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Attachment processes, described as both biological and psychological, are innate to humans, even during infancy (Bowlby, 1973). The biological need for attachment to the caregiver manifests itself in three different attachment styles: secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant (Ainsworth, 1978). Securely attached children are minimally upset when away from their primary caregiver and experience minimal levels of anxiety when exploring their environment. Those children with anxious/ambivalent attachment are visibly upset when separated from their caregiver and are hesitant to explore their surroundings. Children who are avoidant do not respond when removed from their primary caregiver and do not actively explore their surroundings (Ainsworth, 1978). Using attachment theory as originally formulated by Bowlby and extended by Ainsworth, researchers are able to postulate long-term attachment implications based upon these three confirmed styles. Hazan and Shaver (1987) applied attachment theory to adult relationships to explain how romantic relationships are based upon our early attachment relationships with caregivers.

Attachment schemas are manifested in a variety of ways within interpersonal relationships across the lifespan. Enmeshment is a specific type of attachment style in which there are maladaptive levels of cohesion (Barber & Buehler, 1996). Relationships that are enmeshed lack individuation or open communication between members. Partners
in enmeshed relationships may be more likely to base their self-esteem on their partner’s level of acceptance for them than those in non-enmeshed relationships. This has been termed relationship contingent self-esteem (Knee, Bush, Canevello & Cook, 2008).

Individuals with high levels of relationship contingent self esteem lack individuation and employ negative coping strategies in their romantic relationships (Knee et al., 2008).

Individuals within an enmeshed romantic relationship lack sovereignty and competence in the relationship. The individual’s enmeshment to the relationship affects his or her overall self-esteem and sense of self-worth (Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper & Bouvrette, 2005).

Attachment patterns can influence quality and satisfaction with romantic relationships. Spanier (1976) found that attachment quality was positively correlated with relationship satisfaction. Through further analysis researchers can seek to understand how attachment influences satisfaction within romantic relationships (including potential mediating factors such as relationship contingent self-esteem).

Importance of the Study

Attachment patterns and interpersonal relationship patterns tend to be relatively constant throughout adulthood and the lifespan (Barber et al., 1996). Through understanding potential problems that may impede a relationship’s success researchers can understand and improve relationship satisfaction and outcomes. Analysis of the interrelationships among attachment, relationally contingent self esteem, and relationship satisfaction could provide helpful information for practitioners regarding factors that may contribute to success and stability in romantic relationships (Mather, 2011). Research on relational conflict can also provide insights regarding abusive relationships. For
example, one reason why some individuals remain in abusive relationships is that their self-esteem is contingent on their partners’ pleasure (Knee et al., 2008). A better understanding of relational conflict and self esteem could allow therapists to generate new conceptualizations and work more effectively with their clients in the therapy setting.

**Research Questions**

A model will be proposed and tested to examine the relationships between attachment, relationally contingent self-esteem and relationship satisfaction. Each variable will be assessed using two different scales to strengthen validity. The research questions are as follows:

1. Is there a direct relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction?
2. If so, is the relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction partially mediated by relationally contingent self-esteem?
3. If not, is there a fully meditational relationship with relationship contingent self-esteem mediating between the variables of attachment and relationship satisfaction?

**Hypotheses**

1. It is hypothesized that secure attachment will be positively correlated with high levels of relationship satisfaction.
2. Further, it is hypothesized that the relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction will be partially mediated by relationship contingent self-esteem. Specifically, higher attachment security will be related to lower
levels of relationship contingent self-esteem, which will then relate to higher
levels of relationship satisfaction.
Figure 2

*Primary Model*

The relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction: as partially mediated by relationship contingent self-esteem. In this figure the circles represent the construct being tested, while the rectangles represent the scales analyzing the construct.
Figure 2
*Secondary Model*

The relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction: directly mediated by relationship contingent self-esteem. In this figure, the circles represent the construct being tested, while the rectangles represent the scales analyzing the construct.
Attachment, a prominent focus in current research, was initially introduced in 1973 by researcher and theorist Dr. John Bowlby (Bowlby 1973). Attachment manifests itself in many forms throughout the lifetime, from childhood (Ainsworth, 1978) to adult attachment related to love (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Focusing on adult attachment as it relates to love (Hazan et al., 1987), it is theorized that relationship satisfaction consists of six different kinds of love that the couple experiences in their relationship (Hendrick, Dicke & Hendrick, 1986). This satisfaction is assumed to be directly related to the levels of attachment the couple has toward each other. Relationship contingent self-esteem, a term used to describe the degree of enmeshment between romantic partners (Knee et al., 2008), can be the mediator between attachment and relationship satisfaction.

Attachment

Bowlby (1973) described a primary method of motivation that continues across a human being’s lifespan. According to Bowlby’s attachment theory, social and emotional constructs are built through the infant’s attachment with his or her primary caregiver. Parents’ and primary caregivers’ responses to their children’s needs give children an understanding of patterns within the household. These early responses to parental behavior and attachment are hypothesized by Bowlby to create frameworks by which attachment behaviors are internalized and extended throughout the lifespan (Bowlby,
1973). Bowlby coined the term *working model* to describe this lifespan development of attachment to other significant individuals in their lives (Bowlby, 1973).

According to Ainsworth (1978), there are three different types of attachment: secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant. Through the analysis of attachment between young children and their primary caregivers, it was evident that these cohesive relationships are innate from birth. Ainsworth found that children who were securely attached had primary caregivers who were consistent with their parenting methods, using both a loving demeanor and appropriate discipline. The securely attached child expressed no distress when exploring the area around their caregiver (Ainsworth, 1978).

Anxious/ambivalent children had primary caregivers who showed mixed and inconsistent responses to their children’s needs. These children were aggravated and visibly distressed upon separation from their primary caregiver; however, these children are unique because they show no signs of need or attachment upon the caregiver’s return (Bowlby, 1973).

The last form of attachment is avoidant; caregivers who are outright neglectful or snubbing to their child in regard to the child’s needs characterize this attachment. Children who display this type of attachment were open to exploring the environment around them as well as not showing any distress when their parent or primary caregiver left the room (Bowlby, 1973).

These ideas of attachment styles, along with the concept of the *working model*, pave the way for attachment to be conceptualized into later life relationship schemas (Bowlby, 1973). Through analysis it has been shown that these attachment styles are constant through the lifetime and evident in the attachment of later life romantic relationships (Hazan et al., 1987). Using a questionnaire assessing both attachment style
and relationship functions, it was found that romantic relationship attachment is related to an individual’s child/parent attachment style (Hazan et al., 1987). These attachment styles are crucial in understanding how attachment metamorphoses throughout the lifespan, creating later attachment prior to the child becoming the caregiver.

**Attachment and Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem**

Knee and colleagues (2008) coined the term “relationship contingent self-esteem” to describe how enmeshment levels affect self-esteem. Enmeshment is defined as the family patterns that emerge from a combination of psychological and emotional connection between family members (Barber et al., 1996). Enmeshment is seen as a type of negative attachment in which there is a lack of individuation between romantic partners or family members. It has been shown that highly enmeshed individuals with less participatory partners tend to take on delinquent acts (petty crimes), in which their character is altered to gain attention from their partner or family members (Lonardo, Giordano, Longmore & Manning, 2009). This pattern of behavior can affect the overall self-esteem and self-worth of the individual (Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper, & Bouvrette, 2003; Knee et al., 2008).

By definition, the word contingent is synonymous with dependence. Breaking down the term, relationship contingent self-esteem means self-esteem that is dependent on the relationship. Visual diagrams have been produced to show the degree of closeness or enmeshment perceived by individuals in their relationships over a period of time (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). Attachment either cultivates or diminishes the degree to which one person is dependent on another (Knee et al., 2008). According to Stephan and Bachman (1999), having a secure attachment schema allows individuals to decide the
amount of response they will allow themselves to give to a relationship, when responsiveness refers to closeness and reactions. Early attachment styles are learned and transferred through the lifetime, manifesting themselves later in our attachment styles in romantic relationships.

The internal working model, a primary concept in attachment theory, establishes a connection between others and the self. This indicates that our internal schema of the self governs self-esteem and self-worth and individuals’ own methods of seeking out attachment (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Contingent relationships define a person’s own attributes (i.e. self-esteem, attractiveness, self-worth) based upon their attachment to other individuals in his or her lives (Crocker et al., 2003; Knee et al., 2008). Appearance, one component of relationally contingent self esteem, refers to how an individual’s feelings about his or her appearance are contingent upon his or her partner’s thoughts or mood (Crocker et al., 2003). Attachment during adulthood is paired with physiological need; ergo, sexual interaction can be a cause of negative feelings of self-worth or self-esteem based upon their partner’s willingness or negativity toward interaction (Gillath, Mikulincer, Birnbaum, & Shaver, 2008). This displays only one type of interaction between individuals in romantic relationships, but it sheds light on the impact relationship contingent self-esteem can have on individuals who have poor attachment with a loss of individualization in which a large majority of their life is dependent on their partner’s happiness (Knee et al., 2008).

**Attachment and Relationship Satisfaction**

Rates of relationship satisfaction are dependent on multiple variables in the individual’s relationship. It has been shown that relationship satisfaction is reliant on
mood conditions (Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick 1998). These relationship satisfaction scales are shown to have multicultural implications because of the person’s own objectivity (Hendrick et al., 1998). Other priorities in relationships, such as humor, assist in improving relationship satisfaction over the lifetime (Cann, Zapata, & Davis, 2011). Therefore, by elevating the individual’s mood through means such as humor, higher levels of relationship satisfaction can be achieved. Research conducted on perceived satisfaction has shown that the individual’s support system is a large factor (Lal & Bartle-Haring, 2011). Another term used to assess this support system is attachment. Greater levels of attachment security can positively influence the overall satisfaction between partners in the relationship (Lal & Bartle-Haring, 2011).

Attachment and relationship satisfaction are two distinct processes in terms of relationships. Attachment is a primary set of schemas individuals have from birth that creates a framework for later relationships (Bowlby, 1973). Compared to this, relationship satisfaction is the process by which individuals can describe their overall fulfillment their partner encompasses during a snapshot in time (Spanier, 1976). Issues such as attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance can lead to problems with overall levels of relationship satisfaction. This is due to the individual safeguarding his or her emotions due to past experience of relationship trauma, which may have altered attachment schemas (Halchuk, Makinen & Johnson, 2010). Bowlby (1979) assumes that, because attachment bonds are connected through the lifespan, relationship distress is due to attachment distress. If this were true, relationship satisfaction or success would be due to attachment satisfaction or success. Ergo, our early attachment types (secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant) would carry on into future romantic relationships,
providing individuals with a background in how he or she believes “relationships are supposed to be.” (Denton & Burwell, 2006).

In “From the cradle to the grave;” (Bowlby, 1979) indicates that attachment is stagnant through the lifetime. This indicates that later life relationships can be altered on have different outcomes based upon how needs were met as a child. As a result of evolution, humans are wired to connect with others and form close relationship bonds (Hazan et al., 1994). This innate pull raises questions on the effects our attachment bonds have on the overall relationship satisfaction. Specific scales such as the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1981) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) are used to assess the different types and degrees of relationship satisfaction. If partners do not engage in such acts that help to increase relationships satisfaction, the relationship is more likely to disintegrate (Hazan et al., 1994). During dissolution of relationships, attachment theory shows individuals feeling lost and hopeless. This indicates that individuals who have low relationship satisfaction but remain in the relationship are unwilling to engage in this failed attachment bonds. Seeking attachment is an important drive that can foster or inhibit interpersonal relationship growth. Relationship satisfaction can be affected by this attachment as well, changing romantic relationship dynamics (Hazan et al., 1981).

Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem and Relationship Satisfaction

Contingent Self-Esteem comes at a costly price because it creates a need for reinforcement. This process impedes the individual’s own self-esteem and self-worth, giving up these internal factors for the needs of the partner (Knee et al., 2008). This contingency can diminish feelings of confidence and bring forth feelings of obedience
and submission to the “authority.” (Knee et al. (2008). Relationship quality is not one-dimensional; it varies between and within the relationship (Fletcher, Simpson & Thomas, 2000). Similarly, there are various constructs that make up the term contingency. Specifically, other views of appearance and values can actively effect an individuals overall self-worth (Crocker et al., 2003). These multidimensional explanations for factors in relationship attachment provide access to the understanding of human drive for success in the relationship.

In the wake of overcoming contingent relationships and attempting to regain positive levels of self-esteem, individuals often have fluctuating moods, which can lead to depression and severe lowering of overall self-esteem or self worth (Crocker & Knight, 2005). This yo-yo effect indicates that individuals may have difficulty regaining self-esteem or overall self-worth after relationships based upon contingency, and it is probable for them to be reverted to the accustomed strategies for dealing with stressors. Physical health may also take a toll, as individuals compensate, often resorting to alcohol consumption, drug use or other decisions that can affect their physique. Following this, having negative self-esteem caused from previous relationship can cause individuals to halt seeking supportive relationships thereby creating a negative cycle, in which self-validation is much harder to obtain (Crocker et al., 2005).

In relationships, autonomy and confidence are large factors that effect relationship satisfaction. It has been shown that autonomy alone is a large predictor of relationship satisfaction; therefore the more independence one has in his or her relationship the more he or she is content or satisfied with their partner and the overall quality within the relationship (Knee et al., 2008). Interpreting further, autonomy is seen as the opposite of
contingency, meaning that relationship satisfaction would be negatively correlated with relationship contingent self-esteem. Relationship contingent self-esteem has also been shown to cause more negative emotion in the relationship (Knee et al., 2008). It has been shown that those who were rated low or neutral in levels of self-esteem often display levels of mania in their relationship. These individuals give much of themselves and in turn are intense in their relationships and take a lot of risks (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). This indicates that individuals in contingent relationships often make intense decisions that can influence relationship quality or decrease their overall satisfaction with the relationship if these actions are not reciprocated. Other levels of relationship satisfaction are not monitored by negative self-esteem, indicating that individuals with negative or contingent self-esteem tend to be in relationships where mania can ensue (Hendrick et al., 1986).

Research questions and hypotheses

Although there are holes in the current research analysis of relationship contingent self-esteem and relationship contingent self esteem, it is evident that there is strong support for an interaction between attachment, relationship contingent self-esteem and relationship satisfaction. Through analysis of the literature, it is evident that there are several points that can be further analyzed to understand the interactions between the three focuses of the research. First, attachment is related to relationship contingent self-esteem and relationship satisfaction. Insecure attachment often has its roots with other negative traits such as lower levels of self-esteem and overall satisfaction. Specifically, it is assumed that negative attachment levels will be related to high levels of relationship contingent self-esteem and consequently lower levels of relationship satisfaction. The
research suggests that these related aspects of interpersonal/romantic relationships are directly related, specifically the relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction. Consequently it is assumed that relationship contingent self-esteem is a partially or fully mediating factor between relationship satisfaction and attachment, indicating that high levels of relationship contingent self-esteem assist in reducing relationship satisfaction when correlated with specific attachment typologies. Research indicates that all of these factors have specific roles within the relationship; however, no current research shows the interaction between all three, thereby creating a framework for how attachment, relationship contingent self-esteem and relationship satisfaction interact.
Participans

As indicated by Kline (2005), sample sizes should be above 100 participants for an interpretable structural equation model. This is for the simplest of models; however, as the model becomes more complex, sample sizes must increase for validity purposes. According to Kline, 20 participants are needed for each indicator used in the current study. Therefore, with six indicators, a minimum of 120 participants were needed for this study. A total of 385 undergraduate college students from a mid-sized Midwestern university took the study; of these, 170 students with incomplete surveys were excluded, or not meeting the original criteria of being in an exclusive relationship for a minimum of three months. Additionally, 13 students were excluded from this study because they reported being in a homosexual relationship as well as 2 participants were excluded because they reported being international students. Although these exclusions were not necessary, they were done to fulfill continuity between subjects. The remaining sample included 200 students; 82% were female and 18% were male. Students were required to currently be in an exclusive relationship that was a minimum of three months old. Relationships ranged in length from three months to twelve years ($X = 1.997, SD = 1.675$). Students were between the ages of 18 and 32 ($X = 20.65, SD = 2.48$). The student’s class rankings were 19% Freshmen, 16% Sophomores, 35% Juniors, 24.5%
Seniors and 5.5% above Senior ranking. Participants’ demographic information can be found in Table 1.

*Procedures*

Participants were recruited using the research pools of the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services (CPSY) and the Department of Psychological Sciences (PSYSC). CPSY students were recruited through an email sent to course professors recruiting students to be a part of the study. PSYSC students were recruited through an online survey database. As an incentive, course credit was provided for student participation. Participants signed up for the study either through their class or on through an online computer system and were given a web link to the online survey program, InQsit. After participants clicked on the web link, they were presented with information about the survey; once they indicated having read and understood the information, they were presented with the survey. After completion of the survey the participants were directed to a debriefing form that describes the purpose and importance of the study in which they had just participated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Relationship Length</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>3 - 6 months</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>7 - 11 months</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1 - 1.5 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 - 2 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 - 2.5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>2.6 - 3 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.1 - 3.5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>3.6 - 4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>4.1 - 4.5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior +</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.6 - 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 - 5.5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 - 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 - 6.5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6 - 7 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 - 7.5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 - 8 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Length</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  months</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>2.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

The following scales were utilized in the study and were measured in their full original form. Each scale described was used to measure one of the three specific constructs (RCSE, Attachment, and Relationship Satisfaction). Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem was assessed using the RCSE scale and the CSWS. The ECR-R and the AAQ evaluated the construct of Attachment. Relationship Satisfaction was assessed using the RAS and DAS. These scales are described further:

ECR-R. The first scale utilized to assess attachment is the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R; Fraley, Brennan, & Waller, 2000) (see Appendix A). The ECR-R measures two factors related to attachment: avoidance and anxiety. The scale is an 18-item Likert-type scale in which respondents use scores from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Scores are achieved by first reverse scoring (items 9, 11, 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 36) then summing the scores. The ECR-R provides a total score, and two subscale scores; researchers typically use the subscale scores. The current study used the subscale scores. The avoidance subscale has 9 items; a sample item is “I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be close.” The anxiety subscale has 9 items; a sample item is “I am afraid I will lose my partner’s love.” Each subscale score can range from 9-45; the lower the score, the more the respondent is experiencing anxiety or avoidance characteristics. The ECR-R had significant one-year test-retest correlation for the anxiety subscale (.94) and the avoidance subscale (.95) on undergraduate students (Fraley et al., 2000). Also, the scale showed significant levels of internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha score of above .90 for both scales (Fairchild & Finny, 2006). Discriminant validity was also found, as no relationship was
established between the social desirability scale and the ECR-R (Fairchild & Finney, 2006). Convergent construct validity was established with the ECR-R and the UCLA Loneliness Scale, \( r = .528 \) for undergraduate students (Fairchild & Finney, 2006). Cronbach’s alpha for the anxiety subscale is .724 and avoidance subscale is .709 for the current study.

**AAQ.** The second scale used to measure attachment in this study is the Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAQ; Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996) (see Appendix B). This scale was designed to assess how romantic partners relate to each other overall. The AAQ is a 17 item Likert-type scale in which respondents score from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). It is scored by first reverse scoring (items 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 16 and 17) then summing the scores. The AAQ measures attachment by assessing two distinct dimensions, anxiety and avoidance. The avoidance subscale has 8 items, with subscale scores ranging from 8 to 56; an example is “Others often are reluctant to get as close as I would like.” The anxiety subscale has 9 items with subscale scores ranging from 8 to 63; an example is “I often worry that my partner(s) don’t really love me.” The lower the score an individual has on each of the subscales, the more the participant is experiencing the behavior. Cronbach’s alpha was .70 and .74 for men and women respectively on the ambivalence subscale, and alphas ranged from .72 to .74 for the avoidance subscale, showing the scale to have appropriate levels of internal consistency for undergraduate couples (Simpson et al., 1996). Criterion validity for this measure was found in comparison with Bartholomew and Horowitz’s Relationship Questionnaire, as a moderate significant positive correlation was found and this measures a similar construct, demonstrating convergent validity. Both of these scales measure the attachment levels of
romantic interpersonal relationships. Also no significant relationship was found between the AAQ and personality measures, providing evidence of discriminant validity for undergraduate couples (Simpson et al., 1996). Cronbach’s alpha for the current study on the anxiety subscale and the avoidance subscale is .721.

**RCSE.** The first scale to assess RCSE is the Relationship Contingent Self Esteem Scale (RCSE; Knee, Bush, Cook, & Canevello, 2008) (see Appendix C). The RCSE is used to measure the extent to which self-esteem in participants is dependent on interpersonal romantic relationships. The scale is a 12-item Likert-type scale in which respondents score from 1 (Not at all like me) to 5 (Very much like me). Scores are achieved by reverse scoring specific questions first (items 7, 8 and 10), and then summing up all items. Scores can range from 12 to 60. High scores of RCSE show problematic enmeshed attachment to romantic partners, which indicates that an individual’s self-worth is overly dependent on their partner’s feelings. An example item is: “I feel better about myself when it seems that my partner and I are getting along.” Convergent validity has been demonstrated through its statistical association with the Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale, which was designed to measure a similar construct as the RCSE (Knee et al., 2008). Two-week test-retest reliability for this scale was found to be adequate at .78 for heterosexual undergraduate couples (Knee et al., 2008). Cronbach’s alpha for the current study is .725.

**CSWS.** The second scale used to measure relationship contingent self-esteem is the Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale (CSWS; Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper, & Bouvrette, 2003) (see Appendix D). This 35-item Likert-type scale measures college students’ perceptions of self-worth on seven 5-item subscales: others’ approval, appearance,
competition, academic competence, family support, virtue, and God’s love. Item responses ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). These items are scored through first reverse scoring (items 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 20 and 25), then summing up all items for each subscale. Scores may range from 5 to 35 on each subscale; the higher the score a respondent has on each subscale, the more they are experiencing the behavior. The CSWS was shown to have high levels of test-retest reliability over a nine-month period in undergraduate students (.86). Additionally, construct validity was found analyzing the CSWS and Luhtanen and Crocker’s Collective Self-Esteem scale, both of which measure similar attributes (Crocker et al., 2003). Cronbach’s alpha for the subscales of the current study are: Other’s Approval, .763; Appearance, .733; Competition, .739; Academic Competence, .728; Family Support, .718; Virtue, .727; and God’s Love. .780.

**RAS.** The first scale utilized to assess relationship satisfaction is the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1981) (See Appendix E). The purpose of the RAS is to assess the general satisfaction of the overall relationship with their romantic partner. This 7-item Likert-type scale ranges from questions about the self to those regarding the partnership as a whole. An example is as follows: “How good is your relationship compared to most?” Each question on the RAS has a different 5-point Likert-type range. For example, the question above has a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Scores are achieved by finding the average total score (summing the factors and dividing by 7). The higher the overall score, the higher the respondent’s relationship satisfaction. The RAS is used to assess the various dimensions of the relationship as they correlate with other facets of relationships. The scale’s reliability was demonstrated through test-retest methodology at a six to seven week interval in undergraduate students
(.85 correlation between test 1 and 2). Evidence of convergent validity was found by comparing this scale to the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, which measures a similar construct (Hendrick et al., 1988). Cronbach’s alpha for the current study is .733.

**DAS.** The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) was created to allow members of married couples to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement over topics that normally exist in a long-term relationship (See Appendix F). This 32-question Likert-type scale includes questions that expand over numerous facets of the relationship such as career aspirations, collaboration and sexual intimacy between partners. The DAS utilizes various methodologies for scoring its four subscales (Consensus, Satisfaction, Cohesion and Expression). Within this scale, there are six different Likert-type ranges as well as two multiple-choice questions. An example of each subscale is as follows:

- Consensus (“Handling family finances”); Expression (“Sexual relations”); Cohesion (“Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?”); Satisfaction (“In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?”).

The CSWS is scored by summing the items from each subscale and adding the subscale scores together. Lower levels of each subscale indicate less satisfaction and adjustment reported by the respondent. In the original analysis the internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) was .96 in married and divorced couples (Spanier, 1976). Criterion-related validity of the scale was analyzed and proven with a ($p < .001$) when comparing dyadic adjustment of married and divorced couples (Spanier, 1976). Cronbach’s alpha for the current study subscales are as follows: Satisfaction (.718), Cohesion (.731), Expression (.732), and Consensus (.719).
Demographic Survey. An authored-generated demographic survey was also included. Participants were asked to respond to questions on the following topics: age, amount of time in relationship, ethnicity, nationality, year in school, academic major, gender and sexual orientation.

Data Analysis. Data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) procedures. This allowed for a test of the overall fit of the model to the data as well as the relationships among the variables in the conceptual model. Data analysis was used to test the previously noted hypotheses, and to indicate whether the construct of Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem is a partially or fully mediational factor between attachment and relationship satisfaction, by analyzing standardized path coefficients. Also, overall goodness of fit was assessed using a variety of indices (e.g. CFI, RMSEA, TLI, $\chi^2/df$, and $\chi^2$).
As shown in Table 2, all scales elicited an adequate level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .709 - .763$). A multicollinearity diagnostic with variance inflation factors was also analyzed to assess redundancy among the observed variables. These analyses ranged from 1.38 to 3.28, indicating little redundancy. A correlational matrix was created to further understand the relationships of the latent variables in regards to their relationship both between and within the confines of the observed variables. As seen in Table 3, all scales/AAQ Anxiety subscales within the observed variable (e.g. ECR Anxiety and AAQ Anxiety; ECR Avoidance and AAQ Avoidance) are significantly correlated. There is one exception to this, in regards to the relationship between RCSE and the Contingencies of Self-Worth God’s Love Subscale ($r = -.023$). Between subjects correlations showed varying levels of correlations ($p < .01$ to $p = .743$). For example, both Avoidance subscales and Anxiety subscales of the ECR and AAQ were found to be significantly correlated when $p < .01$. The correlation matrix indicates that the scales used in this study do not correlate fully with one another; thus there is no redundancy among the variables.
| Table 2  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Table of Scale Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECR-R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAQ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAQ Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAQ Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSWS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSGL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. α = Cronbach's Alpha; X = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; VIF = Multicollinearity. Items were parcelled in all analyses in order to provide enough indicators for the latent variable.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECR Anxiety</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR Avoidance</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAQ Avoidance</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAQ Anxiety</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCSE</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSOA</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSSC</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSAC</td>
<td>.12 **</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSFS</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSY</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWSGL</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Consensus</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Expression</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Cohesion</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS Satisfaction</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** ECR Anxiety and ECR Avoidance = subscales of the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire - Revised; AAQ Avoidance and AAQ Anxiety = subscales of the Adult Attachment Questionnaire; RCSE = Relationship Contingency Self-Esteem Scale; The contingencies of the Relationship Contingency (other’s approval, competition, appearance, academic competence, family support, virtue and God’s love); RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale; DAS Consensus, DAS Expression, DAS Cohesion & DAS Satisfaction = subscales of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA(CI)</th>
<th>Multivariate Normality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>374.248</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.226</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.094-.118</td>
<td>53.332*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>442.141</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.779</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.107-.130</td>
<td>53.332*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Indicates significant non-normality.*
Additionally, multivariate normality was assessed to account for the potential lack of model fit in both the partially and fully mediated models. Table 4 indicates high levels of multivariate non-normality, which could account for the lack of appropriateness the current sample has when using analyses such as the MLE. This is a definite limitation to the current analyses.

*Structural Equation Modeling*

**Hypothesis 1. The relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction is partially mediated by relationship contingent self-esteem.** Structural equation modeling utilizes a Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE). Hypothesis 1 showed some indication of a significant relationship between the constructs of RCSE and relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .148$, $p = .045$) as well as the constructs of Attachment and Relationship Satisfaction ($\beta = .637$, $p < .001$). However, the pathway between Attachment and RCSE was not significant ($\beta = -.103$, $p = .215$). Although there was significance among two of the primary pathways, these relationships should not be trusted due to a poor model fit [$\chi^2= 374.248$, $df= 116$, $p < .000$; $\chi^2/df= 3.226$; CFI= .790; TLI= .753; RMSEA= .106(CI= .094-.118)$]. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. See Figure 3 for estimated pathway coefficients of the partially mediated model.
Figure 3

Hypothesis 1: Partially Mediated Model.

Note. Standardized Beta Weights Presented.

Note: ECR Anxiety and ECR Avoidance = subscales of the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire - Revised; AAQ Avoidance and AAQ Anxiety = subscales of the Adult Attachment Questionnaire; RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale; DAS Consensus, DAS Expression, DAS Cohesion & DAS Satisfaction = subscales of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale; RCSE = Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem Scale; The Contingencies of Self-Worth subscales read left to right (Other’s Approval, Competition, Appearance, Academic Competence, Family Support, Virtue and God’s Love.)
Hypothesis 2. The relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction is fully mediated by relationship contingent self-esteem. Structural Equation Modeling with MLE was used to assess Hypothesis 2, the fully mediated model between Attachment, RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction. Pathway coefficients between observed and latent variables were similar to those in Hypothesis 1; however, observed pathway coefficients were dissimilar to the previous model. Neither the pathway between Attachment and RCSE ($\beta = -.087$, $p = .294$) nor the pathway between RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction ($\beta = .071$, $p = .407$) were significant. The overall model fit was poor [$\chi^2 = 442.141$, $df = 117$, $p < .000$; $\chi^2/df = 3.779$; CFI = .735; TLI = .692; RMSEA = .118(CI = .107-.130)$]. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported. See Figure 4 for the estimated pathway coefficients of the fully mediated model.
**Figure 4**

Hypothesis 2: Fully Mediated Model.

*Note.* Standardized Beta Weights Presented.

Note: ECR Anxiety and ECR Avoidance = subscales of the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire - Revised; AAQ Avoidance and AAQ Anxiety = subscales of the Adult Attachment Questionnaire; RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale; DAS Consensus, DAS Expression, DAS Cohesion & DAS Satisfaction = subscales of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale; RCSE = Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem Scale; The Contingencies of Self-Worth subscales read left to right (Other’s Approval, Competition, Appearance, Academic Competence, Family Support, Virtue and God’s Love.)
Supplemental Analyses

Supplemental analyses were conducted to both assess potential discrepancies in the above models as well as provide additional information regarding the reliability and redundancy within the latent variables. Due to the extreme difference between all pathway coefficients of latent variables and the latent variable of Contingencies of Self-Worth God’s Love (CSWSGL), (β = -0.025 and β = -0.027), an additional analysis was done without the CSWSGL variable. However, this did not change observed variable pathways (i.e., those between Attachment, RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction) in either model. Due to this, it is assumed that CSWSGL is not the primary factor in having a reduced β on observed construct pathways.
Chapter Five
Discussion

Partially and Fully Mediated Models

The results of the current study indicate that there is no significance in the Structural Equation Modeling of both the partially and fully mediated models of Attachment, RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction. This was surprising, as there are theoretical implications that provide a strong background as to why these three constructs are connected. Enmeshment, a form of attachment in which there is minimal autonomy, has been linked to high levels of relationship contingent self-esteem. Prior research has shown that high levels of attachment security is linked to relationship satisfaction (c.f., Hazan et al., 1987; Knee et al., 2008). It has been shown that secure attachment influences relationship behavior and self-esteem of the individual and can positively influence relationship satisfaction (Crocker et al., 2003; Knee et al., 2008). However, there may be faults in the current interpretation of RCSE, enmeshment and attachment, which resulting in the poor fit of the proposed models. Currently there has been no research connecting RCSE to attachment; therefore, liberties were made to connect relationship satisfaction, attachment, and RCSE, which may have been incorrect.

Although the correlational matrix shows connections between the variables (See Table 3), MLE illustrates that these models are not a good fit. Estimated pathway
coefficients show a strong relationship between Attachment and Relationship Satisfaction as well as a relationship between RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction in the partially mediated model. There are no observed pathway coefficients that are strong in the fully mediated model.

As stated previously, there is theoretical evidence behind the current study; however there has been no empirical support indicating that RCSE is a mediator between relationship satisfaction and attachment. In fact, there has been no empirical evidence indicating a relationship between attachment and RCSE. The original RCSE study did show a correlational relationship between RCSE and relationship satisfaction, but no causal relationship (Knee et al., 2008). Currently, research only provides information regarding the relationship between relationship satisfaction and attachment (Hazan et al., 1981), which is was also demonstrated in the current research with a pathway coefficient of $\beta = .44$. This indicates that there may be missing components to the current model, which could significantly affect its efficacy.

The current research utilizes the relationship between RCSE and enmeshment as an indicator of attachment. Although these constructs are similar and may have a causal relationship, they are two separate entities. Although there is research empirically supporting the relationship between enmeshment and attachment (Londardo et al., 2009) and enmeshment and RCSE (Knee et al., 2008) no research bridges the gap between RCSE and attachment. This may be the biggest fault of the current research and future studies need to address this gap.

*Limitations to the Study*
Within observed variable correlations show that the scales chosen to represent each construct are significantly correlated with one another (with the exception of the scale RCSE and subscale CSWSGL). This indicates that the scales chosen were adequate for assessing their proposed constructs. However, due to the limitation discussed previously regarding the lack of empirical support between the constructs of RCSE and attachment, there may be other constructs missing that play a significant role, such as trauma or levels of relationship commitment. Therefore, future research should explore other factors that may bridge the gap between RCSE and attachment.

Also, it is possible that the sample used in this study contributed to the lack of significant findings. This may due to a variety of factors, including the demographics of the sample (college students), or the wide degree of difference in the length of the sample’s relationship (3 months to 12 years), which could affect levels of commitment. Compared to persons older than 30, traditionally-aged college students have had relatively little life experience and very few long-term romantic partners; thus, studies on romantic relationships may be invalid with this group. The vast majority (65%) of these students had been in their current relationships for no more than two years; 50% had been in the current relationship for one year or less. Perhaps these students had not been in a committed relationship long enough to demonstrate the levels of commitment and enmeshment that could have a significant effect on this model. Also, due to the multivariate normality assessment (Table 3), the sample population’s attachment levels are not normally distributed which could be an explanation for the lack of significance in both hypothesized models, in regards to their SEM Maximum Likelihood Explanations. An additional limitation of the study is the lack of research that has been published on
RCSE since it was originally presented in 2008. Thus, there is little empirical data to help researchers postulate on its relation to other constructs. The current study may have been too ambitious in relation to the current understanding of RCSE.

**Implications for Future Research**

Based on the correlational matrix, there are connections between the subscales, therefore indicating a connection between Attachment, RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction ($r = .001$ to $r = .659^{**}$). Although both proposed models were rejected in the current study, there is room for potential in future research analyses. Future research may need to look at couples (i.e. getting respondents from both partners) to analyze the differences between the levels of RCSE within the relationship. Utilizing a population in which both members of the couple are involved may allow researchers to understand differences in enmeshment levels within a relationship. Also, it is possible that three months may not be long enough for potentially enmeshed couples to have high levels of RCSE; therefore it may be better to wait until the couple has been together for an extended period of time. Also, it might be important to consider how traumatic events such as sexual assault or domestic violence may impact the relationship contingent self-esteem.

Future research may also want to assess a wider range of age groups, and consider the effect of sexual orientation, when assessing the differences in the levels of Attachment, Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem and Relationship Satisfaction between groups. RCSE levels may also differ among diverse populations; these areas have not been explored since publication of the Knee et al. article in 2008. This could give both
researchers and counselors insight into romantic relationships and overall self-esteem of participants/clients.

An additional construct that may be a mediating factor in future research would be levels of commitment within the relationship. Previous research has shown that RCSE is related to levels of commitment in intimate relationships (Knee et al., 2008); therefore, it is purposed that future research needs to assess commitment levels as a mediating factor between relationship satisfaction and attachment with RCSE. Due to the fact that many external factors affect romantic relationships, further analysis also needs to be conducted comparing previous and current romantic relationships.

Summary

The current study assessed the relationship between the three constructs of Attachment, RCSE and Relationship Satisfaction. Maximum Likelihood Model indicates that RCSE is a poor mediator between attachment and relationship satisfaction. However, the correlational matrix shows significant relationships between subscales of the same construct indicating that the subscales correctly assess the construct. Previously there has been no empirically based research to indicate a relationship between RCSE and attachment. Future research needs to assess possible mediating factors between attachment and RCSE. Also, variables such as levels of commitment to the relationship as well as potential relationship trauma may be factors that affect the proposed models.
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Appendix A

The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Questionnaire (ECR-R)

Instructions: The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by clicking a circle to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

The following 7-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

| Strongly Agree (1) | O O O O O O O | Strongly Disagree (7) |

1. I’m afraid I will lose my partner’s love.
2. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
3. I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me.
4. I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them.
5. I often wish that my partner’s feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.
6. I worry a lot about my relationships.
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.
8. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.
9. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me. (R)
10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.
11. I do not often worry about being abandoned. (R)
12. I find that my partner(s) don’t want to get as close as I would like.
13. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
15. I’m afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.
16. It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from my partner.
17. I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.
18. My partner only seems to notice me when I’m angry.
19. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. (R)
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
22. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners. (R)
23. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
25. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner. (R)
27. It’s not difficult for me to get close to my partner. (R)
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner. (R)
29. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need. (R)
30. I tell my partner just about everything. (R)
31. I talk things over with my partner. (R)
32. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
33. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners. (R)
34. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners. (R)
35. It’s easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.
36. My partner really understands me and my needs. (R)

Note. (R) Indicates a reverse-scored item. Items 1-18 comprise the anxiety subscale. Lower scores on this subscale indicate higher attachment anxiety. Items 19-36 comprise the avoidance subscale. Lower scores on this subscale indicate higher attachment avoidance. Therefore, lower scores on the total scale indicate greater attachment insecurity and higher scores on the total scale indicate greater attachment security.
Appendix B

Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAQ)

Instructions: Please indicate how you typically feel toward romantic (dating) partners in general. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

The following 7-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

Strongly Agree (1) O O O O O O O Strongly Disagree (7)

1. I find it relatively easy to get close to others. (R)
2. I'm not very comfortable having to depend on other people.
3. I'm comfortable having others depend on me. (R)
4. I rarely worry about being abandoned by others. (R)
5. I don't like people getting too close to me.
6. I'm somewhat uncomfortable being too close to others.
7. I find it difficult to trust others completely.
8. I'm nervous whenever anyone gets too close to me.
9. Others often want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being. (R)
10. Others often are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
11. I often worry that my partner(s) don't really love me.
12. I rarely worry about my partner(s) leaving me. (R)
13. I often want to merge completely with others, and this desire sometimes scares them away.
14. I'm confident others would never hurt me by suddenly ending our relationship. (R)
15. I usually want more closeness and intimacy than others do.
16. The thought of being left by others rarely enters my mind. (R)
17. I'm confident that my partner(s) love me just as much as I love them. (R)

Note. (R) Indicates a reverse-scored item. Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 comprise the avoidance subscale. Lower scores on this subscale indicate higher levels of avoidance. Items 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 comprise the anxiety subscale. Lower scores on this subscale indicate higher levels of anxiety. Therefore, lower scores on the total scale indicate greater attachment insecurity and higher scores on the total scale indicate greater attachment security.
Appendix C

Relationship Contingent Self-Esteem Scale

Instructions: Please indicate how you typically feel towards romantic (dating) partners in general. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

The following 5-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

1. I feel better about myself when it seems like my partner and I are getting along
2. I feel better about myself when it seems like my partner and I are emotionally connected
3. An important measure of my self-worth is how successful my relationship is.
4. My feelings of self-worth are based on how well things are going in my relationship
5. When my relationship is going well, I feel better about myself overall
6. If my relationship is going well, I feel better about myself overall
7. If my relationship were to end tomorrow, I would not let it affect how I feel about myself (r)
8. My self-worth is unaffected when things go wrong in my relationship. (r)
9. When my partner and I fight, I feel bad about myself in general
10. When my relationship is going bad, my feelings of self-worth remain unaffected (r)
11. I feel better about myself when others tell me that my partner and I have a good relationship
12. When my partner criticizes me or seems disappointed in me, it makes me feel really bad

Note: (r)=reverse-score item. Items are rated on a scale from 1 to 5, with anchors of 1 (not at all like me), 3 (somewhat like me) and 5 (very much like me)
Appendix D

Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale

Instructions: Please indicate how you typically feel toward romantic (dating) partners in general. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

The following 7-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

Strongly Disagree (1) O O O O O O O Strongly Agree (7)

Other's Approval
I don’t care what other people think of me.*
What others think of me has no effect on what I think about myself.*
I don’t care if other people have a negative opinion about me.*
My self-esteem depends on the opinions others hold of me.
I can’t respect myself if others don’t respect me.

Appearance
My self-esteem does not depend on whether or not I feel attractive.*
My self-esteem is influenced by how attractive I think my face or facial features are.
My sense of self-worth suffers whenever I think I don’t look good.
My self-esteem is unrelated to how I feel about the way my body looks.*
When I think I look attractive, I feel good about myself.

Competition
Doing better than others gives me a sense of self-respect.
Knowing that I am better than others on a task raises my self-esteem.
My self-worth is affected by how well I do when I am competing with others.
My self-worth is influenced by how well I do on competitive tasks.
I feel worthwhile when I perform better than others on a task or skill.

Academic Competence
My self-esteem is influenced by my academic performance.
I feel better about myself when I know I’m doing well academically.
Doing well in school gives me a sense of self-respect.
I feel bad about myself whenever my academic performance is lacking.
My opinion about myself isn’t tied to how well I do in school.*

Family Support
It is important to my self-respect that I have a family that cares about me.
When my family members are proud of me, my sense of self-worth increases.
Knowing that my family members love me makes me feel good about myself.
When I don’t feel loved by my family, my self-esteem goes down.
My self-worth is not influenced by the quality of my relationships with my family members.*
**Virtue**
My self-esteem depends on whether or not I follow my moral/ethical principles. My self-esteem would suffer if I did something unethical. I couldn’t respect myself if I didn’t live up to a moral code. Whenever I follow my moral principles, my sense of self-respect gets a boost. Doing something I know is wrong makes me lose my self-respect.

**God’s Love**
My self-esteem goes up when I feel that God loves me. I feel worthwhile when I have God’s love. My self-esteem would suffer if I didn’t have God’s love. My self-worth is based on God’s love. When I think that I’m disobeying God, I feel bad about myself.

*Note:* *Item was reversed for scoring.*
Appendix E

Relationship Assessment Scale

Instructions: Please indicate how you typically feel toward romantic (dating) partners in general. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

1. How well does your partner meet your needs?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Poorly  Average  Extremely well

2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Unsatisfied  Average  Extremely satisfied

3. How good is your relationship compared to most?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Poor  Average  Excellent

4. How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten in this relationship?
   5  4  3  2  1
   Never  Average  Very often

5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations:
   1  2  3  4  5
   Hardly at all  Average  Completely

6. How much do you love your partner?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Not much  Average  Very much

7. How many problems are there in your relationship?
   5  4  3  2  1
   Very few  Average  Very many

Relationship Satisfaction Score: __________ (Add responses together and divide by 7) Score range: 1 (low satisfaction) to 7 (high satisfaction)
Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Instructions: Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

The following 6-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

Always Disagree (0)  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Always Agree (5)

1. Handling family finances
2. Matters of recreation
3. Religious matters
4. Demonstrations of affection
5. Friends
6. Sex relations
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)
8. Philosophy of life
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important
11. Amount of time spent together
12. Making major decisions
13. Household tasks
14. Leisure time interests and activities
15. Career decisions

The following 6-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

Never (0)  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  All of the time (5)

16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation or terminating your relationship? (r)
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house in a fight? (r)
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?
19. Do you confide in your mate?
20. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)? (r)
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel? (r)
22. How often do you and your mate “get on each other’s nerves?” (r)

The following 5-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:
23. Do you kiss your mate?
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

The following 6-point Likert type scale is used for and listed after each item:

Never (0)  Less than once a month (1)  Once of Twice a month (2)  Once or twice a week (3)  Every Day (4) More Often (5)

25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas
26. Laugh together
27. Calmly discuss something
28. Work together on a project

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicated if either item below cause differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks (check yes or no)

29. Yes __  No__  Being too tired for sex
30. Yes__  No__  Not showing love

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, “happy,” represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness all things considered, of your relationship

0  1  2  3  4  5  6
Extremely  Fairly  A Little  Happy  Very  Extremely
Perfect  Unhappy  Unhappy  Unhappy  Happy  Happy

Happy
32. Which of the following statement best describe how you feel about the future of your relationship?

_____ I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does

_____ It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can’t do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

_____ It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going

_____ My relationship can never succeed, and I there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going

Note: r=reverse scoring. Number 32 is scored on a scale of 5 to 0, 5 being the top answer, 0 being the bottom
Demographic Questions

In the box provided please indicate your age. ______

Are you currently in an exclusive romantic relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No

If yes, please indicate how long have you been in your relationship? ______

Are you an international student?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Please indicate what year you are in school.
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Senior +
   f. Graduate Student
   g. Doctoral Student
   h. Other __________________

In the blank provided please write your major. ______________

Please indicate your gender
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Transgendered
   d. Prefer not to answer

What is your sexual orientation?
   a. heterosexual
   b. homosexual
   c. bisexual
   d. Prefer not to answer

Appendix H
Research Consent Form

1. You are invited to take part in a scientific experiment conducted by Emily Barnum, a Counseling Graduate Student and Dr. Sharon Bowman, a faculty member in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services. Questions or concerns about this research may be directed to IRB (765-285-5070) regarding your rights as a participant please feel free to email Emily Barnum (elbarnum@bsu.edu) for questions regarding the experiment itself.

2. This experiment is concerned with how different thoughts and feelings about relationships are related. The questions in this survey will ask you about many aspects of your relationship, including your feelings about your partner as well as normal interactions with your partner. This experiment will be completely conducted online and we estimate that it will take between 60 and 80 minutes.

3. Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are free to discontinue participation in the experiment at any time. Simply close your Internet browser to stop the study at any point. You may also freely decline to answer any of the questions asked of you.

4. The responses that you provide today are confidential. It will never be possible to identify you personally in any report of this research. Within these restrictions, results of this experiment will be made available to you upon request. At the end of the session you will be given more information about our research and who to contact to receive the results. Although every effort will be done to ensure confidentiality of your responses, you should be aware that all Internet-based communication is subject to the remote likelihood of tampering from an outside source. IP addresses will not be investigated and data will be removed from the server.

5. Your participation in this experiment does not guarantee any beneficial results. Yet, we hope that as a result of taking this survey you will gain further knowledge in the research process.

6. The only anticipated risk from participating in this study is that you may not feel comfortable answering some of the questions. You may choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may quit the study at any time.

Who to Contact Should You Experience Any Negative Effects from participating in this Study Should you experience any feelings of anxiety, there are counseling services available to you through the XYZ Counseling Center in Muncie, 555-5551.

By clicking “I agree” below, I am indicating: (1) that I am at least 18 years old, (2) that I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study, (3) and that I understand that my responses will be kept confidential.

Otherwise, please click “I disagree” or close your Internet browser.

Appendix I
Institutional Review Board

DATE: August 22, 2011
TO: Emily Bamum, B.A.
FROM: Ball State University IRB
RE: IRB protocol # 258647-1
TITLE: Attachment, Satisfaction & Self-Esteem
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: August 22, 2011

The Institutional Review Board reviewed your protocol on August 22, 2011 and has determined the procedures you have proposed are appropriate for exemption under the federal regulations. As such, there will be no further review of your protocol, and you are cleared to proceed with the procedures outlined in your protocol. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with the IRB as a matter of record.

Editorial Notes:
1. Approved: Exempt Category 2

While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. (and, if applicable, faculty supervisor) to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project. Please contact please contact John Maloney at (765) 265-5108 or jmaloney@bsu.edu if you are unsure whether your proposed modification requires review or have any questions. Proposed modifications should be addressed in writing and submitted electronically to the IRB (http://www.bsu.edu/irb) for review. Please reference the above IRB protocol number in any communication to the IRB regarding this project.

Reminder: Even though your study is exempt from the relevant federal regulations of the Common Rule (45 CFR 46, subpart A), you and your research team are not exempt from ethical research practices and should therefore employ all protections for your participants and their data which are appropriate to your project.