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Abstract

It has been stated that “satisfying close relationships constitute the very best thing in life” (Berscheid, 1999, p. 260). Close relationships offer companionship and affection, and also encourage physical health and emotional well-being (Berscheid, 1999; Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Burman & Margolin, 1992; Gottman, 1998). So many people strive for a healthy close relationship with another individual, while others continually maintain an emotionally distant relationship. What accounts for this discrepancy, especially when close relationships can be so beneficial to one’s physical and emotional health (Berscheid, 1999)? The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the attachment styles of adults, described by Hazan & Shaver (1987), and the extroverted personality trait described by the Myers-Briggs Temperament Indicator (MBTI). By including The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (KTS-II) (an abbreviated version of The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) (Fraley, Waller, and Brennan, 2000), and the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991), results showed that more people (N = 497), who were classified as having an extroverted personality type, were also classified as having a secure attachment style. Additionally, more people that were classified as having a sensing personality type were found to also have a secure attachment style.
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Berscheid (1999) asserted that “satisfying close relationships constitute the very best thing in life” (p. 260). Not only do close relationships offer companionship and affection, but also encourage physical health and emotional well-being (Berscheid, 1999; Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Burman & Margolin, 1992; Gottman, 1998). Given the many hypothesized benefits of human relationships, it should be no surprise that many people strive for a healthy close relationship with another individual. Yet some people continually maintain an emotionally distant relationship. What accounts for this discrepancy, especially when close relationships can be so beneficial to one’s physical and emotional health? Personality and social development are likely important factors, and have been shown to be predictable variables in the quality of a relationship.

In a review of the literature, Donnellan, Larsen-Rife, & Conger (2005) showed that both parenting and personality characteristics were significant predictors of satisfaction in adult romantic relationships. Participants were selected during their senior year of high school, and they and their families completed a set of questionnaires that measured individual characteristics, quality of family interactions, and family economic circumstances. The participants and their families were visited again by the researchers to conduct a video-recording session as the family interacted during the day. “These tasks were designed to stimulate family interactions involving social skills and emotional expression” (2005, p. 565). Five years later, the same participants were contacted again to participate in another video-recording session to talk about their history, status of relationships, enjoyable events, areas of agreement and disagreement, and plans for the future. The participants with romantic partners were also assessed during this time.
The researchers found that both parenting and personality traits, assessed when the participants were seniors, significantly predicted relationship variables five years later. This conclusion suggests that “both family history and individual differences help explain behavior in romantic relationships” (Donnellan, Larsen-Rife, & Conger, 2005, p. 572). Individuals with a personality that readily expresses anxiety, anger, and distress are more likely to experience emotional hardships in their romantic relationships than individuals who were characterized as calmer (Amato & Booth, 2001). The effect of personality on romantic relationships was also observed in other studies such as: Gattis et al. (2004), Bagge et al. (2004), and Belsky et al. (2003).

Another important factor that plays a role in the variability of romantic relationships is the attachment styles of adults. In a study by Sumer & Knight (2001), the researchers examined whether people with different attachment styles experienced different models of work-family relationships. The authors noted, “Individuals with a preoccupied attachment style were more likely to experience negative spillover from the family/home to the work domain than those with a secure or dismissing style” (2001, p. 653); while individuals with a secure attachment style experienced a healthy balance of family and work in their relationships. In another study by Campbell et al. (2005), researchers explored how the perceptions of a relationship-based conflict would effect assessments of one’s relationship satisfaction, closeness, and quality. Results showed that highly anxious individuals perceived the relational conflict as more distressing, which escalated as the severity of the conflicts increased. Other individuals experienced distress and anxiety, but not to the same degree as the anxious individuals (2005). While the construct of anxiety is a different quality than the anxious attachment style, the effects of one’s personality traits when perceiving relationship-based conflict can still be noted.
The variability of romantic relationships is particularly noticeable when one looks at the difference in perceived quality, reactions, and emotional wellbeing experienced by people of various personalities and attachment styles. However, while the concepts of personality and attachment styles have been independently shown to be significant factors in human relationships, the exact nature of the relationship between these constructs has not been previously explored. The purpose of this study is to examine whether some personalities are prone to have specific attachment styles. Specifically, what personality types are more likely to possess secure attachment styles? By including The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (which is an abbreviated version of The Myers-Briggs Type Indictor), the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) (Fraley, Waller, and Brennan, 2000), and the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991), this study will investigate whether people classified as an extroverted Myers-Briggs personality type are more likely to have a secure attachment style.

Attachment Theory

The theory of attachment styles (J. Bowlby, 1973, 1979, 1980, 1988) has been researched for many decades. This theory evaluates the relationship of an infant with a primary caregiver and assesses the bond that the two share. In early research, there are three possible styles of attachment that occur within the infant (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). These styles include: secure, avoidant (fearful), and ambivalent (preoccupied); the fourth style (disorganized-disoriented) was later identified by Main & Solomon (1986). Refer to Figure 1 for a complete diagram of the four attachment styles.

Ainsworth studied her theory by creating an experimental design called “The Strange Situation” (Ainsworth et al., 1978). This was a 20-minute experiment with many parts. First, the
child and mother would enter the laboratory room where a stranger (another woman) would join
them (Bretherton, 1992). The mother would then exit the room while the stranger and baby
played together until the mother quickly returned. The separation would usually last about 3
minutes or shorter. Second, another separation would occur which included both the mother and
the stranger briefly leaving the baby alone, until both the mother and stranger return to the child.

Ainsworth found, as she expected, that the infants would generally be much more
exploratory in the lab room when the child's mother was present than when she was gone. The
child also seemed much more comfortable when interacting with the mother than with the
stranger (Ainsworth & Bell, 1970). Along with the expected results, Ainsworth also noticed
through the experiment that unexpected behavioral patterns would develop when the child was
reunited with the mother. Some infants seemed angry after the mother had returned from her
absence. They would kick or swing at her while contradictorily trying to be close to her. Other
children would “snub or avoid the mother on reunion, even though they had often searched for
her while she was gone” (Bretherton, 1992). Later analysis revealed that those children who
acted ambivalent or avoidant had a “less than harmonious” relationship with their mothers at
home (1992). Another group of children, on the other hand, demonstrated interaction, contact,
and proximity when their mothers returned (Ainsworth, Bell, & Stayton, 1974). Ainsworth
observed these three different reactions and labeled them ambivalent, avoidant, and secure
attachment styles, respectively.

The secure attachment style is characterized as a healthy relationship where the infant
cries when the mother has left the room, and is excited again when the mother returns (Papalia,
Olds, & Feldman, 2004). Avoidant attachment, sometimes referred to as fearful attachment style,
is demonstrated when the infant rarely cries when the mother leaves the room and does not
Initiate any contact when she returns. These children seem to not notice when she is away or when she returns to the room. Ambivalent attachment, sometimes referred to as preoccupied, is much more complicated. This attachment style includes the infant demonstrating a restless temperament before the caregiver leaves, extreme anger during the absence, and a combination of happiness and resistance (kicking or swiping) upon the arrival of the mother. The last attachment style, which was not characterized by Ainsworth, is entitled disorganized-disoriented because of its unique characteristics. This style is noticed in infants whose patterns of behavior are often contradictory and vary across situations. They may demonstrate an ambivalent attachment one day, but then may demonstrate an avoidant attachment the next day. This attachment is usually seen in infants where the caregiver is insensitive and/or abusive (Papalia, 2004).

Over the years, research has shown that attachment styles of infants are not limited to the connection between caregivers and infants. Attachment styles can also carry over into later relationships such as the emotional bond between romantic partners. In a study by Hazan & Shaver (1987), the researchers conducted two studies that measured individual attachment styles in adult romantic relationships. The first study included 620 participants completing a three-part questionnaire. The first part contained questions regarding the participant’s most important relationships in their life; the second part asked specific questions (i.e. whether the relationship was current or past) regarding the relationships mentioned in part one; and the third part of the questionnaire concerned the individuals attachment style and attachment history (1987). From this three-part questionnaire, the researchers were able to characterize the differences between the three attachment styles. "Secure subjects, in comparison with insecure subjects, reported warmer relationships with both parents and between their two parents" (1987, p. 517). Avoidant
participants, when compared to ambivalent subjects, characterized their mother as rejecting and cold; and ambivalent subjects characterized their father as unfair. It should be noted that “both sets of correlations are compatible with expectations based on Ainsworth et al.’s (1978) studies of infant-caregiver attachment” (Hazan & Shaver, 1987, p. 517).

The second study was conducted using 108 college undergraduates who were enrolled in a class entitled Understanding Human Conflict. The subjects would receive questionnaires following each relational topic in class. The survey asked questions relating to the person’s most important love relationship and their relative feelings of loneliness. From the responses of the participants along with the results from the first study, the results indicated that “relative prevalence of the three attachment styles is roughly the same in adulthood as in infancy” (Hazan & Shaver, 1987, p. 511). If the individual is known to have a secure attachment style as an infant, he/she is likely to have a secure connection with his/her romantic partner (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). This relationship could be described as both individuals feeling safe when the other is nearby, both engaging in close, intimate, bodily contact, and both individuals feeling insecure when the other is inaccessible (Hazan, 1987). The adult relationship of the individual is the focus of the current study. To assess the attachment styles of individuals, this study will be using the Experiences in Close Relationships Revised (ECR-R) (Fraley, Waller, and Brennan, 2000), and the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991).

**Myers-Briggs Type Indicator**

To measure the participant’s personality this study will use an abbreviated version of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Based on Jungian concepts, the MBTI categorizes individuals into sixteen personality types (Jung, 1971). The sixteen types are determined by a combination of four dichotomies: (1) extroversion/introversion, (2) sensing
intuition, (3) thinking/feeling, and (4) judgment/perception. After answering a series of
categorical questions, a respondent’s typology is comprised of a dominant concept in each of the
four subgroups. For example, if someone was categorized as an INFI, his/her personality would
be introverted (I), intuitive (N), feeling (F), and judging (J). This test is intriguing not only
because it shows what an individual will do in a situation, but also because it shows how the
person concludes what he/she just experienced (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

The first dichotomy is the extroversion/introversion scale. The extroversion/introversion
category is used to measure whether the individual is extroverted or introverted. Extroverted
individuals are primarily oriented to social settings and focus their attention on people and
objects in the outer world. Introverts, on the other hand, are primarily oriented toward the inner
world of one’s self, and thus focus their attention on one’s thoughts and perceptions (Myers &
McCaulley, 1985).

The sensing/intuition category is the second group in the MBTI and is designed to
categorize people according to the way one perceives the external world. Sensing individuals
report observable facts through the means of one’s own senses. These individuals tend to be very
methodological and precise in their perception of the world. The intuited individual is quite the
opposite. The intuitive person reports meanings, relationships, and/or possibilities that have
been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

The thinking/feeling category is the third group of the MBTI and is designed to reflect a
person’s preference between two contrasting ways of judgment. A thinking individual primarily
decides impersonally on the basis of logical consequences, while, a feeling person bases their
judgments on personal and social values (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). One can see the
contrasting qualities of each MBTI category.
The fourth dichotomy within the MBTI is the judgment/perception group. This index is designed to describe the process a person uses in dealing with the outer world. A judgment individual uses decision processes (either thinking or feeling) for dealing with the outer world. A perception person has reported a preference for using a perceptive process (either sensing or intuition) for dealing with the outer world (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). All of these categories are unique in description and are useful to describe different personalities.

One of the applications of the MBTI includes the use of the test in counseling settings. This measure has been used to assess the correlation between personality style and the problems that occur in romantic relationships (Sherman, 1981). Sherman's study has shown that correlations are present when comparing the MBTI to adult romantic relationships. The couples who reported similar MBTI scales (in all four categories) reported the fewest relationship problems (Sherman, 1981).

The reliability and validity of the MBTI has also been well documented. Various studies have investigated the split-half reliability coefficients for the MBTI (Carlson, 1985; Carlyn, 1977; Carskadon, 1979), and have found that reliability varied from .80 to .90. The Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT) databank, also displayed reliability coefficients averaging from .75 to .85 in correlation: EI = .79, SN = .84, TF = .74, and JP = .82. These results were based on more than 32,000 participants (Capraro & Capraro, 2002). When the researchers used more than 10,000 participants, the range was as follows: EI = .74 to .83, SN = .74 to .85, TF = .64 to .82, and JP = .78 to .84 (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Along with the MBTI reliability scores, research by Thompson and Borrello (1986) indicated supporting evidence for the construct validity of the MBTI. By conducting four factor analyses, "the factor adequacy coefficients indicate that the calculated factors measure the
constructs they were expected to measure” (Thompson & Borrello, 1986, p. 152). Twenty out of the twenty-four items of the Judging-Perceiving scale had a correlation with Factor I greater than .30 in absolute value. Sixteen out of the twenty-three items in the Thinking-Feeling scale had a correlation with Factor II greater than .30 in absolute value. Nineteen out of the twenty-three items in the Extraversion-Introversion scale had a correlation with Factor III greater than .30 in absolute value; and twenty-one out of the twenty-six items in the Sensing-Intuition scale had a correlation with Factor IV greater than .30 in absolute value. Other researchers including Tzeng, Outcalt, Boyer, Ware, and Landis (1984) have also demonstrated item-level construct validity of the MBTI. Overall, “the results of the assessments of the MBTI tend to substantiate that it is a reliable instrument that has four distinct psychometric dimensions (validated by item-level factor analysis) that are unidimensional and consistent with the theoretical constructs of the MBTI” (Zumbo & Taylor, 1993).

The Relationship between Personality Type and Attachment Style

Extroversion is described as “a trait characterized by a keen interest in other people and external events, and venturing forth with confidence into the unknown” (Ewen, 1998, p. 289). Extroverts tend to focus their attention on people and external objects, rather than their inner world of thoughts and ideas (Jung, 1971). Other researchers have characterized this trait as talkative, assertive, and energetic (Norman, 1963). The most extensive research has been conducted on the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R), which defines extroversion as gregarious, assertive or forceful, active and energetic, excitement-seeking, positive emotions and enthusiastic, and warmth (i.e. outgoing) (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Extroversion can also play a part in the romantic relationships of adults. In a study involving Dutch emigrants, significant correlations were found between attachment styles and
the Big Five dimensions, particularly extroversion and emotional stability (Bakker, Van Oudenhoven, & Van Der Zee, 2004). This study demonstrated that attachment styles can be linked to the health of a relationship, similar to the way emotional stability can also contribute to a romantic relationship. By asking a total of 847 participants (57% male and 43% female) to complete the Attachment Styles Questionnaire (ASQ; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2003), a 30-Item shortened version of the Five Factor Personality Questionnaire (FFPI; Hendriks, Hofstee, & De Raad, 1999), and other measures that assessed psychological and sociocultural adjustment, the results showed that “secure attachment appeared to be a combination of Extroversion and, to a lesser degree, Agreeableness” (Bakker, 2004).

In another study involving Chinese students (N=128) at the Chinese University in Hong Kong, the subjects were administered the Interpersonal Relationship Harmony Inventory and the Collective Self-Esteem Scale to research the constructs of relational agreement. The results showed that “relationship harmony has been found to correlate with self-reported openness, emotional stability, helpfulness, restraint, and extroversion” (Li, Kwan, & Bond, 2006), which are characteristics often associated with relationship harmony. This is an important concept in the current study because it shows that extroversion plays a role in relationship quality.

Based upon this research suggesting that extroversion plays a role in the strength of romantic relationships, it is my hypothesis that individuals categorized with an extroverted personality will be more likely to have a secure attachment style.
Method

Participants

The participants in this study were Introductory Psychology students (N=497) at Ball State University (18+ years old). The students were mainly comprised of adult male (166 individuals) and female (331 individuals) Caucasians; however the percent of differed racial participants was equivalent to the prevalence in the general population. The participants received partial course credit for their involvement.

Materials

In the proposed study, the participants were first asked to complete a set of demographic questions. These questions include: age, year in school, marital statues, ethnicity, and whether English is their primary language. The participants were then asked to complete two measures of attachment style: The Experiences and Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R; Fraley, Waller, and Brennan, 2000) and the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). Along with these attachment questionnaires, participants were also asked to complete The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II (KTS-II; Keirsey, 1998) which is an abbreviated version of The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Refer to Appendix C for a complete listing of the measures used.

Attachment style. The ECR-R is an attachment questionnaire that was developed by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) to create a more precise measurement of adult attachment styles. The researchers examined four measurements of attachment style, and out of the four measurements, the ECR scales demonstrated the best psychometric properties (Fraley, 2000, p. 362). By using the Item Response Theory (IRT) method of measurement assessment, the researchers selected items in the ECR that needed improvement. According to the authors, “By
doing so, we were able to create scales that increased measurement precision by 50% to 100%—without increasing the total number of items” (2000, p. 362).

Sibley, Fischer, & Liu (2005), conducted three studies that investigate the reliability and validity of the ECR-R (i.e. test-retest reliability, convergent, and discriminate validity). The first study examined the temporal stability of the ECR-R. The results showed that the test-retest correlations displayed high levels of stability for each attachment style (secure, $r = .55$; preoccupied, $r = .64$; dismissing, $r = .64$; and fearful, $r = .76$). Study 2 then used Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to examine the factor structure of the ECR-R. The results showed that the “ECR-R accurately fits the hypothesized two-factor solution representing dimensions of attachment anxiety and avoidance” (Sibley, Fischer, & Liu, 2005, p. 1529). Finally, the third study examined the ECR-R by examining the proportions of emotional variance experienced during social interactions with not only a romantic partner, but also of a family member and a platonic friend. As predicted, the ECR-R showed sizable portions of rating variance of experienced anxiety and avoidance during social interactions with a romantic partner (correlation, equivalent to roughly .50).

Overall, the results showed that the ECR-R provided highly stable indicators of attachment. “Hierarchical linear modeling analyses [also] further validated the ECR-R, suggesting that it explained between 30% to 40% of the between-person variation in social interaction diary ratings of attachment-related emotions experienced during interactions with a romantic partner, and only 5% to 15% of that in interactions with family and friends” (Sibley, Fischer, Liu, 2005).

However, with all of these results, some limitations to the ECR-R are present that need to be explained. First, the ECR-R scales assess insecurity (i.e. high levels of the Anxiety and
Avoidance dimensions) with considerably less precision than security (i.e. low levels of the Anxiety and Avoidance dimensions). This could be contributed to the original limitations of the item pool where these scales were constructed. "Items represented in existing attachment inventories apparently do not assess security with the same degree of fidelity as insecurity" (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000, p. 360). The second limitation to the ECR-R is that many of the items are redundant. While it may be a good way to be thorough, the redundancy of items may decrease diversity of concepts. With these limitations, researchers suggest that other measurements of attachment style may be needed to contribute to the validity of ECR-R (Sibley, Fischer, Liu, 2005). For this reason, the current study will also include Bartholomew and Horowitz’s Relationship Questionnaire.

The RQ is an attachment questionnaire that dichotomized individuals on two models: the internal model of the self (positive or negative) and the internal model of others (positive or negative). Based on these two models, the attachment style of the individual can be shown. Individuals with a secure attachment style have been characterized as having both a positive model of themselves and others, while individuals with a fearful attachment have both a negative model of themselves and others. Preoccupied attachment styles have a negative model of the self and a positive model of others, while a dismissing attachment style has a positive model of the self and a negative model of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

The researchers developed the attachment measure by conducting several personal interviews with the participant about his/her relationship with friends and family. The friends and family would also be interviewed regarding the participant’s relationships. From these two reports, the researchers showed that the valence of the two models are indeed separate, and "the results supported Bowlby's theory that four different attachment styles can be identified"
(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991, p. 234). Other research has demonstrated strong discriminant validity for the RQ (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). However, it must be noted that low reliability rates for the RQ have also been reported (Garbarino, 1998; Scharfe & Bartholomew, 1994). Due to these findings, the RQ will solely be used in this study as a validity measure to the ECR-R, and will not be the principle way to measure attachment styles in adults.

Temperament type. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS) is one of the most popular online personality assessments (Reile & Harris-Bowlsbey, 2000) and is mainly used as a free alternative to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Waskel (1995) found alpha coefficients for internal consistency of the KTS in the range of .74 to .89 for the four KTS scales. The KTS was also shown to have correlations in the range of .54 to .74 with the MBTI when measuring the psychological type in a sample of business administration students (Quinn, Lewis, and Fischer, 1992). A study by Kelly (2001) demonstrated strong to moderate positive correlations (ranging from a low of .60 to a high of .78) between the MBTI and the KTS, which was the first empirical evidence of convergent validity.

In regards to concurrent validity, this study also showed a complete match between the MBTI and KTS between all four types for about 34.5% of the participants, and a match of three of the four types for 41.7% of the participants. Two of the four types were matched for 20.9% of the participants, and there were no cases of complete mismatch between the MBTI and the KTS-II. In a study by Tucker and Gillespie (1993), correlations between the MBTI and KTS ranged from .68 to .84 in a sample of undergraduate psychology students. “In summary, numerous validity and reliability studies have been conducted on the KTS and its underlying temperament theory. The results consistently provide moderate to strong support for both the instrument and theory” (Wheeler, Jessup, & Martinez, 2002, p. 266).
Procedure

The participants were invited to participate in this confidential study through a web-based system called Inqsit. Each participant was asked to submit an electronic informed consent (Appendix A) prior to completing the survey, so that the researchers were able to keep participant information separate from their responses. Informed consent forms were then communicated through the selection of the “Agreement” button on the bottom of the informed consent page. The study had a total purposed duration of about 1 hour to complete, and course credit was provided after the student submitted personal information on a confidential research participation log-in page.

The surveys were constructed so that students could skip any items that they declined to answer without penalty, and the students were not required to provide identifying information such as a name or student I.D. number while completing the anonymous section of the surveys. A debriefing statement (Appendix B) was then provided for students to read or print out after they submitted their responses. The participants were also allowed to print a copy of the consent form if they desired additional information regarding the study or felt any emotional discomfort.

Results

Descriptives

Five-hundred and ninety-five people completed the survey; however 497 were actually used in the study. Participants who completed the survey in less than three minutes were deleted from the data set. After looking at the duration distribution (mean duration time = 45.53 min.), it is unlikely that the participants could honestly respond to all 254 questions within three minutes.
(mean duration time = 45.53 min.). Therefore, a three minute cut-off-time was created. Sixteen percent of the overall population (98 individuals) was eliminated due to this cut-off.

The mean participant age was 19 years. Females constituted about 66% of the data set (331 individuals), males composed about 33% (166 individuals). Sixty-eight percent were freshman, 18% were sophomores, 7% were juniors, and 5% were seniors. Ninety-five percent reported themselves as single, while the remaining 5% reported themselves as married or cohabitating. Ninety-two percent reported themselves as Caucasian, 5% were African-American, 1% were Hispanic, and 1% were Asian. Ninety-nine percent of the respondents reported English as their primary language.

Based on the RQ, 47% of the participants had a secure attachment style, which is very similar to most population frequencies reported in other studies (Dion, Dion, & Keelan, 1998). Refer to Table 1 for a complete distribution of the self-report attachment styles of the participants in the present study based on the RQ. Refer to Figure 1 for a complete diagram of the four attachment styles.

Based on the KTS-II, approximately 18% of the participants reported having an ESFJ personality type, 11.9% had an ESTJ personality type, and 11.7% had an ISFJ personality type. These personality types were the top three types according to the survey. Refer to Table 2 for a complete distribution of the reported MBTI personality types of the participants. Expected frequencies were calculated based on the percentages reported by Keirsey (1998) as indicated in Table 2.

__Confirmatory Analysis__

A chi square analysis was used to examine the results. This included a cross tabulation of the variables extroversion and attachment style (measured by the ECR-R). Refer to Table 3 for a
complete distribution of the population percentages of extroversion and a secure attachment style. The participants demonstrated significant differences for the outcome variable extroversion/introversion based on the predictor of attachment orientation, $X^2(1, n = 497) = 32.45, p < .04$ (one-sided). These results showed that people who had an extraverted personality type were more likely to possess a secure attachment style. Thirty-five percent of participants possessed both a secure attachment style and extroverted personality; while only 19% possessed both a secure attachment style and introverted personality.

*Exploratory Analysis*

In an exploratory analysis, a cross tabulation was used to examine the variables of the KTS-II personality dichotomies of sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving along with a secure attachment style (measured by the ECR-R). However, the dichotomy of sensing/intuition was the only personality type that yielded any significant findings. Refer to Table 4 for a complete distribution of the population percentages of sensing and a secure attachment style. Using a chi square analysis, significant differences were observed on the outcome variable sensing/intuition based on the predictor of attachment orientation, $X^2(1, n = 497) = 33.86, p < .04$ (two-sided). These results showed that people who had a sensing personality type were more likely to possess a secure attachment style. Thirty-seven percent of the participants possessed both a secure attachment style and sensing personality; while only 17% possessed both a secure attachment style and introverted personality. There were no significant relationships between demographic variables (i.e. gender, age) and attachment styles or the MBTI variable extroversion/introversion.
Discussion

The subject of attachment styles is a growing area of study in the field of psychology. However, the relationship between attachment styles and personality has rarely been studied; specifically using the MBTI or the KTS-II. The purpose of this study was to investigate this unique relationship to see if a significant correlation existed. While one may not know the directionality of these two variables, after looking at the results of this study one can conclude that such a relationship does exist.

It was shown that individuals with an extraverted personality type are more likely to possess a secure attachment style. These results were predicted due to an extensive review of the literature pertaining to these subjects. Past studies had implied that people with a secure attachment style most likely have an extroverted personality (Bakker, Van Oudenhoven, & Van Der Zee, 2004; Li, Kwan, & Bond, 2006). This could be due the fact that extroverted individuals tend to focus their perceptions on people and other outer world objects. With this perception, extroverts may have a better understanding of people in various social situations, and know how to read and understand people more than the more isolated introverted personality types. With these characteristics, the previous study may have shown that the extroverted personality type is more likely to possess a secure attachment style because they understand people and how to react to different social situations.

Although some results were predicted, there were some results that were not anticipated. It was also shown that individuals possessing a sensing personality were more likely to have a secure attachment style. An individual with a secure attachment style may deal with the “here and now” of the relationship and not dwell on past emotional experiences; which is quite similar to the description of a sensing personality type. While the directionality has not been concluded
between these variables, the results could be due to the methodical and precise perception of sensing individuals. Sensing individuals report observable facts through the means of one’s own senses, and when dealing with the complexities of an adult romantic relationship, these characteristics can prove to be quite beneficial.

With every scientific study, there are always certain strengths and weaknesses. The strengths of this study could be seen in the validity of the measures used, and a relatively large sample size. However some of the weaknesses of the study could be seen in the extraneous variables of the study. Variables such as social desirability could be a factor when the participants were describing their attachment style. When asked to measure one’s personality, it is very common to want to describe oneself in the most positive light as possible. However, while social desirability is a valid concept to consider in this study, the participants were fairly congruent with the past studies of population distribution for attachment style (See Table 1). While some participants may have demonstrated some social desirability, predictive validity of the attachment questionnaires demonstrated the unlikelihood that this extraneous variable played a role in the results of the current study.

With the significant results of the current study, future research could be directed at examining the relationship between other personality types/styles and attachment (e.g. using the interpersonal circumplex). The area of personality and attachment styles are vast and broad; and the applicability of these findings for assessment, diagnostic, and therapy outcomes add considerably to the field of psychology. After reviewing the current study, it is hoped future research would extend these findings in any of the above applications.
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Appendix A:

Personality and Relational Style

Statement of Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a confidential research survey. Your participation is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions if there is anything that you do not understand.

Why is this study being done?

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between personality, relational styles and psychopathology. We hope to learn whether certain personality types are related to different types of relational styles. This knowledge may help scientists and therapists better understand how certain personalities and mental health affect relations with others.

What is involved in this study?

You will answer a series of questions on the following survey to determine your personality type, psychopathology and preferred relational style.

How many people will take part in this study?

We will have approximately 200 people from Ball State University take part in this study.

How long will I be in the study?

Your participation in this survey should take about one hour. You will receive one hour of credit for this survey toward fulfilling course requirements.

What are the risks of participating in this study?

Some participants may feel that some questions are too personal to answer. Please feel free to skip any questions that you feel are too personal, and feel free to stop your participation in the study at any time. You will not be penalized if you decide to stop participating or decline to answer any questions. Anyone experiencing feelings of anxiety or stress as a result of participating in this study is encouraged to seek assistance from the BSU Counseling and Psychological Services Center in Lucina Hall, 285-1736.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?

You may not personally benefit from being in this study. However, there are two ways in which it is possible for you to benefit.

First, you will be debriefed at the end of the study on what scientists currently know about personality, relational styles, and psychopathology.
Second, you will be exposed to the process of taking a scientific survey, and you will learn about what it is like to participate in psychology research first hand. Not all students are given this opportunity at Ball State University, and participating in this survey study may increase your knowledge about scientific approaches to psychology and how psychological science is often conducted.

**What other options are there?**

You have the option of not taking part in this study. You will not be penalized for your decision to decline participation.

**What about confidentiality?**

For this survey, your responses will be completely anonymous. You will not put your name or any identifying information on the actual questionnaires. You will be filling out these questionnaires on a computer. Unfortunately, as the Internet is not a fully secure medium, complete anonymity cannot be assured in a web-based survey. However, all efforts will be extended to assure encryption and firewall protection of survey responses. For example, we do not ask for any identifying information on the surveys. This information will entered on a separate log-in page and will only be used to assign participation credit. This information will not be connected with your responses on the surveys. Your survey responses will be stored in an anonymous database and all original source files will be deleted once you have submitted your survey. There will be no way for anyone to tell which survey you personally completed. Once the anonymous information from all of the surveys has been entered into the researcher’s computer, all data will be held for five years, and then will be destroyed.

**What are the costs?**

There are no costs associated with your participation. You will receive 1 research credit for your participation in this study.

**What are my rights?**

Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in any or all of this survey, and you may cease responding at any time. You will not be penalized for your decision to decline a response to individual questions or to the survey as a whole.

**Who should I call with questions or problems concerning the study?**

Questions about this study or your feelings about this study may be directed to the co-investigators: Brandy Pierson and Abby Rosswurm under the faculty supervision of Dr. Lucinda Woodward, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychological Science at Lewoodward@bsu.edu, phone: (765)285-1693. You may contact Brandy Pierson at Bpierson@bsu.edu, phone: (765)977-2382 or Abby Rosswurm at Arrosswurm@bsu.edu, phone: (260) 615-4955 with further question.
For one’s rights as a research subject, the following person may be contacted: Coordinator of Research Compliance, Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Programs, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, 765-285-5070 or irb@bsu.edu.

If you should have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in this study, please e-mail the co-investigators, Abby Rosswurm at Arrosswurm@bsu.edu or Brandy Pierson at Brpierson@bsu.edu before proceeding further.

We encourage all participants to print a copy of this informed consent for future reference in the event of unanticipated questions or concerns.

If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter before submitting this form. If you have questions at a future date, contact the Co-Investigators listed on this form.

I agree to participate

I decline to participate
Appendix B:

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for completing the Study Personality and Relational Styles. Your participation will help us better understand the relationship between personality, relational styles, and psychological well-being. The current study was designed to assess Myers-Briggs personality type, attachment style, mental health and interpersonal style. The intent of this study was to discover a relationship between these four psychological concepts. It is hoped that a better understanding of personality will increase our understanding of other consistent aspects of human behavior. Furthermore, these findings might be extended to help mental health professionals understand the dynamic characteristics of personality. I’d be happy to answer any questions you have.

Questions about this study or your feelings about this study may be directed to the research investigators: Brandy Pierson and Abby Rosswurm under the faculty supervision of Dr. Lucinda Woodward, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychological Science at [lewwoodward@bsu.edu](mailto:lewwoodward@bsu.edu), phone: (765) 285-1693. You may contact Brandy Pierson at [brpierson@bsu.edu](mailto:brpierson@bsu.edu), phone: (765) 977-2382 or Abby Rosswurm at [arrosswurm@bsu.edu](mailto:arrosswurm@bsu.edu), phone: (260) 615-4955 with further question.

For one’s rights as a research subject, the following person may be contacted: Coordinator of Research Compliance, Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Programs, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, 765-285-5070 or [irb@bsu.edu](mailto:irb@bsu.edu).

Anyone experiencing feelings of anxiety or stress as a result of participating in this study is encouraged to seek assistance from the BSU Counseling and Psychological Services Center in Lucina Hall at 765-285-1736.

For more information on these topics please see the following:


Appendix C:

Survey Questionnaires

Study Title: Personality and Relational Styles

1. Age (in years)

2. Gender
   A. Male
   B. Female

3. Year in school
   A. freshman
   B. sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Graduate
   F. Other

4. Marital status
   A. single
   B. Married
   C. Co-habitating
   D. Divorced
   E. Separated
   F. Widowed

5. Ethnicity/Race
   A. Caucasian
   B. African American
   C. Hispanic
   D. Asian
   E. American Indian
   F. other

6. Is English your primary language?
   Yes/No

MBTI

Instructions: Check either (a) or (b) that best describes you

7. When the phone rings do you
   A. hurry to get to it first
   B. hope someone else will answer

8. Are you more
   A. observant than introspective
   B. introspective than observant
9. Is it worse to
A. have your head in the clouds
B. be in a rut

10. With people are you usually more
A. firm than gentle
B. gentle than firm

11. Are you more comfortable in making
A. critical judgments
B. value judgments

12. Is clutter in the workplace something you
A. take time to straighten up
B. tolerate pretty well

13. Is it your way to
A. make up your mind quickly
B. pick and choose at some length

14. Waiting in line, do you often
A. chat with the others
B. stick to business

15. Are you more
A. sensible than ideational
B. ideational than sensible

16. Are you more interested in
A. what is actual
B. what is possible

17. In making decisions do you go more by
A. data
B. desires

18. In sizing up others do you tend to be
A. objective and impersonal
B. friendly and personal

19. Do you prefer contracts to be
A. signed, sealed, and delivered
B. settled on a handshake

20. Are you more satisfied having
A. a finished product
B. work in progress

21. At a party, do you
A. interact with many, even strangers
B. interact with a few friends

22. Do you tend to be more
A. factual than speculative
B. speculative than factual

23. Do you like writers who
A. say what they mean
B. use metaphors and symbolism

24. Which appeals to you more:
A. consistency of thought
B. harmonious relationships

25. In disappointing someone are you
A. frank and straightforward
B. warm and considerate

26. On the job do you want your activities
A. scheduled
B. unscheduled

27. Do you more often prefer
A. final, unalterable statements
B. tentative, preliminary statements

28. Does interacting with strangers
A. energize you
B. tax your reserves

29. Facts are more likely to
A. speak for themselves
B. illustrate principles

30. Do you find visionaries and theorists
A. somewhat annoying
B. rather fascinating

31. In a heated discussion, do you
A. stick to your guns
B. look for common ground
32. Is it better to be  
A. just  
B. merciful  

33. At work, is it more natural for you to  
A. point out mistakes  
B. try to please  

34. Are you more comfortable  
A. after a decision  
B. before a decision  

35. Do you tend to  
A. say right out what's on your mind  
B. keep you ears open  

36. Common sense is  
A. usually reliable  
B. frequently questionable  

37. Children often do not  
A. make themselves useful enough  
B. exercise their fantasy enough  

38. When in charge of others are you  
A. firm and unbending  
B. forgiving and lenient  

39. Are you more often  
A. a cool-headed person  
B. a warm-hearted person  

40. Are you prone to  
A. nailing things down  
B. exploring the possibilities  

41. In most situations are you more  
A. deliberate  
B. spontaneous  

42. Do you think of yourself as  
A. outgoing  
B. private  

43. Are you more frequently  
A. a practical sort of person  
B. a fanciful sort of person  

44. Do you speak more in  
A. particulars than generalities  
B. generalities than particulars  

45. Which is more of a compliment:  
A. "There's a logical person"  
B. "There's a sentimental person"  

46. Which rules you more  
A. your thoughts  
B. your feelings  

47. When finishing a job, do you like to  
A. tie up all the loose ends  
B. move on to something else  

48. Do you prefer to work  
A. to deadlines  
B. just whenever  

49. Are you the kind of person who  
A. is rather talkative  
B. doesn't miss much  

50. Are you inclined to take what is said  
A. more literally  
B. more figuratively  

51. Do you more often see  
A. what's right in front of you  
B. what can only be imagined  

52. Is it worse to be  
A. a softy  
B. hard-nosed  

53. In hard circumstances are you sometimes  
A. too unsympathetic  
B. too sympathetic  

54. Do you tend to choose  
A. rather carefully
B. somewhat impulsively

55. Are you inclined to be more
A. hurried than leisurely
B. leisurely than hurried

56. At work do you tend to
A. be sociable with your colleagues
B. keep more to yourself

57. Are you more likely to trust
A. your experiences
B. your conceptions

58. Are you more inclined to feel
A. down to earth
B. somewhat removed

59. Do you think of yourself as a
A. tough-minded person
B. tender-hearted person

60. Do you value more in yourself being
A. reasonable
B. devoted

61. Do you usually want things
A. settled and decided
B. just penciled in

62. Would you say you are more
A. serious and determined
B. easy going

63. Do you consider yourself
A. a good conversationalist
B. a good listener

64. Do you prize in yourself
A. a strong hold on reality
B. a vivid imagination

65. Are you drawn more to
A. fundamentals
B. overtones

66. Which seems the greater fault:
A. to be too compassionate
B. to be too dispassionate

67. Are you swayed more by
A. convincing evidence
B. a touching appeal

68. Do you feel better about
A. coming to closure
B. keeping your options open

69. Is it preferable mostly to
A. make sure things are arranged
B. just let things happen naturally

70. Are you inclined to be
A. easy to approach
B. reserved

71. In stories do you prefer
A. action and adventure
B. fantasy and heroism

72. Is it easier for you to
A. put others to good use
B. identify with others

73. Which do you wish more for yourself
A. strength of will
B. strength of emotion

74. Do you see yourself as basically
A. thick-skinned
B. thin-skinned

75. Do you tend to notice
A. disorderliness
B. opportunities for change

76. Are you more
A. routinized than whimsical
B. whimsical than routinized
ECR-R

Instructions: The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, no just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond by indicating how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

77. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

78. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

79. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

80. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

81. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

82. I worry a lot about my relationships.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

83. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

84. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

85. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

86. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

87. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

88. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"
89. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

90. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

91. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

92. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

93. I worry that I won't measure up to other people. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

94. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

95. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

96. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

97. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

98. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

99. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

100. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

101. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

102. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

103. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner. 
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

104. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

105. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

106. I tell my partner just about everything.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

107. I talk things over with my partner.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

108. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

109. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

110. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

111. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

112. My partner really understands me and my needs.
Likert range=7 "Strongly Disagree" "Strongly Agree"

RQ

Instructions: Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Select the letter corresponding to the relationship style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are.

250. Which style description (A through D) corresponds closely to yourself in your current or most recent relationship?

A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without a close relationship with my partner but I sometimes worry that others doesn’t value me as much as I value them.
D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

251. Style A: 
Likert range=7 "Disagree Strongly" "Agree Strongly"

252. Style B: 
Likert range=7 "Disagree Strongly" "Agree Strongly"

253. Style C: 
Likert range=7 "Disagree Strongly" "Agree Strongly"

254. Style D: 
Likert range=7 "Disagree Strongly" "Agree Strongly"
**Table 1. Distribution of the self-report attachment styles of the participants based on the RQ.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Frequency in Current Study</th>
<th>Percent in Current Study</th>
<th>Percent based on Dion (1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Distribution of the reported KTS-II personality types of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Personality</th>
<th>Frequency in Current Study</th>
<th>Percent in Current Study</th>
<th>Percent based on Keirsey (1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 497 100.0%
Table 3. Cross tabulation between the variables extroversion and a secure attachment style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Not Secure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introverts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extroverts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Cross tabulation of the variables sensing and a secure attachment style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Not Secure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Diagram of the four attachment styles based on Bartholomew & Horowitz, (1991).