

Adolescents' Working Models and Styles for Relationships with Parents, Friends, and Romantic Partners

Wyndol Furman, Valerie A. Simon, Laura Shaffer, and Heather A. Bouchey

This study examined the links among adolescents' representations of their relationships with parents, friends, and romantic partners. Sixty-eight adolescents were interviewed three times to assess their working models for each of these types of relationships. Working models of friendships were related to working models of relationships with parents and romantic partners. Working models of relationships with parents and romantic partners were inconsistently related. A similar pattern of results was obtained for self-report measures of relational styles for the three types of relationships. Perceived experiences were also related. Specifically, support in relationships with parents tended to be related to support in romantic relationships and friendships, but the latter two were unrelated. On the other hand, self and other controlling behaviors in friendships were related to corresponding behaviors in romantic relationships. Negative interactions in the three types of relationships also tended to be related. Taken together, the findings indicate that the representations of the three types of relationships are distinct, yet related. Discussion focuses on the nature of the links among the three.

INTRODUCTION

Over the course of interacting with their parents, children develop mental representations of their relationships with their parents (Bowlby, 1973, 1979). Such representations or expectations guide children's behavior and serve as a basis for predicting and interpreting their parents' behavior. Bowlby used the term working models to describe such representations, and other social scientists have described similar concepts using terms such as schemas, scripts, prototypes, states of minds, or, as discussed later in the present article, views.

Bowlby (1973, 1979) proposed that such representations not only influence children's cognitions, affect, and behavior with parents, but also shape representations of other close relationships, such as friendships or romantic relationships. In turn, individuals' representations of friendships and romantic relationships influence their behavior in these types of relationships. Consistent with this idea, mother-infant attachment has been found to be predictive of representations of peers (Suess, Grossmann, & Sroufe, 1992; Wartner, Grossmann, Fremmer-Bombik, & Suess, 1994). Security of attachments with parents has also been found to be related to the quality of friendships that children form (see Berlin & Cassidy, 1999). Finally, the links between parent-child attachment and experiences with peers may be mediated by representations of peers (Cassidy, Kirsh, Scolton, & Park, 1996). Previous studies of representations of peers, however, have only examined attributions of intent with regard to a peer's negative behavior. Little is known about other aspects of children's representa-

tions of peers, or their representations of friendships, in particular. Similarly, only a few investigators have examined links between parent-child attachment and features of adolescent friendships (Lieberman, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 1999; Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999), and none have examined representations of friendships in adolescence. This developmental period is particularly interesting because the onset of formal operations may permit representations to change through personal insight and reflections, whereas in childhood, concrete changes in experiences are thought to be necessary for changes in representations to occur (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985).

In a separate line of research, social psychologists have examined the links between parent-child relationships and romantic relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987) proposed that representations of parent-child relationships would influence representations of romantic relationships, because both relationships serve similar attachment functions. Thus, a person with a secure representation of parental attachment would be comfortable turning to a romantic partner in times of distress. Someone with an anxious-avoidant (dismissing) representation of attachment to parents would be reluctant to depend on a romantic partner. Finally, an individual with an anxious-ambivalent (preoccupied) representation of attachment to parents would feel uncertain about a romantic partner's availability and, thus, find it difficult to be comforted by the partner. Consistent with these

ideas, self-reports of adult romantic attachment style are related to retrospective reports of parent–child relationships (Collins & Reed, 1990; Feeney & Noller, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Similarly, interview measures of adults' working models of romantic relationships are associated with comparable measures of working models of relationships with parents (Owens et al., 1995).

Most research on representations of romantic relationships has focused on young adults or married couples. Because adolescents have had little direct experience in these relationships, their representations of relationships with parents may play a particularly important role in shaping their expectations of romantic relationships. Alternatively, the links may not be as apparent when romantic relationships are just developing and usually not very intimate in nature. The one known study on this topic found that adolescents' representations of relationships with mothers and fathers were inconsistently related to their representations of romantic relationships (Furman, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1994).

The links between representations of friendships and romantic relationships have not received much attention. Furman and colleagues have argued that friendships play an important role in the formation of romantic relationships and their corresponding representations (Furman, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1994). Parent–child relationships may lay the foundation for the ability to be close to and intimate with others, but friendships are expected to contribute to the development of reciprocity and mutual intimacy that are central to romantic relationships. Characteristics of the affiliation system such as collaboration, co-construction, reciprocity, and symmetrical interchanges are central features of both friendships and romantic relationships. Accordingly, we expected representations of friendships and romantic relationships to be related.

The primary purpose of the current study was to examine the associations among adolescents' representations of parent–child relationships, friendships, and romantic relationships. Given the formative nature of early caregiving relationships, we expected representations of parent–child relationships to be related to representations of friendships and romantic relationships. Adolescent friendships and romantic relationships share many features, and thus, links between representations of these two types of peer relationships were also predicted. Although representations of different types of relationships were expected to be related to one another, we expected only modest links. The different relationships were expected to build on, but not necessarily duplicate, other relationship experiences.

Another purpose of this study was to provide a broad assessment of representations of friendships and romantic relationships. Such representations were conceptualized as relational views, or representations of a particular type of relationship, the self in that type of relationship, and the partner in that type of relationship. Views are expected to guide a person's behavior and serve as a basis for predicting and interpreting the partner's behavior. They are hypothesized to incorporate expectations regarding all of the behavioral systems that are salient in a given type of relationship at a given point in development. For example, representations of the attachment system should be central to views of parent–child relationships, at least until early adulthood; whereas representations of affiliation would be featured in views of friendship (Furman, 2001). Views of mature romantic relationships would incorporate not only expectations concerning attachment, but also affiliation, caregiving, and sexuality. In effect, relational views are expectations regarding intimacy and closeness, which may be enacted in terms of attachment, caregiving, sexuality, and affiliation.

Although the concept of relational views is intended to incorporate representations of aspects of close relationships in addition to attachment, we believe that individual differences in such relational views can be assessed by a system similar to the categorical one utilized by attachment researchers. That is, relational views, like representations of attachment, can be categorized as secure, dismissing (anxious–avoidant), or preoccupied (anxious–ambivalent). This classification system appears applicable to friendships and adolescent romantic relationships because representations of these relationships are concerned with issues of intimacy and closeness, just as are representations of attachment relationships. That is, these categories can capture differences not only in representations of attachment but also in representations of closeness and intimacy in the other behavioral systems operating in a given relationship (e.g., caregiving, sexuality, and affiliation). For example, those with secure views of romantic relationships will not only want to seek proximity to partners in times of distress, but will value caregiving, view sex as an expression of intimacy, and emphasize the mutuality and friendship aspects of romantic relationships as well. Support for this position can be found in the adult attachment literature, in which researchers have documented that individuals with different romantic styles vary in features of caregiving, sexuality, and affiliation, as well as attachment (for further discussion, see Furman & Simon, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1994).

In the present study, we also examined the correspondence among views at two levels—relational styles and relational working models (Furman & Wehner, 1994). Relational styles refer to self-perceptions of representations of relationships, whereas working models (states of mind) refer to internalized representations of relationships. Styles are assessed through self-report measures of relationships, such as the various romantic attachment questionnaires (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987); whereas working models (states of mind) are assessed through George, Kaplan, and Main's (1985) Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) or similar interviews designed to assess friendships or romantic relationships (Crowell & Owens, 1996; Furman, 2001). Styles and models are only moderately related to one another (see Crowell, Fraley, & Shaver, 1999).

Although the primary focus of this study was on adolescents' representations or views, we also examined whether similarities existed in the experiences in different types of relationships. These two constructs are generally related because experiences in relationships are expected to shape one's views and in turn views may shape one's experiences. The two are, however, somewhat distinct, as it is possible for adolescents and adults to think about relationships independent of their experiences. That is, the emergence of formal operations allows them to step outside of their relationships and observe and evaluate their experiences (Main et al., 1985). They may recognize that they have had adverse experiences, yet continue to value and desire close relationships. In these cases, they would be characterized as having secure views, despite having negative experiences. More commonly, however, experiences and views are expected to be congruent with each other. Because we expected views of different types of relationships to be related and to affect experiences in these relationships, we predicted that the experiences in the different relationships also would be related. In the present study, we tested this hypothesis by examining the degree of correspondence in the amount of support, controlling behavior, and negative interactions in adolescents' relationships with parents, friends, and romantic partners.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 68 high school seniors, ranging in age from 16 to 19 years, who were recruited from two school districts of a large western metropolitan city. Half were female and half were male. The sample was ethnically and socioeconomically diverse: 63%

were European American, 16% were African American, 13% were Hispanic, and 3% were Asian. Fifty-four percent of participants lived with married parents, and 46% lived in a single-parent home. They reported having an average of 8.4 friends. All participants were heterosexual and had had at least one romantic relationship that had lasted three months or longer, and had dated an average of 8.9 people. Sixty-eight percent were in a relationship at the time of the study.

Procedure

The participants were part of a large study on adolescent romantic relationships. Letters describing the study were mailed to high school seniors in participating schools. Interested adolescents were asked to come to the laboratory for a series of three interviews and to complete two sets of questionnaires between sessions. Those with a longstanding romantic partner were observed participating in a series of structured tasks with their partner during a fourth session. Participants were paid \$60 to \$80 for completing all phases of the study.

Separate interviews were conducted to assess working models of relationships with parents, friends, and romantic partners. The three interviews were administered at least 1 week apart by different female interviewers. To control for carryover or practice effects, the order of the three interviews and the order of questionnaires were counterbalanced across participants.

Interview Measures

AAI. The AAI was used to assess adolescents' working models of and experiences with parents or parental figures (George et al., 1985). The AAI is a semistructured interview that typically lasts about an hour. Participants were asked to describe their childhood relationships with their parents and to support their descriptions by providing particular memories. They were asked about instances of separation, rejection, threatening behavior, and being upset, hurt, or ill. Additionally, they were asked to explain why their parents behaved the way they did, how these experiences had influenced their personality, and what they had learned from the experiences.

The interviews were audiotaped and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Using Main and Goldwyn's (1998) scoring system, the transcripts were coded to obtain measures of inferred relationship experiences and working models (states of minds). The coding of experiences was based on the patterns of interaction in the relationships, whereas the coding

of working models focused on how participants currently described, interpreted, and understood such experiences.

Experiences with each parent were coded using Main and Goldwyn's (1998) standard five scales: (1) Loving, (2) Rejection, (3) Involving/role reversal, (4) Neglect, and (5) Pressure to achieve. Each parental figure was rated separately, but scores were averaged across all parental figures, because the distinction between parents was not made in either the style or working model measures of this study. Additionally, the use of average scores for parents provided a means of including the experiences of adolescents who had stepparents or relatives who were significant parental figures. Finally, supplementary analyses revealed that corresponding father and mother scores were significantly related and loaded on the same factors.

The averaged experience scores were subjected to a principal component analysis with an oblique rotation. Examination of the loadings revealed a primary factor of Parental Support with the loving scale loading positively, and rejection and neglect scales loading negatively. Additionally, two splinter factors were found: (1) Involving Behavior, with the involving/role reversal scale as its sole loading scale; and (2) Pressure to Achieve, with the pressure to achieve scale as its sole loading scale. Subsequent analyses focused on the first factor, which had parallel factors in the other interviews. Parental support scores were derived by averaging the three scale scores that had loaded on the factor, Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$.

Working models (states of mind) were coded using Main and Goldwyn's (1998) standard scales: (1) Idealization, (2) Involving anger, (3) Derogation, (4) Insistence upon lack of recall, (5) Metacognitive monitoring, (6) Passivity of discourse, (7) Fear of loss, (8) Unresolved loss, (9) Unresolved abuse, (10) Overall coherence of transcript, and (11) Overall coherence of mind. A principal component analysis of the working model (state of mind) scales in these interviews yielded two factors: (1) dismissing versus secure models, and (2) preoccupied models (for details, see Furman, 2001).

It should be noted that Main no longer refers to these scales as indices of "internal working models" but instead as indices of "state of mind with regard to attachment" (Main & Goldwyn, 1998; Main, 1999). The new term is intended to have a meaning similar to that of the original term, but Main thought that the original term should be replaced as it may have misleading or unwarranted connotations. Although we share some of her reservations about the working model terminology, we chose to use her original term

for several reasons. We and other investigators have used it more commonly than the state of mind terminology. Additionally, the results of the present study and other research suggest that representations are somewhat specific to types of relationships and incorporate representations of multiple aspects of closeness and intimacy (see Discussion section). These ideas could be captured in a term such as "states of mind with respect to parent-child relationships," but the term "working models of parent-child relationships" seems linguistically simpler and is intended to be conceptually identical. Regardless of the terminology, the important point is that we used the same "state of mind" coding scales as have Main and other investigators, and placed the same emphasis on coherence of discourse and the interviewee's ability to collaborate with the interviewer as have other investigators.

Transcripts were classified as secure, dismissing, preoccupied, unresolved, or cannot classify on the basis of the working model (state of mind) scales and the characteristic descriptions of the categories. Secure transcripts were those in which the adolescents were able to describe the relationships coherently, valued them, and found them to be influential in their lives. Dismissing ones were those in which the adolescent attempted to limit the influence of the relationships by idealizing, derogating, or failing to remember their experiences. In the preoccupied transcripts, the adolescent was vague, passive in speech, confused, angry, or preoccupied with the experiences or relationships. Transcripts were categorized as unresolved if a marked lapse in reason or discourse occurred when describing a loss or abusive experience. Finally, transcripts were categorized as "cannot classify" when they failed to meet the criteria for placement in the other categories.

In addition to providing an overall classification, coders also indicated how prototypically secure, dismissing, and preoccupied the transcript was using 9-point Likert scales. These sets of three scores, rather than the pairs of two working model factors, were used in the analyses because the prototype scores are intended to be composites of these working model scales and yet retain the distinction between the secure and dismissing category. Additionally, the three prototype scores for each type of relationship were highly related to the corresponding factor scores, mean $r(67) = .77$, all $r_s > .65$. A series of supplementary analyses with working model factor scores also revealed results similar to those obtained with the prototype scores.

Friendship Interview. The Friendship Interview was used to assess adolescents' working models of

and experiences in close friendships (Furman, 2001). The interview focused primarily on the one to three high school friendships they considered most important, although participants were provided with opportunities to discuss other friendships or share their insights about close friendships in general. Friendships that had become romantic relationships were excluded from the interview.

The Friendship Interview was based on the AAI, and many questions were the same as or similar to those of the AAI. For example, participants were asked to describe their friendships using specific memories to support their description. They were asked about separation, rejection, threatening behavior, and being upset. Additionally, they were asked how their friendships had influenced their personality, and what they had learned from their experiences in these relationships.

Some questions were modified to take into account the differences between relationships with parents and peers. For instance, the AAI questions about being upset were included, but the ones about being hurt or ill were not, as adolescents do not commonly seek care from peers in those instances. Because of the symmetrical nature of friendships, the interview included questions about caregiving and affiliation as well as attachment. Thus, adolescents were asked about what their friends did when upset, as well as what they did in similar circumstances.

Experiences with each of their most important friends were rated using 18 scales derived from Crowell and Owens' (1996) Current Relationship Interview scoring system and Main and Goldwyn's (1998) system. Specifically, the following were coded for each friend: loving behavior, rejection, communication, support seeking, support providing, controlling behavior, involving behavior, and dependent behavior. The participant's communication, support seeking, support providing, controlling behavior, involving behavior, dependent behavior, and satisfaction were also coded, as were the frequency of conflict, conflict resolution, and mutuality in each dyad. Minor modifications were made in the scales because of the age of the participants and the nature of adolescent relationships.

Scores were averaged across friendships. A principal component analysis with an oblique rotation yielded three factors: (1) Dyadic Support, with a negative loading of friend rejection and positive loadings of self communication, self support providing, self support seeking, friend loving, friend communication, friend support providing, friend support seeking, mutuality, and conflict resolution; (2) Other Controlling–Self Dependent, with loadings of friend

controlling behavior, friend involving behavior, and self dependent; and (3) Self Controlling–Other Dependent, with loadings of self controlling behavior, self involving behavior, and friend dependent behavior.

Working models (states of minds) were rated using Main and Goldwyn's (1998) standard scales. Additionally, Crowell and Owens' (1996) autonomy and intimacy scales were scored. Using the scores on the working model scales and the characteristic descriptions of the categories, coders classified the transcripts into five categories that paralleled those for the AAI. Similarly, they rated how prototypically secure, dismissing, and preoccupied the transcript was. The bases of the classification were similar to those for the AAI, but also took into account the nature of friendships among adolescents and young adults in this culture. For example, to categorize a person as having a secure working model of friendships, we considered not only whether they valued the attachment feature of support seeking, but also whether they valued caregiving, and affiliative features, such as cooperation, mutuality, and shared interests.

Romantic Relationship Interview. The Romantic Relationship Interview was used to assess working models of and experiences in romantic relationships. This interview was the same as the Friendship Interview except that the questions focused on romantic relationships; transcripts were coded in the same manner as were the friendship transcripts. A principal component analysis revealed three factors that were similar to the three factors for friendships. The same scales loaded on the Dyadic Support factor. For the two Control–Dependency factors, the control and dependency scales loaded in the same way, but the involving scales loaded like the dependency scales, whereas for friendships, they had loaded like the control scales. Accordingly, scores for the three variables for each of the two types of relationships were derived by averaging the variables that had loaded in the same manner for both types of relationships, *mean* Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$, *range* = .65 to .95. Thus, the involving scales were not included in these scores.

Coding process. Different coders coded each of the three interviews for a participant. All three coders had attended Main and Hesse's Adult Attachment Workshop, and had successfully completed or were successfully completing Main and Hesse's Reliability Certification Procedure. All received additional training and practice in the coding of romantic and friendship interviews.

To assess interrater agreement, one of the coders coded a second interview of the person. This interview was, however, always coded after the one in which he or she was the primary coder, and after he

or she had coded a minimum of 18 additional participant transcripts. Thus, any potential influence from having coded another interview from the same participant was minimized. Pairs of coders independently coded 12.5% of the transcripts; the levels of interrater agreement for the overall classification, the three continuous prototype scores, and the three experience factor scores were satisfactory, classification $\kappa = .86$; scores: $mean r(67) = .82$, $range = .72$ to $.91$.

Questionnaire Measures

Behavioral Systems Questionnaire (BSQ). Three parallel versions of the BSQ were used to measure adolescents' self-perceptions of relational styles for relationships with parents, romantic partners, and friends (Furman & Wehner, 1999). For each of the three types of relationships, relational styles were measured by assessing perceptions of how they approach attachment, caregiving of the other, and affiliation in that particular type of relationship. For each type of relationship, secure, dismissing, and preoccupied styles were each assessed with 15 to 20 five-point Likert items. Sample items of each style are listed in the Appendix. The romantic relationship version of the BSQ also included items about sexual behavior, but these were not included in the present analyses, so that the scales for the three types of relationships would parallel one another. Internal consistencies of the three style scores for each of the three types of relationships were all satisfactory, all Cronbach α s $> .85$. In several studies, romantic style scores have been found to be moderately to highly related to several attachment style measures, including Hazan and Shaver's (1987) measure, Collins and Read's (1990) Adult Attachment Scales, and Brennan, Clark, and Shaver's (1998) Experiences in Close Relationships measure (see Furman & Wehner, 2001).

Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI). The NRI was used to measure perceptions of experiences in close relationships (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). The NRI included three questions about each of six different aspects of support, including companionship, reliable alliance, enhancement of worth, instrumental help, affection, and intimacy. Additionally, the NRI included three item measures for annoyance and conflict.

Participants were asked to rate how much each feature occurred in each relationship using standard 5-point Likert scales. Thus, one of the companionship items was "How much free time do you spend with each of these persons?" and one of the conflict items was "How much do you and this person disagree and quarrel?" Participants were asked to answer each question about relationships with a mother, father,

same-sex friend, and two romantic partners. For the present purposes, scores were averaged across the two parents and across the two romantic relationships.

Prior analyses have revealed that the six support scales for each relationship load on a Support factor for that relationship and the conflict and annoyance scales for each relationship load on a Negative Interaction factor for that relationship (Furman, 1996). The Support and Negative Interaction factor scores for parents, friend, and romantic partners were used in the analyses of the present study. Cronbach α s of the factors exceeded $.89$. Validation evidence is summarized in Furman (1996).

RESULTS

Concordance of Interview Working Models

The degree of concordance in the working model classifications derived from the three interviews was examined first. The analyses of the working model classifications used the three primary categories so as to parallel the data with the continuous scores. The 4% of transcripts that were categorized as unresolved/disorganized had also been assigned to one of the three primary categories, and that classification was used in these analyses. The 2% that were categorized as cannot classify were treated as missing data in the categorical analyses reported here. A similar pattern of results as those reported here were obtained when the unresolved/disorganized and cannot classify categories were included.

As shown in Table 1, working models of relationships with parents and friends were significantly related, $\kappa = .29$, $p < .01$. Fifty-eight percent of the participants received the same classification on the two interviews (chance = 41%). The concordance in the classifications of the parent and romantic relationship working models only approached significance, $\kappa = .14$, $p < .10$ (see Table 2). Only 46% were categorized the

Table 1 Concordance of Classifications of Working Models of Relationships with Parents and Friends

	Friends		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Parents			
Secure	23 (15)	5 (3)	9 (6)
Preoccupied	0 (0)	5 (3)	0 (0)
Dismissing	23 (15)	5 (3)	30 (19)

Note: The pairs of numbers represent the percentage and number (in parentheses) of participants in each cell. $\kappa = .29$; $p < .01$.

Table 2 Concordance of Classifications of Working Models of Relationships with Parents and Romantic Partners

	Romantic Partners		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Parents			
Secure	28 (18)	3 (2)	6 (4)
Preoccupied	2 (1)	3 (2)	0 (0)
Dismissing	35 (23)	8 (5)	15 (10)

Note: The pairs of numbers represent the percentage and number (in parentheses) of participants in each cell. $\kappa = .14; p < .10$.

same (chance = 37%). Examination of the specific classifications revealed that a number of adolescents had dismissing models for relationships with parents, but secure models for romantic relationships. In contrast, the degree of concordance between working models of friendships and romantic relationships was relatively high, $\kappa = .36, p < .001$. As shown in Table 3, the working models of the two types of relationships were classified the same in 61% of the cases (chance = 39%).

Next, we determined whether the working model prototype ratings for the three relationship types were related (see Table 4). Consistent with the findings for the classification data, the secure, preoccupied, and dismissing prototype ratings for relationships with parents were related to corresponding ratings for friendships, $mean r(67) = .50, ps < .01$. Although the classifications of models of relationships with parents and romantic partners were not concordant, the secure and preoccupied prototype ratings for the two types of relationships were related to each other, $rs(67) = .24$ and $.45, ps < .05$, respectively. The dismissing prototype ratings of relationships with parents and romantic partners were not related. Finally, corresponding ratings for relationships with

Table 3 Concordance of Classifications of Working Models of Relationships with Friends and Romantic Partners

	Romantic Partners		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Friends			
Secure	36 (24)	6 (4)	4 (3)
Preoccupied	4 (3)	10 (7)	1 (1)
Dismissing	22 (15)	0 (0)	15 (10)

Note: The pairs of numbers represent the percentage and number (in parentheses) of participants in each cell. $\kappa = .36; p < .001$.

Table 4 Correlations of Corresponding Prototype Scores for Different Relationships

	Working Models		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Parent–friend	.41**	.61**	.47**
Parent–romantic	.24*	.45**	.17
Friend–romantic	.32*	.52**	.43**

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

friends and romantic partners were all significantly related, $mean r(67) = .42, ps < .05$.

A series of regression analyses was then conducted in which the prototypic scores for one type of relationship were predicted from the corresponding scores from the other two types of relationships; the order of entry was varied in a series of iterative analyses to determine the degree to which each of the two predictors provided a unique contribution above the other predictor. Table 5 presents the increments in the R^2 s that occurred when the second predictor was added to the regression equation.

In the prediction of the prototype scores for rela-

Table 5 Unique Contribution of Each Relationship’s Prototype Scores in Predicting Prototypes of Other Relationships

	Working Models		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Prediction of parent			
1. Friend entered second	.06**	.20**	.19**
2. Romantic entered second	.01	.02	.00
Prediction of friend			
1. Parent entered second	.11**	.18**	.16**
2. Romantic entered second	.05*	.08**	.13**
Prediction of romantic partner			
1. Parent entered second	.02	.02	.00
2. Friend entered second	.05*	.10**	.16**

Note: The table depicts the changes in R^2 when a second relationship’s score is added as a second step in a regression equation in which one relationship’s score is being predicted from the scores of the other relationships. For example, the first row depicts the R^2 changes associated with the inclusion of the friend’s score to an equation predicting parent’s score from romantic partner’s score (i.e., the increase above that provided by romantic partner alone). * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

tionships with parents, each of the three scores for prototype friendships provided a significant increase above that provided from the corresponding romantic relationship prototype score, all R^2 changes $\geq .06$, $ps < .01$. In contrast, none of the romantic relationship scores provided a significant increment when included in the second step.

In the prediction of the scores for friendships, all of the scores for relationships with parents provided significant increments when entered after the corresponding romantic relationship score, all R^2 changes $\geq .11$, $ps < .01$. When the romantic relationship score was entered second, each provided a significant increment as well, all R^2 changes $\geq .05$, $ps < .05$.

Finally, when scores for romantic relationships were predicted, each of the friendship scores provided a significant increment above that obtained from the corresponding score for relationships with parents alone, all R^2 changes $\geq .05$, $ps < .05$. On the other hand, none of the scores for relationships with parents provided a significant increment when entered second.

Associations among Relational Styles

The pattern of relations among BSQ relational styles for the three different types of relationships was analyzed next (see Table 6). As was found for the working model scores, the three style scores for relationships with parents were related to corresponding scores for friendships, $mean r(67) = .42$, $ps < .05$. In contrast, only the preoccupied ratings for relationships with parents and romantic partners were related to one another, $r(67) = .48$, $p < .01$. Finally, the three style scores for friendships were related to those for romantic relationships, just as had been found for the working model variables, $mean r(67) = .48$, $ps < .05$.

The primary analyses of the BSQ were conducted using parallel items that assessed attachment, caregiving, and affiliation for each type of relationship so as to ensure that any relations were not masked because of differences in the items. Because the caregiv-

Table 6 Correlations of Corresponding Styles for Different Relationships

	Relationship Style		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Parent–friend	.36**	.47**	.42**
Parent–romantic	.23	.48**	.07
Friend–romantic	.28*	.62**	.53**

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

Table 7 Unique Contribution of Each Relationship's Style Scores in Predicting Style Scores of Other Relationships

	Relationship Style		
	Secure	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Prediction of parent			
1. Friend entered second	.06*	.05+	.17**
2. Romantic entered second	.02	.05+	.03
Prediction of friend			
1. Parent entered second	.06*	.04+	.13**
2. Romantic entered second	.05+	.22**	.26**
Prediction of romantic partner			
1. Parent entered second	.02	.04+	.03
2. Friend entered second	.05+	.22**	.30**

Note: The table depicts the changes in R^2 when a second relationship's score is added as a second step in a regression equation in which one relationship's score is being predicted from the scores of the other relationships. For example, the first row depicts the R^2 changes associated with the inclusion of the friend's score to an equation predicting parent's score from romantic partner's score (i.e., the increase above that provided by romantic partner alone). * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; + $p < .10$.

ing items may not be appropriate for adolescent relationships with parents, however, we also conducted a set of analyses in which the style scores for relationships with parents did not include the caregiving items. The same pattern of results was obtained; all the correlations between corresponding scores for parents and friends were significant, but the links between styles for parents and romantic partners were only significant for the preoccupied scores.

As was done with the working model scores, a series of regression analyses were conducted in which the style scores for one type of relationship were predicted from the corresponding scores from the other two types of relationships (Table 7). When scores for relationships with parents were predicted, two of the friendship scores provided significant increments above those obtained from the corresponding romantic relationship score alone, and the third score—the preoccupied score—tended to do so as well, all R^2 changes $\geq .05$. On the other hand, only the preoccupied romantic relationship score approached providing a significant increment after the corresponding friendship score had been entered.

In the prediction of the friendship styles, two of the scores for relationships with parents provided signif-

icant increments when entered after the corresponding romantic relationship score, and there was a trend for the third—the preoccupied style—to provide an increment as well, all R^2 changes $\geq .04$. Similarly, when the corresponding romantic relationship score was entered second, two provided a significant increment, and the third provided a near-significant increment as well, all R^2 changes $\geq .05$.

In the prediction of the romantic relationship style scores, the friendship style scores provided a significant or near-significant increment above that obtained from the parent style scores, all R^2 changes $> .06$, $ps < .05$. In contrast, only the preoccupied parent style score approached providing a significant increment above that obtained from the friendship style scores.

Associations among Relationship Experiences

To examine the associations among relationship experiences, analyses were conducted on the experience scores derived from the interview, and on the factor scores of the NRI. The links among the support scores of the three interviews were examined first. Parental support was significantly related to dyadic support in romantic relationships, $r(67) = .34$, $p < .05$, and tended to be related to dyadic support in friendships, $r(67) = .23$, $p < .10$. Support scores in friendships and romantic relationships were not significantly related, $r(67) = .05$, ns .

The links between the control scores for friendships and romantic relationships were examined next. (A parallel variable did not exist for relationships with parents.) The friend controlling behavior and romantic partner controlling behavior scores were significantly related, $r(67) = .31$, $p < .05$, as were the self controlling behavior scores for the two types of relationships, $r(67) = .25$, $p < .05$.

Finally the correlations of the NRI support and negative interaction scores across the three types of relationships were examined (see Table 8). Once again, perceptions of parental support were significantly related to perceptions of support by friends and romantic partners, $rs(67) = .25$, $p < .05$, whereas perceptions of support by friends and romantic partners were unrelated. Negative interaction scores in the three relationships all tended to be related to one another, $rs(67) = .24$, $ps < .06$.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with past findings (Furman, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1994), adolescents' views of friendships and romantic relationships were found to be consis-

Table 8 Correlations of Perceived Support and Negative Interactions in Different Relationships

	Support	Negative Interactions
Parent–friend	.25*	.26*
Parent–romantic	.25*	.24+
Friend–romantic	.00	.25*

* $p < .05$; + $p < .10$.

tently related, as were their views of friendships and parent–adolescent relationships. The links between representations of relationships with parents and romantic partners were somewhat inconsistent.

Very similar patterns of results were found for internal working models and relational styles, even though corresponding models and styles were only modestly related, $mean r(67) = .25$. The consistency of findings indicates that the associations are not specific to a particular method of assessment. Furthermore, the links also are not simply a function of method variance, as that explanation could not account for the consistency of findings with the two methods. Moreover, if the findings were simply due to method variance, the links between views of relationships with parents and views of romantic relationships should have been as consistent as the other links. Finally, a method variance explanation would have difficulty accounting for the results of the regression analyses. Frequently, the addition of the views of a second type of relationship provided a significant increment in the prediction of the views of the final relationship type. If the links reflected only method variance, the variance should have been shared by all three types of relationships, and the amount of unique variance should have been low.

In a similar vein, the pattern of relations does not seem to reflect some personality trait. If a personality trait were responsible for the links, one would have also expected a consistent pattern of associations across the three types of relationships. One would also have expected a high proportion of individuals to be classified the same for the three types of relationships, but only 36% were (chance = 17%). An explanation in terms of personality traits would also have difficulty accounting for other research that has shown categorizations of the AAI to be unrelated to categorizations of discourse about work that were based on a similar interview (Crowell et al., 1996). Instead, the associations found in this study seem to reflect links in the representations of these relationships.

Links among Relationships

Past work on adult attachment has focused on the influence of parent–child relationships on romantic relationships, and has given little consideration to the role of friendships. In the present study, however, consistent links were found between views of friendships and romantic relationships. All of the correlations between views of friendships and romantic relationships were significant. Moreover, the three prototype scores and the three style scores for friendships each provided a significant increment in the prediction of corresponding scores for romantic relationships. In contrast, none of the scores for relationships with parents provided a significant increment. Although one cannot infer causality from these cross-sectional data, the findings are consistent with the idea that views of close friendships may shape expectations in romantic relationships.

Views of friendships were also related to views of relationships with parents. In fact, an examination of the overall pattern of results suggests that views of friendships may mediate the links between views of relationships with parents and those of romantic relationships. Friendships were linked not only with each of the other two types of relationships, but when their influence was controlled for, the links between views of relationships with parents and those with romantic partners were no longer significant. One might speculate that experiences in relationships with parents may influence expectations of friendships, but because they are peer relationships, the experiences in friendships and the expectations that result from them may be the mechanism that influences expectations for romantic relationships, or at least adolescent romantic relationships. Longitudinal work, however, will be required to test this hypothesis.

Moreover, the mediator explanation is not a complete account of the relations because the views of friendships consistently provided a significant increment in the prediction of views of romantic relationships after views of relationships with parents had been entered. It seems that views of friendships may serve as a mechanism for carrying forth not only what has been learned in relationships with parents, but also what has been learned in friendships. Consistent with the behavioral systems conceptualization (Furman, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1994), friendships seem to play an important role in their own right, although firm inferences about causality will require longitudinal studies.

What might account for the somewhat inconsistent links between views of relationships with parents and those with romantic partners? Some adolescents may

be reluctant to acknowledge any similarities in their relationships with parents and those with romantic partners. Some may go through a phase of conflict with parents, overtly distancing themselves in the process of transforming these relationships (Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck, & Duckett, 1996). Whereas these explanations may account for the relatively weak relations between the adolescents' BSQ style scores for relationships with parents and romantic partners, it is more difficult for these explanations to account for the somewhat inconsistent ties between working model scores. These ties should be less influenced by such overt efforts to distort the presentation of adolescents' relationships with parents. Moreover, such explanations would lead one to expect views of relationships with parents to be unrelated to views of friendships, which is not the case.

The findings can, however, be explained by considering the behavioral systems that are active in the different relationships. In middle adolescence, both romantic partners and friends are expected to be affiliative figures (Furman & Wehner, 1994); attachment processes are not expected to have emerged in most romantic relationships, although they may be present in close friendships as well as relationships with parents. If these characterizations are accurate, then one might expect views of relationships with parents and romantic partners to be less related because their salient behavioral systems differ. This explanation would also predict that the links between views of romantic relationships and relationships with parents may be more apparent in late adolescence or adulthood, as romantic relationships develop and caregiving and attachment components become more important. Conversely, the links may also become more apparent as relationships with parents become symmetrical and egalitarian in nature. Consistent with these ideas, past research has found such links in late adolescence, both at the level of styles and working models (see Furman & Wehner, 1997).

In effect, the findings suggest that the links among the views of different relationships vary in nature. Further support for this idea comes from the analysis of the variables that examined adolescents' experiences in these relationships. Links between friendships and romantic relationships were found on the control–dependency variables. Both friendships and romantic relationships are voluntary, relatively egalitarian relationships. Through experiences in these relationships, children and adolescents may be learning what relationships are like with somebody relatively equal to them in status and power. They may learn how decisions are made and how power is determined when the other is a peer, rather than a parent or au-

thority. The experiences in one form of peer relationship may carry over to the other type of relationship.

Links were also found in perceptions of negative interactions in the three types of relationships. Perhaps teens vary in their proneness to interpersonal conflict, or perhaps the experiences with conflict in one type of relationship may affect conflict in other relationships. Such effects could be explained in terms of imitation, behavioral contagion, or the influence of relational views.

Whereas links were found in the control and negative interaction variables, support in friendships and romantic relationships were not correlated with each other. It is possible that the ability to be supportive in the two types of relationships is unrelated, but it seems more likely that it is the number of opportunities to be supportive that is unrelated. That is, friends and romantic partners may vie for the teens' attention; if much time is spent with a romantic partner, adolescents may have fewer opportunities to have supportive interactions with friends. Alternatively, if adolescents' romantic relationships are relatively short compared with their friendships, they may have fewer opportunities to have supportive interactions with romantic partners. In either case, the length and seriousness of the romantic relationship may moderate the links between friendships and romantic relationships (Connolly & Johnson, 1996).

Parental support tended to be related to support in both friendships and romantic relationships. The support scores for the friendships and romantic relationships are primarily composed of scales that reflect features of the attachment and caregiving system (e.g., communication, seeking support, or providing support). Attachment theorists have long hypothesized that experiences with parents may influence how the attachment and caregiving systems are manifested in subsequent relationships (Bowlby, 1973; Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986).

The significant relations between parental support and support in romantic relationships also suggests that links exist between these relationships during the adolescent years, as well as in adulthood. The findings illustrate that it would be incorrect to infer that such links did not exist, simply because they had not been found in the measures of views in this and a prior study (Furman, 1999). Instead, the task for future research is to identify the ways in which the relationships are linked to one another, and the ways in which they are not.

Finally, it is interesting to note that similar results were found with the style and working model measures even though the two types of measures were only modestly related to each other. Both types of

measures, however, are thought to assess the ability to provide caregiving and to rely on attachment figures in times of need (Shaver, Belsky, & Brennan, 2000). Accordingly, the links between the views of the relationships may reflect carryover in these features from one relationship to another. The significant or near significant ties between parental support and support in the two forms of peer relationships are consistent with this idea, although it is not clear how this explanation would account for the absence of such a link between romantic relationships and friendships, or the significant ties in controlling behavior in these two types of relationships.

Alternatively, the links among styles and the links among working models may parallel one another. For example, we would expect self-perceptions of security in one type of relationship to be associated with self-perceptions of security in another type, just as we would expect secure internal working models of one type of relationship to be associated with secure internal working models of another type. Thus, the similarity in the findings for the style and working model measures may have occurred not because of the common element they assess, but because of parallel processes underlying the links among each of them.

Differences in Views

Up to this point, we have focused on the concordance in views of different relationships, but the different views were not identical to one another. A number of adolescents had dismissing working models of their relationships with parents, but secure models of relationships with romantic partners or friends. What might account for this difference? The higher rates of secure models of these relationships do not seem to result from an adolescent idealization of romantic relationships or friendships. To be categorized as having a secure model, adolescents must coherently substantiate assertions that their relationships were positive in nature; idealized relationships would be indicative of dismissing models, not secure models. Moreover, we did not obtain unusually high proportions of secure models of friendships and romantic relationships, but instead had a low proportion of secure models of relationships with parents, a point returned to shortly.

The difference also does not seem to reflect a transition from parents to peers as primary attachment figures. Parents remain the primary secure base for most adolescents (Hazan, Hutt, Sturgeon, & Bricker, 1991); full-blown romantic attachments do not usually occur until early adulthood because they are thought to take an average of 2 years to develop (Fra-

ley & Davis, 1997; Hazan et al., 1991). In the present study, the median length of the important relationships adolescents chose to describe was 8 months; the median of their longest relationship was 11 months.

Even if the transition in primary attachment figure has not fully happened, perhaps the early phases of this transition lead to a reworking of models of relationships with parents. Yet, there is no theoretical reason to expect that a change from being the primary figure to becoming the secondary figure would result in a higher proportion of dismissing models of relationships with parents. In fact, secure representations of parents appear to be less common in middle adolescence than in later adolescence or adulthood (cf. Ward & Carlson, 1995 and van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenberg, 1996), yet parents are more likely to be primary attachment figures to middle adolescents than they are to young adults (Hazan et al., 1991).

Instead, it appears that some adolescents may no longer believe that their parents are available and responsive to their needs, and may look elsewhere for satisfying close relationships. They may have positive expectations for their relationships with friends or romantic partners, as their interchanges with peers may generally be positive in nature. In some cases, the expectations may change in nature if they encounter adverse experiences.

For some individuals, the view that parents are not responsive may be specific to the adolescent period when these relationships are undergoing transformation. They may be less coherent about these relationships or less valuing of them, as they struggle to redefine the relationships. The idea that some portion of the insecure views may be transitory in nature is supported by the fact that the proportion of secure models of relationships with parents appears to be higher in late adolescence or adulthood than in middle adolescence (cf. Ward & Carlson, 1996 and Van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenberg, 1996). Clearly, longitudinal work is needed to delineate developmental changes in views of relationships and their links with experiences.

Another possible explanation for the higher proportion of secure models of peer relationships is that adolescents have some choice in their romantic partners and friends, which may sometimes result in more positive experiences than those that they had with their parents. Some adolescents who are prone to insecurity due to past experiences may have secure models if they have a partner or friend who is particularly available and responsive. Again, longitudinal work could shed light on the developmental course of views.

Research is also needed to identify the differences between those who have concordant views of different types of relationships, and those who have secure views of some and insecure views of other relationships. Furman and Wehner (1994) suggested that the experiences within a particular type of relationship are especially important in shaping views of that relationship type, but as yet, this hypothesis has not been systematically tested. It is also possible that gender or other individual differences variables may influence the degree of concordance. The sample size of the present study, however, precluded examining such potential differences.

In any case, it is important to emphasize that the links among views of different types of relationships are modest in size, even those between friendships and romantic relationships. Romantic relationships present new challenges and opportunities to adolescents, just as friendships did in childhood (Furman & Flanagan, 1997). For example, sexuality is a central feature of romantic relationships that is not typical of relationships with parents or friends. One's experiences with sexuality are likely to shape one's views of this form of relationship, but may not affect views of relationships with friends or parents. In effect, the current findings are consistent with contemporary conceptualizations of development that emphasize carryover from experiences in relationships, but do not predict simple replications of the experiences.

Relational Views

The present findings have some interesting implications for understanding what is being assessed in the interview and self-report measures. We hypothesized that these measures assessed relational views, which incorporate representations of features of the relationship that are salient at a given point in development. We were able to use these measures effectively to assess views of friendships and romantic relationships. It is unclear, however, whether most adolescent friendships would qualify as attachment relationships, and most adolescent romantic relationships would certainly not. Accordingly, it appears that at least the measures of views of friendships and romantic relationships seem to tap views of general features of these relationships, and not attachment per se. Similarly, the links in the views of these relationships suggest that the carryover in representations from one type of relationship to another does not occur just in reference to attachment, but rather in more general terms.

The AAI has been conceptualized as measuring "state of mind with respect to attachment" (Hesse,

1999; Main, 1999). The questions in the AAI were carefully selected to examine only attachment-related issues, and thus, only assess states of mind (working models) regarding attachment. Yet we think that the state of mind (working model) being assessed could be part of a broader state of mind that would include not only representations of attachment, but also caregiving, affiliation, and other elements of intimacy and closeness—in other words, a relational view. This conceptual distinction is a relatively minor one when the attachment system is the most important aspect of these relationships; however, it is more important when affiliation and caregiving by children are central features of relationships with parents, such as might occur as individuals and their parents grow older. Then we would expect the states of mind (working model) with respect to parental figures to center on representations of caregiving and affiliation, as well as attachment. The concept of relational view is particularly important when assessing representations of other attachment relationships, such as committed romantic relationships, in which affiliation, caregiving, and sexuality all play important roles.

Additionally, we found that the models of different relationships were related, yet distinct. Young adults' models of relationships with parents and their relationships with romantic partners have also been found to be relatively distinct (Owens et al., 1995). Accordingly, it seems that the interview measures are somewhat specific to different types of relationships, and thus, the AAI may measure state of mind regarding attachment with parental figures only, and not all attachment figures. This distinction is particularly important when individuals have multiple attachment relationships, such as with parents and romantic partners, because they may have different states of mind (working models) regarding the different types of attachment relationships.

The current study also found that the styles of different types of relationships were associated with one another, but clearly were not identical. This pattern of findings is consistent with hierarchical models of representations (e.g., Collins & Read, 1994; Furman & Simon, 1999) and with past work that has found significant but modest links among attachment styles of different types of relationships (see Crowell et al., 1999).

Main and other researchers developed invaluable tools for assessing representations of attachment relationships. The present findings suggest that these measures may contribute in ways beyond their primary intention, as it appears that the approach underlying them can be applied for examining other close, nonattachment relationships.

As the application of these approaches is extended to other types of relationships, a better understanding should be gained of views of relationships and the links among different relationships. The present findings suggest that views of and experiences in the different relationships may be linked, but longitudinal work will be required both to untangle the causal links and to delineate the developmental course of these views. Such research may also help identify the factors that contribute to concordant or discordant views. It is hoped that the present study may serve as a springboard for examining such issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Preparation of this manuscript was supported by Grant 50106 from the National Institute of Mental Health (W. Furman, Principal Investigator). The authors would like to thank Mary Main and Judith Crowell for permitting adaptation of their interviews and coding systems to the relationships in this study. Appreciation is expressed to MaryFrances Porter for her coordination of the data collection. Thanks also go to the adolescents, families, and schools that participated in the project.

ADDRESSES AND AFFILIATIONS

Corresponding author: Wyndol Furman, Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208-0204; e-mail: wfurman@nova.psy.du.edu. Valerie A. Simon, Laura Shaffer, and Heather A. Bouchee were also at the University of Denver when this study was conducted. Valerie Simon now is at Brown University School of Medicine, Providence, RI; Laura Shaffer is at Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC; and Heather Bouchee is at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE ITEMS OF THE BEHAVIORAL SYSTEMS QUESTIONNAIRE

Secure style

Attachment: I seek out "MY FRIENDS" when something bad happens.

Caregiving: I enjoy being able to take care of "MY FRIENDS."

Affiliation: Both "MY FRIENDS" and I make frequent efforts to see and talk with each other.

Preoccupied style

Attachment: I am afraid "MY FRIENDS" think I am too dependent.

Caregiving: I get too wrapped up in "MY FRIENDS" worries.

Affiliation: I want to do more things with "MY FRIENDS" than they want to.

Dismissing style

Attachment: I rarely turn to "MY FRIENDS" when upset.

Caregiving: I want "MY FRIENDS" to be independent and *not* need me.

Affiliation: I do not put much effort into having good relationships with "MY FRIENDS."

Note: These items are from the version assessing styles for friendships. Parallel versions exist for romantic relationships and relationships with parents.

REFERENCES

- Berlin, L. J., & Cassidy, J. (1999). Relations among relationships: Contributions from attachment theory and research. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 688-712). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cassidy, J., Kirsh, S. J., Scolton, K. L., & Parke, R. D. (1996). Attachment and representations of peer relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 892-904.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 644-663.
- Connolly, J. A., & Johnson, A. M. (1996). Adolescents' romantic relationships and the structure and quality of their close interpersonal ties. *Personal Relationships*, *3*, 185-195.
- Crowell, J. A., Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Measurement of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 434-465). New York: Guilford Press.
- Crowell, J., & Owens, G. (1996). *The Current Relationship Interview and scoring system, Version 2*. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Stony Brook.
- Crowell, J. A., Waters, E., Treboux, D., O'Connor, E., Colons-Downs, C., Felder, O., Golby, B., & Posada, G. (1996). Discriminant validity of the Adult Attachment Interview. *Child Development*, *67*, 2584-2599.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 281-291.
- Fraley, R. C., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults' close friendships and romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, *4*, 131-144.
- Furman, W. (1996). The measurement of children and adolescent's perceptions of friendships: Conceptual and methodological issues. In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendships in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 41-65). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Furman, W. (1999). Friends and lovers: The role of peer relationships in adolescent romantic relationships. In W. A. Collins & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Relationships as developmental contexts: The 30th Minnesota Symposia on Child Development* (pp. 133-154). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Furman, W. (2001). Working models of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *18*, 583-602.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*, *21*, 1016-1022.
- Furman, W., & Flanagan, A. (1997). The influence of earlier relationships on marriage: An attachment perspective. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples interventions* (pp. 179-202). New York: Wiley.
- Furman, W., & Simon, V. (1999). Cognitive representations of romantic relationships. In W. Furman, B. B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 75-98). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & G. P. Gullota (Eds.), *Advances in adolescent development: Vol. 6. Relationships during adolescence* (pp. 168-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1997). Adolescent romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. In S. Shulman & W. A. Collins (Eds.), *New directions for child development: No. 78. Romantic relationships in adolescence: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 21-36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1999). *The Behavioral Systems Questionnaire-Revised*. Unpublished measure, University of Denver, Denver, CO.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (2001). *The Behavioral Systems Questionnaire-Manual*. Manuscript in preparation.
- George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1985). *An adult attachment interview*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Berkeley.
- Hazan, C., Hutt, M., Sturgeon, J., & Bricker, T. (1991, March). *The process of relinquishing parents as attachment figures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 511-524.
- Hesse, E. (1999). The Adult Attachment Interview: Historical and current perspectives. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment theory and research* (pp. 395-433). New York: Guilford.
- Larson, R., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G., Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E. (1996). Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengage-

- ment and transformation. *Child Development*, 32, 744–754.
- Lieberman, M., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (1999). Developmental patterns in security of attachment to mother and father in late childhood and early adolescence: Associations with peer relations. *Child Development*, 70, 202–213.
- Main, M. (1999). Attachment theory: Eighteen points with suggestions for future studies. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 845–887). New York: Guilford Press.
- Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1998). *Adult attachment scoring and classification systems*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Berkeley.
- Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1–2, Serial No. 209).
- Owens, G., Crowell, J. A., Pan, H., Treboux, D., O'Connor, E., & Waters, E. (1995). The prototype hypothesis and the origins of attachment working models: Adult relationships with parents and romantic partners. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 60(Nos. 2 & 3, Serial No. 244).
- Shaver, P. R., Belsky, J., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). The Adult Attachment Interview and self-reports of romantic attachment: Associations across domains and methods. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 25–44.
- Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., & Carlson, E. A. (1999). One social world: The integrated development of parent-child and peer relationships. In W. A. Collins & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Relationships as developmental contexts: The 30th Minnesota Symposia on Child Development* (pp. 241–261). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sroufe, L. A., & Fleeson, J. (1986). Attachment and the construction of relationships. In W. Hartup & Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Relationships and development* (pp. 51–71). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Suess, G. J., Grossmann, K. E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1992). Effects of infant attachment to mother and father on quality of adaptation in preschool: From dyadic to individual organization of self. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 15, 43–65.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Bakermans-Kranenberg, M. J. (1996). Attachment representations in mothers, fathers, adolescents, and clinical groups: A meta-analytic search for normative data. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 8–21.
- Ward, M. J., & Carlson, E. A. (1995). Associations among adult attachment representations, maternal sensitivity, and infant-mother attachment in a sample of adolescent mothers. *Child Development*, 66, 69–79.
- Wartner, U., Grossmann, K., Fremmer-Bombik, E., & Suess, G. (1994). Attachment patterns at age six in south Germany: Predictability from infancy and implications for preschool behavior. *Child Development*, 65, 1014–1027.