

Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis: Further Differentiation Within Insecure Attachment Patterns

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

THEORETICAL EMPHASES IN PSYCHOANALYSIS HAVE CHANGED over the years from classical drive theory to an increasing focus on the role of object relationships and object representation in personality development and psychopathology (e.g., Winnicott, 1960; Blatt, 1974; Mahler, Pine, and Bergman, 1975; Kernberg, 1976; Blatt & Lerner, 1983a). Central to object relational models is the concept of mental representation of self and other. 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 mental schemas guide an individual's behavior, particularly in interpersonal relationships (Blatt & Lerner, 1983b). These cognitive-affective schemas or mental representations of self and other develop over the life cycle. They 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

Kenneth Levy is a graduate student in the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program at the City University of New York and a psychology intern at The New York Presbyterian Hospital. Weill School of Medicine, Cornell Medical Center.

Sidney J. Blatt is a member of the Departments of Psychiatry and Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

psychopathology (Blatt, 1991, 1995). They also reflect the individual's developmental level and such important aspects of psychic life as impulses, affects, drives, and fantasies (Sandler and Rosenblatt, 1962; Beres and Joseph, 1970; Blatt, 1974).

This shift to object relations theories within psychoanalysis is consistent with and, in part, influenced by research in infant development (e.g., Emde, 1983; Litchenberg, 1985; Stern, 1985) and by attachment theory and research (e.g., Bowlby, 1973, 1980, 1982; Ainsworth et al., 1978; Sroufe, 1983; Main, Kaplan, and Cassidy, 1985; Main and Cassidy, 1988). Despite its historical links with psychoanalytic and object relations perspectives, attachment theory has been adopted primarily by investigators in developmental psychology concerned about "normal" development and, until recently, has been relatively neglected by psychoanalytic clinicians. The recent theoretical and empirical work of Mary Main and her colleagues (Main and Goldwyn, 1985; Main et al., 1985; Main and Cassidy, 1988; Main and Hesse, 1990), elaborating on the nature of internal working models of attachment, provides further opportunity to integrate attachment theory and research with object relational theories of mental representations in psychoanalysis.

Mental representations in object relations theory are generally analogous to the internal working models discussed in attachment theory. Both attachment theory (e.g., Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1980; Bretherton, 1985) and object relations theory (e.g., Fairbairn, 1952; Winnicott, 1960; Jacobson, 1964; Blatt, 1974; Kernberg, 1976) postulate that "mental representations," or "internal working models" 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 (Slade and Aber, 1992; Diamond and Blatt, 1994). Despite their convergences, psychoanalytic concepts of mental representations and concepts of internal working models in attachment theory are different in important respects. Mental representations and internal working models are not just different terms that describe the same phenomena. Compared with internal working models of attachment theory, the concept of representations in object relations theory has a more epigenetic developmental quality (Blatt, 1974; Diamond and Blatt, 1994; Levy, Blatt, and Shaver, 1998). Mental representations in psychoana-

lytic theory proceed through a developmental sequence, becoming increasingly complex, abstract, symbolic, and verbally mediated (Freud, 1914; Blatt, 1974, 1995; Horowitz, 1977).

This paper examines some of the ways in which object relations and attachment theories can inform each other and thus provide a broad-ranging theoretical model of personality development and psychopathology across a wider developmental spectrum. Recent attachment research provides a valuable heuristic framework for conducting psychoanalytic research, enriching psychoanalytic clinicians and investigators. And psychoanalytic concepts can inform and facilitate theory and research in developmental psychology and attachment theory to place their findings in a broad theoretical context. With this in mind we review the current status of the attachment literature with children and adults from both a developmental and social psychological perspective. The primary purpose of this paper is to address the importance of distinguishing among different developmental levels of mental representations and how these differences can enrich and extend our understanding of various attachment patterns.

Attachment Theory

Bowlby, a British psychiatrist, was trained as a physician and psychoanalyst early in this century when object relations approaches to psychoanalysis were first beginning to be formulated (see Karen, 1994, for an account of Bowlby's intellectual development). Bowlby was trained in the period when Anna Freud, Melanie Klein, and Donald Winnicott and others were beginning to apply psychoanalytic concepts to the study and treatment of children, during the period of transition in psychoanalysis from a one-person, closed system psychology primarily concerned with drive forces and discharge thresholds to two-person, more open systems, object relational theories. Bowlby clashed with his supervisor Melanie Klein over the issue of whether to involve the mother in the psychoanalytic treatment of a child. This difference in focus was the beginning of Bowlby's eventual estrangement from the psychoanalytic community. In contrast to object relations theorists such as Winnicott who retained much of Freud's emphasis on sexual and aggressive drives and fantasies, Bowlby's attachment theory focused on the affective bond

in close interpersonal relationships. Bowlby believed that Klein and other psychoanalysts overestimated the role of infantile fantasy, neglecting the role of actual experiences. Moreover, Bowlby boldly proposed that internal working models "are tolerably accurate reflections of the experiences those individuals have actually had" (Bowlby, 1973, p. 235). In contrast to Bowlby, Fairbairn (1952), Guntrip (1971), and Winnicott (1965) retained enough ties to drive theory in terms of unconscious fantasy and infantile distortion that they avoided the banishment that Bowlby experienced. Additionally, in contrast to most psychoanalysts of the time, Bowlby was also empirically minded. Rather than draw inferences about childhood from the free associations, dreams, transferences, and other mental productions of adults primarily seen in psychoanalytic treatment, Bowlby wanted to study and work directly with children. His focus was on the observable behavior of infants and their interactions with their caregivers, especially their mothers, and he encouraged prospective studies of the effects of early attachment relationships on personality development. In this sense he was again different than many of his object relations colleagues who focused instead on adults' mental representations of self and others in close relationships, often revealed during psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, although these colleagues also believed that these representations were the result of early relationships with parents.

While Bowlby was critical of certain aspects of classic psychoanalytic formulations, his work clearly falls within the framework of psychoanalysis because he retained and extended many of Freud's clinical and developmental insights. Central to Bowlby, as with Freud, is the view that notable early experiences have significant impact on subsequent development. Attachment theory emerged from Bowlby's observations in England during World War II of the pervasive disruptive consequences of deprivation of contact with the mother in children temporarily separated from their primary caregiver (usually the mother) because of the war; he observed that "the young child's hunger for his mother's love and presence is as great as his hunger for food" and that her absence inevitably generates "a powerful sense of loss and anger" (Bowlby, 1969, p. xiii). Bowlby identified a clear and predictable sequence of three emotional reactions that typically occur subsequent to the separation of an infant from its primary caregiver:

first, protest that involves crying, active searching, and resistance to others' soothing efforts; then despair, which is a state of passivity and obvious sadness; and then detachment, which involves an active, seemingly defensive disregard for and avoidance of the mother if she returns. Successive, systematic observation revealed that the typical infant checks back regularly, visually and/or physically, to ensure the mother is available and responsive. If the mother moves or directs her attention elsewhere, the child attempts to recapture that attention through eye contact, smiling, vocalizing (babbling, crying), or returning to her side (including clinging and following). When the attachment system is strongly activated, most children cry and seek physical contact with their primary caregiver. When the attachment system is idle, children play happily, smile easily, share toys and discoveries with their caregiver, and display warm interest in others. The attachment system is especially prone to activation under conditions of anxiety, fear, illness, and fatigue. These observations were further elaborated by Bowlby's (1944) classic study of forty-four delinquent children.

Based on ethological theory, Bowlby postulated that the caregiver-infant attachment bond is a complex, instinctually guided behavioral system that has functioned throughout human evolution to protect the infant from danger and predators. Secure attachment to the mother in infancy derives primarily from the mother's reliable and sensitive provision of security and love as well as food and warmth. Consistent differences occur, however, in the degree to which infant-mother relationships are characterized by experiences of security. Some mothers are slow or erratic in responding to their infant's cries; other mothers regularly intrude into or interfere with their infant's desired activities (sometimes to force "affection" on the infant at a particular moment). The infants of these mothers cry more often and explore less (even in the mother's presence) than securely attached infants, and they often mingle active seeking of the mother with overt expressions of anger and seem generally anxious. In addition, some infants may eventually try to avoid mothers who previously had frequently rebuffed or rejected their infant's attempts to establish physical contact with her. These distinctions led investigators (e.g., Ainsworth) to contrast secure attachment with two types of insecure attachment that they called avoidant and anxious ambivalent.

Bowlby (1973) and Ainsworth (1969) formulated that infants construct mental representations or affective-cognitive schemas of the self and of others, as well as develop expectations about interpersonal relations based on transactions with their attachment figures. These "internal working mental models" (Ainsworth, 1969; Bowlby, 1973), or mental representations, are the building blocks of personality development, and they direct and shape future interpersonal relationships. The continuity of these mental models over time is rooted in the nature of concepts of self and others, as well as interpersonal expectations constructed by the child. This internal working model of the interaction between self and others guides subsequent interpersonal relationships. For example, an infant whose needs are typically left unmet may develop a model of others as unreliable and uncaring and of the self as unlovable. Consequently, the neglected infant and child may, as an adult, believe that each new person will prove to be inaccessible, uncaring, and unresponsive. Conversely, the child whose needs have been addressed in a consistent loving and supportive manner may subsequently regard others as dependable and trustworthy and the self as lovable and attractive.

Based on Bowlby's attachment theory, Ainsworth conducted a seminal study to observe the effects of childbearing techniques employed by mothers on the development of a child's attachment patterns. Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth et al., 1978) developed a technique called the "strange situation," which involves eight standard episodes staged in a playroom through which the infant, the caregiver, and a "stranger" interact in a comfortable setting and the behaviors of the infant are observed. First, the baby has the chance to explore toys while the mother is present. Gradually, a stranger enters, converses with the mother, and invites the baby to play. Then the mother leaves the baby with the stranger, returns for a reunion, and then the baby is left alone; the stranger then returns, and finally, the mother returns for a second reunion. Ainsworth was able to categorize infants with considerable reliability into three distinct groups based on their reunion behavior with their mothers after this brief separation. Based on observations of infants and their caretakers, Ainsworth et al. (1978) identified three distinct patterns or styles of infant-mother attachment: secure (63% of the dyads tested), avoidant (21%), and anxious-ambivalent (16%). All three types of infants are *attached* to

their mothers, yet significant individual differences in the quality of that attachment relationship can be identified and measured reliably. The *avoidant* dyad is characterized by a quiet distance in the mother's presence, acting unaware of the mother's departure, and avoiding the mother upon reunion. The *anxious-ambivalent* dyad is characterized by much emotional protest and anger on the part of the infant. The baby acts extremely distressed on the mother's departure and becomes angry and resistant. The baby approaches the mother for attention but angrily resists being picked up, yet is clingy, dependent, often crying, and unable to be soothed and comforted upon the mother's return. The *secure* dyad is characterized by the child's confident use of the mother as a "secure base" (Bowlby, 1988) to explore the playroom with great ease and comfort in the mother's presence. This exploration diminishes upon the mother's departure, but the child greets the mother on her return with great enthusiasm and seeks proximity and interaction with the mother, resumes exploration of the environment, and is able to play again independently. These findings (Ainsworth et al., 1978) have been replicated and extended by many subsequent investigators in a number of different cultures (e.g., Waters, Wippman, and Sroufe, 1979; Erikson, Sroufe, and Egeland, 1985; Main et al., 1985; Sroufe and Fleeson, 1986; see reviews by Bretherton, 1985 and Paterson and Moran, 1988).

Consistent with Bowlby's theory, these three attachment styles are closely associated with differences in caretaker warmth and responsiveness (Ainsworth et al., 1971, 1974, 1978; Blehar, Lieberman, & Ainsworth, 1977; Maslin and Bates, 1983; Belsky, Rovine, and Taylor, 1984; Egeland and Farber, 1984; Grossmann et al., 1985; Main et al., 1985; Goldberg et al., 1986; Smith and Pederson, 1988; Crowell and Feldman, 1988; Pederson et al., 1990; Isabella and Belsky, 1991; see van IJzendoorn, 1995, for metaanalysis). Ainsworth and colleagues (1971, 1975) and Grossmann et al. (1985), in a German sample, found that maternal sensitivity during infancy was strongly predictive of the security of infants' attachment to their mothers. Other studies have also provided strong support for the link between mother's sensitivity and attachment security of her infant. For example, mothers of securely attached, in contrast to mothers of insecurely attached, infants tend to hold their babies more carefully, tenderly, and for longer periods of time during early infancy (Main et al., 1985).

Additionally, mothers of securely attached infants respond more frequently to their infants' crying, show more affection when holding the baby, are more likely to acknowledge the baby with a smile or conversation when entering the baby's room, and are better at feeding the baby because of their attention to the baby's signals compared to mothers of babies later independently judged to be insecurely attached. These findings are consistent with findings from studies of maternal sensitivity (e.g., Crowell and Feldman, 1988) in which the mother's level of sensitivity to her infant's communication significantly predicted the infant's attachment style (Smith and Pedersen, 1988).

A number of longitudinal studies have investigated the influence of infant attachment styles on subsequent functioning and adaptive potential. Securely attached infants as preschoolers are cooperative, popular with peers, and highly resilient and resourceful (Sroufe, 1983) and at age 6 are relaxed and friendly and converse with their parents in a free-flowing and easy manner (Main and Cassidy, 1988). Insecure avoidant infants as preschoolers appear emotionally insulated, hostile, and antisocial (Sroufe, 1983) and later tend to distance themselves from their parents' and ignore their parents initiatives in conversation (Main and Cassidy, 1988). Anxious-resistant or preoccupied insecure infants are tense and impulsive as toddlers and passive and helpless in preschool (Sroufe, 1983) and later show a mixture of insecurity and hostile behavior in interaction with their parents (Main and Cassidy, 1988).

Two studies (Grossman and Grossman, 1991; Elicker, Englund, and Sroufe, 1993) followed children for as long as 10 years after their assessment in the strange situation and found central personality variables and social behavior predictable over that decade. Elicker, Englund, and Sroufe (1993) report that infant attachment style, even after controlling for the infant's adjustment and home environment, reliably predicted the child's social skill and self-confidence 10 years later. Specifically, secure attachment in infancy predicted more positive relationships with teachers and more socially adept, close friendships with peers at age 11. Waters et al. (1995) followed 50 individuals for 20 years and found a 64% stability in attachment classification (actually greater than 70% stability for individuals with no major negative life events and less than 50% stability for those

who lost a parent, endured parental divorce, etc.). Thus longitudinal research, though still preliminary, suggests that attachment patterns identified during infancy are stable over time (Bretherton, 1985), even into early adulthood (age 20). Although the available evidence indicates that attachment classifications are fairly stable over extended periods of time, various factors contribute to their relative stability and change, including temperament, continuing relationships with the same family members, negative life events, change-resistant internal working models, and behavior patterns that produce self-fulfilling prophecies. All of these factors most likely play a significant role (see Rothbard and Shaver, 1994, for a review of research on continuity), but further research is needed to elaborate how and to what degree these various factors contribute to the stability or change of attachment styles.

Adult Attachment

Based on Bowlby's (1977) contention that the attachment system is active "from the cradle to the grave," various investigators (e.g., Main et al., 1985; Hazan and Shaver, 1987, 1990; West and Sheldon, 1988; Sperling, 1988; Sperling and Berman, 1991) independently began to apply the concepts of attachment theory to the study of adult behavior and personality.

Based on Ainsworth's differentiation of types of patterns of attachment, Main et al. (1985) developed an interview to assess adults' internal working models—the security of the adult's overall model of attachment and of the self in attachment experiences—in order to study the relationship of behaviors in adults to the quality of the attachment to their parents. The interview inquires into "descriptions of early relationships and attachment related events for the adult's sense of the way these relationships and events had affected adult personality; by probing for both specific corroborative and contradictory memories of parents and the relationship with parents" (Main et al., 1985, p. 98). Three major patterns of adult attachment were initially identified: secure, detached, and enmeshed; two additional styles were subsequently identified: the disorganized style and the unclassifiable style. The first three categories parallel the attachment classifications originally identified in studies of children (Ainsworth

et al., 1978), and the disorganized style parallels a pattern later described in infants (Main and Solomon, 1990).

Attachment from a Social Psychological Perspective

In contrast to Main's focus on the study of the relationship of adults with their parents, Hazan and Shaver (1987; Shaver, Hazan, and Bradshaw, 1988), from a social psychological perspective, applied the childhood attachment paradigm to the study of adult romantic love. Hazan and Shaver (1987) developed questionnaires to assess attachment styles in adult relationships. They reasoned that the same three attachment styles identified in children might exist in adolescence and adulthood and have important implications for the formation of romantic relationships (Shaver and Hazan, 1987; Shaver et al., 1988). They translated Ainsworth's descriptions of the three infant attachment types into a single-item measure appropriate to adult romantic relationships. Following Ainsworth et al. (1978), they labeled the three types of adult attachments as secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent. Subjects were first asked to characterize themselves as secure, avoidant, or anxious-ambivalent in romantic relationships based on three descriptions; they were then asked to respond to questions related to their "most important" experiences of romantic love, their mental models of self and relationships, and their memories of childhood relationships with parents (attachment history). Hazan and Shaver (1987) found approximately the same proportions of the three attachment types in adolescents and young adults (secure—62%, avoidant—23%, and anxious-ambivalent—15%) that Ainsworth et al. (1978) had obtained in the studies of infants. Similar percentages have been found in subsequent studies using Hazan and Shaver's measure in at least three different industrialized countries (Collins and Read, 1990; Feeney and Nollar, 1990; Muklincer, Florian, and Tolmacz, 1990).

Hazan and Shaver (1987) also found significant links between self-reported romantic attachment style and the quality of interpersonal relationships. Secure subjects' experiences of love were characterized by caring, intimacy, supportiveness, and understanding; avoidant subjects by fear of intimacy; and anxious ambivalent subjects by emotional instability, obsession, physical attraction, and the desire for

union. Additionally, greater loneliness was found among insecure subjects. In a subsequent study, Hazan and Shaver (1990) also reported that secure subjects, in contrast to both groups of insecure subjects, reported less depression, anxiety, hostility, and physical illness than insecure subjects. Avoidant subjects tended to be satisfied with work but not with their coworkers and, instead, preferred to work alone. Anxious ambivalent subjects, in contrast, preferred to work with others and did not enjoy the actual work but more the people with whom they worked.

An important recent development in attachment research has been the contributions of (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) who noticed an inconsistency between conception of avoidance in formulations of Main and those of Hazan and Shaver. Bartholomew noted that Main's prototype of the adult avoidant style (assessed in the context of parenting) is more defensive, denial-oriented, and overtly unemotional than Hazan and Shaver's avoidant attachment prototype (assessed in the context of romantic attachment), which seems more vulnerable, conscious of emotional pain, and "fearful." Thus, Bartholomew viewed Main's avoidant style as predominantly dismissing, whereas Hazan and Shaver's avoidant style seemed predominantly fearful.

Consistent with Bowlby, Bartholomew conceptualized adult attachment styles in terms of the combination of the representational models of self and others that purportedly underlie these styles. It became evident to Bartholomew that the four attachment categories (Figure 1) could be arrayed in a two-dimensional space, with one dimension being the "model of self" (positive versus negative) and the other being the "model of others" (positive versus negative).

For secure individuals, models of self and other are both generally positive. For preoccupied or anxious-ambivalent individuals, the model of others is positive (i.e., relationships are attractive), but the model of self is not. For dismissing individuals, the reverse is true: the somewhat defensively maintained model of self is positive, whereas the model of others is negative (i.e., intimacy in relationships is regarded with caution or avoided). Fearful individuals have relatively negative models of both self and others.

To assess both types of avoidant styles, dismissing and fearful, Bartholomew developed a four-category interview that parallels

Figure 1 Bartholomew's Analysis of Four Adult Attachment Styles in Terms of Two Dimensions, Model of Self and Model of Other.

		Model of Self	
		Positive	Negative
Model of Other	Positive	SECURE Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy	PREOCCUPIED Preoccupied with relationships
	Negative	DISMISSING Dismissing of intimacy; Counterdependent	FEARFUL Fearful of intimacy; Socially avoidant

Main's Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) and a four-category self-report measure that parallels the work of Hazan and Shaver. In a number of studies, Bartholomew found that the personality styles of the two avoidant types were quite distinct. Fearful avoidant individuals are characterized as low in self-esteem, hesitant, shy, lonely, vulnerable, dependent, self-critical, afraid of rejection, and lacking in social confidence. On the other hand, dismissively avoidant individuals are characterized as high in self-esteem, socially self-confident, unemotional, defensive, independent, cynical, critical of others, distant from others, and more interested in achievement than in relationships. Although dismissing avoidant individuals rated themselves as high in self-esteem, their peers saw them as hostile and socially autocratic. This finding is consistent with Kobak and Sceery (1988) who, using the AAI, found that avoidant subjects rated themselves as socially adept and psychologically sound, whereas their peers viewed them as more hostile and less ego-resilient. Thus, fearfully avoidant individuals are characterized by a conscious desire for relatedness which is inhibited by fears of its consequences, whereas dismissing avoidant subjects are characterized by a defensive denial of the need and/or desire for relatedness. Research is accumulating that supports the importance of Bartholomew's distinction between fearful and dismissing types of avoidant attachment (see Brennan, Shaver, and Tobey, 1990; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; Horowitz, Rosenberg, and Bartholomew, 1993; Feeney, Nollar, and Hanrahan, 1994; Levy, Blatt, and Shaver, 1998).

Although the AAI category system, Hazan and Shaver's three-category typology, Bartholomew's four-category typology, and several variations of these conceptual frameworks are all rooted in Bowlby and Ainsworth's theory and research, they are not conceptually identical (e.g., some are more clearly dimensional than others, and some focus on parenting whereas others focus on romantic relationships), and they have generated different kinds of measures. The AAI is scored primarily in terms of indicators of "current state of mind," such as awkward pauses, gaps in memory, incoherent discourse, and other signs of defensiveness. The self-report measures, such as Bartholomew's and Hazan and Shaver's, tap self-characterizations of beliefs, feelings, and behaviors in romantic or other close relationships. Comparisons between the AAI and self-report categories have typically failed to correspond (Borman and Cole, 1993; Crowell, Treboux, and Waters, 1993; Shaver, Belsky, and Brennan, in press). Studies that have related the dimensional coding scales from the AAI to the self-report measures, however, have found that they are significantly related, even if the two categorical typologies were not significantly related (Shaver, Belsky, and Brennan, in press). Additionally, while it is true that there was no criterion such as children's performance in the Strange Situation used in the development of the Hazan and Shaver or Bartholomew measures, there is considerable construct validity in the realms of personality and adult relationships for these measures. In sum, a host of studies since 1987 like Hazan and Shaver's brief measure and various extensions of it have been sufficiently precise (see Scharfe and Bartholomew, 1994) to generate a large and coherent body of evidence supporting their construct validity. Adult attachment styles have significantly predicted relationship outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, breakups, commitment), patterns of coping with stress, couple communication, and even phenomena such as religious experiences and patterns of career development as well as studies that make behavioral predictions (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; Hazan and Hutt, 1991; Mikulincer and Nachshon, 1991; Simpson, Rholes, and Nelligan, 1992; Feeney and Kirpatrick, 1995; Fraley and Shaver, 1998; for reviews see Shaver and Hazan, 1993; Hazan and Shaver, 1994; Shaver and Clark). Moreover, Rholes, Simpson, and Blakely (1995) used self-report measures to assess attachment in a study of the quality of mother-child relationships.

Similar to studies relating the AAI derived attachment styles to outcomes in the child strange situation, they found that avoidant mothers did not feel as close to their preschool children as did more secure mothers, and they behaved in less supportive ways toward their children during a laboratory teaching task. Still there are no studies relating the self-report measures to children's attachment patterns derived from the Strange Situation. Taken together, however, findings using self-report measures are highly consistent with those using the interview method, even if the two categorical typologies are not significantly related (Crowell, Fraley, and Shaver, 1999).

Bartholomew and Shaver (1998) contend that recent examination of several studies based on Bartholomew's measures and either the AAI or Hazan and Shaver's measure suggests a rough continuum ranging from the AAI (an interview measure focused on parenting issues and coded categorically rather than dimensionally), through Bartholomew's parental attachment and peer/romantic interviews and self-report measure, to Shaver and Hazan's self-report measure. Methods that lie close to each other on this continuum are more highly related empirically, but factor analyses or structural equation models based on several measures consistently indicate the presence of an underlying latent construct (see Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994a, b), which Bartholomew and Shaver (1998) interpret as reflecting a common core that is established in childhood. These attachment orientations may become differentiated with development and social experience. Several other investigators have replicated and extended the findings of Hazan and Shaver and Bartholomew (Levy and Davis, 1988; Collins and Read, 1990; Feeney and Noller, 1990; Mikulincer et al., 1990; Simpson, 1990; Simpson, Rholes, and Nelligan, 1992), demonstrating that these measures of attachment style in adults are precise (see Scharfe and Bartholomew, 1994) and generated a large and coherent body of evidence supporting their construct validity (for reviews see Shaver and Hazan, 1993; Hazan and Shaver, 1994; Shaver and Clark, 1994).

Adult attachment styles have significantly predicted relationship outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, breakups, commitment), patterns of coping with stress, couple communication, and even phenomena such as religious experiences and patterns of career development, as well as behavioral predictions (Brennan and Shaver, 1994; Feeney and

Kirkpatrick, 1996; Hazan and Hutt, 1991; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994; Mikulincer and Nachshon, 1991; Simpson et al., 1992). Thus, the findings of these studies do not seem to be a function of some kind of a pervasive self-report response bias or set.

Developmental Levels of Representation and Attachment

While attachment theory is a developmental theory, attachment theorists and researchers, have, ironically, neglected to integrate a developmental perspective into this work, particularly when considering the concept of internal working models. Attachment styles are described as essentially static, and thus, the concept of attachment styles could be enriched considerably by the introduction of a developmental dynamic. Compared with attachment theory's somewhat fixed notion of "internal working models," the concept of "representations" in object relations theory has a more epigenetic, developmental quality (Blatt, 1974; Diamond and Blatt, 1994; Levy, Blatt, and Shaver, 1998). Psychoanalytic theorists (Blatt, 1974, 1995; Freud, 1914; Horowitz, 1977) view modes of representation as proceeding through a developmental sequence, becoming increasingly complex, abstract, symbolic, and verbally mediated. Thus, psychoanalysis can contribute to the study of attachment through the identification of developmental levels of representation.

Blatt and his colleagues (Blatt, 1974, 1995; Blatt and Lerner, 1983), integrating psychoanalytic theory and the cognitive developmental perspective of Piaget (1952) 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. Following these epigenetic principles, Blatt and colleagues stress that 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 (1976) view that representations derive from relationships to primary caregivers interpersonal experiences are stored in memory (internalized) and that

Table 1 Differentiation-Relatedness of Self and Object Representations.

Level/Scale Point	Description
1. Self/other boundary compromise	Basic sense of physical cohesion or integrity 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 perspective of others.
9. Reciprocally related integrated unfolding self and others	Cohesive sense of self and others in reciprocal 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.

through the process of internalization. Kernberg proposes that early these memories consist of three parts: (a) representation of self, (b) a representation of others, and (c) the affective tone characteristic of these representations. 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 richness and complexity.

Because internal working models 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, internal working models in attachment theory focus primarily on the content (i.e., positive versus negative) of representations of self and others and not on the structure of the cognitive schema. Although attachment theorists have forged links between a Piagetian stage of object permanence and the consolidation of internal working models of attachment (Bretherton, 1985; Main et al., 1985), they have not explored the implication of such a link for understanding aspects of the process of internalization in secure and insecure internal working models of attachment relationships. Different patterns of attachment not only involve differences in the content of internal working models but also differences in the structure of those models (e.g., degree of differentiation and integration), and it may be the structure of these models, more so than the content, that results in different capacities and potentials for adaptation. Thus, within specific attachment styles, internal working models 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 (Main et al., 1985) is not linked to developmental processes and does not identify differences in the structure of representation. The concept of coherence of the narrative in the AAI is based on discourse usage as identified in linguistic analysis (e.g., Grice, 1975) such as adherence to or violation of four linguistic maxims (quality, quantity, relation, and manner).

*Integrating Psychoanalytic and Attachment Theory
Perspectives on Representation*

A recent formulation of personality development provides a potential basis for introducing a developmental perspective into attachment research and theory. Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, 1974; Blatt and Shichman, 1983; Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1995) propose a broad theoretical model of personality development involving a multidimensional dialectic interaction of two primary developmental lines of interpersonal relatedness and self-definition. They posit that psychological development involves two fundamental developmental tasks: (1) the establishment of the capacity to form stable, enduring, mutually satisfying, reciprocal interpersonal relationships and (2) the achievement of a differentiated, consolidated, stable, realistic, essentially positive identity. Normal development throughout the life cycle involves a complex, reciprocal transaction between these two developmental sequences. Meaningful and satisfying relationships contribute to the evolving concept of the self, and a new sense of self leads, in turn, to more mature levels of interpersonal relatedness (Blatt, 1974; Blatt and Shichman, 1983; Blatt and Blass, 1990, 1991, 1992; Blatt, 1990, 1995). The relatedness developmental line is characterized by concerns with trust, warmth, cooperation, and intimacy, while the self-definitional developmental line is characterized by concerns with autonomy, initiative, self-worth, and identity. Moreover, levels of personality and cognitive organization within each of these two developmental lines or sequences range from relatively undifferentiated and unintegrated to highly differentiated and integrated levels. These two developmental lines not only provide a basis for considering personality development, but they have particular relevance for the conceptualization of psychopathology. Distortions and exaggerated emphasis of either developmental line and the defensive avoidance of the other leads to particular configurations of psychopathology (Blatt and Shichman, 1983). Moreover, Blatt and Shichman (1983) contend that these two different configurations are related to several types of personality disorder behaviors. In their discussion, they posit that exaggerated and distorted emphasis on the interpersonal (or anacletic development) is related to depression, hysteria, and dependent and borderline personalities. In contrast, the

self-definitional (or introjective) developmental line is related to self-critical, guilty (introjective) depression, phallic narcissism, obsessive-compulsive, paranoid, schizoid, schizotypal, and overideational borderline personalities.

As indicated by attachment research, secure attachment involves both a capacity to establish affective bonds and to tolerate and benefit from separation. Secure attachment involves both increasingly mature levels of interpersonal relatedness and of autonomy and individuation as expressed in the capacity to both love and to work (Hazan and Shaver, 1990). Thus, secure attachment represents an integration of these two developmental lines and involves an integrated and coordinated development of the capacity for establishing mature levels of interpersonal relatedness and essentially positive and realistic senses of self. These capacities are hypothesized to derive from the degree of differentiation and integration of representations of self and others, which allows for a nuanced, contextual, and diverse understanding of one's experience, the complexity of others, and the social world.

The application of this cognitive developmental, object relations perspective to attachment theory could provide a broader elucidation of interpersonal functioning from relatively less to more adaptive manifestations within each of the insecure types, thus giving attachment theory broader application to both nonclinical and clinical populations. Recent theorizing has related the introjective and anacletic developmental lines to avoidant and preoccupied attachment styles, respectively (Pilkonis, 1988; Blatt and Homann, 1992; Blatt and Maroudas, 1992; Levine and Tuber, 1993). For example, the interpersonal (or anacletic) developmental line is characterized by exaggerated attempts to establish interpersonal relationships similar to anxious-ambivalent attachment with its fears of abandonment and compulsive careseeking. A number of studies have shown that anxious-ambivalent/preoccupied attachment is associated with the anacletic/dependent type of depression, 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, characterized by concerns about loss of self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness, blame, and guilt (Kelly, Levy, and Blatt, 1994; Zuroff and Fitzpatrick, 1995).

Developmental Levels within Avoidant Attachment

Bartholomew's identification of two types of avoidant attachment (fearful and dismissive) may actually represent two developmental levels that can be differentiated within the avoidant insecure attachment style. Levy et al.'s (1998) study of the relationship between young adults' attachment styles and the content and structure of their mental representations of their parents found that the descriptions of parents by dismissively avoidant subjects, as compared to 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 dismissive subjects; in fact, the descriptions given by fearful avoidant individuals were similar on these dimensions to those of secure subjects. Fearful avoidant individuals expressed significantly greater ambivalence when describing their parents than dismissively avoidant subjects, primarily because dismissive subjects described their parents in polarized terms as *either* highly idealized or as 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 negative aspects of their feelings about their parents and an ability to tolerate contradiction in others. In contrast, the lack of ambivalence in the descriptions of parents of dismissing avoidant subjects suggests an avoidance of conflictual issues in their 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 more 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 et al., 1990; Simpson et al., 1992) all stress that dismissing avoidant

subjects are unable to deal with emotions, particularly negative emotions. These findings are also congruent with previous research on mental representations that indicate that 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 finding that secure and fearful individuals gave more articulated descriptions (i.e., had more attributes) 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 fearful avoidance. Thus, these findings suggest a developmental differentiation within avoidant insecure attachment based on 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 avoidant attachment style.

Developmental Levels Within Preoccupied Anxious–Ambivalent Attachment

Similar to the identification of two developmental levels of avoidant attachment, a differentiation appears possible within the preoccupied (anxious–ambivalent) style of attachment. Hazan and Shaver and Main and colleagues describe the anxious pattern of attachment as characterized by compulsive careseeking and a fear of abandonment. West and colleagues (West and Sheldon, 1988), primarily from a clinical perspective consistent with Bowlby's original formulations, discussed how a preoccupation with relatedness can be expressed as either compulsive careseeking or compulsive caregiving. They developed a self-report measure for these two insecure styles and for two other insecure patterns of insecure attachment (compulsive self-reliance and angry withdrawal). Compulsive careseeking, as described by Bowlby (1977), is characterized by urgent and frequent careseeking behaviors in order 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 careseeking. Compulsive caregiving, on the other hand, 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 need for symbiosis, in which the mother seeks to obtain need gratification by using 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 careseekers, in contrast, seem less mature because they primarily seek unilateral relationships that provide contact, nurturance, gratification, support, approval, and acceptance from others. Schaffer (1993) found that compulsive careseekers reported significantly greater levels of dependency, self-criticism, and anxiety, as well as a lower level of self-efficacy than compulsive caregivers. Schaffer (1993) also found that compulsive caregivers, as compared to careseekers, have more adaptive forms of regulating affect. Specifically, compulsive careseeking 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, suggesting that the latter group has access to more adaptive forms 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 compulsive careseekers. Schaffer also found that compulsive careseekers score higher than both compulsive caregivers and secure subjects on measures of alexithymia, indicating that compulsive careseekers may have difficulty differentiating and describing their feelings. Compulsive careseekers employ maladaptive action patterns and self-sacrificing defenses, while compulsive caregivers used more adaptive defenses. Thus, Schaffer's (1993) findings suggest a developmental continuum along the preoccupied/anxious-ambivalent spectrum, with compulsive caregiving attachment reflecting a higher developmental level of

attachment as compared to compulsive careseeking attachment. Compulsive careseeking 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 careseekers 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 careseekers and compulsive caregivers.

Additional evidence for a developmental distinction within the anxious-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 a questionnaire that measures anaclitic (dependent) and introjective (self-critical) tendencies (Depressive Experiences Questionnaire [DEQ]), which assesses a broad range of feelings and beliefs regarding the self and interpersonal relationships. 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 (Zuroff, Quinlan, and Blatt, 1991). Numerous studies demonstrate the validity of the three factors (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 interpersonal 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.

Attachment Theory, Psychoanalysis, and Psychopathology

A major implication of these formulations is that an important differentiation can be made within attachment categories based on the level or degree of differentiation and integration of the underlying mental representations or internal working models. These representations occur along a developmental continuum ranging from lower to higher levels of organization. These formulations provide a useful framework for understanding the quality of interpersonal relationships based on a fuller integration of attachment processes and psychoanalytic developmental theories of personality development and psychopathology.

Variability in the degree of differentiation and integration of mental representations within attachment categories suggests that each category encompasses individuals with different levels of object relations and adaptive potentials. A number of studies (Alexander, 1993; Alexander et al., 1993; Levy, 1993; Anderson and Alexander, 1994; Rosenstein and Horowitz, 1996) have found that borderline, histrionic, and dependent personality disorders are related to a preoccupied attachment style. For example, Levy (1993) examined the relationship between adult attachment styles, using Bartholomew's self-report attachment measure, and personality disorders, using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory, in seventy-five college students. They found that preoccupied 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 individual's reported less schizoid, borderline, antisocial, avoidant, schizotypal and passive-aggressive traits. 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. Dismissing attachment was associated with narcissistic and antisocial personality disorders, and self-reported narcissistic, antisocial, and paranoid personality traits. Alexander and colleagues (Alexander, 1993; Alexander et al., 1993; Anderson and Alexander, 1994) in a sample of 112 adult female incest survivors assessed the relationship between attachment and personality disorders using both the AAI and Bartholomew's structured interview and self-report as measures of attachment and the Millon Multiaxial Clinical Inventory-II (MCMI-II; Millon, 1987). Preoccupied attachment was associated with dependent, avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorder. Fearful avoidance was correlated with avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorder. Dismissing subjects reported the least distress, most likely due to their proclivity to suppress negative affect (Kobak and Sceery, 1988). In terms of the AAI, unresolved subjects were the most distressed and showed the greatest likelihood of avoidant, self-defeating, and borderline personality disorder.

Further research (Levy et al., in press; Ouimette and Klein, 1993; Ouimette et al., 1994) using the DEQ has also found that personality disorders are related to anacletic (anxious attachment) and introjective (avoidant attachment) developmental lines. In an inpatient sample, they found that the anacletic developmental line was significantly related to histrionic, dependent, and borderline features and significantly negatively correlated with schizoid features. The introjective developmental line was related to schizoid, schizotypal, narcissistic, and borderline features. In addition, the difference between the correlations of the anacletic and introjective developmental lines were significant for schizoid, narcissistic, and dependent personality disorders. Ouimette and colleagues (Ouimette and Klein, 1993; Ouimette et al., 1994) reported similar results in both a college sample and outpatient sample.

The findings of these studies also suggest the value of conceptualizing degrees or developmental levels within attachment patterns. Within the anxious-ambivalent/preoccupied/emeshed pattern or anacletic developmental line, borderline, histrionic, hysterical, dependent, and infantile individuals are all concerned with bonding and relatedness, however, these disorders represent a wide range of functioning. Likewise, within the introjective developmental line,

fearful avoidant attachment is related to obsessive-compulsive, avoidant and schizoid personality disorders and dismissing avoidant attachment is related to narcissistic, antisocial and paranoid personality disorders. Again, as with disorders in the anaclitic developmental line, these disorders in the introjective developmental line represent a wide range of functioning. Thus, the degree of differentiation and integration or developmental level of representations may 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).

In contrast, investigations in the Ainsworth tradition have specifically rejected the concept of levels of attachment in favor of the view that everyone forms attachments and that individuals (and relationships) differ in terms of attachment quality. That is, some individuals are secure in their attachment while others are insecure avoidant or insecure preoccupied in their attachment. The findings cited above suggest that individuals differ, however, not only in terms of attachment quality or style, but also in the level or degree of differentiation of internal working models that underlie these attachment patterns. Differences in attachment styles should be based not only on the degree, quality, or strength of attachment, but also on the degree of differentiation and integration of mental representations or internal working models that underlie these attachment organizations.

In terms of representational systems, borderline pathology results from a lack of differentiation and integration of multiple and often disparate representations. Additionally, borderline patients have difficulties in evocative constancy, that is—the ability to evoke and sustain enduring representations of self and others, particularly during stressful moments. Evocative constancy is the capacity to sustain a coherent image of the object regardless of his or her perceptual or emotional availability (Adler and Buie, 1979; Blatt and Shichman, 1983; Blatt and Auerbach, 1988). Psychoanalytic theorists such as Mahler and Kernberg and others have linked borderline pathology to failures to resolve the rapprochement crisis, a developmental process that occurs with the consolidation of the capacity for evocative constancy. Thus, when a significant relationship is disrupted or threatened, the borderline patient experiences the other not only as disinterested or unavailable, but often as completely lost. Disturbances in

evocative constancy among borderline patients are also expressed in an inability to maintain a cohesive, effective sense of self in the face of criticism or rejection. Cognitive processes become fragmented, idiosyncratic, and illogical (Blatt and Auerbach, 1988). Many aspects of the symptomatic expression of borderline pathology center on the failure of evocative constancy, including the vacillation between clinging and repudiation of others; the polarized often horrific, images of self and other; a pervasive sense of emptiness. Borderline patients tend to feel irrevocably abandoned when others are unavailable or unresponsive, and these patients are unable to sustain a stable sense of self or a benign sense of other in the face of criticism or rejection. They have the propensity toward exaggerated emotional displays and incessant emotional demands in order to sustain contact with the object (Blatt and Auerbach, 1988). All the foregoing may function, as “an attempt to vivify experiences to compensate for deficits in evocative schema” (Blatt, 1995, p. 452).

In contrast people with hysterical, dependent, and infantile personality disorders are better able than borderline individuals to evoke and maintain representations of self and others, however, these representations are not easily maintained and often feel tenuous. The infantile and dependent individuals are concerned about being cared for, often in terms of concrete aspects of the relationship. At a higher developmental level, hysterical individuals are concerned about establishing mutual relationships—wanting to love as well as be loved—and therefore are often concerned with the experiences and feelings of others.

The integration of psychoanalytic concepts with attachment theory enables us to view attachment styles not just as static, separate, and discrete types or categories, but also as based on the level of differentiation and integration of the underlying representational system that occurs along a developmental continuum ranging from lower to higher levels of organization. These formulations derive from an integration of attachment processes and psychoanalytic developmental theories of psychopathology.

Conclusions

Attachment theory and psychoanalysis (particularly object relations theory) can reciprocally inform and facilitate each other's develop-

ment. Attachment theory and research provides a powerful and valuable heuristic framework for conducting psychoanalytic research, testing psychoanalytic hypotheses, and enriching the perspective of psychoanalytic clinicians and investigators. And conversely, psychoanalysis can contribute to attachment theory with concepts such as developmental levels of representation, thereby placing attachment theory in a broader theoretical context. This integration of attachment and psychoanalytic developmental theory provides a broad-ranging theoretical model of personality development and psychopathology across a wide developmental spectrum. Thus, psychoanalytic theory and research can enrich, and be enriched in turn, by attachment theory and research in understanding normal and disrupted developmental processes. Attachment theory provides a useful framework for the testing of psychoanalytic ideas, while psychoanalytic theory provides a broader elucidation of internal working models. The integration of these two bodies of knowledge can enrich our understanding of personality development (Blatt, Auerbach, and Levy, 1997) and psychopathology (Levy, 1993; Diamond et al., 1998) as well as the therapeutic process (Blatt et al., 1996; Fonagy et al., 1996; Blatt, Auerbach, and Levy, 1997; Slade, in press).

REFERENCES

- Adler, G. & Buie, D. H. (1979), Aloneness and borderline psychopathology: The possible relevance of developmental issues. *Internat. J. Psychoanal.* 60:83-96.
- Ainsworth, M. S. (1969), Object relations, dependency, and attachment: Theoretical review of infant-mother relationship. *Devel. Psychol.*, 40:969-1025.
- Bell, S. M. & Stayton, D. J. (1971), Individual differences in strange situation behavior of one-year-olds. In: *The Origins of Human Social Relations*, ed., H. R. Schaffer. New York: Academic Press, pp. 17-57.
- (1974), Infant-mother attachment and social behavior: Socialization as a product of reciprocal response to signals. In: *The Integration of a Child into a Social World*, ed. M. P. M. Richards. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-135.
- Blehar, M. C., Waters, E. and Wall, S. (1978), *Patterns of Attachment*. 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. Interpers. Violence*, 8:346-362.
- & Anderson, C. L. (1994), An attachment approach. *Psychotherapy*, 31:665-675.
- Bartholomew, K. (1989), *Attachment styles in young adults: Implications of self-concept and interpersonal functioning*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- (1990), Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *J. Soc. & Personal Relationships*, 7:147-178.
- & Horowitz, L. (1991), Attachment styles among young adults: A four category model of attachment. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, 61:226-241.
- & Shaver, P. R. (1998), Measures of attachment: Do they all converge? In: *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*, ed. J. A. Simpson and W. S. Rholes. New York: Guilford, pp. 25-45.
- Beres, D. & Joseph, E. (1970), The concept of mental representation in psychoanalysis. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 51:1-9.
- 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, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 299-335.
- (1991), Cognitive morphology of psychopathology. *J. Nervous & Mental Dis.*, 179:449-458.
- (1995), Representational structures in psychopathology. In: *Representation, Emotion, and Cognition in Developmental Psychopathology*, ed. D. Cicchetti and S. Toth. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, pp. 1-33.
- & Auerbach, J. S. (1988), Differential cognitive disturbances in three types of "borderline" patients. *J. Personality Disorders*, 2:198-211.
- and Blass, R. B. (1990), Attachment and separateness: A dialectic model of the products and processes of development throughout the life cycle. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 45:107-127. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- and ——— (1995), Relatedness and self-definition: A dialectic model of personality development. In: *Development and Vulnerabilities in Close Relationships*, G. G. Noam and K. W. Fischer. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 309-338.
- & Homann, E. (1992), Parent-child interaction in the etiology of dependent and self-critical depression. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.*, 12:47-92.
- & Lerner, H. D. (1983), The psychological assessment of object representation. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 47:7-28.
- & Maroundas, C. (1992), Convergence among psychoanalytic and cognitive-behavioral theories of depression. *Psychoanal. Psychol.* 9:157-190.
- & Shichman, S. (1983), Two primary configurations of psychopathology. *Psychoanal. & Contemp. Thought*, 6:187-254.
- & Zuroff, D. (1992), Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition: Two prototypes for depression. *Clinical Psychol. Rev.*, 12:527-562.
- D'Afflitti, J. P., Quinlan, D. M. (1976), Experiences of depression in normal young adults. *J. Abnormal Psychol.*, 85:383-389.
- & Levy, K. N. (1997), Mental representations in personality development, psychopathology, and the therapeutic process. *General Psychology Review*, 1:351-374.

- Stayner, D. A., Auerbach, J. S. & Behrends, R. (1996), Change in object and self representations in long-term intensive inpatient treatment of seriously disturbed adolescents and young adults. *Psychiatry*, 59:82–107.
- Zohar, A. H., Quinlan, D. M., Zuroff, D. C. & Mongrain, M. (1995), Subscales within the dependency factor of the depressive experiences questionnaire. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 64:319–339.
- Borman, E. & Cole, H. (1993), A comparison of three measures of adult attachment. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, LA.
- Bornstein, R. F., Galley, D. J. & Leone, D. R. (1986), Parental representations and orality. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 50:80–89.
- Leone, D. R., & Galley, D. J. (1988), Rorschach measures of oral dependence and the internalized self-representation in normal college students. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 52:648–657.
- & ——— (1990), Construct validity of Blatt's measure of qualitative and structural dimensions of object representations: Test-retest stability of parental contact. *J. Soc. Behav. & Personal.*, 6:641–649.
- Bowlby, J. (1944), Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home-life (I). *Internat. J. Psychoanal.* 25:19–53.
- (1969), *Attachment and Loss: Vol 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- (1973), *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 2. Separation*. 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 Publications.
- (1980), *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 3. Loss: Sadness and Depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- (1988), *A Secure Base*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Shaver, P. R., and Tobey, A. E. (1991), Attachment styles, gender, and parental problem drinking. *J. Soc. & Personal Relation.* 8:451–466.
- & Shaver, P. R. (1994), Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. *Personal. & Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, 21, 267–283.
- Bretherton, I. (1985), Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Monographs of the Soc. Res. Child Dev.*, 50, (1 & 2), Serial No. 209, 3–35.
- (1987), New perspectives on attachment relations: Security, communication, and internal working models. In: *Handbook of Infant Development*, ed. J. Osofoky. New York: Wiley, pp. 1061–1100.
- Collins, N. L. & REad, S. J. (1990), Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 58:644–663.
- Crowell, J. A. & Feldman, S. S. (1988), Mothers' internal models of relationships and children's behavioral and developmental status: A study of mother-child interaction. *Child Develop.*, 59:1273–1285.
- Treboux, D. & Waters, E. (1993), *Alternatives to the AAI? Self-reports of attachment style and relationship with mothers and partners*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, LA.
- Fraley, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (1999), Measurement of adult attachment. In: *Handbook of Attachment*, ed. J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver. New York: Guilford Press.

- Diamond, D. & Blatt, S. J. (1994), Internal working models of attachment and psychoanalytic theories of the representational world: A comparison and critique. In: *Attachment in Adults: Clinical and Developmental Perspectives*, ed. M. B. Sperling and W. H. Berman. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 72–97.
- Kaslow, N., Coonerty, S. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Changes in separation-individuation and intersubjectivity in long-term treatment. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 7:363–397.
- Blatt, S. J., Stayner, D. & Kaslow, N. (1992), Differentiation, cohesion, and relatedness of self and other representations: A developmental scale. Unpublished manuscript.
- Egeland, B. & Farber, E. A. (1984), Infant-mother attachment: Factors related to its development and changes over time. *Child Develop.*, 88:753–771.
- Elicker, J., Englund, M. & Sroufe, L. A. (1993), Predicting peer competence and peer relationships in childhood from early parent-child relationships. In: *Family-Peer Relationships: Modes of Linkage*, ed. R. D. Parke & G. W. Ladd. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 77–106.
- Emde, R. N. (1983), The prerepresentational self and its affective core. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Erikson, M. F., Sroufe, L. A. and Egeland, B. (1985), The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in pre-school in a high-risk sample. In: *Growing Points in Attachment*, ed. I. Bretherton & E. Waters. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50:147–166.
- Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1952), *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Feeney, B. C. & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1996), Effects of adult attachment and presence of romantic partners on physiological responses to stress. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 70:255–270.
- Feeney, J. A. & Noller, P. (1990), Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 58:281–291.
- Noller, P. & Hanrahan, M. (1994), Assessing adult attachment: Developments in the conceptualization of security and insecurity. In: *Attachment in Adults*, ed. M. B. Sperling and W. H. Berman. New York: Guilford, pp. 128–154.
- Fonagy, P., Leigh, T., Steele, M., Steele, H., Kennedy, R., Mattoon, G., Target, M. & Gerber, A. (1996), The relation of attachment status, psychiatric classification and response to psychotherapy. *J. Consult. & Clinical Psychol.*, 64:22–31.
- Fraley, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (1998), Airport separations: A naturalistic study of adult attachment dynamics in separating couples. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 75:1198–1212.
- Freud, S. (1914), On narcissism: An introduction. *Standard Edition*, 14:73–102. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- George, C., Kaplan, N. & Main, M. (1985), The Berkeley Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.
- Goldberg, S., Perrutton, M. & Minde, K. (1986), Maternal behavior and attachment in low birth-weight twins and singletons. *Child Develop.*, 57:34–46.
- Grice, H. P. (1975), Logic and conversation. In: *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3*, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Moran. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41–58.

- Griffin, D. W. & Bartholomew, K. (1994a), The metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In: *Advances in Personal Relationships*, K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman. London: Jessica Kingsley, pp. 17–52.
- Bartholomew, K. (1994b), Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.* 67:430–445.
- Grossmann, K. E. & Grossmann, K. (1991), Attachment quality as an organizer of emotional behavioral responses in a longitudinal perspective. In: *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*, ed. C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris. London: Tavistock/Routledge, pp. 93–114.
- Grossman, K., Grossman, K. E., Spangler, G., Suss, G. & Unzner, L. (1985), Maternal sensitivity and newborns' orientation responses as related to quality of attachment in Northern Germany. In: *Growing Points of Attachment Theory and Research*, ed. I. Bretherton & J. E. Waters. *Monogr. Soc. Research in Child Development*, 50 (1–2, serial #209), pp. 233–256.
- Gruen, R. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Changes in self- and object representation during long-term dynamically oriented treatment. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 7:399–422.
- Guntrip, H. (1971), *Psychoanalytic Theory, Therapy, and the Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hazan, C. & Hutt, M. (1991), The process of relinquishing parents as attachment figures. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA, April.
- & Shaver, P. R. (1987), Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, 52:511–524.
- & ——— (1990), Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, 59:270–280.
- & Shaver, P. R. (1994), Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psycholog. Inq.*, 5:1–22.
- Horowitz, L. M., Rosenberg, S. E. & Bartholomew, K. (1993), Interpersonal problems, attachment styles, and outcome in brief dynamic psychotherapy. *J. Consulting & Clin. Psychol.*, 61:549–560.
- Horowitz, M. J. (1977), Structure and processes of change. In: *Hysterical Personality*, ed. M. J. Horowitz. New York: Aronson.
- Isabella, R. A. & Belsky, J. (1991), Interactional synchrony and origins of infant-mother attachment: A replication study. *Child Devel.*, 62:373–384.
- Jacobson, E. (1964), *The Self and the Object World*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Karen, R. (1994), *Becoming Attached*. New York: Warner Books.
- Kelly, K. M., Levy, K. N. & Blatt, S. J. (1996), *Attachment Styles and Depression*. New research presented at the 1996 American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting, New York, NY, May.
- (1976), *Object Relations Theory and Clinical Psychoanalysis*. New York: Aronson.
- & Hazan, C. (1994), Attachment styles and close relationships: A four-year prospective study. *Personal Relations*, 1:123–142.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. & Davis, K. E. (1994), Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 66:502–512.
- Kobak, R. R. & Sceery, A. (1988), Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representation of self and others. *Child Devel.*, 59:135–146.

- Levine, L. V. & Tuber, S. B. (1993), Measures of mental representation: Clinical and theoretical considerations. *Bull. Menn. Clinic*, 57:69–87.
- Levy, K. N. (1993), *Adult Attachment Styles and Personality Pathology*. New research presented at the 1993 American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, May.
- Edell, W. S., Blatt, S. J., Becker, D. F., Quinlan, D. M., Kolligian, J. & McGlashan, T. H. (in press), Two configurations of psychopathology: The relationship of dependency, anaclitic neediness, and self-criticism to personality pathology. *J. Personality*.
- Blatt, S. J. & Shaver, P. R. (1998), Attachment styles and parental representations. *J. Personal. & Social Psychol.*, 74:407–419.
- Litchenberg, J. (1985), Response: In search of the elusive baby. *Psychoanal. Inq.*, 5:621–648.
- Main, M. & 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.
- & Solomon, J. (1990), Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. 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. 95–124.
- Kaplan, N. & Cassidy, J. (1985), Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monogr. Soc. for Res. Child Devel.* 50, (1 and 2), Serial No. 209, 66–104.
- Mahler, M., Pine, F. & Bergman, A. (1975), *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Main, M. & Cassidy, J. (1988), Categories of response with the parent at age six: Predicted from infant attachment classifications and stable over a one month period. *Devel. Psychol.*, 24:415–426.
- & Goldwyn, R. (1985), Adult attachment scoring and classification system. Unpublished scoring manual. Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.
- Matas, L., Arend, R. & Sroufe, L. A. (1978), Continuity of adaptation in the second year: The relationship between quality of attachment and later competence. *Child Devel.*, 49:547–556.
- Mikulincer, M. & Nachshon, O. (1991), Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. *J. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, 61:321–331.
- Florian, V. & Tolmacz, R. (1990), Attachment style and fear of personal death: A case study of affect regulation. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.*, 58:273–280.
- Millon, T. (1981), *Disorders of Personality: DSM-III, Axis II*. New York: Wiley.
- (1987), *Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Quimette, P. C., & Klein, D. N. (1993), The 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: *Empirical Studies of Psychoanalytic Theories*, Vol. 4, ed. R. Bornstein & J. Masling, ??.

- Klein, D. N., Anderson, R., Riso, L. P. & Lizardi, H. (1994), Relationship of sociotropy/autonomy and dependency/self-criticism to DSM-III-R personality disorders. *J. Abnormal Psychol.*, 103:743–749.
- Patterson, A. & Moran, G. (1988), Attachment theory, personality development, and psychotherapy. *Clinical Psychol. Rev.*, 8:611–636.
- Pederson, D. R., Moran, G., Sitko, C., Campbell, K., Ghesquire, K. & Acton, H. (1990), Maternal sensitivity and the security of infant–mother attachment: A Q-Sort Study. *Child Devel.*, 61:1974–1983.
- Piaget, J. (1952), *The Origins of Intelligence in Children*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Pilkonis, P. A. (1988), Personality prototypes among depressives: Themes of dependency and autonomy. *J. Personality Disorders*, 2:144–152.
- Quinlan, D. M., Blatt, S. J., Chevron, E. S. & Wein, S. J. (1992), Parental descriptions: Benevolence, punitiveness, and ambition. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 59:340–351.
- Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J. A. & Blakely, B. S. (1995), Adult attachment styles and mothers' relationships with their young children. *Personal Relationships*, 2:35–54.
- Rosenstein, D. S. & Horowitz, H. A. (19??), Adolescent attachment and psychopathology. *J. Consulting & Clinical Psychol.*, 64:244–253.
- Rothbard, J. C. & Shaver, P. R. (1994), Continuity of attachment across the life span. In: *Attachment in Adults: Clinical and Developmental Perspectives*, ed. M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 31–71.
- Sandler, J. & Rosenblatt, B. (1972), 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 adult attachment in the experience and regulation of affect. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Scharfe, E. & Bartholomew, K. (1994), Reliability and stability of adult attachment patterns. *Personal Relationships*, 1:23–43.
- & Clark, C. L. (1994), The psychodynamics of adult romantic attachment. In: *Empirical perspectives on object relations theories*, ed. R. F. Bornstein & J. M. Masling. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, pp. 105–156.
- & Hazan, C. (1987), Being lonely, falling in love: Perspectives from attachment theory. *J. Soc. Behav. & Personal.*, 2:105–124.
- & ——— (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.
- & Bradshaw, D. (1988), Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In: *The Psychology of Love*, ed. R. J. Sternberg & M. Barnes. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 68–99.
- Shaver, P. R., Belsky, J. & Brennan, K. A. (under review), Comparing measures of adult attachment: An examination of interview and self-report methods. *Personal Relationships*.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990), Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.*, 59:971–980.
- 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. Personal. & Soc. Psychol.*, 60:434–446.

- Slade, A. (in press), Attachment theory and research: Implications for theory and practice of individual psychotherapy. In: *Handbook of Attachment Theory and Research*, ed. J. Cassidy & P. Shaver. New York: Guilford Press.
- & Aber, J. L. (1992), Attachments, drives, and development: Conflicts and convergences in theory. In: *The Interface of Psychoanalysis and Psychology*, ed. J. Barron, M. Eagle, & D. Wolitsky. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, pp. 154–185.
- Smith, P. B., & Pederson, D. R. (1988), Maternal sensitivity and patterns of infant–mother attachment. *Child Devel.*, 59:1097–1101.
- Sperling, M. B. & Berman, W. H. (1991), An attachment classification of desperate love. *J. Personal. Assess.*, 56:45–55.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1983), Infant-caregiver attachment and patterns of adaptation in the preschool: The roots of competence and maladaptation. *Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology*, ed. M. Perlmutter. 16:41–83.
- & Fleeson, J. (1986), Attachment and the construction of relationships. In: *Relationships and Development*, ed. W. W. Harup & Z. Rubin. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 51–71.
- Stern, D. (1985), *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1995), Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the AAI. *Psycholog. Bull.*, 117:387–403.
- Waters, E., Wippman, & Sroufe, L. A. (1979), Attachment, positive affect, and competence in the peer group: Two studies in construct validation. *Child Devel.*, 50:821–829.
- Merrick, S. K., Albersheim, W. & Treboux, D. (1995), *Attachment security from infancy to early adulthood: A 20-year longitudinal study*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.
- Werner, H. (1948), *Comparative Psychology of Mental Development*. New York: International Universities Press.
- West, M. & Sheldon, A. E. R. (1988), Classification of pathological attachment patterns in adults. *J. Personality Disorders*, 2:153–159.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1960), The theory of the parent–infant relationship. In: *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment*, ed. ?? New York: International Universities Press, pp. 37–55.
- (1965), *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Zuroff, D. C. & Fitzpatrick, D. K. (1995), Depressive personality styles: Implications for adult attachment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18:253–365.
- Quinlan, D. M. & Blatt, S. J. (1990), Psychometric properties of the DEQ. *J. Personality Assessment*, 55:65–72.

Department of Psychiatry
The New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center
21 Bloomingdale Road
White Plains, NY 10605