

Relationships between Parental behavior, and attachment patterns in Korean and North American Adolescents*

Hyo Soon You

Kathleen Malley-Morrison

Korea National
Open University

Boston University

In this cross-cultural study, the relationships among recollections of parental behavior, gender, and attachment patterns were examined in 115 Korean college students and 77 North American college students.

The results revealed that the North Americans were no more likely to rate themselves as secure in their attachment patterns than the Koreans, but the Koreans rated themselves as higher on one of the insecure attachment styles, the preoccupied. There was a significant gender difference only in the North American participants on the fearful attachment score; no significant gender differences were found on any attachment score in Korean participants. Pearson correlation analyses showed significant negative relationships between father's acceptance and preoccupied attachment scores in North Americans; however in the Korean sample, there were significant positive relationships between secure attachment scores and both father's and mother's acceptance as well as between fearful attachment and mothers's control. Hierarchical multiple regressions confirmed the contribution of parental behavior to the attachment styles. Koreans recalled their parents as less accepting and as less controlling than North Americans did. Korean females recollected their father as more accepting than Korean males did and North American females recollected their mother as more accepting than North American males did.

Key Words : attachment pattern • parental acceptance and control

* This study was supported by the 1999's research fund of Korea National Open University. Some portion of this study was presented at the 107th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at Boston, August, 1999.

Building on early attachment theory and research (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980; Ainsworth, 1982; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978), attachment researchers (Main & Goldwyn, 1988; Hazen & Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) have recently examined the adult attachment styles and the relationships between working models of attachment and adult's social and emotional adaptation. For example, Hazen and Shaver(1987) found considerable evidence supporting their expectation that the qualitatively different patterns of attachment identified in childhood (secure, avoidant, and anxious - ambivalent classified by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978) are parallel to patterns that characterize adults. Moreover, they found that adults with different attachment styles differed predictably in the way they experienced love in romantic relationships.

Based on Hazen and Shaver's work(1987), Bartholomew(1990) defined attachment patterns in relation to the intersection of positive and negative representations of the self and others, and developed a four category model of attachment-- secure, dismissive, preoccupied, and fearful. The secure pattern is defined as involving a positive self-model and

positive other model; secure individuals are both confident in themselves and comfortable with intimacy in their close relationships. The dismissive attachment pattern is defined in terms of a positive self-model and negative other model; these persons are characterized by an avoidance of close relationships. Finally, the two other attachment patterns, preoccupied and fearful, are defined in terms of a negative self-model and chronic anxiety about rejection and abandonment in their close relationships. The preoccupied attachment pattern is defined in terms of a positive other model and the fearful attachment pattern is defined in terms of a negative other model(Bartholomew & howowitz, 1991).

The usefulness of this four attachment style system has been supported by in a substantial number of North American studies(e.g., Brennan, Shaver, & Tobey, 1991; Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, & Bartholomew, 1994), cross-cultural studies (e.g. You & Malley-Morrison, in press; Sümer & Güngör, 1999) as well as in Korean samples(e.g., Jang, 1997). For example, in a study of a North American sample, Dutton and his colleagues found that Bartholomew and Horowitz's four attachment styles differed in their corre-

lations with constellation measures that assessed anger, jealousy, Borderline Personality Organization, and trauma symptoms. Jang(1997) reported that Bartholomew and Horowitz's four attachment style measure was appropriate for studying adult attachment in Koreans. After reviewed the adult attachment interview and self-report instruments measuring adult attachment, Jang (1978) suggested that Bartholomew's four category model of attachment is more proper to study adult's attachment than Hazen and Shaver's three category model of attachment.

According to Bowlby(1969, 1973, 1980), individual differences in attachment relationships result from early interactions between a child and his or her caregivers. Ainsworth, Blehar, Water, & Wall.(1978) suggested that the three attachment styles identified in infancy-- secure, avoidant, and anxious- ambivalent --are related to infants' expectations of their caregivers' expectations and responsiveness. Securely attached infants have a strong base and believe that parents are available in times of need. In contrast, infants with insecure styles, either avoidant or anxious- ambivalent, perceive caregivers as unavailable and have doubt about the relief others can bring in time of

stress.

Similar to the relationship between infants' attachment styles and parenting, researchers on adult attachment(e.g., Collins and Read, 1990; Bartholomew, 1993; Bringle and Bagby, 1992) have reported significant relationships between recollections of parental behavior and adult's attachment. For example, Collins and Read(1990) found that both male and female adult participants' perceptions of their mothers and fathers as warm, responsive and not-rejecting were connected to their feelings of being comfortable with depending on others. Bartholomew(1993) suggested that securely attached people had more positive relationships with parents than did insecure individuals. Bringle and Bagby(1992) found that in both males and females attachment style was linked to their parent's parenting; specifically, warm mothering was related to the secure style and warm fathering was associated positively with both secure and avoidant styles. Carnelley, Pietromonaco, & Jaffe (1994) found that women reporting less positive childhood experiences with their mothers and their fathers had higher scores on the avoidant and preoccupied attachment styles.

Hazen and Shaver (1987) pointed out they found no reliable gender

differences on their self-report measure of adult attachment. However, Bartholomew(1994) argued that gender differences are evident on measures assessing four rather than three patterns of adult attachment. For example, Bartholomew and Horowitz(1991) reported that in a sample of North American young adults, females scored significantly higher than males on preoccupied attachment and males scored significantly higher than females on dismissive attachment. Even though several studies of adult attachment (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson, 1990; Hazen and Shaver, 1987) have suggested that there may be gender differences in patterns of correlation between adult attachment status and gender, few studies on adult attachment have reported such gender differences.

Research on adult attachment styles has been conducted primarily within English-speaking Western societies(e.g., Brennan & Shaver, 1995; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Feeney & Noller, 1990). While there appears to be very little cross-cultural research on adult attachment, there is some evidence of cross-cultural variation in adult attachment. For example, Yalçinkaya and Rapoza (1998) found that young American women rated themselves as higher

on anxious-ambivalent and avoidant attachment than Young Turkish women. Among the purposes of the current study were determining whether North American and Koreans differ in adult attachment patterns, and further whether there are cultural variations between North Americans and Koreans in associations between adult attachment status and recollections of parental behavior.

In this study, we focused on one frequently studied dimension of cultural variation--i.e., individualism versus collectivism. According to researchers in this field(for example, Hofstede, 1980, Hui & Triandis, 1986), individualism emphasizes "I", autonomy, independence, initiative, and privacy, whereas collectivism emphasizes "we", collective identity, dependence, and group solidarity. In the United States, one of the most individualistic countries, self determination, personal control, and independence are very important. Individuals are strongly encouraged to separate from their ascribed relationships such as family.

In a collectivistic culture, greater emphasis is placed on the needs and goals of the in-group rather than on the individual, as well as on social norms and duties, and beliefs and values that are shared by the in-

group members (Triandis, 1988). In Korea, a collectivistic country, the individual is viewed as fractional part of a more significant whole, the family (Kim, 1977). Decisions that are usually considered to be "individual matters" in the United States are often subject to family scrutiny and approval in Korea (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985).

Although there are some evidences of cross-cultural variation in the experience of parental behavior (e.g. Saavedra, 1980; Trommsdorff, 1985; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985), there are also important commonalities across cultures. For example, building on Baumrind's (1967, 1971, 1983) work on parental behavior patterns, researchers focused on parental acceptance and control have found that mothers are warmer but less controlling than fathers in both individualistic societies (Lamb, 1981; Maccoby & Martin, 1983) and collectivistic societies (Shek, 1995; Berndt, Cheung, Lau, Hau, & Lew, 1993). Some research in Western countries has suggested that parents are warmer toward daughters than toward sons and more controlling and punitive toward sons than daughters (Block, 1983, 1984); similarly, daughters have been found to perceive their fathers as warmer and as less controlling than did sons in

Asian countries (Berndt, et al., 1993). However, in contrast to the individualistic societies where parental control is associated with perceived parental hostility and rejection (Saavedra, 1980 ; Trommsdorff, 1985), control is associated with perceived parental warmth and acceptance in Korea (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985) as well as other collectivistic societies (Kornadt, 1987; Trommsdorff, 1985). For example, Korean adolescents view parental strictness as an indication of parental warmth and low neglect.

Building on previous research revealing the importance of the relationships between perceived parental acceptance and control and adult attachment, as well as evidence of cultural and gender differences in both perceived parenting practices and attachment patterns, we assumed that the perception of parental behaviors and the gender of the young adults in the individualistic and the collectivistic society might be differentially related to the attachment patterns in these two cultures.

Specifically, in this study we examined the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between parental acceptance and control, as recalled by adolescents and adult attachment status?

2. Is this relationship the same or different in Caucasian American as opposed to Korean adolescents?
3. Does gender play a role in this relationship, either within or across cultures?

Method

Participants

Seventy seven North American college students (40 females, 37 males) from Boston University participated for credit towards a requirement in their psychology course. Ages ranged from 17 to 22, with a mean of 19 years. Most of the North American participants (91%) came from middle and upper middle class backgrounds. Korean participants were 45 females and 70 males (total 115 students) who were enrolled in the introduction of psychology course at Sung Kyun Kwan University in Seoul. Their ages ranged from 18 to 27, with a mean of 20 years. Seventy eight percents of the Korean participants came from middle and upper middle class backgrounds. Korea data were collected at October, 1997 and American data were collected during the fall semester, 1997.

Measures

The participants completed a questionnaire packet that included a demographic questionnaire, four category attachment style questionnaire, a 20-item acceptance scale from the Rohner (1980) Parental Acceptance - Rejection Questionnaire, and a 20-item control scale from Schludermann and Schludermann (1970) Children's Report of Questionnaire. In order to be used with Korean participants, the English versions of these measures were translated into Korean by bilingual persons familiar with questions being asked and with the nature of the research. The measures were then back-translated into English by a Korean-American. The original English version and the back-translated version of the questionnaires were then compared, and discrepancies were noted and corrected. Attachment style Questionnaire is a 4-paragraph questionnaire developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). Each paragraph describes one of the four attachment styles (secure, fearful, avoidant, and dismissing). Participants were asked to rate each paragraph on a seven-point scale, reflecting the degree to which each style applies to them. They also chose which paragraph describes them best. In

this study, we analyzed only the rating of participants on the four attachment paragraphs. The construct validity of Bartholomew's four attachment pattern has been established not only in English-speaking Western cultures (Bartholomew, 1993) but also in Korea (Jang, 1997). While Cronbach alpha cannot be calculated on single-item scales, evidence for reliability comes from our findings. There were significant correlations between secure and fearful attachment ($r = -.36, p < .01$), and between preoccupied and dismissive attachment ($r = -.34, p < .01$) in the North American participants and also between secure and preoccupied attachment ($r = .20, p < .05$), and fearful attachment ($r = -.24, p < .05$) and between preoccupied and dismissive attachment ($r = -.23, p < .01$), and fearful attachment ($r = -.31, p < .01$) in Korean samples.

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner, 1980) is a 60 item, self-report measure asking about experiences in families-of-origin. The original questionnaire consists of four scales—warmth, hostility, neglect and undifferentiated rejection. In this study only the warmth and rejection scales, 20 items total, were administered. Examples of items are: "my father

used to talk to me about our plans and listen to what I had to say."; "My father used to tell me how proud he was of me when I was good." Participants were asked to reflect on their relationships with their fathers and their mothers when they were young and rate on a four point Likert-like scale ranging from 'almost always true' to 'almost never true'. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Measure in this study's participants were .97 (for North Americans) and .90 (for Koreans).

The original Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory is a 192-item measure developed by Schaefer (1965). However, the widely used inventory is a shortened version by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970). This inventory has 18 scales on three dimensions of parenting—acceptance vs. rejection, psychological control vs. psychological autonomy and firm vs. lax control. In this study, we used only the 20 items of the two dimensions of parenting, psychological control vs. psychological autonomy and firm vs. lax control. Examples of items are: "My father, when I was young "was very strict with me." and "stuck to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions." Participants respond to each item on the basis of whether

the items are 'like', 'somewhat like', or 'not like' their mother/father when they were young. The Cronbach alpha of coefficients of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory of the participants were .78(for North Americans) and .62(for Koreans).

Analyses

The variables investigated in this study were the four attachment styles, ethnicity, gender, father's acceptance and control and mother's acceptance and control. Simple factorial analyses of variance, Pearson correlations, and hierarchial

multiple regression were run using SPSS.

Results

The descriptive statistics for the four attachment patterns are shown in Table 1. One way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate whether the North American and Korean samples differ in continuous scores of the four attachment patterns. The results showed that there is a significant ethnic difference only on the preoccupied attachment score ($F(1, 189) = 6.78, p < .01$), indicating that Korean participants

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Attachment Scores

Variable	Ethnic	Gender	M	SD	F	M(Total)	SD(Total)	F(Total)
Secure	North American	Female	4.53	1.36	.29	4.61	1.45	1.47
		Male	4.70	1.56				
	Korean	Female	4.25	1.66	.19	4.33	1.61	
		Male	4.39	1.59				
Dismissive	North American	Female	3.35	1.48	1.34	3.55	1.54	.02
		Male	3.76	1.61				
	Korean	Female	3.34	1.80	.77	3.51	1.66	
		Male	3.61	1.56				
Preoccupied	North American	Female	3.28	2.03	2.13	3.58	1.95	6.78**
		Male	3.92	1.83				
	Korean	Female	4.00	1.64	1.82	4.25	1.55	
		Male	4.40	1.48				
Fearful	North American	Female	4.08	2.12	6.74*	3.55	1.93	.29
		Male	2.97	1.54				
	Korean	Female	3.64	1.78	1.38	3.40	1.68	
		Male	3.26	1.61				

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Parental Behavior

Variable	Ethnic	Gender	M	SD	F	M(Total)	SD(Total)	F(Total)
Mother Acceptance	North American	Female	71.23	6.65	7.66**	68.55	9.26	18.40***
		Male	65.58	10.83				
	Korean	Female	62.89	9.40	.27	62.25	10.32	
		Male	61.84	10.91				
Father Acceptance	North American	Female	65.38	11.75	2.00	63.67	11.15	41.42***
		Male	61.78	10.28				
	Korean	Female	55.91	12.10	5.17*	53.01	11.21	
		Male	51.12	10.24				
Mother Control	North American	Female	38.50	7.70	2.75	40.01	8.48	36.91***
		Male	41.69	9.08				
	Korean	Female	32.70	7.91	.00	32.76	7.70	
		Male	32.79	7.61				
Father Control	North American	Female	41.45	7.70	.09	41.18	8.15	6.37*
		Male	40.89	8.73				
	Korean	Female	37.59	7.30	.18	38.02	8.64	
		Male	38.29	9.44				

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

rated themselves as more preoccupied than North American did. The result of one way ANOVAs also revealed that there is a significant gender difference on fearful attachment scores ($F(1, 75) = 6.74, p < .01$) in the North American participants. There were no significant gender difference on any attachment scores in Korean participants.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the recollection of parental behaviors. The results of one way ANOVAs to investigate the role of ethnicity in recollections of parental behavior indicated that there

are significant differences between North American and Korean participants. Specifically, Korean reported their parents to be less controlling (father control, $F(1, 186) = 6.37, p < .05$; mother control, $F(1, 185) = 36.91, p < .001$) and less accepting (father acceptance, $F(1, 188) = 41.42, p < .001$; mother acceptance, $F(1, 187) = 18.40, p < .001$, respectively) than North American did. There was a significant gender difference only on the recollection of mother acceptance ($F(1, 74) = 7.66, p < .01$) in North American participants and only on the recollection of father acceptance

Table 3. Intercorrelations of Attachment Scores with Parental Behavior

Variable	Secure		Dismissive		Preoccupied		Fearful	
	North American	Korean	North American	Korean	North American	Korean	North American	Korean
Mother Acceptance	.15	.19*	-.13	.02	-.01	.06	-.06	.01
Father Acceptance	.16	.23*	-.03	.03	-.23*	.08	-.12	-.10
Mother Control	.07	-.02	-.07	.01	.16	-.12	.02	.22*
Father Control	.05	.11	.04	.01	-.06	-.08	-.02	-.07

* = $p < .05$

in Korean participants ($F(1, 112) = 5.17, p < .05$) indicating that North American males did and Korean American females reported their fathers as

Table 4. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Attachment Pattern

Ethnic	Variable	Step 1 Beta	Step 2 Beta	Step 3 Beta	Step 4 Beta	R ² Change	F Change
Korean	Secure						
	Mother Acceptance	.21*	.16	.16	.10	.04	4.77*
	Father Acceptance	-	.20*	.20*	.29**	.04	4.35*
	Mother Control	-	-	.00	-.03	.00	.00
	Father Control	-	-	-	.21*	.03	4.03*
	F	F(1,109) =4.77	F(1,108) =4.63	F(1,107) =3.06	F(1,106) =3.37		
	Fearful						
	Mother Acceptance	-	-	-	-		
	Father Acceptance	-.11	-.13	-	-	.01	1.31
	Mother control	-	.23*	-	-	.05	6.10*
	Father control	-	-	-	-		
	F	F(1,109) =1.31	F(1,108) =3.73				
North American	Preoccupied						
	Mother Acceptance	-	-	-	-		
	Father Acceptance	-.23*	-.21	-.27*	-	.06	4.30*
	Mother control	-	.11	.27	-	.01	.86
	Father control	-	-	-.30*	-	.06	4.61*
	F	F(1,74) =4.29	F(1,73) =2.57	F(1,72) =3.33			

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

- = excluded variable

more accepting than Korean males did.

Pearson correlational analyses (Table 3) revealed significant negative relationships between father's acceptance and preoccupied attachment scores in North Americans ($r = -.23, p < .05$); in the Koreans, by contrast, there are significant positive relationships between secure attachment scores and both father's acceptance ($r = .23, p < .05$) and mother's acceptance ($r = .19, p < .05$) as well as between the fearful attachment score and mother's control ($r = .22, p < .05$).

To assess the relative contribution of the recollection of maternal and paternal acceptance and control to each of the four attachment patterns, we performed hierarchical multiple regressions (Table 4), with mother acceptance entered at step 1, father acceptance at step 2, mother control at step 3, and father control at step 4. The results were generally similar to those of the Pearson correlations—that is, in the

Korean sample, both mother acceptance ($\beta = .21, p < .05$) and father acceptance ($\beta = .20, p < .05$) contributed significantly and positively to secure attachment, and mother control ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) contributed significantly and positively to fearful attachment. In these

analysis, mother acceptance contributed significantly to secure attachment (R^2 change = .04, $p < .05$) at step 1, father acceptance added significantly (R^2 change = .04, $p < .05$) at step 2, and father control added significantly (R^2 change = .03, $p < .05$) at step 4. Mother control contributed significantly (R^2 change = .05, $p < .05$) to the prediction of the fearful attachment score with the other variables not adding significantly to the variance explained. Father acceptance ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$) contributed significantly and negatively to preoccupied attachment in North Americans. In these analyses, father acceptance had significant (R^2 change = .06, $p < .05$) predictive power at step 1, with father control adding significantly (R^2 change = .06, $p < .05$) to the prediction of preoccupied attachment at step 3.

Discussion

The results of this study contribute to our understanding of the similarities and differences between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. North Americans are no more likely to rate themselves as secure in their attachment patterns than Koreans, but the Koreans rate

themselves as higher on one of the insecure attachment styles – specifically, the preoccupied. This finding might be explained by the notion that Korean put weight on the respect of others and strong ties and loyalty to the family in parenting which is related to the characteristic of the preoccupied attachment. According to Bartholomew and Horowitz(1991), the preoccupied attachment style is characterized by a sense of unworthiness, combined with positive regard of others. This result partially confirmed the studies(Yalçinkaya and Rapoza,1998; Sümer and Güngör, 1999) which had done in an another collectivistic country, Turkey. Yalçinkaya and Rapoza(1998) also found no significant differences between women from the U.S. and Turkey in secure attachment scores, however significant differences between these groups in avoidant and anxious – ambivalent attachment, as assessed through Hazen and Shaver's(1985) three– category adult attachment measure. Anxious – ambivalent attachment corresponds conceptually to Bartholomew and Horowitz's(1991) preoccupied attachment. Sümer and Güngör (1999) reported that while preoccupied individuals in the Turkish sample were overrepresented, dismissive and fearful individuals in the U.S. sample were

overrepresented.

Our data suggest that differences between cultural groups on adult attachment scores may be associated with different parental practices. In this study, we found that father's acceptance is associated with attachment in both cultures. However, father acceptance was negatively correlated with the preoccupied attachment in North American participants and positively correlated with secure attachment in Korean participants. According to the results of the regression analyses, father acceptance added significantly to the prediction of the secure attachment at step 2, where as mother acceptance did not add to the prediction of the secure attachment in Korean participants. Father control also contributed to the prediction of the secure attachment score of Korean young adults. By contrast, in North American young adults, father acceptance had predictive power for preoccupied attachment to which father control added significantly. These results indicated that the father seems to play important role in the attachment of adolescents in both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, but in different ways. That is, father seems to be important in predicting secure attachment of Korean adolescents but in predicting

preoccupied attachment in North American adolescents.

This might be explained by the fact that Korean view parental strictness and control as an indication of parental warmth and low neglect (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985) whereas in the individualistic societies parental control is associated with parental hostility and rejection (Trommsdorff, 1985). However further study is necessary to clarify the cultural difference in the relationship between the parental behavior and attachment pattern.

While other behavior was not associated with any of the attachment scores of North American participants, mother control was positively correlated with fearful attachment in Korean participants. This result might be explained by the notion that mother control is seen as being slightly aggressive, hostile and rejecting by Korean youths (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985). Looking at the differences in the recollections of parental behavior between the two cultures, it is interesting to find out that Koreans, whose parental role is authoritarian in nature (Crane, 1974), perceived their mothers and fathers as less accepting and also less controlling than North Americans did. This result confirmed Feldman, Rosenthal,

Mont-Reynaud, Leung and Lau (1991) and Yalçinkaya and Rapoza's (1998) findings. Feldman et al. (1991) found that Chinese children in Hong Kong described their parents as less controlling and as less warm than did U.S. children. Yalçinkaya and Rapoza (1998) found that Turkish women reported their mothers as less accepting and their fathers as less controlling than U.S. women did.

With respect to gender differences in the recollection of parental behavior, there were significant differences on the father acceptance score in Korean participants and on mother acceptance in North American participants. These results indicated that Korean females recollected their father as more accepting than Korean males did and North American females recollected their mother as more accepting than North American males did. The results of this study supported the results of other studies indicating that parents are warmer toward daughters than toward sons in Western cultures (Block, 1983) and that daughters perceive their fathers as warmer and as less controlling than do sons in Asian countries (Berndt, et al., 1993). According to Confucian ideology in the traditional Asian countries such as China and Korea, fathers are typically characterized as a stern

disciplinarians, more concerned with the demands of propriety and necessity than with feelings, and to be feared by the child. Especially, in this Eastern culture, the father-son relationship is considered to be the most important dyad and it serves as a prototype for other formal relationships such as master-servant, teacher-student, and elder-younger. The relationships between father and son required benevolence, authority, responsibility, and obedience. So fathers were expected to be stricter toward their sons than toward their daughters.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* (pp.3-30). New-York: Basic.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K. (1993). From childhood to adult relationship: Attachment theory and research. In S. Dack(Eds.), *Learning about relationships* (pp.30-62). Newbury Pack: Sage.
- Bartholomew, K. (1994). Assessment of individual differences in adult attachment. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 23-26.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4 (1 part 2).
- Baumrind, D. (1983). Rejoinder to Lewis's reinterpretation of parental firm control effects: Are authoritative families really harmonious? *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 132-142.
- Berndt, T. J., Cheung, P. C., Lau, S., Hau, K. T. & Lew, W.(1993). Perceptions of parenting in Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong: Sex differences and Societal differences. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 156-164.

- Block, J. H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. *Child Development*, 54, 1335-1354.
- Block, J. H. (1984). *Sex role identity and ego development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss. Vol. I, Attachment*. New York: basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss. Vol. II, Separation*. New York: basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss. Vol. III, Loss*. New York: basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation and romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 267-283.
- Brennan, K. A., Shaver, P. R., & Tobey, A.E.(1991). Attachment styles, gender, and parental problem drinking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 451-466.
- Bringle, R. & Bagby, G. J.(1992). Self-Esteem and Perceived Quality Romantic and Family Relationships in Young Adults. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 26, 340-356.
- Carnelley, K. B., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1994). Depression, working models of others and relationship functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 127-140.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Crane, P. S. (1974). *Korean Patterns* (3d ed.). Seoul: Kukje.
- Dutton, D. G., Saunders, K., Starzomski, A. & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 14-20.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment styles as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 281-291.
- Feldman, S. S., Rosenthal, D. A., Mont-Reynaud, R., Leung, K., & Lau, S.(1991). Ain't misbehavin': Adolescent values and family environments as correlates of misconduct in Australia. Hong Kong, and the Unites States. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 1, 109-134.
- Haszn, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of*

- Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 225-248.
- Jang, H. S. (1997). The comparison of 3-group model with 4-group model of adult attachment. *Korean Journal of Psychology: Developmental*, 10, 123-138.
- Jang, H. S. (1998). Measuring adult attachment: Review of the interview and self-report instrument. *The Korean Journal of Human Development*, 6, 147-168.
- Kim, H. C. (1977). Education of the Korean immigrant child. *Integrated Education*, 15, 15-18.
- Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment models, affect regulation and representations of self and others. *Child Development*, 59, 135-146.
- Kornadt, H. J. (1987). The aggression motive and personality development: Japan and Germany. In F. Halish & J. Kuhl (Eds.), *Motivation, intention and volition*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Lamb, M. E. (1981). Fathers and child development: An integrative overview. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (2nd ed., pp.1-70). New York: Wiley.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, Personality and social development* (4th ed., pp.1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1988). *An adult attachment classification system*, Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Department of Psychology, Berkeley.
- Rohner, R. P. (1980). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.
- Rohner, R. P., & Pettengill, S. M. (1985). Perceived parental acceptances - Rejection and parental control among Korean adolescents. *Child Development*, 56, 524-528.
- Saavedra, J. M. (1980). Effects of perceived parental warmth and control on the self-evaluation of Puerto Rican adolescent males. *Behavior Science Research*, 15, 41-54.
- Schludermann, E. & Schludermann, S.

- (1970). Replicability of Factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI). *Journal of Psychology*, 76, 239-249.
- Shaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development*, 38, 413-424.
- Shek, D.(1995). Chinese Adolescents' Perceptions of Parenting Styles of Fathers and Mothers. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 156, 175-190.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 971-980.
- Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish samples and a cross-cultural comparison. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14, 107-109.
- Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In C. Bagley & G. K. Verma Eds.), *Personality, cognition and values: Cross-Cultural perspectives of childhood and adolescence*. London: macmillan.
- Trommsdorff, G.(1985). Some comparative aspects of socialization in japan and Germany. In I. R. Lagunes & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.). *From a different perspective: Studies of behavior across cultures* (pp. 231-240). Lesse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Yalçinkaya, A., & Rapoza, K. (1998). *Parenting practices and attachment styles in the United States and Turkey*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Eastern Psychological Association at Boston.
- You, H. S., & Malley-Morrison, K. (in press). Young adults attachment styles and intimate relationships with close friends: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

미국과 한국 청년의 부모의 양육태도와 애착에 관한 연구

유효순

케서린 멜리-모리슨

한국방송통신대학교

보스턴 대학교

이 연구에서는 미국과 한국의 대학생을 대상으로 부모의 양육태도와 애착형태 및 남·녀 성의 관계를 알아보고자 하였다. 결과를 보면, 안정애착 평정에는 미국과 한국 대학생간에 유의한 차이가 없었다. 그러나 한국 대학생들은 불안애착 중 한 형태인 몰두된 애착에 미국 학생들보다 유의하게 높게 평정하였다. 한국 대학생의 경우, 애착평정에 남녀간에 유의한 차이가 없었으나 미국 여학생들은 남학생보다 두려움 애착평정 점수가 유의하게 높았다. 피어슨 상관분석결과는 미국 학생들의 아버지의 수용과 몰두된 애착에 유의한 부적상관을 보였으나 한국 학생들의 경우는 아버지의 수용과 안정애착이 유의한 정적 상관을 보였고 어머니의 통제와 두려움애착이 정적상관을 보였다. 회귀분석 결과는 이러한 부모의 양육태도와 애착형태와의 상관관계를 지지하였다. 또한 한국 대학생들은 미국 대학생들보다 부모가 덜 통제적이며 덜 수용적이었다라고 회상하였으며 한국 여학생들은 남학생보다 아버지가 더 수용적이었다고 회상하였다. 반면에 미국 여학생들은 남학생들보다 어머니가 더 수용적이었다고 회상하였다.

핵심어 : 애착형태 • 부모의 수용과 통제