensions of each other or as mirrored images (i.e., images in which aspects of self and other are identical). At an intermediate level, representations are organized around a unitary idealization or denigration of self or other (i.e., around an exaggerated sense of the goodness or badness of the figure described). At the next level, these exaggerated aspects of self and other alternate in a juxtaposition of polarized (i.e., all good or all bad) extremes. Later scale levels reflect both an increasing capacity to integrate disparate aspects of self and other and an increased tolerance for ambivalence and ambiguity (Kernberg, 1977).

The scale also reflects a trend toward empathically attuned mutuality in complex interpersonal relationships. At lower levels, the sense of

TABLE 1  
Differentiation-Relatedness of Self and Object Representations

<i>Level/Scale Point</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Self/other boundary.	Basic sense of physical cohesion or integrity compromise of representations are lacking or are breached.
2. Self/other boundary confusion.	Self and other are represented as physically intact and separate, but feelings and thoughts are amorphous, undifferentiated, or confused. Description may consist of a single global impressionistic quality or a flood of details with a sense of confusion and vagueness.
3. Self/other mirroring.	Characteristics of self and other, such as physical appearance or body qualities, shape or size, are virtually identical.
4. Self/other idealization or denigration.	Attempt to consolidate representations based on unitary, unmodulated idealization or denigration. Extreme, exaggerated, one-sided descriptions.
5. Semi-differentiated, tenuous consolidation of representations through splitting (polarization) and/or by an emphasis on concrete part properties.	Marked oscillation between dramatically opposite qualities or an emphasis on manifest external features.
6. Emergent, ambivalent constancy (cohesion) of self and an emergent sense of relatedness.	Emerging consolidation of disparate aspects of self and other in a somewhat hesitant, equivocal, or ambivalent integration. A list of appropriate conventional characteristics, but they lack a sense of uniqueness. Tentative movement toward a more individuated and cohesive sense of self and other.
7. Consolidated, constant (stable) self and other in unilateral relationships.	Thoughts, feelings, needs, and fantasies are differentiated and modulated. Increasing tolerance for and integration of disparate aspects. Distinguishing qualities and characteristics. Sympathetic understanding of others.
8. Cohesive, individuated, empathically related self and others.	Cohesive, nuanced, and related sense of self and others. A definite sense of identity and an interest in interpersonal relationships and a capacity to understand the perspectives of others.
9. Reciprocally related, integrated unfolding, self and others.	Cohesive sense of self and others in relationships that transform both the self and the other in complex, continually unfolding ways.
10. Creative, integrated constructions of self and other in empathic, reciprocally attuned relationships.	Integrated reciprocal relations with an appreciation that one contributes to the construction of meaning in complex interpersonal relationships.

relatedness in representations may involve being controlled by the other (e.g., trying to resist the onslaught of an other who is experienced as bad and destructive). At increasingly higher levels, relatedness may be expressed primarily in parallel interactions, in expressions of cooperation and mutuality in understanding the other's perspective, or in expressions of empathically attuned reciprocity (Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996). At the highest levels, descriptions reflect an awareness of one's participation in complex, relational matrices that determine perceptions, attributions, and the construction of meaning.

These 10 levels of differentiation relatedness were established on the basis of the clinical and developmental findings and reflect what are generally regarded as clinically significant distinctions in the transition from grossly pathological to intact and even healthy object relations. The scale points are thus best regarded as discrete categories, not points on a continuum. In other words, the underlying logic of this measure is ordinal and not interval or nominal. The various levels of this scale, therefore, may not be equidistant from each other, and the specific number of scale points is to some extent arbitrary. That is, new levels of differentiation-relatedness can be added in light of new clinical observations, theoretical formulations, and research findings. Nevertheless, a clear implication of this scale is that higher differentiation-relatedness ratings reflect a greater degree of psychological health. In theory, differentiation-relatedness, Levels 8, 9, and 10, are indicative of mental health, and differentiation-relatedness Level 7 (consolidation of object constancy) is regarded as a prerequisite for normal psychological and interpersonal functioning.

Interrater and retest reliability of this scoring procedure is at acceptable levels (Stayner, 1994), and early reports support the validity of this scale as a measure of differentiation-relatedness (e.g., Blatt and Auerbach, 2001; Blatt, Auerbach, and Aryan, 1998; Blatt et al., 1996; Gruen and Blatt, 1990; Diamond et al., 1990; Diamond et al., 1991; Levy et al., 1998).

*Conceptual-Level Scale.* With a 9-point scale derived from psychoanalytic and cognitive developmental concepts (Blatt, 1974; Blatt et al., 1979, 1988), the conceptual level of descriptions of self and significant other can be rated on an ordinal continuum that includes sensorimotor, concrete-perceptual, iconic, and, finally, conceptual levels of representation. Definitions of each of these points are presented in Table 2. This scale has been used extensively in prior research, and several reports

TABLE 2  
Conceptual Level Scale for Descriptions of Self and Object Representations

<i>Level/Scale Point</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Sensorimotor-Preoperational (Score 1).	The person is described primarily in terms of the gratification or frustration he/she provides. There is little sense that the person is experienced or defined as an entity separate and independent of his/her direct effect on the subject's pleasure or pain.
2. Concrete-Perceptual (Score 3).	The person is described primarily in concrete literal terms, often in terms of physical attributes. Emphasis is often on what the person looks like in terms of external physical characteristics.
3. Iconic (Score 5–7).	
a. External Iconic (Score 5).	Description is primarily of the person's activities and functions.
b. Internal Iconic (Score 7).	The person is described in terms of attributes of what he/she thinks, feels and values, rather than what he/she does. The description is based more on internal psychological dimensions.
4. Conceptual (Score 9).	The description of the person integrates a wide range of levels such that external appearances and activities are contrasted and integrated with internal dimensions. Apparent contradictions are resolved in an integrated, complex, coherent synthesis.

indicate the reliability and validity of this scoring procedure (e.g., Blatt et al., 1979, 1988; Bornstein and O'Neill, 1992).

*Qualitative-Thematic Scales.* The descriptions of significant others can be rated not only on structural dimensions of the descriptions (differentiation-relatedness and conceptual level), but also on a series of 7-point scales designed to assess each of 12 qualities that could be attributed to the person being described. Table 3 indicates that these qualities are: affectionate, ambitious, malevolent–benevolent, cold–warm, degree of constructive involvement, intellectual, judgmental, negative–positive ideal, nurturant, punitive, successful, and strong–weak. Prior research indicates acceptable levels of interrater reliability

TABLE 3  
The 12 Thematic Content Scales for the Description of Significant Others

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Description</i>
Affectionate	The degree to which the person is described as having and displaying overt affection or warm regard.
Ambitious	The degree to which the person is described as displaying aspiration in instrumental or occupational domains for self and/or others; as having an ardent desire to achieve; as aspiring, driving, or exerting pressure on self and others.
Malevolent–benevolent	The degree to which the person’s intentions toward or effects on others are described as having or expressing intense ill will, spite, or hatred, rather than as doing or being disposed to doing good.
Cold–warm	The degree to which the person’s interpersonal affective style is described as unemotional and impersonal, rather than as warm and loving.
Degree of constructive involvement	The degree to which the person’s interactions with others are described as negative (either distant and reserved, or overinvolved), rather than as positive (constructive involvement with respect for other’s individuality).
Intellectual	The extent of the person’s emphasis on study, reflection, and speculation, interest in ideas, creative use of intellect, or capacity for rational and intelligent thought and an appreciation for complexity.
Judgmental	The degree to which the person is described as holding critical or excessively high standards, rather than as being accepting and tolerant.
Negative–positive ideal	The degree to which the one is described as someone whom an individual wants to be like or emulate; the degree of admiration for qualities the individual possesses.
Nurturant	The degree to which the person is described as giving care and attention without making emotional demands, rather than seeking to have one’s own needs met.
Punitive	The extent to which the person is described as either physically or emotionally abusive and as inflicting suffering and pain.
Successful	The extent to which the individual is described as feeling satisfied with his or her own accomplishments, whatever those accomplishments might be.
Strength (strong–weak)	The extent to which the individual is described as effective, efficient, and able to resist pressure and endure, as possessing a stable sense of self, and as appearing to be a consistent figure.

with this procedure (Blatt et al., 1979, 1988; Bornstein and O'Neill, 1992). Factor analyses (Blatt et al., 1979; Quinlan et al., 1992) of these 12 thematic attributes revealed three underlying factors—Benevolent, Punitive, and Striving. The Benevolent factor comprises the attributes affectionate, benevolent, warm, constructive involvement, positive ideal, nurturant, successful, and strong. The Punitive factor includes the attributes judgmental, punitive, and ambivalent. The Striving factor includes the attributes ambitious and intellectual.

The number of these 12 qualitative attributes that can be scored in the description (0 to 12) indicates the degree to which the figure had been articulated.

In addition, the degree of ambivalence expressed when describing the figure can be scored on a 5-point scale, and the length of the description can be assessed on a 7-point scale.

Research findings support the validity of these structural and thematic dimensions. Conceptual complexity of descriptions of parents in non-clinical samples, for example, is significantly related to experiences of depression (Blatt et al., 1979), emotional awareness (Lane et al., 1990), negotiation strategies, and self-reported acting out (Schultz and Selman, 1989). In a clinical sample, Bornstein and O'Neill (1992) found that psychotic and borderline patients give less differentiated, conceptually less complex descriptions, and more negative and more ambivalent representations, of both parents than do normal individuals. Moreover, Bornstein and O'Neill found that conceptual complexity is negatively related to degree of psychopathology as assessed on the Global Assessment Scale (GAS; Endicott et al., 1976), the presence and severity of hallucinations, and the impairment index on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Dahlstrom, Welsh, and Dahlstrom, 1972). Thus, the content and structure of parental representations are related in clinical samples to independent assessments of level of psychopathology and clinical functioning (Auerbach and Blatt, 1997) and in nonclinical samples to aspects of general functioning. In addition, recent research (Blatt et al., 1996) indicates that changes in the structure and content of these descriptions of self and other are significantly correlated with independent assessment of therapeutic progress in long-term, intensive, inpatient treatment of seriously disturbed, treatment-resistant patients.

Recent studies have examined the content and structure of mental representations in different types of attachment patterns (Levy et al.,

1998). The findings of these investigations support the conclusion that different developmental levels can be identified in the representations of individuals within each type of insecure attachment. Thus, the degree of differentiation and integration or developmental level of representations provides an important basis for making distinctions within attachment categories that helps explain the relationship of attachment classifications to various types and degrees of psychopathology (Blatt, 1995). Variability in the degree of differentiation and integration of mental representations within the IWMs associated with the various attachment categories allows for the possibility that each type of insecure attachment may encompass individuals with varying levels of object relations and adaptive potential.

#### *Developmental Levels with Attachment Patterns*

Attachment research indicates that secure attachment involves both a capacity to establish affective bonds and to tolerate and benefit from separation. Thus, secure attachment represents an integration of the two fundamental developmental lines in an integrated and coordinated development of the capacity for establishing mature levels of interpersonal relatedness and essentially a positive and realistic sense of self. This integration is assumed to derive from increased differentiation and integration of representations of self and others that allow for a nuanced, contextual, and diverse understanding of one's experience, the complexity of others, and the social world.

Disruptions of the anaclitic and introjective developmental lines have been linked to avoidant and resistant attachment patterns, respectively (Blatt and Homann, 1992; Blatt and Maroudas, 1992; Levine and Tuber, 1993; Pilkonis, 1988). For example, preoccupation with issues of the interpersonal (or anaclitic) developmental line is characterized by exaggerated attempts to establish interpersonal relationships as noted in resistant-ambivalent attachment, with its fears of abandonment and compulsive care-seeking. Several studies have shown that anxious-ambivalent/preoccupied attachment is associated with the anaclitic/dependent type of depression, characterized by concerns with disruptions of interpersonal relations and fears of abandonment and loneliness. In contrast, avoidant attachment has been associated with a preoccupation with issues related to the introjective developmental line and with an

introjective/self-critical type of depression, characterized by concerns about loss of self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness, blame, and guilt (Blatt and Homann, 1992; Zuroff et al., 1995). Recent research and theory has differentiated several developmental levels within each of these insecure attachment patterns.

*Developmental Levels Within Avoidant Attachment.* Bartholomew's identification of two types of avoidant attachment (fearful and dismissive) appears to represent two developmental levels that can be differentiated within the insecure-avoidant attachment style. The study of the relationship between young adults' attachment patterns and the content and structure of their mental representations of their parents (Levy et al., 1998) found that the descriptions of parents by dismissively avoidant subjects, as compared with descriptions by fearfully avoidant subjects, were significantly less differentiated, less conceptually complex, and less elaborate (had fewer attributes). Though fearful avoidant subjects, in contrast, represented their parents as more malevolent and punitive, their descriptions were more differentiated and at a higher conceptual level than were those of dismissive subjects; in fact the descriptions given by fearful avoidant individuals were similar on these structural dimensions to those of secure subjects. Fearful avoidant individuals expressed significantly greater ambivalence when describing their parents than did dismissively avoidant subjects, primarily because dismissive subjects described their parents in polarized terms as *either* highly idealized or punitive, malevolent, and lacking warmth. The ambivalence displayed in the descriptions of parents by fearful avoidant individuals suggests that they have an increased acknowledgment or awareness of both negative and positive aspects of their feelings about their parents and an ability to tolerate this contradiction. In contrast, the lack of ambivalence in the descriptions of parents of dismissing avoidant subjects suggests an avoidance of conflictual issues by exaggerated one-sided descriptions and an inability to acknowledge both positive and negative aspects of their parents—an essential step toward more differentiated and integrated representations. The descriptions of dismissing individuals have a one-sided polarized quality—either idealizing or denigrating, with relatively little complexity and expression of ambivalence. These findings are consistent with research on adult attachment that has found that avoidant subjects have greater difficulty integrating both positive and

negative qualities of romantic partners (Hazan and Shaver, 1987) and of early relationships with parents (Main et al., 1985). Additionally, Main et al. (1985), Kobak and Sceery (1988), Hazan and Shaver (1987), and others (Mikulincer, Orbach, and Iavnieli, 1998; Simpson et al., 1992) all stress that dismissing avoidant subjects have limited ability to deal with emotions, particularly negative emotions. These findings are also congruent with previous case reports on mental representations that indicate the complexity of representations of others allows for better tolerance and integration of negative feelings toward others (Diamond et al., 1990; Gruen and Blatt, 1990). The findings that secure and fearful individuals gave more articulated descriptions (i.e., had more attributes) than dismissive individuals indicates a greater capacity for emotional elaboration. Although fearfully avoidant subjects have more ambivalent and more negative representations of their parents, they appreciate the complexity of relationships and differentiate themselves and their parents more fully than do dismissively avoidant subjects. These findings suggest that dismissive avoidance is a less adaptive expression of avoidant attachment than is fearful avoidance. Thus, these findings suggest a developmental differentiation within insecure-avoidant attachment on the basis of the degree of differentiation and integration of representations; fearful avoidant subjects appear to be developmentally more mature than dismissively avoidant subjects. Dismissive avoidance appears to represent a less integrated and adaptive expression of the avoidant attachment style (Levy et al., 1998).

*Developmental Levels Within Preoccupied or Resistant-Ambivalent Attachment.* Just as it is possible to identify two developmental levels of avoidant attachment, a differentiation appears possible within the preoccupied (resistant-ambivalent) style of attachment. Hazan and Shaver as well as Main and colleagues describe the anxious pattern of attachment as characterized by compulsive care-seeking and a fear of abandonment. West and colleagues (1987), from a clinical perspective consistent with Bowlby's original formulations, discussed how a preoccupation with relatedness can be expressed as either compulsive care-seeking or compulsive caregiving. They developed a self-report measure for these two insecure patterns and for two other insecure patterns of insecure attachment (compulsive self-reliance and angry withdrawal). Compulsive care-seeking, as described by Bowlby (1977), is characterized by behaviors

intended to maintain a sense of security. Bowlby (1977) hypothesized that this pattern develops from the infant's experience of an unreliable, unavailable, or unresponsive caregiver. Compulsive caregiving, in contrast, appears to reflect a more mature and integrated expression or higher developmental level of a preoccupied attachment style as compared to the less mature, unilateral, nonreciprocal, compulsive care-seeking. Compulsive caregiving is a pattern of attachment resulting from role reversal, in which the child assumes the role of the caregiving parent. This pattern emerges out of an infant-caregiver relationship marked by the mother's uses her child as an attachment figure. The compulsive caregiver provides care in the way he or she wants to be cared for, and therefore this style may have greater potential for establishing a sense of relatedness, eventually with reciprocity and mutuality. Compulsive care-seekers seem less mature because they primarily seek unilateral relationships that provide them with contact, nurturance, gratification, support, approval, and acceptance from others. Schaffer (1993) found that compulsive care-seekers reported significantly greater levels of dependency, self-criticism, and anxiety, as well as a lower level of self-efficacy, than did compulsive caregivers. Schaffer (1993) also found that compulsive caregivers, as compared with care-seekers, have more adaptive forms of regulating affect. Specifically, compulsive care-seeking attachment is associated with oral/somatic and sexual/aggressive ways of affect regulation, while compulsive caregiving attachment is associated with cognitive and social/interpersonal efforts of affect regulation. Additionally, compulsive caregiving subjects, like secure subjects, were more successful at using interpersonal efforts to regulate affect and were generally more successful at modulating affect than were compulsive care-seekers. Schaffer also found that compulsive care-seekers score higher than both compulsive care-givers and secure subjects on measures of alexithymia. This result suggests that compulsive care-seekers may have difficulty differentiating and describing their feelings. Compulsive care-seekers employ maladaptive action patterns while compulsive caregivers used more adaptive defenses. Thus, Schaffer's (1993) findings suggest a developmental continuum along the resistant-ambivalent spectrum, with compulsive caregiving attachment reflecting a higher developmental level than compulsive care-seeking. Compulsive care-seeking is characterized by the use of relationships primarily for the gratification of one's needs, with little awareness of the other as a separate individual with

needs of his or her own. Because of deficits in evocative constancy, compulsive care-seekers are more reliant on the presence of attachment figures. In contrast, compulsive caregiving attachment reflects a relationship that is centered around the gratification of the needs of the other. In order to care for another, one must perceive and appreciate the needs of the other. In this respect, compulsive caregiving requires greater differentiation between self and other and thus represents a higher developmental level. Subsequent research should be directed toward comparing the mental representations of self and significant others of compulsive care-seekers and compulsive caregivers.

Recent evidence for a developmental distinction within the resistant-ambivalent/preoccupied style comes from research by Blatt and colleagues on different types of depression. Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, D'Afflitti, and Quinlan, 1976) developed the Depressive Experiences Questionnaire (DEQ), a 66-item self-report scale, that measures anaclitic (dependent) and introjective (self-critical) tendencies. Specifically, three factors on the DEQ assess experiences of dependency, self-criticism, and efficacy. These factors have good levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability and have been replicated in other samples (e.g., Zuroff, Quinlan, and Blatt, 1990). Numerous studies demonstrate the validity of the three factors (Blaney and Kutcher, 1991; see Blatt and Zuroff, 1992, for a review). Recently Blatt and colleagues (Blatt et al., 1993) identified two subscales within the Dependency factor: (a) an anaclitic dependency or neediness subscale characterized by items that expressed concerns with feelings of helplessness, having fears and apprehensions about separateness and rejection, and intense concerns about loss of gratification and experiences of frustration, and (b) a relatedness subscale characterized by feelings of sadness and loneliness in response to disruptions of a specific relationship. Anaclitic dependency or neediness had significantly greater correlations with independent measures of depression, while relatedness concerns had significantly higher correlations with measures of self-esteem (Blatt et al., 1993). These findings provide further evidence of a differentiation of several levels of developmental maturity within the quality of interpersonal relatedness. Subsequent research should be directed at examining the relationships of these measures of interpersonal and self-definitional concerns on the DEQ in different types of attachment patterns in adolescents and adults.

*Research on Psychopathology*

The two developmental lines of relatedness and self-definition provide a basis not only for considering personality development but also for the conceptualization of psychopathology. Distorted and exaggerated emphasis of either developmental line of relatedness or self-definition, and the defensive avoidance of the other, leads to particular configurations of maladaptive functioning. Blatt and Shichman (1983) contend that two different basic personality configurations, anaclitic and introjective, are related to several types of disordered behavior. They posit that exaggerated and distorted emphasis on the interpersonal (or anaclitic development) is related to anaclitic depression, hysteria, dependent and borderline personality disorder. In contrast, the self-definitional (or introjective) developmental line is related to self-critical, guilty (introjective) depression, phallic narcissism, paranoid and obsessive-compulsive disorders, and avoidant, schizoid, schizotypal, and overrideational borderline personality disorder. Research evidence supports this clustering personality disorders into anaclitic and introjective disorders. It is noteworthy, that this differentiation of psychopathology into two primary configurations is based on a distinction that is similar to the differentiation between resistant-preoccupied and avoidant insecure attachment

Converging research evidence indicates that the differentiation between anaclitic and introjective disorders and preoccupied and dismissive attachment, respectively, can contribute to a systematic clustering of personality disorders (Goldberg et al., 1989; Levy et al., 1994; Ouimette and Klein, 1993; Ouimette et al., 1994; Alexander, 1993; Alexander and Anderson, 1994; Levy, 1993; Levy and Clarkin, 2001; Rosenstein and Horowitz, 1996).

Goldberg et al. (1989), using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1981) and the Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (DAS) to investigate personality disorders, found that the DAS Need for Approval scale was significantly related to dependent personality disorder traits and that the DAS Perfectionism scale was significantly related to negativistic (or passive-aggressive) personality traits. Ouimette and colleagues (Ouimette and Klein, 1993; Ouimette et al., 1994), using several different measures to assess dependency and self-criticism (Blatt et al., 1976) and sociotropy and autonomy (Beck, 1983), and using the Personality Disorder Examination (PDE; Loranger, 1988) to assess personality

disorders, found that borderline, obsessive-compulsive, paranoid, passive-aggressive, schizoid and narcissistic personality disorders were significantly correlated with concerns about issues of self-definition (e.g., self-criticism and autonomy) while dependent and histrionic personality disorders were significantly correlated with concerns about issues of interpersonal relatedness (e.g., dependency and sociotropy) in both college students and in an outpatient clinical sample. Levy and coworkers (Levy et al., 1994) found similar results with a sample of seriously disturbed inpatients. Shahar et al. (in press) using data from the Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program (TDCRP), investigated at intake the relationship of clinicians' ratings of personality disorders, using the Personality Assessment Form (PAF; Pilkonis and Frank, 1988), with the Perfectionism and Need for Approval factors of the DAS. The Perfectionism factor was related to clinicians' ratings on the PAF of schizotypal, avoidant, and depressive disorders as well as the eccentric cluster, while the Need for Approval factor was positively related to clinicians' ratings of dependent personality disorder and negatively related to ratings of schizotypal personality disorder.

Several recent investigations of attachment patterns report similar results as the studies examining Blatt's two-configuration model (Alexander, 1993; Alexander and Anderson, 1994; Brennan and Shaver, 1998; Levy, 1993; Levy and Clarkin, 2001; Meyer et al., 2001; Rosenstein and Horowitz, 1996). Generally, these studies have found that resistant attachment is related to borderline, histrionic, and dependent personality disorders whereas dismissing attachment is related to narcissistic, antisocial and paranoid personality disorders. For example, Levy (1993), using Bartholomew's self-report attachment measure and the MCMI, examined the relationship between adult attachment styles and personality disorders in 75 college students. He found that resistant attachment was related to measures of borderline, dependent, and passive-aggressive personality disorders. Fearful avoidant attachment was related to avoidant and schizoid personality disorder. Dismissing avoidant attachment was related to narcissistic, antisocial, and paranoid personality disorders. Securely attached individuals reported fewer schizoid, borderline, antisocial, avoidant, schizotypal and passive-aggressive traits. In a later study of psychiatric inpatients, Levy and Clarkin (2001), using both self-report (Inventory of Personality Organization [Clarkin, Foelsch, and Kernberg, 1999]; Personality Disorders Questionnaire [Hyler, 1994]) as

well as a structured interview measure of personality disorders (International Personality Disorders Examination; Loranger et al., 1994), found that resistant attachment was related to borderline, dependent, and passive-aggressive personality disorders. Fearful avoidant attachment was related to avoidant and schizoid personality disorders and dismissing avoidant attachment was related to narcissistic, antisocial, and paranoid personality disorders. Attachment security correlated negatively with the schizoid, avoidant, schizotypal, and passive-aggressive scales. Brennan and Shaver (1998) found similar relationships in a large nonclinical sample of adolescents and young adults. In a study of 60 hospitalized adolescents, Rosenstein and Horowitz (1996), using the AAI, found that preoccupied attachment was associated with histrionic, borderline, schizotypal, and obsessive-compulsive disorder and self-reported avoidant, anxious, and dysthymic personality traits on the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II (MCMI; Millon, 1981). Dismissing attachment was associated with narcissistic and antisocial personality disorders, and with self-reported narcissistic, antisocial, and paranoid personality traits. Using both the AAI and Bartholomew's structured interview and self-report as measures of attachment and the MCMI-II as a measure of personality disturbance (Millon, 1981), Alexander and colleagues (Alexander, 1993; Alexander and Anderson, 1994) assessed the relationship between attachment and personality disorders in a sample of adult female incest victims. Resistant attachment was associated with dependent, avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorders. Fearful avoidance was correlated with avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorders. Dismissing subjects reported the least distress, most likely because of their proclivity to suppress negative affect (Kobak and Sceery, 1988). Subjects with unresolved/disorganized attachments were the most distressed and showed the greatest likelihood of avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorders.

The overall pattern of results in these studies is consistent with theoretical formulations and indicates that many of the personality disorders described in Axis II of DSM-III are interrelated disorders that cluster in their relationship to the two fundamental personality dimensions, self-definition and interpersonal relatedness. Several personality disorders (i.e., histrionic, dependent, borderline) appear to be focused in different ways, and possibly at different developmental levels, on issues of interpersonal relatedness. And another set of personality disorders

(i.e., avoidant, paranoid, obsessive-compulsive, narcissistic) appear to express a preoccupation with establishing, preserving, and maintaining a sense of self, possibly in different ways and at different developmental levels. These results suggest that many of the personality disorders listed in Axis II are interrelated and that these relationships can be defined by the two primary dimensions of personality development—relatedness and self definition (e.g., Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1996) as well as by the two primary configurations of psychopathology—anaclitic and introjective (e.g., Blatt, 1974, 1991, 1995; Blatt and Shichman, 1983). These results also suggest that many of the personality disorders listed in Axis II are linked to the two underlying insecure attachment styles—resistant and avoidant. Finally, Meyer et al. (2001) in a naturalistic prospective study of 149 patients with affective, anxiety, substance use, and other disorders found, using Pilkonis's prototype rating measure of adult attachment patterns, that an anxious-dependent attachment was related to borderline, histrionic, avoidant, dependent, and self-defeating personality disorders. In contrast, a defensive avoidant attachment pattern was positively related to schizotypal and schizoid personality disorders.

These studies also suggest the value of conceptualizing levels or degrees within attachment patterns. Borderline, histrionic, and dependent individuals (anaclitic individuals) are all concerned with bonding and relatedness; however, these disorders represent a wide range of functioning within the anxious-preoccupied attachment pattern. Likewise, fearful avoidant attachment are related to obsessive-compulsive, avoidant and schizoid personality disorders and dismissing avoidant attachment are related to narcissistic, antisocial and paranoid personality disorders (introjective disorders)—in patients with exaggerated concern and an extensive defensive effort to preserve a sense of self, but at different levels of functioning. Variability in the degree of differentiation and integration of mental representations within attachment patterns suggest that each pattern encompasses individuals with different levels of object relations and adaptive potentials. Thus, the degree of differentiation and integration, or developmental level, of representations of self and others provide an important basis for making distinctions within attachment categories that helps explain the relationship of attachment classifications to various types and degrees of psychopathology (Blatt, 1995; Levy and Blatt, 1999).

### Summary

A fundamental polarity of interpersonal relatedness and self-definition describes two major dimensions of personality development as discussed by psychoanalytic and nonpsychoanalytic theoreticians. These two dimensions not only define personality development, but also provide the conceptual structure for defining two primary configurations of psychopathology. And this polarity of seeking or avoiding contact provides the basis for differentiating among the two major forms of insecure attachment in infants, adolescents, and adults. Even further, recent research on the disorganized insecure attachment suggests that the polarity of approach or avoidance of interpersonal contact enabled investigators to differentiate among two types of disorganized infants as well as two types of maternal caring patterns that seem central in the development of disorganized attachment.

The second half of this chapter integrated formulations about the nature of mental representations or internal working models from the perspective of psychoanalytic theory and attachment research and theory. Using these integrated formulations about different developmental levels within representations or IWMs, more and less adaptive forms of resistant/preoccupied and avoidant insecure attachment styles were identified, bringing a fuller developmental perspective to the study of secure and insecure attachment patterns.

### REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1951), *The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology*, trans. P. Radin. New York: Humanities Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967), *Infancy in Uganda: Infant Care and the Growth of Love*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969), Object relations, dependency, and attachment: A theoretical review of the mother–infant relationship. *Devel. Psychol.*, 40:969–1025.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Blehar, M. E., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978), *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Alexander, P. C. (1993), The differential effects of abuse characteristics and attachment in the prediction of long-term effects of sexual abuse. *J. Interperson. Violence*, 8:346–362.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Anderson, C. L. (1994), An attachment approach to psychotherapy with the incest survivor. *Psychotherapy*, 31:665–675.
- Angyal, A. (1941), *Foundations for a Science of Personality*. New York: Viking Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1951), *Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory*, ed. E. Hanfmann & R. M. Jones. New York: Wiley.
- Aron, L. (1996), *A Meeting of Minds: Mutuality in Psychoanalysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Auerbach, J. S. & Blatt, S. J. (1996), Self-representation in severe psychopathology: The role of reflexive self-awareness. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 13:297–341.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1997), Impairment of self-representation in schizophrenia: The roles of boundary articulation and self-reflexivity. *Bull. Menn. Clin.*, 61:297–316.
- Bakan, D. (1966), *The Duality of Human Existence: An Essay on Psychology and Religion*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Balint, M. (1959), *Thrills and Repression*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. (1991), Attachment styles among young adults: A test of four category model. *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.*, 61:226–241.
- Beck, A. T. (1983), Cognitive therapy of depression: New perspectives. In: *Treatment of Depression: Old Controversies and New Approaches*, ed. P. J. Clayton & J. E. Barrett. New York: Raven, pp. 265–290.
- Benjamin, L. S. (1995), Good defenses make good neighbors. In: *Ego Defenses: Theory and Measurement*, ed. H. Conte & R. Plutchik. New York: Wiley, pp. 53–78.
- Beres, D. & Joseph, E. (1970), The concept of mental representation in psychoanalysis. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 51:1–9.
- Blaney, P. H. & Kutcher, G. S. (1991), Measures of depressive dimensions: Are they interchangeable? *J. Person. Assess.*, 56:502–512.
- Blatt, S. J. (1974), Levels of object representation in anaclitic and introjective depression. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 29:107–157. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990), Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition: Two personality configurations and their implications for psychopathology and psychotherapy. In: *Repression and Dissociation: Implications for Personality Theory, Psychopathology and Health*, ed. J. L. Singer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 299–335.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1991), Depression and destructive risk-taking behavior in adolescence. In: *Self-Regulatory Behavior and Risk-Taking: Causes and Consequences*, ed. L. P. Lipsitt & L. L. Mitnick. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 285–309.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1991), A cognitive morphology of psychopathology. *J. Nerv. Mental Dis.*, 179:449–458.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995), Representational structures in psychopathology. In: *Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychopathology, Vol. 6: Emotion, Cognition, and Representation*, ed. D. Cicchetti & S. Toth. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, pp. 1–33.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999), Personality factors in the brief treatment of depression: Further analyses of the NIMH sponsored Treatment for Depression Collaborative Research Program. In: *Psychotherapy Indications and Outcomes*, ed. D. S. Janowsky. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, pp. 23–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Auerbach, J. S. (1988), Differential cognitive disturbances in three types of “borderline” patients. *J. Person. Disord.*, 2:198–211.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (2001), Mental representation, severe psychopathology, and the therapeutic process. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 49:113–159.

- \_\_\_\_\_ & Aryan, M. (1998), Representational structures and the therapeutic process. In: *Empirical Studies of Psychoanalytic Theories, Vol. 8: Empirical Investigations of the Therapeutic Hour*, ed. R. F. Bornstein & J. M. Masling. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 63–107.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bers, S. A. & Schaffer, C. (1992), The assessment of self. Unpublished research manual, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Blass, R. B. (1990), Attachment and separateness: A dialectic model of the products and processes of psychological development. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 45:107–127. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1996), Relatedness and self definition: A dialectic model of personality development. In: *Development and Vulnerabilities in Close Relationships*, ed. G. G. Noam & K. W. Fischer. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 309–338.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Brenneis, C. B., Schimek, J. & Glick, M. (1976), A developmental analysis of the concept of the object on the Rorschach. Unpublished research manual, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- \_\_\_\_\_ D'Afflitti, J. P. & Quinlan, D. M. (1976), Experiences of depression in normal young adults. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 85:383–389.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ford, R. Q., Berman, W., Cook, B. & Meyer, R. (1988), The assessment of change during the intensive treatment of borderline and schizophrenic young adults. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 5:127–158.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Hart, B., Quinlan, D. M., Leadbeater, B. & Auerbach, J. (1993), Interpersonal and self-critical dysphoria and behavioral problems in adolescents. *J. Youth Adolesc.*, 22:253–269.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Homann, E. (1992), Parent–child interaction in the etiology of dependent and self-critical depression. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.*, 12:47–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Lerner, H. D. (1983), The psychological assessment of object representation. *J. Person. Assess.*, 47:7–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1983), Psychodynamic perspectives on personality theory. In: *The Clinical Psychology Handbook*, ed. M. Hersen, A. Kazdin & A. S. Bellak. New York: Pergamon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Maroudas, C. (1992), Convergence of psychoanalytic and cognitive behavioral theories of depression. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 9:157–190.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Ritzler, B. A. (1974), Suicide and the representation of transparency and cross sections on the Rorschach. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.*, 42:280–287.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1974), Thought disorder and boundary disturbances in psychosis. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.*, 42:370–381.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Schimek, J. & Brenneis, C. B. (1980), The nature of the psychotic experience and its implications for the therapeutic process. In: *The Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia*, ed. J. Strauss, M. Bowers, T. W. Downey, S. Fleck, S. Jackson & I. Levine. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 101–114.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Shichman, S. (1983), Two primary configurations of psychopathology. *Psychoanal. Contemp. Thought*, 6:187–254.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Stayner, D., Auerbach, J. & Behrends, R. S. (1996), Change in object and self representations in long-term, intensive, inpatient treatment of seriously disturbed adolescents and young adults. *Psychiat.: Interperson. Biol. Process.*, 59:82–107.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Wein, S. J., Chevron, E. S. & Quinlan, D. M. (1979), Parental representations and depression in normal young adults. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 88:388–397.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Wild, C. M. (1976), *Schizophrenia: A Developmental Analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Ritzler, B. A. (1975), Disturbances in object representation in schizophrenia. *Psychoanal. Contemp. Sci.*, 4:235–288.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Zuroff, D. C. (1992), Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition: Two prototypes for depression. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.*, 12:527–562.
- Bornstein, R. F. & O'Neill, R. M. (1992), Perceptions of parents and psychopathology. *J. Nerv. Mental Disord.*, 180:475–483.
- Bowlby, J. (1973), *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 2: Separation, Anxiety, and Anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1977), The making and breaking of affectional bonds, 1: Etiology and psychopathology in light of attachment theory. *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, 130:201–210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1979), *The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds*. New York: Tavistock.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1980), *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 3: Loss: Sadness and Depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1982), *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1982), *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 3: Loss*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L. & Shaver, P. R. (1998), Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In: *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*, ed. J. Simpson & W. Rholes. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 46–76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Shaver, P. R. (1998), Attachment styles and personality disorders: Their connections to each other and to parental divorce, parental death, and perceptions of parental caregiving. *J. Person.*, 66:835–878.
- Bretherton, I. (1985), Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. In: *Growing Points in Attachment Theory and Research*, ed. I. Bretherton & E. Waters. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Devel.*, 50(1–2, Serial No. 209):3–35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995), A communication perspective on attachment relationships and internal working models. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Devel.*, 60:310–329.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1999), Updating the “internal working model” construct: some reflections. *Attach. Human Devel.*, 1:343–357.
- Bruner, J. (1964), The course of cognitive growth. *Amer. Psychol.*, 19:1–15.
- Cicchetti, D. & Aber, L. J. (1986), Early precursors of later depression: An organizational perspective. In: *Advances in Infant Research, Vol. 3*, ed. L. Lipsitt. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Clarkin, J. F., Foelsch, P. A. & Kernberg, O. F. (1999), *The Inventory of Personality Organization*. White Plains, NY: New York-Presbyterian Hospital, Joan and Sanford I. Weill Medical College, Cornell University, Westchester Division.
- Collins, N. L. & Read, S. J. (1990), Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.*, 58:644–663.
- Coonerty, S. (1986), An exploration of separation-individuation themes in borderline personality disorder. *J. Person. Assess.*, 50:501–511.
- Dahlstrom, W. G., Welsh, G. S. & Dahlstrom, L. E. (1972), *An MMPI Handbook, Vol. 1: Clinical Interpretation*, rev. ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Diamond, D. & Blatt, S. J. (1994), Internal working models and the representational world in attachment and psychoanalytic theories. In: *Attachment in Adults: Clinical and Developmental Perspectives*, ed. M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 72–97.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Stayner, D. & Kaslow, N. (1991), Self–other differentiation of object representations. Unpublished research manual, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Kaslow, N., Coonerty, S. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Change in separation-individuation and intersubjectivity in long-term treatment. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 7:363–397.
- Emde, R. N. (1983), The prerepresentational self and its affective core. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 38:165–192. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Endicott, J., Spitzer, R. L., Fleiss, J. L. & Cohen, J. (1976), The Global Assessment Scale: A procedure for measuring overall severity of psychiatric disturbance. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, 33:766–771.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950), *Childhood and Society*, 2nd ed. New York: Norton.
- Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1952), *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Feldman, R. & Blatt, S. J. (1996), Precursors of relatedness and self-definition in mother–infant interaction. In: *Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Developmental Psychology*, ed. J. Masling & R. F. Bornstein. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 1–42.
- Fraley, C. R. & Waller, N. G. (1998), Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In: *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*, ed. J. Simpson & W. S. Rholes. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 77–114.
- Franz, C. E. & White, K. M. (1985), Individuation and attachment in personality development: Extending Erikson’s theory. *J. Person.*, 53:224–256.
- Freud, S. (1915), Instincts and their vicissitudes. *Standard Edition*, 14:117–140. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1926), Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety. *Standard Edition*, 20:87–174. London: Hogarth Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1930), Civilization and its discontents. *Standard Edition*, 21:64–145. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- Friedman, H. S. & Booth-Kewey, S. (1987), The “disease-prone personality”: A meta-analytic view of the construct. *Amer. Psychol.*, 42:539–555.
- George, C., Kaplan, N. & Main, M. (1985), The Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.
- Gilligan, C. (1982), *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldberg, J. O., Segal, Z. V., Vella, D. D. & Shaw, B. F. (1989), Depressive personality: Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory profiles of sociotropic and autonomous subtypes. *J. Person. Disord.*, 3:193–198.
- Gruen, R. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Change in self and object representation during long-term dynamically oriented treatment. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 7:399–422.
- Hatcher, R. & Krohn, A. (1980), Level of object representation and capacity for intensive psychotherapy in neurotics and borderlines. In: *Borderline Phenomena and the Rorschach Test*, ed. J. Kwawer, H. Lerner, P. Lerner & A. Sugerma. New York: International Universities Press, pp. 299–320.

- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1987), Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.*, 52:511–524.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1990), Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.*, 59:270–280.
- Hesse, E. & Main, M. (2000), Disorganized infant, child, and adult attachment: Collapse in behavioral and attentional strategies. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 48:1097–1127.
- Homann, E. (1991), Parent–child interaction in dependent and self-critical depression. Unpublished master’s thesis. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Horney, K. (1945), *Our Inner Conflicts*. New York: Norton.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1950), *Neurosis and Human Growth*. New York: Norton.
- Horowitz, M. J. (1972), Modes of representation of thought. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 20:793–819.
- Hyler, S. (1994), *PDQ-4+ Personality Questionnaire*. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute.
- Jacobson, E. (1964), *The Self and the Object World*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Jacobson, T., Huss, M., Fendrich, M., Kruesi, M. J. P. & Ziegenhain, U. (1997), Children’s ability to delay gratification: Longitudinal relations to mother–child attachment. *J. Genet. Psychol.*, 158:411–426.
- Jordan, J. V. (1986), The meaning of mutuality. Work in progress, 23. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.
- Kaplan, N. (1987), Individual differences in six-year-old’s thoughts about separation: Predicted from attachment to mother at age one. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kegan, R. (1982), *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1975), *Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism*. New York: Aronson.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1976), *Object Relations Theory and Clinical Psychoanalysis*. New York: Aronson.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1977), Boundaries and structure in love relations. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 25:81–114.
- Kobak, R. R. (1989), The Attachment Interview Q-sort: Revised. Unpublished manuscript, University of Delaware, Newark.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cole, H. E., Ferenz-Gilles, R. & Fleming, W. S. (1993), Attachment and emotion regulation during mother–teen problem solving: A control theory analysis. *Child Devel.*, 64:231–245.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Sceery, A. (1988), Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation and representations of self and others. *Child Devel.*, 59:135–146.
- Krohn, A. & Mayman, M. (1974), Levels of object representation in dreams and projective tests. *Bull. Menn. Clin.*, 38:445–466.
- Lane, R. D., Quinlan, D. M., Schwartz, G. E., Walker, P. A. & Zeitlin, S. B. (1990), The Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale: A cognitive-developmental measure of emotion. *J. Person. Assess.*, 55:124–134.
- Leichtman, M. (1996a), *The Rorschach: A Developmental Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996b), The nature of the Rorschach task. *J. Person. Assess.*, 67:478–493.
- Levine, L. V. & Tuber, S. B. (1993), Measures of mental representation: Clinical and theoretical considerations. *Bull. Menn. Clin.*, 57:69–87.
- Levy, K. N. (1993, May), Adult attachment styles and personality pathology. Presented at meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, San Francisco.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Blatt, S. J. (1999), Attachment theory and psychoanalysis: Further differentiation within insecure attachment patterns. *Psychoanal. Inq.*, 19:541–575.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Shaver, P. (1998), Attachment styles and parental representations. *J. Person. Social Psychol.*, 74:407–419.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Clarkin, J. F. (2001), Personal communication.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Kolligian, J., Quinlan, D. M., Becker, D. F., Edell, W. S. & McGlashan, T. H. (1994, May), Dependent and self-critical personality disorders. Presented at meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Lichtenberg, J. (1985), Response: In search of the elusive baby. *Psychoanal. Inq.*, 5:621–648.
- Loewald, H. W. (1962), Internalization, separation, mourning, and the superego. *Psychoanal. Quart.*, 31:483–504.
- Loranger, A. W. (1988), *Personality Disorder Examination* [manual]. Yonkers, NY: DV Communications.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sartorius, N., Andreoli, A. & Diekstra, R. F. W. (1994), The International Personality Disorders Examination: The World Health Organization/Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration International Pilot Study of Personality Disorders. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, 51:215–224.
- Lyons-Ruth, K. (2001), The two-person construction of defenses: Disorganized attachment strategies, unintegrated mental states and hostile/helpless relational processes. *Psychologist Psychoanalyst*, 21:40–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Block, D. (1996), The disturbed caregiving system: Relations among childhood trauma, maternal caregiving, and infant affect and attachment. *Infant Mental Health J.*, 17:257–275.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bronfman, E. & Atwood, G. (1999), A relational diathesis model of hostile-helpless states of mind: Expressive in mother–infant interaction. In: *Attachment Disorganization*, ed. J. Solomon & C. George. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 33–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Parsons, E. (1999), Atypical maternal behavior and disorganized infant attachment strategies: Frightened, frightening, and atypical maternal behavior and disorganized infant attachment strategies. In: *Atypical Patterns of Infant Attachment: Theory, Research, and Current Directions*, ed. J. Vondra & D. Barnett. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Devel.*, 64.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Jacobvitz, D. (1999), Attachment disorganization: Unresolved loss, relational violence, and lapses in behavioral and attentional strategies. In: *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Implications*, ed. J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 52–554.
- Mahler, M. S., Pine, F. & Bergman, A. (1975), *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant: Symbiosis and Individuation*. New York: Basic Books.

- Main, M. & Cassidy, J. (1988), Categories of response to reunion with the parent at age 6: Predictable from infant attachment classifications and stable over a 1 month period. *Devel. Psychol.*, 24:415–426.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Goldwyn, R. (1984), Predicting rejection of her infant from mother's representation of her own experience: Implications for the abused–abusing intergenerational cycle. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 8:203–217.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1998), Adult attachment scoring and classification system. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Hesse, E. (1990), Parents' unresolved traumatic experiences are related to infant disorganized status: Is frightened and/or frightening parental behavior the linking mechanism? In: *Attachment in the Preschool Years: Theory, Research and Intervention*, ed. M. T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti & E. M. Cummings. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 161–184.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ (1992), Disorganized/disoriented infant behavior in the strange situation, lapses in the monitoring of reasoning and discourse during the parent's Adult Attachment Interview, and dissociative states. In: *Attachment and Psychoanalysis* [trans. from Italian], ed. M. Ammaniti & D. Stern. Rome: Guis, Laterza & Figli, pp. 86–140.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Kaplan, N. & Cassidy, J. (1985), Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In: *Growing Points in Attachment Theory and Research*, ed. I. Bretherton & E. Waters. Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Devel., 50(1 & 2, Serial No. 209):66–104.
- Marvin, R. S. (1977), An ethological-cognitive model for the attenuation of mother–child attachment behavior. In: *Advances in the Study of Communication and Affect, Vol. 3: Attachment Behavior*, ed. T. M. Alloway, L. Krames & P. Pliner. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 25–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Britner, P. A. (1999), Normative development: The ontogeny of attachment. In: *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications*, ed. J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 44–67.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Greenberg, M. T. (1982), Preschoolers' changing conceptions of their mothers: A social-cognitive study of mother–child attachment. In: *New Directions for Child Development, No. 18: Children's Planning Strategies*, ed. D. Forbes & M. T. Greenberg. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 47–60.
- Mayman, M. (1967), Object-representations and object-relationships in Rorschach responses. *J. Project. Techniq. Person. Assess.*, 31:17–24.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Faris, M. (1969), Early memories as expressions of relationship paradigms. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 31:507–520.
- McAdams, D. P. (1980), A thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. *J. Res. Person.*, 14:413–432.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1985), *Power, Intimacy, and the Life Story: Personological Inquiries into Identity*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- McClelland, D. C. (1980), Motive dispositions: The merits of operant and respondent measures. In: *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, ed. L. Wheeler. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1986), Some reflections on the two psychologies of love. *J. Person.*, 54: 334–353.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A. & Lowell, E. L. (1953), *The Achievement Motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Meyer, B., Pilkonis, P. A., Proietti, J. M., Heape, C. L. & Egan, M. (2001), Attachment styles and personality disorders as predictors of symptom course. *J. Person. Disord.*, 15:371–389.
- Mikulincer, M., Orbach, I. & Iavnieli. (1998), Adult attachment style and affect regulation: Strategic variations in subjective self–other similarity. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.*, 75:436–448.
- Miller, J. B. (1984), *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Millon, T. (1981), *Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory Manual*, 3rd ed. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1981), *Disorder of Personality, DSM-III, Axis II*. New York: Wiley.
- Mitchell, S. A. (1988), *Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nigg, J. T., Lohr, N. E., Western, D., Gold, L. J. & Silk, K. R. (1992), Malevolent object representation in borderline personality disorder and major depression. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 101:61–67.
- Ogden, T. H. (1986), *The Matrix of the Mind: Object Relations and the Psychoanalytic Dialogue*. New York: Aronson.
- Ouimette, P.C. & Klein, D. N. (1993), Convergence of psychoanalytic and cognitive-behavioral theories of depression: A review of the empirical literature and new data on Blatt's and Beck's models. In: *Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Psychopathology*, ed. J. Masling & R. Bornstein. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 191–223.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Anderson, R., Riso, L. P. & Lizardi, H. (1994), Relationship of sociotropy/autonomy and dependency/self-criticism to DSM-III-R personality disorders. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 103:743–749.
- Piaget, J. (1950), *The Psychology of Intelligence*, trans. M. Piercy & D. E. Berlyne. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pilkonis, P. A. (1988), Personality prototypes among depressives: Themes of dependency and autonomy. *J. Person. Disord.*, 2:144–152.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & Frank, E. (1988), Personality pathology in recurrent depression: Nature, prevalence, and relationship to treatment response. *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 145: 435–441.
- Quinlan, D. M., Blatt, S. J., Chevron, E. S. & Wein, S. J. (1992), The analysis of descriptions of parents: Identification of a more differentiated factor structure. *J. Person. Assess.*, 59:340–351.
- Rank, O. (1929), *Truth and Reality*, trans. J. Taft. New York: Knopf.
- Ryan, E. R. & Bell, M. D. (1984), Changes in object relations from psychosis to recovery. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 93:209–215.
- Sander, L. W. (1984), Polarity, paradox, and the organizing process in development. In: *Frontiers of Infant Psychiatry*, ed. J. Call, E. Galenson & R. Tyson. New York: Basic Books, pp. 315–327.

- Sandler, J. & Rosenblatt, B. (1962), The concept of the representational world. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 17:128–145. New York: International Universities Press.
- Schaffer, C. E. (1993), The role of attachment in the experience and regulation of affect. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Schultz, L. H. & Selman, R. L. (1989), Bridging the gap between interpersonal thought and action in early adolescence: The role of psychodynamic processes. *Devel. Psychopathol.*, 1:133–152.
- Shahar, G., Blatt, S. J. & Ford, R. Q. (2003), The identification of mixed anaclitic-introjective psychopathology in young adult inpatients. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*
- \_\_\_\_\_, Zuroff, D. C. & Pilknois, P. (in press), Additive effects of personality disorders and personality vulnerability on patients' response to brief treatment for depression. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.*
- Shaver, P. R. & Hazan, C. (1993), Adult romantic attachment: Theory and evidence. In: *Advances in Personal Relationships, Vol. 4*, ed. D. Perlman & W. Jones. London: Jessica Kingsley, pp. 29–70.
- Shor, J. & Sanville, J. (1978), *Illusions in Loving: A Psychoanalytic Approach to Intimacy and Autonomy*. Los Angeles: Double Helix.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S. & Nelligan, J. S. (1992), Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.*, 60:434–446.
- Slade, A. & Aber, L. J. (1992), Attachment, drives and development: Conflicts and convergences in theory. In: *The Interface of Psychoanalysis and Psychology*, ed. J. Barron, M. Eagle & D. Wolitsky. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 154–185.
- Spiegel, H. & Spiegel, D. (1978), *Trance and Treatment: Clinical Uses of Hypnosis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1983), Infant–caregiver attachment and patterns of attachment in preschool: The roots of maladaptive competence. In: *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, Vol. 16*, ed. M. Perlmutter. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 41–83.
- Stayner, D. (1994), The relationship between clinical functioning and changes in self and object representations in the treatment of severely impaired inpatients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Steele, H., Steele, M. & Fonagy, P. (1996), Associations among attachment classifications of mothers, fathers, and their infants. *Child Devel.*, 67:541–555.
- Stern, D. N. (1985), *The Interpersonal World of the Infant: A View from Psychoanalysis and Developmental Psychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Surrey, J. L. (1985), Self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. Unpublished manuscript, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.
- Urist, J. (1977), The Rorschach test and the assessment of object relations. *J. Person. Assess.*, 41:3–9.
- Wartner, U. G., Grossman, K., Fremmer-Bombik, E. & Suess, G. (1994), Attachment patterns at age six in south Germany: Predictability from infancy and implications for preschool behavior. *Child Devel.*, 65:1014–1027.

- Werner, H. (1948), *Comparative Psychology of Mental Development*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Westen, D., Lohr, N. E., Silk, K., Gold, L. & Kerber, K. (1990), Object relations and social cognition in borderlines, major depressives, and normals: A Thematic Apperception Test analysis. *Psycholog. Assess.*, 2:355–364.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1991), Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In: *Thinking Clearly About Psychology, Vol. 2: Personality and Psychotherapy*, ed. W. W. Grove & D. Cicchetti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 89–113.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1960), The theory of the parent–infant relationship. In: *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. New York: International Universities Press, pp. 37–55.
- Winter, D. (1973), *The Power Motive*. New York: Free Press.
- Zuroff, D. C. & Fitzpatrick, D. (1995), Depressive personality styles: Implications for adult attachment. *Person. Individ. Diff.*, 18:253–265.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Quinlan, D. M. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Psychometric properties of the Depressive Experiences Questionnaire in a college population. *J. Person. Assess.*, 55:65–72.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Stotland, S., Sweetman, E., Craig, J. & Koestner, R. (1995), Dependency, self-criticism, and social interactions. *Brit. J. Clin. Psychol.*, 34:543–553.

25 Park Street  
New York, NY 06519  
sidney.blatt@yale.edu