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ABSTRACT

In order to understand why individuals differ in their use of facework strategies, the current study evaluated the two dimensional attachment construct as a predictor of coping style. This study aimed to determine how attachment theory, specifically the constructs of anxiety and avoidance, predict factors within face theory, specifically distancing, pursuing, and criticizing during a romantic conflict.

Undergraduate participants (N = 306) completed a questionnaire measuring their attachment style as well as their preferred type of responses to hypothetical interpersonal conflicts with their significant other. Results indicated that avoidance is a significant predictor of distancer behaviors. Additionally, results expressed that anxiety is a significant predictor of distancing and pursuing behaviors. The findings also suggest that criticism is correlated with anxiety, avoidance, and correlated with pursuing behaviors. The current study contributes to attachment theory and face theory research by replicating past findings, but by also considering for the first time the variable of criticism within this context.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Facework refers to ways people cooperatively attempt to promote both others’ and one's own sense of self-esteem, autonomy, and solidarity in conversation (Goffman, 1955). Facework is a matter of self-regulation and the ritual recreation of face, or the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself (Goffman, 1955). Additionally, there is plenty to learn about what influences facework, and attachment provides a possibility that has not received much research attention. One important focus for this study is facework behaviors. This study examines how attachment patterns influence the way people respond to confrontational, face threatening scenarios in romantic relationships. In order to link attachment patterns to behavior, emotional appraisals must also be thought about (Lazarus, 1991). Appraisal theory explains the relationship between attachment and facework behaviors. Appraisal theory has centrality to the study because a person needs to assess and make a judgment about how they view an action in a face-to-face encounter (Scherer, 1999).

Bowlby (1982) emphasized the importance of emotion regulation, psychological well-being, and mental health of relational bonds with people who are available, sensitive, and supportive in times of need. Having relational bonds allows a person to cope constructively with stressful events, maintain self-esteem, and uphold emotional stability (Zhang, 2012). Thus the emotions and behaviors of romantic partners can play a significant role in distress regulation and psychological growth. Furthermore, the potential or actual loss of a romantic relationship often produces severe emotional dysregulation (Bowlby, 1982). The romantic relationship context is
being used for the current study because romantic relationships are of extreme importance to individuals. People care about their significant other on a different and more intense level than they do about their friends (Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000).

For the present study the theoretical construct face is examined in detail. Face is the identity individuals strive to project during social interactions with others (Goffman, 1955, 1967). Most people want to have a positive face and show themselves in a positive light, and successfully upholding face for oneself and others requires skillful communication (Goffman, 1955; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; Zhang, Cao, & Grigoriou, 2011). Maintaining and saving face for oneself and others allows individuals to successfully and efficiently cooperate, appear likeable, (Baumeister, 1998; Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005), and act competent (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; Vohs et al., 2005). In every relationship, people experience confrontational messages like insults, criticisms, or rejections. These are understood as "face threats" because they threaten the self-image of the person. Individuals are generally motivated to maintain and save face for both themselves and others because face loss can cause embarrassment (Goffman, 1959), defensiveness (Cupach & Carson, 2002; Zhang, 2005), reputation damage (Goffman, 1959), conflict (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; Wilson et al., 1998), and relational dissatisfaction (Carson & Cupach, 2000; Zhang & Stafford, 2008.) If someone is failing to maintain face, in situations like those, he/she will still strive to minimize the loss of face for themselves and others through facework behaviors. Therefore, any individual attempting to resolve conflict, offer support, show affection, or persuade must understand how others perceive face threats.

In this chapter, attachment and facework are described in turn, leading to a set of hypotheses and research questions. After that, a study is described intending to discuss the relationship between attachment and facework.
Attachment Theory

Attachment is a special emotional relationship that involves an exchange of comfort, care, and pleasure. An attachment style as John Bowlby (1988) describes is a lasting psychological connectedness between human beings. Bowlby states that early experiences in childhood have an important influence on development and behavior later in life (Mongeau & Henningsen, 2008). Early attachment styles are established in childhood through the infant/caregiver relationship. Attachment patterns established early in life can lead to a number of outcomes. For example, children who are securely attached as infants tend to develop stronger self-esteem and better self-reliance as they grow older. In addition to this, Bowlby believed that attachment had an evolutionary component; it aids in survival. "The propensity to make strong emotional bonds to particular individuals [is] a basic component of human nature" (Bowlby, 1988, 3).

Attachment theory has two principle components; normative components and modal components. These are patterns of behavior and stages of development for the individual. These components help to explain deviations and differences of the attachment (Simpson & Rholes, 1998). People can have the same attachment style, but handle situations differently. A person’s attachment style affects the way individuals process interactions with others (Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005; Sadikaj, Moskowitz, & Zuroff, 2011), the nature of their communication goals (Bowlby, 1969/1982; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2004; Sadikaj, Moskowitz, & Zuroff, 2011), and their expectations of close others (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2014). Attachment style is a construct that therefore, provides promising individual-differences or explains variation in listeners’ perceptions of face threatening conversations.

For the purposes of the present study, a two dimensional construct consisting of anxiety and avoidance are proposed. These dimensions associate with the preoccupied and avoidant attachment style. The anxiety dimension characterizes people with high anxiety, leading them to pursue intimacy and validation from others,
demonstrate increased vigilance, and show hypersensitivity to signs of rejection and abandonment. The avoidant dimension characterizes people as highly dismissive, getting validation from feeling self-sufficient and having a high level of independence (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2004). Individuals that identify with high avoidance tend to withdraw and ignore whereas individuals with high anxiety tend to ask and question others to settle their anxiety (Zayas & Shoda, 2005).

Research clearly indicates that attachment can be measured in terms of two independent dimensions, attachment-related anxiety and avoidance (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). A person’s position on the anxiety dimension indicates the degree to which an individual worries that a partner will not be available and responsive in times of need. A person’s position on the avoidance dimension indicates the extent to which he or she distrusts relationship partners’ good will and strives to maintain behavioral independence, self-reliance, and emotional distance. The two dimensions are associated in theoretically predictable ways with relationship quality and adjustment.

Attachment theory helps us understand whether individuals generally interpret negative (confrontational, critical, or rejecting) messages as face challenging or face threatening. This can be seen as the subjective appraisal of threats, not simply the actual occurrence of the threat (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). This is because people activate their attachment system when they interpret an occurrence (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). When they perceive the message as face challenging, people take it as a chance to joke or smooth over the situation, or to ask or clarify a situation. When individuals perceive the message given as a threat, the threat is looked at as a hazard or a risk to their social status. A perceived threat takes the situation and makes it into a negative experience or a negative encounter. The next section will describe the two attachment styles associated with the attachment dimension with interpretation of negative messages in detail.
A Preoccupied Person

An individual who often felt neglected and abandoned as a child will still experience feelings of abandonment as an adult: This is what is called a preoccupied attachment style. The person is preoccupied with the fear that close others will abandon him or her, resulting in anxiety. Anxiety is an active variable that allows individuals to act on their feelings and express how they feel. Very often the sustained efforts to increase closeness with other people lead to dysfunctional "suffocating" behaviors that can actually drive their relational partners away. The preoccupied individual demonstrates the pattern of approaching or questioning situations because they are more likely to need comfort and support from a problem due to fear of being abandoned (Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992).

If a preoccupied individual encounters an insult or criticism said by their romantic partner, he or she may feel hurt by the comment, but are still compelled to appraise the comment as a face challenge. Because an individual with a preoccupied attachment style fears relational distance and abandonment; it is more likely that he or she will try to "smooth over" or "joke away" an insult or criticism in order to "restore closeness" (Richo, 2002). This is because the preoccupied individual will want to approach the situation rather than fight (insult back) the threat or flee from the situation (withdraw or ignore) (Richo, 2002).

An Avoidant Person

A child who often tends to avoid parents and caregivers will experience feelings of avoidance as an adult: This is what is called the avoidant attachment style. The person will have problems with and will not invest too much emotion in close relationships. Avoidance is a passive style that pushes people to hide away or escape from how they feel and not address an issue. This leads to a fear of commitment in adult relationships and dismissiveness. An avoidant person attempts to manage those
feelings through shunning/evading behaviors such as ignoring calls or texts, or not making plans to see their significant other. These actions are ways that people strive to decrease the closeness and connections they feel with emotionally close others. An avoidant person’s cognition or thinking is consumed with thoughts of feeling emotionally self-sufficient, emotionally detached, and they are only focused on themselves as an individual (Bartholomew & Horowitz et al., 1991).

Avoidant individuals perceive closeness as threatening and tend to see bids for attention like texts, making plans, or phone calls as intrusive and anxiety provoking. They are not consciously aware of their attachment need which makes an avoidant person’s thinking dismissing and disinterested (Bartholomew & Horowitz et al., 1991). Very often the sustained efforts to decrease closeness with other people leads to dysfunctional feelings of escaping and suppressing feelings and can leave their partner questioning what has gone wrong (Richo, 2012). If an avoidant individual encounters an insult or criticism, he or she may not feel compelled to appraise the comment as a challenge and would rather see the comment as a threat to fight (insult back) or flee (withdraw or ignore). If seen as a threat, it is likely that he or she will try to "get defensive" or "critique" an insult or criticism in order to "not take part in the situation". He or she may feel angry by the encounter and may not want to answer the comment at all. If in contrast an avoidant person appraises the insult or criticism as a “challenge,” he or she is more likely to ignore the comment. This is because they want to drop the topic and the insult in order to preserve relational distance due to fear of emotional closeness. An understanding of the manner in which people with differing attachment styles react to actions performed by other people requires a discussion of face theory.
Face Theory

All people have a social self, a public image, or a face (Goffman, 1955; Cupach & Metts, 2008). Face is the identity individuals project during social interactions with others. It is also a projected image of oneself. When one has face concern there is an interest in maintaining one’s face or the face of others. Correspondingly, saving face is how people keep the reputation and respect of others while maintaining their identity (Cupach & Metts, 2008). When people chose to withhold something that will make another feel bad about themselves, they are doing so in order to save another’s face (Goldsmith, 2007).

Individuals want to keep their presence clean and shown in a good light (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987). For example, if one chooses to disclose something that may be of harm about a person, one must know that loss of face will occur for the receiver. Losing face is when information or action discredits the image that one is putting forth (Cupach & Metts, 2008; Goffman, 1955, 1967). When people lose face, they become flustered, embarrassed, and even shamefaced. The loss of face feeling in a face-to-face interaction in romantic relationships can be detrimental to other relationships just because of the level of upset and humiliation that occurs.

A face threatening act is one that challenges or threatens the social identity that one has put into play. For example, being criticized or rejected by another may threaten a person’s sense of esteem or value. Individuals naturally want to try and control how others view themselves on a regular basis. Once a person formulates that there is an appraised threat or challenge, the individuals’ coping strategy choice will lead to facework behavior. The type of person and their attachment style influences their preferences for specific facework and coping strategies.
Coping Response Styles

Coping response styles are ways in which an individual chooses to react to actions done by their significant other (Richo, 2010). There are two coping response styles, distancing and pursuing. Fogarty (1979) first coined the terms pursuer and distancer and suggested that this dynamic was a way to avoid or enhance closeness. Fogarty (1979) believed that pursuing and distancing are generally stable traits and that no one is a pure pursuer or distancer; rather, everyone has a primary tendency towards one of these extremes. Some individuals can sway more toward the pursuing side or more toward the distancing. The sway toward one side will represent how the individual embraces more qualities and characteristics of one coping style (Betchen, 2005). Both people that pursue and people that distance have been noted to have a fear of intimacy; the former were found to be related to anxious preoccupied attachment patterns and the latter were observed to be related to fearful avoidant attachment patterns.

Distancers will appraise face threats differently than pursuers and engage in dissimilar facework strategies. Distancers will be more standoffish and pursuers will approach the situation head on with no shame in questioning (Betchen, 2005; Richo, 2010). Pursuers tend to be “go-getters” and attack the situation and distancers try to escape reality and put off what might come up in the future. Distancing can be seen as a form of defense because the individual wants to have a better sense of autonomy (Bartholomew & Horowitz et al., 1991), while pursuing can be seen as a strategy or tactic to engage in a better sense of feeling close to another individual.

These coping styles are particularly important in face-to-face interactions, in which a message is always sent not only by the verbal message, but also by nonverbal behaviors. Nonverbal behaviors can include the tone or infliction of voice of the individual sending the message. For example, if an individual threatens your positive face by insulting your personality and calling you a name in a loud voice, the message
that is being sent by the name caller is that they do not like you and are making fun of you. That can make you feel embarrassed or shamefaced, and the repercussions of this action are that you might want to react by fighting (approaching) or fleeing (running away) from the situation.

Ultimately, when it comes to distancing or pursuing, the individual must answer the question of, “Is proximity seeking a viable option” (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007)? If the answer is yes than the individual will pursue the relationship and if the answer is no the individual will distance the relationship (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). An individual can tend to pursue or distance more than others, but pursuing and distancing constantly occur in a romantic relationship.

Criticism

Distancers and pursuers are usually looked at in the context of withdrawing and accommodating. The current study looks at the criticism dimension for distancing and pursuing as well. Criticism is the practice of judging the merits and faults of something or someone in an articulate way. In the literature about attachment styles, fear of abandonment and fear of closeness are always mentioned and discussed heavily, but criticism is seldom talked about. Criticism will be included in the current study because it does not receive enough attention when discussing the coping style of an individual. Criticism should be talked about because it can often be destructive, personal and not constructive. Individuals may try to personally attack another by saying “I don’t like you” or “I don’t want to be around your attitude”. Statements like these can offend others and damage relationships. Furthermore, Ainsworth and Bell’s (1970) findings suggest that preoccupied toddlers got angry with their mother after they displayed fear. This study is testing to find the same pattern of fear followed by an approach to anger in adult relationships. Emotions such as anger or hatred can be displayed because of an individual using the criticizing coping style.
In the conceptual model a comprehensive system of related variables that shows how individual differences in attachment styles influence both the cognitive mechanism for social confrontation and the facework strategies people enact when they feel threatened is presented. Additionally, this system of variables helps us to see what kinds of attachment patterns and cognitive responses are associated with distancer and pursuer behaviors. The type of attachment style a person holds influences the manner in which people appraise the face threats they receive and should predict the coping behavior that is used during a face-to-face encounter.

Integrating attachment theory with face theory is beneficial to understand facework behaviors within an interpersonal romantic relationship. Currently researchers have little information on how people behave with criticism in confrontational scenarios within the romantic relationship, and this study wishes to find support in the theoretical and conceptual variables of confrontational scenarios.

The following study proposes 4 hypotheses.
H1a: Attachment Anxiety is positively associated with pursuer behaviors
H1b: Attachment Anxiety is positively associated with distancer behaviors
H2a: Attachment Avoidance is positively associated with distancer behaviors
H2b: Attachment Avoidance is negatively associated with pursuer behaviors

Additionally, two research questions can be proposed. Anxiety and avoidance are likely to inform appraisals of speaker intention, severity of emotional reaction, and attentiveness to certain types of messages, especially in the context of intimate relationships.

RQ1: How does the interaction between anxiety and avoidance relate to pursuer behavior?
RQ2: How does the interaction between anxiety and avoidance relate to distancer behavior?

Furthermore, research questions are asked about a previously unexamined dimension of criticism within anxiety and avoidance.

RQ3: How is anxiety related to criticism?
RQ4: How is avoidance related to criticism?
RQ5: How are pursuing and distancing related to criticism?
Chapter 2

METHODS

This study assesses the influence of adult attachment and discusses the different dimensions (avoidance and anxiety) with the preference for distancer or pursuer types of coping styles in response to a face threat from a hypothetical relational partner. A pilot test established reliability and validity of emotion subscales and of facework behavior prompts in scenarios. A questionnaire measured the level of attachment-related anxiety, the level of attachment-related avoidance, and the coping styles (facework strategies) a participant preferred in response to the positive face threat scenarios. Measuring attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance allows the proposed investigation to assess adult attachment as a possible predictor of the kinds of facework behaviors individuals prefer when associating with distancing or pursuing.

Procedure for Pilot Questionnaire

A pilot test was conducted to determine validity of composed facework behavior prompts. The proposed study involves a standard questionnaire designed to include the resulting validated pilot measures. Pilot study participants (N=41) included University of Delaware undergraduate/graduate students currently enrolled in COMM 343 and COMM 418/618 classes.

The intent of the pilot test was to test for severity of emotional response, level of realism, and engagement in behavior based upon scenario. The pilot test included the following six scenarios, all of which included esteem face threats within romantic relationships: “Imagine that your partner seems upset and when you ask them what's
wrong, they say that you wouldn't understand”, “Imagine that your partner strongly
criticizes how you act or behave”, “Imagine that your partner forgets your birthday”,
“Imagine that your partner insults your opinion about something you really feel
strongly about”, “Imagine that your partner rejects you when they ask you to consider
moving in with them”, and “Imagine that your partner doesn't notice your new
haircut”.

All questionnaire items were in the form of six-point Likert scales with the
points labelled strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree
and strongly agree. The first set of questions comprised six items measuring for level
of emotional response. The questions asked for emotional responses relevant to
esteem needs (“left out” “alone”, “rejected”, and “abandoned”) and autonomy needs
(e.g., “smothered,” or “pushed around”). Higher scores on items in this dimension
indicated more severe feelings.

The second set of questions consisted of two items assessing how realistic the
scenarios were perceived by the participants. The questions were measuring how
likely it is that someone might be in the situation and how realistic the scenario is.
Higher scores on items in this dimension indicated a more realistic scenario.

The third and final set of questions, included 14 items, measuring the types of
behaviors participants would engage in after reading the scenarios. The specific
behavior was reflected in the categories of withdraw, pursue, and criticize. Within the
withdraw category, the behaviors are “Give them the silent treatment,” “Act like I
don't care and blow it off,” “Avoid them,” “Seem disinterested,” and “Ignore it”.
Within the pursue category the behaviors are “Do what I can to make the other person
happy,” “Ask them if they're unhappy with me,” “Say or do something to seek
reassurance,” “Ask if they still love me,” and “Do something nice to make things
better”. Lastly the criticize category encompasses the behaviors of “say something
angry to my partner about it,” “say something critical to my partner about it,” “let my partner know how much it upset me,” and “let my partner know that I was mad about it”.

**Analysis of Pilot**

The Cronbach’s alpha reliability analyses represented a strong reliability across the behaviors of withdraw (.857), pursue (.810), and criticize (.760) for the pilot study. Moreover, the means of the withdraw, pursue, and criticize variables were all fairly similar (Appendix C). On the contrary, the means of the behaviors within the individual scenarios were not as similar and more spread out (ranging from 2-5). This could mean that the scenarios could have affected the means, which is not ideal.

For the purposes of the present study, “Ignore it” for the withdraw items and “Do what I can to make the other person happy” for the pursue items were dropped in the behavior subscales in order to make the survey shorter and the reliability of the items higher. In addition, the perceived realism of the scenarios was acceptable, ranging from 3.9 to 4.79 on a six-point scale.

Instead of having six scenario prompts for the final study, four scenarios were used because two scenarios “Imagine that your partner doesn't notice your new haircut” and “Imagine that your partner strongly criticizes how you act or behave”, lack emotional upset and realism. The average perceived realism score among the four remaining scenarios is acceptable (M = 4.49).

**Main Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the link between attachment style and facework behavior based on an individual’s choice of coping styles. The main study presented an 83-item questionnaire. The questionnaire included hypothetical face threatening scenarios chosen from the pilot analyses which reflected how much
the participant, while relating to their imagined romantic partner, chose answers reflecting the actions of withdraw, pursue, criticize, or the concept of feeling alone. The questionnaire also included three additional variables: age, sex, and attachment security measures.

**Procedure**

The research population for the main study included 306 University of Delaware undergraduate college students, 24.8% male and 75.2% female recruited from the COMM 256 course. The mean age of the sample was 20 years old. Participants filled out a survey for extra credit or had an opportunity to complete an alternate assignment as provided by the instructor. The students who participated in the pilot study were not eligible for the proposed study to avoid cross-contamination.

The four scenarios used were “Imagine that your partner seems upset and when you ask them what's wrong, they say that you wouldn't understand”, “Imagine that your partner forgets your birthday”, “Imagine that your partner insults your opinion about something you really feel strongly about”, and “Imagine that your partner rejects you when they ask you to consider moving in with them”.

Means for the study’s main variables of alone, anxiety, avoidance, and criticism are seen in Table 1. All means remained similar. Furthermore, for each of the 4 prompts, participants also indicated the behavior they prefer or most likely to embody in on a 6-item Likert scale in response to the statement, “Thinking about the previous scenario, I would…” (See Table 2). The participants tended to want to pursue based upon the scenarios given rather than distance themselves, but even more so, participants tended to want to criticize their partner based upon the scenario given.
Table 1  Means for the Variables of Total Distance/ Pursue/ Criticize/ Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Means for Overall Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Distance</th>
<th>Total Pursue</th>
<th>Total Criticize</th>
<th>Total Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, to increase reliability the study had to make sure participants were likely to find the face threatening scenarios similar to each other. Although there were two scenarios (Scenario 1 and 2) with reliabilities that were lower than the others, overall the reliability averages of each individual scenario were in the same range. The even spread of the reliabilities between the variables distance, pursue, criticize, and alone suggests that the variables were within an appropriate range of variability; see Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3  Reliability for the Scale of Items Measuring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Distance</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pursue</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Criticize</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alone</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4  
Reliability for the Overall Scenarios for the Scale of Items Measuring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Distance</th>
<th>Total Pursue</th>
<th>Total Criticize</th>
<th>Total Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment Measures**

The Experiences in the Close Relationship Scale (ECR)-Short Form (Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, & Vogel, 2007) measures attachment security. Respondents indicate levels of agreement or disagreement (1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree) with the 12-item ECR-S (e.g., “I am nervous when partners get too close to me”). The ECR-S includes two 6-item scales, one to assess anxiety and one to assess avoidance. Wei et al. (2007) report alpha coefficients ranging from .77 to .86 for the anxiety subscale and from .78 to .88 for the avoidance subscale across 6 different studies while similarly the current study report alpha coefficients ranging from .75 to .83 for the anxiety subscale and from .76 to .86 for the avoidance subscale.

According to Wei et al. (2007), “the psychometric properties (i.e., internal consistency, test-retest reliability, factor structure, and validity) of the short (12-item) version of the scale appeared to be comparable or equivalent to the original (36-item) version of the scale” (p. 203). The ECR-S is the most suitable self-report attachment measure due to its valid and reliable assessment of the anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment, which are of primary importance to the current study. See Appendix A for the full item listing of the ECR-S.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has described the pilot study and its validation of the measures used in the current investigation. This chapter has also described the operationalization of the variables of interest and outlined the statistical procedures conducted for the pilot study and the main study analysis. The following chapter will
include the results of these analyses and present interpretations of the findings for the hypotheses presented in Chapter 1.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

The current study presented hypothetical face threatening scenarios about romantic relationships and analyzed the relationships through the two coping styles of pursuing and distancing and the two attachment constructs of anxiety and avoidance. This chapter includes descriptive statistics, linear regressions, and bivariate correlations for the major variables of distance, pursue, criticize, and alone. These variables represent the feelings of distancing or avoiding away from a romantic partner (Distance), pursuing or initiating a romantic partner (Pursue), and criticizing by saying or acting in a rude way to your romantic partner (Criticize). Additionally, the regressions were performed to use the interaction effect of avoidance and anxiety into the regression as the second block of variables to see if distancing and pursuing had a significant relationship with the interaction effect as well.

Post-hoc statistical power analyses were conducted for the sample size of 306 using G*Power3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). For the regressions, post-hoc power analyses revealed power estimates of 1.00 for large and medium effect sizes and .52 for small effect sizes. For the correlations, power estimates were 1.00 for .3 and .97 for .2.

Regression Equation 1: Distancing as the Dependent Variable

Hypothesis 1b predicted that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with distancer behaviors. Additionally, Hypothesis 2a predicted that attachment avoidance is positively associated with distancer behaviors. RQ2 inquired, how does the interaction between anxiety and avoidance relate to distancer behavior? In the first
regression analysis, distancing was set as the dependent variable and anxiety and avoidance constituted the first block of independent variables. A second block of variables, anxiety multiplied by avoidance, constituted an interaction variable. Results indicated that the avoidant attachment style and the anxious attachment style accounted for 14.5% of the explained variance of global distance, $R^2 = .145$, $F(2, 303) = 25.788, p < .001$. Anxiety was a significant predictor of distancing, $\beta = .247, t = 4.579, p < .001$, supporting H1b. Avoidance was also a significant predictor of distancing, $\beta = .329, t = 6.136, p < .001$, supporting H2a.

In answer to RQ2, the interaction effect between the avoidant attachment style and the anxious attachment style was entered into the equation, which increased the $R^2$ of the model very slightly. $R^2$ change = .004, $F$ change (1, 302) = 1.496, but as the interaction term was added it produced an insignificant effect (.222). The insignificant results represent that the interaction between anxiety and avoidance did not find an effect relating to distancing behavior. See Tables 5, 6 and 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.145</td>
<td>25.788</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Regression 1: Distancing as the Dependent Variable: Model Summary

Table 6 Regression 1: Distancing as the Dependent Variable: Model Summary-Change Statistics
Table 7  Regression Equation 1: Predicting Distancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F Total</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>25.788</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.136***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.597***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>27.284</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Equation 2: Pursuing as a Dependent Variable**

Hypothesis 1a predicted that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with pursuer behaviors and Hypothesis 2b predicted that attachment avoidance is negatively associated with pursuer behaviors. RQ1 inquired, how does the interaction between anxiety and avoidance relate to pursuer behavior? A second regression analysis was performed in which pursuing was the dependent variable. Results indicated that the avoidant attachment style and the anxious attachment style accounted for 20.6% of the explained variance of global pursue, $R^2 = .206, F (2, 303) = 39.273, p < .001$. Anxiety was a significant predictor of pursuing, $\beta = .436, t = 8.431, p < .001$, supporting H1a. However, avoidance was not a significant predictor of pursuing in the negative direction. Pursuing did not decrease as avoidance increased. Hypothesis 2b was not supported $\beta = -.075, t = -1.457$.

Relevant to RQ1, the interaction between the avoidance attachment style and the anxious attachment style was entered into the equation, which increased the $R^2$ of the model slightly. $R^2$ change = .005, $F$ change $(1,302) = 1.975$, but as after the interaction term was added it produced an insignificant effect. (.161).
insignificant results represent that the interaction between anxiety and avoidance did not find an effect relating to pursuing behavior. See Tables 8, 9, and 10 below.

**Table 8**  Regression 2: Pursuing as the Dependent Variable: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.454a</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.459b</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9**  Regression 2: Pursuing as the Dependent Variable: Model Summary - Change Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.206</td>
<td>39.273</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10**  Regression Equation 2: Predicting Pursuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R2 Total</th>
<th>F Total</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>30.273</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>8.431***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>32.248</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anxiety | .625 | 4.347***
---|---|---
Interaction Effect | .272 | -1.406

**Correlations**

Three additional research questions were asked in order to find out (RQ3) how anxiety was related to criticism, (RQ4) how avoidance was related to criticism and (RQ5) how pursuing and distancing were related to criticism. Relevant to RQ 3, anxiety and criticism are correlated $r=.379$, $p<.001$. As anxiety increased, the preference for engaging in criticism increased. In RQ4, avoidance was correlated negatively with criticism $r=-.146$, $p<.05$. The more avoidant a person is the less likely they will engage in criticism. Moreover RQ5, pursuing was related to criticism, but distancing was not. As the desire to pursue increased, the preference for criticism also increased, $r=.478$, $p<.001$. There was no relationship between distancing and criticism, $r=.094$, $p=.101$

**Conclusion**

In summary, the results of the study supported H1a, H1b, H2a, but did not support H2b. Attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance tested to be positively associated with distancer behaviors. Additionally, attachment anxiety tested to be positively associated with pursuer behaviors, however, attachment avoidance did not test negatively associated with pursuer behaviors. Furthermore, the interaction between the two attachment constructs and the distancer and pursuer behaviors did not offer any meaningful explanation for answering the question about each coping style explaining RQ1 and RQ2. As for RQ’s 3, 4, and 5, representing the variable of
criticism, anxiety and criticism were correlated. Additionally, avoidance was correlated negatively with criticism and pursuing was correlated with criticism, but distancing was not. The next chapter will discuss the theoretical and practical implications of these findings and present directions for future studies.
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between the two dimensions of anxiety and avoidance on preferences for facework strategies (pursuing, distancing, and criticizing) in response to face threats. This was done in an effort to further the theoretical underpinnings of this project, attachment theory, and face theory. The study provided practical insights into facework within close romantic relationships.

In sum, the results reported here suggest that when under face threat, individuals who identify with high avoidance prefer distancing behaviors such as avoiding and ignoring in response to a face threat from a romantic partner. In contrast, individuals who identify with high anxiety choose pursuing behaviors such as questioning and approaching or joking and smoothing over, and also favor distancing behaviors such as ignoring and avoiding. These individuals select both methods when dealing with a conflict and also use criticism in response to a face threat from a romantic partner. This next section shall provide both a theoretical overview of the results reported prior and a hypothesis-by-hypothesis break down of the results.

Theoretical Overview

The results reported here extend our understanding of attachment theory, face theory, and facework behaviors. Prior research has shown that differences in culture influence the importance of specific face needs when making requests from others that lead to distinctly different forms of request making (Cai & Wilson, 2009). The current results suggest that in conjunction with a specific face threatening situation,
relationship between the romantic partners, and pursuing and distancing, attachment styles also contribute to the types of behaviors individuals may employ to restore their social and relational identity when they feel it is under threat. One useful dichotomy within facework behaviors suggested by the current project is distancer and pursuer behaviors. This distinction captures the sense in which a person may defend their social and relational identity by creating or reducing interpersonal distance between themselves and the partner engaging in face threatening behavior.

The findings of the current study are theoretically consistent with the logic of attachment theory. Attachment theory holds that individuals are often haunted by the childhood fears of the past in their adult relationships (Bowlby, 1988). For example, individuals who felt abandoned by caregivers as children re-experience their fear as preoccupied adults in close relationships and manifest their feelings of abandonment with their partners when they feel threatened. Behaviors such as joking and smoothing over are both care-taking approaches that are motivated by the need to reduce distance in the event of a face-threat. Likewise, criticizing the partner for their face threats is an aggressive approach behavior motivated by the desire to discourage actions that trigger feelings of abandonment. Hence, fears of abandonment result in behaviors geared toward reducing distance. The findings reported here suggest a similar pattern with regard to avoidance and is characterized by a fear of engulfment: Individuals with high avoidance preferred distancing actions such as ignoring and avoiding. In other words, as described by attachment theory, fears of engulfment lead to behaviors that increase a sense of distance between partners.

A third perspective, excitation transfer theory, affords a useful explanation as to why caretaking approach behaviors such as smoothing over and joking are also associated with aggressive approach behaviors like criticism. Excitation transfer holds that one kind of emotional arousal can transfer and transform into another. The theory
implies that preoccupied individuals go from anxiety to aggression and anger (Zillmann, Katcher, & Milavsky, 1972). In contrast, avoidant folks withhold their anger and aggression as yet another form of distancing.

**Results Summary and Implications**

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that attachment anxiety would be positively associated with pursuer behaviors and was supported. An individual with high anxiety wants to feel close to their significant other and not feel abandoned. In order to maintain a positive connection, individuals that are highly anxious feel they should seek reassurance involving intimacy. They constantly approach the relationship because they worry if they do not pursue negative outcomes will follow. Anxiety and pursuing characteristics aim to seek out comfort and support from a romantic partner. An individual who pursues cannot deal well with interpersonal space and they like to constantly ask and question their romantic partner in order to satisfy their needs.

The prediction that attachment anxiety is positively associated with distancing behaviors was supported. Even though anxiety is often associated with “clinginess” or “neediness”, being anxious can also cause people to distance themselves from their problems or fears. Hence, anxiety represents a type of feeling that may exacerbate relational procrastination or fear of commitment. An avoidant person who distances does not like extended togetherness and needs alone time. Moreover, if an individual with high anxiety expresses distancing characteristics, they may pretend to themselves that they don’t have attachment needs and may bury their feelings of distress, which can cause more anxiety. It is not that the needs of attachment do not exist, rather they are just being repressed and not dealt with properly.
Hypothesis 2

The prediction that higher attachment avoidance is positively associated with distancer behaviors was supported. The highly avoidant individual tends to evade closeness, because their independence and self-sufficiency are more important than their intimacy. Someone with high avoidance is hyper vigilant about their partner’s attempts to control them or limit their autonomy and freedom in any way (Bowlby, 1969). Additionally, they engage in distancing behaviors with their romantic partner by flirting to reduce the seriousness of the relationship, making autonomous decisions, ignoring their partner, or dismissing their feelings and needs and only focusing on themselves. Their partner may complain that they don’t seem to need their significant other or that they are not open to communication enough, because they keep secrets or don’t share feelings often. This in turn makes the person with high avoidance feel self-sufficient because their partner seems needy (Monin, Feeney, & Schulz, 2012).

The hypothesis that attachment avoidance is negatively associated with pursuer behaviors was not supported. It is important to note, however, that a small but insignificant correlation in the predicted negative direction was found. The direction for the hypothesis was correct, but the effect size was not enough to have reported significance. This small effect size however may be a result of the chosen situations and behaviors. The situations may have better captured pursuing situations as opposed to distancing situations for a romantic relationship because, generally, people with an avoidant attachment style tend to not display pursuing characteristics (Fogarty, 1979).

Research Questions 1 and 2

The interaction between anxiety and avoidance were found not to relate to distancer or pursuer behavior. The fact that anxiety and avoidance are opposite ends of the same continuum may have caused multicollinearity. For the interaction effect
of anxiety and avoidance to be significant these two variables would need to be different enough to distinguish.

Research Questions 3, 4, and 5

Anxiety was found to be positively related to criticism. Criticizing a partner in a face threatening situation is an angry approach motivated by the desire to discourage behaviors that trigger feelings of abandonment. If an anxious person demonstrates feelings of anger, these feelings can be expressed as actions of aggression. This is because the anger is covering up the feelings of anxiety. On a different note, avoidance was found to be negatively related to criticism. Criticism does not need to be expressed by an avoidant person because they want to avoid the altercation or negative encounter all together. Moreover, pursuing was related to criticism, but distancing was not. Pursuing which was associated with an anxious attachment style was also associated with a preference for criticism as a form of facework. Avoidant individuals do not want to express aggression and anger because they want to get away from the conflict all together. Pursuing can lead to lashing out while distancing is an attempt by the avoidant individual to ignore the altercation.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

One implication suggested by this study is the codependence of preoccupied and avoidant attachment styles when joined together in a relationship. High attachment anxiety individuals are usually disinterested in other high attachment anxiety people. The “seduce and retreat” of an avoidant attachment style in romance is both stimulating and unsettling in that it reactivates abandonment fears with relationships and beliefs about not being “enough”, lovable, or securely loved. Similar to the attachment styles, distancers need someone pursuing them to sustain their emotional needs and pursuers need some distancing them to balance out their
questioning and insecure thoughts. Distancing and pursuing tend to coincide with each other and there are extreme amounts of both actions in romantic relationships even if a person identifies solely with one coping style.

Practically, the pursuer-distancer dynamic is understood among relational therapists as one of the most challenging dynamics for romantic couples to manage (Fogarty, 1979). The present study helps to clarify the relationship between attachment and behavior. Doing so may further not only our understanding of human behavior, but may also aid in a couple seeking a better understanding of the “source” or a partner’s challenging behavior.

This study found that people with high anxiety like to pursue and people with avoidance like to pursue and distance. Previous research, (Betchen, 2005) tends to associate distancing with avoidance and pursuing with anxiety, but the results of this study suggest that this not always the case. Although in some sense, this study replicates earlier findings (Betchen, 2005) concerning attachment styles and coping styles while providing further insight to the role that criticism performs for the anxious attachment style.

**Methodological Limitations**

Although this study produced significant and unique findings, interpretations of the results must also consider limitations. A limitation of the current study is that the sample of college students represents a small, but highly relevant, section of the general population. Although not representative of the general public, the college student sample is a group of people that experience romantic relationships which are relevant to attachment and face issues. In addition, there were significantly more females than males, possibly biasing results. Additional research should consider a more diverse population.
A small number of scenarios in the pilot and main survey is another limitation to the study. Even though the pilot test uncovered realistic and believable scenarios, other scenarios could have been considered which may have activated different emotions among participants. This study can only demonstrate the generalizations about coping styles and attachment styles through the six scenarios given.

Another limitation was that the present study did not have a positively related hypothesis for avoidance and pursuing characteristics. This implied that if avoidance increased the probability of pursuing behaviors would increase. There was however a hypothesis for a positive relationship between avoidance and distancing characteristics. As a consequence, pursuing did not receive as much attention as did distancing.

Lastly, Research questions 3-5 could not predict direction for the variables relating to criticism. In asking about criticism in research question form, one can only assume the directional interest. In reality a correlation is non-directional and the relationship is the most critical aspect. Further research should make predictions about the variable criticism so additional authors can support this study's assumptions.

**Further Research**

The results of the current study suggest directions for future research. To begin, they further illustrate the need for more studies to be related to criticism. Additionally, future studies should take into consideration appraisal theory. If appraisal theory was discussed in this study as the lynch pin between attachment theory and face theory the study could have added more depth and breadth to its findings. Future studies could also discuss the concept of “threat” and “challenge” being a variable instead of just a characteristic of distancers and pursuers. Researchers can look at how participants perceive/view scenarios and whether they see them as a challenge or as a threat as a part of facework. Future research can also look into distancers and pursuers as a characteristic rather than a trait. When is it possible to
pursue or distance in a specific situation as a communicative strategy independent of one’s attachment style? Furthermore, many studies work with the romantic relationship facet because it has been tested to activate participants enough in surveys. People see these relationships as realistic and likely to occur, but another question to answer in relation to relationships is how would people pursue and distance between friendships or family relationships? Is the romantic relationship the only relationship worth finding out about?

**Summary of Findings and Conclusion**

This study revealed that attachment functions as a meaningful predictor of coping style. Specifically, attachment anxiety significantly predicts distancing and pursuing, while attachment avoidance significantly predicts distancing behaviors. Additionally, the interaction effect of avoidance and anxiety did not find significant results with pursuing and distancing. The variable of criticism is a new addition to the attachment and coping style research and it was found that criticism was correlated positively with anxiety and pursing and avoidance was correlated negatively with criticism. Unexpectedly, distancing was not correlated with criticism at all. In conclusion, the current study replicated the findings of previous research.
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Appendix A  

ATTACHMENT SCALE

Table 11  Attachment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33R</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35R</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27R</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22R</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I do not often worry about being abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I am nervous when partners get too close to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Items are reverse-coded. The order of the final 12-item short version is 33R, 18, 11, 26, 35R, 16, 17, 22R, 27R, 32, 13, and 6.
## Appendix B

**PURSUER/DISTANCER SCALE**

### Table 12  Pursuer/Distancer Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pursuer Characteristics</th>
<th>Distancer Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot easily pull back when a partner needs space</td>
<td>Cannot easily make a commitment when a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clings or cannot seem to get enough contact</td>
<td>Distances or cannot seem to get enough space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is overly attentive, overly accepting, overly allowing</td>
<td>Takes a partner’s attentions for granted or feels smothered by them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingly shares feelings and information</td>
<td>Maintains secrets or a secret life and may become angry at being asked questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes more care of a partner than himself/herself</td>
<td>Feels entitled to be taken care of without reciprocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels he/she can never give enough</td>
<td>Construes giving and receiving as smothering or obligating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes along with a partner’s agenda or timing</td>
<td>Insists on being in control and making the decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has poor boundaries and tolerates abuse, unhappiness or infidelity</td>
<td>Maintains rigid boundaries and has no tolerance for abuse, disloyalty, or deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is addicted to the partner and keeps giving more</td>
<td>Seduces the other and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is encouraged by a partner’s exuberance</td>
<td>Is embarrassed or angered by assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May settle for sex as proof of love or use it to purchase feelings of security</td>
<td>May use frequent sex as a substitute for closeness or withhold sex to manipulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May use appropriate sexual boundaries to please the other being defenseless against predation</td>
<td>May use sexual distance or lack of interest as a way of maintaining independence, a defense against vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs a partner to be a constant companion (“Stay with me”)</td>
<td>Needs a partner to stay put while he/she comes and goes (“Let me be”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks connection and closeness Feels at a loss without the presence of a partner</td>
<td>Seeks connection but not closeness Is made anxious by extended togetherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalizes—i.e., makes excuses</td>
<td>Intellectualizes, replaces feelings with logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows fear, hides anger</td>
<td>Shows anger, hides fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walks in eggshells, always compromising</td>
<td>Acts hostile, creates uproar, or picks fights to establish distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels distress about comings/goings</td>
<td>Feels distress about giving/receiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets needs become neediness</td>
<td>Turns needs into expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks like the one reaching out, which seems like love but may really be fear</td>
<td>Looks like the cold one, which seems unloving but may really be fear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C  
**PILOT STUDY STATISTICS**

### Table 13  
**Realistic Scenario**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.7927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.9268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.5732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.7927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.4390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RL: Real/ Likely- Stands for if the scenario was realistic and likely to occur.

### Table 14  
**Scenario Making Participants Feel Alone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.8049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.4329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.6341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.6280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alone: Stands for if the scenario made the participant feel alone.

### Table 15  
**Scenario Accounting for Pursuing/ Criticizing/ Withdrawing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pursue2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.5793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursue3 41 3.0244
Pursue5 41 2.7134
Pursue6 41 3.9085
Criticize2 41 3.0793
Criticize3 41 4.5793
Criticize5 41 4.3293
Criticize6 41 3.9451
Valid N (listwise) 41

Pursue: Stands for if the scenario made the participant feel like they wanted to pursue

Criticize: Stands for if the scenario made the participant feel like they wanted to criticize

Withdraw: Stands for if the scenario made the participant feel like they wanted to withdraw

### Table 16 Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Withdraw</th>
<th>Total Pursue</th>
<th>Total Criticize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Withdraw</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pursue</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Criticize</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.501**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
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