

CHAPTER III

Results

Data Analyses

The data were coded and entered into an SPSS file. The data were reviewed for errors. Condescriptives were run on all the variables to detect any entry errors and outliers (± 3 S.D.s from the mean) and to check for skewness and kurtosis (>1). All dependent and independent variables (i.e., FSSC, FSS, RSQ, RQ, ASI, PBI, STAI, AFQC and AFQA) were normally distributed.

Correlations were run between the dependent variables [i.e. childhood fears (FSSC), adulthood fears (FSS)] and demographics and the control variables (anxiety and PTSD) to determine which if any of the variables should be treated as covariates (Table 3 and 3a). ~~Although Trait anxiety was highly correlated with state anxiety ($r = .79$, $p < .001$), it was decided to treat both forms of anxiety as covariates. and It could be reasoned that trait anxiety was important, given that participants were recalling recalled childhood and adulthood fears and not experiencing the fears at that moment because participants who are predisposed to anxiety (i.e., trait) may be more attuned to stimuli and appraise them as more frightening, more threatening. Therefore, a general trait of anxiety may be more appropriate. On the other hand, the act of filling out the questionnaire and recalling a specific incident might evoke anxiety, i.e. state anxiety. It was reasoned that trait anxiety was the more appropriate measure of anxiety. Therefore, only the scores from trait anxiety were used as a covariate. Because trait anxiety and gender were significantly correlated with fearfulness and were treated as covariates in the hypotheses testing analyses (Table 3).~~ Highly anxious participants reported more

childhood and adulthood fearfulness than less anxious participants ([trait anxiety: childhood fears \$r = .44\$, \$p < .01\$ and adulthood fears \$r = .55\$, \$p < .01\$; \[state anxiety childhood fears \\$r = .36\\$, \\$p < .00\\$ and adulthood fears \\$r = .49\\$, \\$p < .00\\$\]\(#\) \). Females reported more fearfulness than males \(childhood fears, \$r = -.20\$, \$p < .01\$, adulthood fears, \$r = .20\$, \$p < .01\$ \). PTSD was weakly but significantly correlated with a select number of variables.](#)

Table 3

Correlations Between Childhood Fears and Age, Gender, T-Anxiety, S-Anxiety, and PTSD in College Students

	Age	Gender	T-Anxiety	<u>S-Anxiety</u>	PTSD
(a) Fear Survey Schedule Childhood (FSSC)					
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.03	-.19	.44**	<u>.36**</u>	.27**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.05	.00	.50**	<u>.36**</u>	.32**
2. The Unknown	.06	.00	.35**	.30** <u> </u>	.15
3. Minor Injury & small animals	.01	-.25**	.23**	.23** <u> </u>	.21**
4. Danger & death	-.04	-.23**	.23**	.24** <u> </u>	.19**
5. Medical fears	-.09	-.03	.24**	.22** <u> </u>	.07
6. Other fears	.09	-.09	.34**	.21** <u> </u>	.12

Table 3a

Correlations Between Adulthood Fears and Age, Gender, T-Anxiety, S-Anxiety, and PTSD in [College Students](#)

	Age	Gender	T-Anxiety	S- Anxiety	PTSD
(b) Fear Survey Schedule					
FSS Total	-.08	-.18*	.54**	.50**	.20*
Factors:					
FSS Factor 1					
-Threats to the self	-.07	-.20*	.55**	.50**	.18*
FSS Factor 2					
-Small animals	-.03	-.19*	.24**	.23**	.21**
FSS Factor 3					
-High places	-.03	-.13	.24**	.23**	.08

* Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .001 level

All independent variables (~~childhood and current attachment style and~~ views of parents, childhood and current attachment style) were inter-correlated to detect ~~for~~ multicollinearity (Table 4 and 4a). The PBI measures adults' reports of view of mother and father from ages 4-16. The RQ and RSQ measure adulthood attachment style. The ASI measures reported childhood attachment to mother and father. ~~The PBI measures adults' reports of view of mother and father from ages 4-16.~~ The majority of coefficients among the attachment measures and view of parents were low and insignificant indicating that each instrument measures ~~examined~~ different aspects of ~~the~~ parental relationships.

Approach to Hypotheses Testing

———The hypotheses were tested using MANOVAs and ANOVAs. The analyses were run first without the covariates and then rerun using MANCOVAs and ANCOVAs first with trait anxiety and gender as covariates and then rerun with state anxiety and gender as covariates. (When the analyses were computed with PTSD as a covariate, PTSD was not a significant covariate and was subsequently dropped and the analyses is re-run with just trait/state anxiety and gender as covariates). This approach ~~allowed the determination of~~ determined to what the extent ~~to which~~ the covariate(s) influenced the relationship between fearfulness and parental relationships. If the overall MANOVA was found to be insignificant then the ANOVAs were not consulted, so as not to violate Type I error.

Fear measures:

Data Used for the Analyses

Childhood Fear Measure (FSSC). The FSSC has established and widely used subscales (Ollendick, 1983) and so those were used for data analysis with the FSSC.

Adult Fear Measure (FSS). The FSS does not have established subscales, and studies conducting factor analyses with the FSS were done 30 years ago on a psychiatric population (Adams, J., Rothstein, W. & McCarter, R., 1973). Given that this sample

Table 4

Inter-correlations between Attachment Measures¹ and Views of Parents²

	ASIM	ASIF	RQ	PBIMC	PBIMP	PBIFC	PBIFP
Participants (n=153)							
ASIM	1.0	.09	.03	-.31**	.16	-.12	-.02
ASIF		1.0	.09	.01	.06	.32**	.16
RQ			1.0	-.10	.08	-.17*	.22*
PBIMC				1.0	-.19*	.26**	-.06
PBIMP					1.0	-.20*	.30**
PBIFC						1.0	-.19*
PBIFP							1.0

1. ASIM= Attachment Style Inventory for Mothers, ASIF= Attachment Style Inventory Fathers, RQ= Relationship Questionnaire

2. PBIMC= Parental Bonding Inventory Mothers Care, PBIMP= Parental Bonding Inventory Mothers Protection, PBIFC= Parental Bonding Inventory Fathers Care, PBIFP= Parental Bonding Inventory Fathers Protection

* Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

Table 4a

Inter-correlations between Attachment Measures (with RSQ) and Views of Parents

	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing
Participants (n=153)				
ASIM	-.12	.14	.01	.07
ASIF	-.09	-.06	.00	.05
RSQ: Secure	1.0	-.63**	-.31**	-.33**
Fearful	-.63**	1.0	.18*	.33**
Preoccupied	-.31**	.18*	.07	.07
Dismissing	-.33**	.33**	1.0	1.0
RQ	-.29**	.33	.03	.20*
PBIMC	.15	-.24**	.00	-.22**
PBIMP	-.17*	.23**	.15	.09
PBIFC	.38**	-.33**	-.23**	-.22**
PBIFP	-.21*	.23*	.10	.07

3. ASIM-Attachment Style Inventory for Mothers, ASIF-Attachment Style Inventory Fathers, RSQ-Relationship Scales Questionnaire

4. PBIMC-Parental Bonding Inventory Mothers Care, PBIMP-Parental Bonding Inventory Mothers Protection, PBIFC-Parental Bonding Inventory Fathers Care, PBIFP-Parental Bonding Inventory Fathers Protection

* Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

consisted of a non-psychiatric population of college students, these factors were deemed inappropriate for use with this sample. A PCA factor analysis was run on the current data in order to reveal factors for the current population. A varimax rotation was run and the original 108 item scale was reduced to a 76 item scale and which yielded three factors. Factor 1 -Threats to the self consisted of 66 items (the majority of the 108 item scale) and accounts for 30% of the variance (e.g. strangers, angry people, being in strange places). High reliability was found (Cronbach $\alpha=.97$). Factor 2 - Small animals consisted of three items and accounted for 5% of the variance (e.g. crawling insects, mice or rats, harmless snakes). Moderate reliability was found (Cronbach $\alpha=.56$). Factor 3 -High places consisted of two items and accounted for 5% of the variance (e.g. high places on land, looking down from high places). High reliability was with high internal consistency found (Cronbach $\alpha=.89$).

Additional childhood and adulthood fear measures. For the purpose of this study, additional childhood fear questions were developed to access identify fears not mentioned included on the FSSC and FSS. A varimax factor rotation was run on the additional fear questions for childhood. The factor analysis yielded three factors. Reliability was found to be high (Cronbach $\alpha=.63$). Factor 1 consists of seven items and is thought to be a measure of fantasy based fears (e.g. fear of monster, aliens, the dark, being alone). Factor 2 consists of seven items and is thought to be a measure of sensitivity to criticism (e.g. fear of being criticized by mother/father, being punished by mother/father, being teased, feelings being easily hurt). Factor 3 consists of five items and is thought to be a measure of night time based fears (e.g. nightmares, night terrors, sleep walking, sleep talking, recurrent dreams).

Additional fear questions were developed to ~~access~~ identify adulthood fears not mentioned on the FSS. A varimax factor rotation was run but the factors did not make clinical sense. Therefore, the scale was utilized by taking the mean of the total scale.

ReliabilityInternal consistency -was found to be high (Cronbach $\alpha = .86$).

Views of parents (PBI). The PBI was administered separately for views of mothers and for fathers. Cut off scores recommended by Parker (1979) assigned participants into high and low care and high and low protection groups.

Attachment measures (RO, RSQ, ASI). As recommended by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) participants were assigned into attachment styles based on which attachment category that they rated on the RQ with the highest score ~~as~~ describing their general style of close relationships in adulthood. In case of a tie between ratings on attachment styles, participants also chose one category ~~as the~~ that best description of described their relationship style. This best description item was used as a tie breaker.

The RSQ was utilized as a continuous measure as recommended by Griffen and Bartholomew (1994). Means were found for each of the four attachment categories measured (see exploratory results section for details on the analyses and outcomes).

The ASI was utilized as recommended by Sperling (personal communication, 2003). He recommended using the category considered by participants to be the best description of their attachment style to mother/father in childhood. He also recommended running Pearson Bivariate correlations between the ASI and fear scores.

The STAI was used as a continuous variable. Additionally, Pearson Bivariate Bivariate correlations were run between overall childhood and adulthood fearfulness (r

=.82, $p < .001$). Participants who reported greater childhood fearfulness also report greater adulthood fearfulness.

In addition, to childhood and adulthood fears as measured by the FSSC and FSS respectively, an exploratory scale of additional fear questions was utilized to assess fears not mentioned on the FSS. A varimax factor rotation was run on these data but the factors did not make clinical sense. Therefore, the scale was utilized by taking the mean of the total scale. Internal consistency on the total scale was found to be high (Cronbach $\alpha = .86$).

***Parenting Measures*

The PBI was administered separately for views of mothers and fathers. Cut-off scores recommended by Parker (1979) assigned participants into high and low care and protection groups.

As recommended by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) participants were assigned into attachment styles based on which attachment category that they rated on the RQ with the highest score as describing their general style of close relationships. In case of a tie between ratings on attachment styles, participants also chose one category as the best description of their relationship style. The best description item was used as a tie breaker. The RSQ was utilized as a continuous measure as recommended by Griffen & Bartholomew (1994). Means were found for each of the four attachment categories measured (see exploratory results section for details on the analyses and outcomes).

The ASI was utilized as recommended by Sperling (personal communication, 2002). He recommended using the category considered by participants to be the best

~~description of their attachment style to mother/father in childhood. He also recommended running Pearson's Bivariate correlations between the fear variables and attachment style.~~

~~The STAI was used as a continuous variable. Additionally, Pearson's bivariate correlations were run between overall childhood and adulthood fearfulness ($r = .82$, $p < .001$). Participants who report childhood fearfulness also report adulthood fearfulness.~~

Descriptives of Attachment Classifications

~~Three studies, found in the literature that used the RQ, were consulted to determine compare to the number of participants reporting each type of attachment style in the RQ, in order to compare the distribution of current attachment styles in this study with that found in the literature (Table 5), obtain a general idea of how many participants usually report each attachment style. The most reported The majority of participants in the current study rated themselves as attachment style is the secure subtype attachment. The next most frequently reported attachment style is the preoccupied subtype. The third most frequently reported attachment style is the fearful subtype, and the least reported attachment style is the dismissing subtype (Table 5).~~

Hypotheses Testing

Relationship between Childhood Fears and Views of Parents and Attachment Styles

Hypothesis 1-1

∴

It was predicted that adults who report their parents as having been neglectful (low care, low protection) or having had affectionless control (low care, high protection) as measured by the PBI would also will report more *overall childhood fearfulness* as

measured by the FSSC than those participants who report ~~their parents as their parents~~ having ~~been~~ been-optimal (high ~~in~~ caringe, and low protection) and/or having had affectionate constraint (high care, high protection).

Hypothesis 1a

÷ Childhood Fearfulness ~~were~~was also assessed on each of the six subscales of fear (viz. Failure and criticism, The Unknown, Minor injury and animals, Danger and death, Medical fears and Other fears) to determine if certain fears awere more highly related to views of parents than others.

Table 5

Comparison of Samples with Attachment Style on the RQ

	Rosenberg	Festa (2001)	Bartholomew (1994)
Secure	43.1% (66)	42.9% (105)	70.24% (59)
Fearful	26.8% (41)	26.5% (65)	10.71% (9)
Preoccupied	15.7% (24)	14.7% (36)	11.90% (10)
Dismissing	14.4% (22)	15.9% (39)	7.14% (6)

The PBI was completed separately for mother and father. The PBI yields a care scale and a protection scale. As recommended by Parker (2000), participants are assigned into high and low categories for each scale based on specific cutoff points. The normative scores for mothers are: a care score of 27.0 and a protection score of 13.5. The normative scores for father are: a care score of 24.0 and a protection score of 12.5.

Numbers of participants reporting high and low maternal and paternal care and protection are reported in below (Table 6).

Table 5

Comparison of Samples with Attachment Style on the RQ

	Rosenberg	Festa (2001)	Bartholomew (1994)
Secure	43.1% (66)	42.9% (105)	70.24% (59)
Fearful	26.8% (41)	26.5% (65)	10.71% (9)
Preoccupied	15.7% (24)	14.7% (36)	11.90% (10)
Dismissing	14.4% (22)	15.9% (39)	7.14% (6)

Table-6

Number of Participants in Care (high, low) and Protection (high, low) Groups for Mother and Father on the PBI (mother n=152, father n= 149)

Mothers

Care		Protection	
High	Low	High	Low
67.3% (103)	32% (49)	55.6% (85)	43.8% (67)

Fathers

Care		Protection	
High	Low	High	Low
58.2 % (89)	39.2 % (60)	53.6% (82)	43.8% (67)

PBI-Mothers:

PBI-Mothers. Hypotheses 1 and 1a were tested using a 2x2 MANOVA with FSSC and its six factors as the dependent variables and care (high, low) and protection (high, low) as the independent factors, not controlling for any covariates. The results yielded an overall main effect for protection: Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,143) = 2.51, p < .05$. The results yielded no significant main effect for care: Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,143) = 1.76, ns$. There was no significant interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,143) = .697, ns$.

An ANOVA revealed significance on overall fear score for maternal protection $F(1, 148) = 8.45, p < .01$ which was attributed to subscale 1 -Failure and criticism $F(1,148) = 12.02, p < .001$ ($M(M): 64.2$ vs. 56.4), subscale 2 -The unknown $F(1,148) = 5.88, p < .05$ ($M(M): 40.1$ vs. 37.0) and subscale 4 -Danger and death $F(1,148) = 4.48, p < .05$ ($M(M): 30.20$ vs. 27.90) (Table 7). Participants who recalled mothers as being high on protection also reported more overall childhood fears particularly in the areas of fear of failure and criticism, the unknown and danger and death than those participants who recalled their mothers as low on protection.

Table 6

Number of Participants in Care (high, low) and Protection (high, low) Groups for Mother and Father on the PBI (mother n=152, father n= 149)

Mothers			
Care		Protection	
High	Low	High	Low
67.3% (103)	32% (49)	55.6% (85)	43.8% (67)

Fathers			
Care		Protection	
High	Low	High	Low
58.2 % (89)	39.2 % (60)	53.6% (82)	43.8% (67)

Table 7

Mean Fearfulness in Participants with Low and High Maternal Protection (without Covariates)

	High n=85	Low n=67	F (1,148)	p
Total	191.7	177.1	8.45	.00**
Subscales:				
1. Failure & criticism	64.2	56.4	12.02	.00**
2. Unknown	40.1	37.0	5.88	.02*
3. Minor Injury & small animals	37.2	35.6	2.88	.09
4. Danger & death	30.2	27.9	4.49	.04*
5. Medical fears	11.0	10.8	.37	.54
6. Other fears	9.0	9.4	.62	.43

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

(Table 7)-

~~Trait anxiety and gender were significantly correlated with the FSSC and could confound the results.~~ The analysis was rerun with trait anxiety and gender as ~~the~~ covariates. The analysis yielded a significant effect for each covariate. -The same pattern of results remained ~~the same as above~~. The MANCOVA yielded a marginally significant main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = 2.07, p=.06$. Care, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = 1.09, ns$ and the interaction of care and protection remained non-significant, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = .390, ns$. An ANCOVA revealed the difference on protection to be attributed to overall fear $F(1,145)$

Table 7

Mean Fearfulness in Participants with Low and High Maternal Protection (without Covariates)

	High	Low	
	n=85	n=67	F (1,148) — p

=3.96, $p<.05$ and subscale 1 -Failure and criticism Hotelling's Trace $F(1,145) = 9.08, p <.01$.

The analysis was rerun with state anxiety and gender as covariates. The analysis yielded a significant effect for each covariate. The analysis yielded the same results. ~~same~~

~~pattern of results remained~~ The MANCOVA yielded a marginally significant main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = 2.11, p = .06$. Care, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = 1.50, ns$ and the interaction of care and protection remained non-significant, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,140) = .42, ns$. An ANCOVA revealed the difference on protection to be attributed to overall fear $F(1,145) = 4.20, p < .05$ and subscale 1 - Failure and criticism Hotelling's Trace $F(1,145) = 9.31, p < .01$.

~~PBI-Fathers~~

~~PBI-Fathers~~. The same approach to analysis was performed on the father PBI data. The results yielded an overall main effect for paternal care, Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,140) = 3.84, p < .001$. The results yielded no significant main effect for paternal protection, Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,140) = .39, ns$ or for the interaction between the paternal care and protection groups, Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,140) = 1.10, ns$.

~~The An ANOVAs~~ revealed a significant effect for paternal care on subscale 1 - Failure and criticism $F(1,145) = 8.67, p < .01$ (~~M:~~ 57.08 vs. 65.01) and subscale 5 - Medical fears $F(1,145) = 4.13, p < .05$ (~~M:~~ 10.44 vs. 11.96). Participants who reported low paternal care also reported more childhood fears in the areas of failure and criticism and medical fears than participants who reported their fathers high on care.

~~Trait anxiety and gender were significantly correlated with the FSSC and could confound the results.~~ ~~When T~~ the analysis was rerun with trait anxiety and gender as covariates (~~both covariates were significant~~), ~~t~~. The MANCOVA yielded a significant main effect for care, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,137) = 2.22, p < .05$, ~~An ANCOVA did not~~

reveal the difference to be attributed to any of the factors. When run together the analysis was significant, but no one particular subscale can be attributed for the difference. The results did not yield and a non-significant main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace F (6,137) = .36, ns, or for and the interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace F (6,137) = .89, ns. The ANCOVAs did not reveal the difference to be attributed to any specific subscale.-

The MANCOVA rerun with state anxiety and gender as covariates revealed a significant main effect for care, Hotelling's Trace F (6,137) = 2.74, p < .05, which was attributed to subscale 1 -Failure and criticism F (1, 142) = 4.51, p < .05. The results did not yield a significant main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace F (6,137) = .35, ns, or for the interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace F (6,137) = 1.12, ns.

———In summary, the hypothesis was partially supported. Participants who reported their mothers as high in protection also reported more childhood fearfulness than participants who reported their mothers as low in protection, often in the area of failure and criticism.-Participants who reported their fathers as low on care also reported more childhood fearfulness than participants who reported their fathers as high on care. These results remained robust even after controlling for the effects of anxiety- (trait and state) and gender.

Hypothesis 2

÷ It was predicted that adults with ~~specifically~~ insecure attachment ~~specifically~~ of the preoccupied and fearful attachment styles subtypes as measured by the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) will report more overall *childhood* fearfulness as measured by the Childhood Fear Survey Schedule (FSSC) - than those with ~~dismissing~~ insecure attachment style of the dismissing sub-type or secure attachment style as measured by the RQ.

Hypothesis 2a

Childhood Fearfulness were also assessed on each of the six subscales of fear (viz. Failure and criticism, The Unknown, Minor injury and animals, Danger and death, Medical fears and Other fears) to determine if certain fears were more highly related to certain current attachment style than to others.

Hypotheses 2 and 2a were tested using a one way MANOVA with FSSC and its six subscales as the dependent variables and attachment style (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing) as the independent variables/factors, not controlling for any covariates. -The results yielded an overall main effect for attachment style, Hotelling's Trace, $F(6,144) = 2.00, p < .01$.

An ANCOVA revealed significance for attachment style on the overall fear score which was attributed to subscale 1 -Failure and criticism $F(3,149) = 4.00, p < .01$ and subscale 3 -Minor injury and small animals $F(3,149) = 2.61, p < .05$ and approached significance for and in subscale 4 -Danger and death $F(3,149) = 2.35, p = .07$.

Tukey's post hoc analysis revealed that on subscale 1 -Failure and criticism participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting secure attachment styles ($M: (M: 64.03$ vs. 57.07) and participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness than participants

reporting dismissing attachment styles (~~$M: (M: 64.03$~~ vs. 54.95) (Table 8). On subscale 3 - Minor injury and small animals, participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting dismissing attachment styles (~~$M: (M: 54.95$~~ vs. 34.68). On subscale 4 - Danger and death participants reporting preoccupied attachment also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting dismissing attachment (approaching significant difference) (~~$M: (M: 28.12$~~ vs. 25.36). Participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles had more fearfulness of failure and criticism than participants reporting secure and dismissing attachment styles and more fear of minor injury and small animals and danger and death than participants reporting dismissing attachment styles. (Table 8).

~~Trait anxiety and gender were significantly correlated with the FSSC and could confound the results.~~ The analyses were rerun using a MANCOVA with the covariates of

trait anxiety and gender, which were both significant. -There was no overall ~~main~~-effect for current attachment style, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,141) = 1.39$, ns.

However, when the MANCOVA was rerun with state anxiety and gender as covariates, there was a significant effect for attachment style, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,141) = 1.63$, $p < .05$. The ANCOVA revealed a marginally significant effect on overall childhood fears, $F(3,146) = 2.50$, $p < .06$ and a significant effect on subscale 3 -Minor injury and small animals $F(3,146) = 2.95$, $p < .05$ and subscale 4 -Danger and death $F(3,146) = 2.77$, $p < .05$. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that participants who reported preoccupied attachment style experienced greater overall childhood fears compared to participants reporting dismissing attachment style ($M: 197.35$ vs. 167.30), which could be

[attributed to marginally significant differences between these two groups on subscale 3 - Minor injury and small animals and subscale 4 -Danger and death.](#)

Table 8

Mean Fearfulness Scores by Current Attachment Style (without covariates)

FSSC	Secure n=66	Fearful n=41	Preoccupied n=24	Dismissing n=22	F(3,149)	p
Overall	184.138	202.83	188.46	167.159	2.72	.05*
1. Failure & criticism	57.07	66.83	64.03	54.95	4.00	.01**
2. Unknown	39.18	39.77	42.00	35.86	1.13	.34
3. Minor Injury & small animals	38.06	40.41	34.68	54.95	2.61	.05*
4. Danger & death	30.76	32.33	28.12	25.36	2.35	.07
5. Medical Fears	10.73	10.93	12.50	9.41	1.98	.12
6. Other fears	8.85	10.05	8.75	9.05	1.39	.25

* significant at the .05 level

** significant at the .01 level

In summary, this hypothesis was partially supported. Before controlling for anxiety and gender, participants who reported preoccupied attachment style also reported greater childhood fears in the areas of Failure and criticism, Minor injury and small animals and Danger and death compared to participants who reported dismissing attachment style. When trait anxiety and gender were covaried, this difference no longer was significant. Participants with high trait anxiety, irrespective of their current attachment styles, recalled more childhood fears. This was not the case for state anxiety.;
~~but when~~ When -state anxiety and gender were covaried, the hypothesis was supported.
 Participants who reported preoccupied attachment styles also reported more childhood fearfulness ~~on subscale 1 - Failure and criticism~~ than participants who reported dismissing attachment styles, specifically in the areas of fear of minor injury and small animals and fear of danger and death.

~~Participants who reported preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness on subscale 3 - Minor injury and small animals than participants who reported dismissing attachment styles.~~

Table 8

~~Mean Fearfulness Scores by Current Attachment Style (without covariates)~~

FSSC	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing	F(3,149)	p
	n=66	n=41	n=24	n=22		

* significant at the .05 level

** significant at the .01 level

Hypothesis 3

÷ It was predicted that adults with insecure attachment of the hostile or ambivalent styles to their mother and/or father in childhood as ~~reported~~~~reported~~ on the Attachment Style Inventory (ASI) will report more *overall childhood fearfulness* as measured by the Fear Survey Schedule for Children (FSSC) than those ~~reporting with~~ secure attachment styles or dismissing attachment styles in childhood ~~to their mother as reported on the ASI.~~

Hypothesis 3a

~~Childhood f:~~ Fearfulness was also assessed on each of the six subscales of fear (viz. Failure and criticism, The Unknown, Minor injury and animals, Danger and death, Medical fears and Other fears) to determine if certain fears are more highly related to ~~r~~ Reported childhood attachment style than to others.

Attachment to Mothers. ~~As recommended by Sperling (personal communication),~~ Pearson's Bivariate correlations were ~~computed~~~~run~~ ~~between with the FSSC and its six subscales and reported childhood~~ attachment to mothers ~~and the Fear Survey Schedule for Children and its six subscales~~ (see Table 9). ~~Partial correlations were then~~ ~~recomputed~~ again, ~~first, partialling out trait anxiety and gender~~ (Table 9a) ~~and then,~~ ~~recomputed, partialling out state anxiety and gender~~ (Table 9b). ~~The coefficients are reported in terms of overall fear and then for each subscale for all three sets of analyses.~~

Overall fear: ~~As predicted, p~~ Participants ~~who~~ ~~rated themselves high on~~ ~~reporting~~ ~~all three insecure attachment styles,~~ ~~insecure attachment styles also reported high overall~~ ~~fearfulness~~ [avoidant ($r = (r = .21, p < .05)$), hostile ($r = (r = .26, p < .01)$) and ambivalent ($r = (r = .23, p < .01)$)] ~~scored higher overall, on the FSSC than participants reporting~~

secure/dependent attachment styles ($r = -.09$, ns). Moreover, when the rough measure of security of attachment was used, rather than the rating scale (Sperling, personal communication, 2003) and participants reporting high levels of security also reported fewer childhood fears on the rough measure of security of attachment ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$).

The partial correlations, controlling for trait anxiety and gender, found that avoidant and secure attachment style were related to overall fears. Participants rating themselves high on avoidant also rated themselves high on overall fears ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) whereas those who rated themselves secure (rough measure) also reported fewer overall fears ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$).

When state anxiety and gender are controlled, the correlations between overall fears and attachment styles are as follows: Participants who rated themselves higher on insecure attachment styles also reported higher overall fearfulness [avoidant ($r = .18$, $p < .05$), hostile ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) and ambivalent ($r = .16$, $p < .06$)]. In the same way as found in the Pearson Bivariate correlation when the rough measure of security of attachment is

Table 9

Pearson Bivariate Correlations Between Childhood Fear Variables and Childhood Attachment Style to Mother

	Attachment Styles				Rough measure
	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.21*	-.09	.26**	.23**	-.31**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.05	.00	.50**	.32**	-.31**
2. Unknown	.08	.01	.15	.13	-.17*
3. Minor injury & small animals	.08	-.02	.14	.16*	-.24**
4. Danger & death	.14	-.06	.18*	.11	-.23**
5. Medical fears	.12	-.02	.13	.18*	-.24**
6. Other fears	.05	-.01	.17*	.01	.20*

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

Table 9a

Partial Correlations^a Between Childhood Fear Variables and Childhood Attachment Style to Mother

	Attachment Styles				
	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.19*	-.04	.34**	.25**	-.31**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.22**	-.19*	.16	.15	-.19*
2. Unknown	.05	-.00	.03	.01	-.09
3. Minor injury & small animals	.09	-.01	.06	.10	-.19*
4. Danger & death	.15	-.07	.11	.04	-.19**
5. Medical fears	.07	-.01	.04	.10	-.19*
6. Other fears	-.02	.01	.04	-.11	-.10

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

^a Covarying out trait anxiety and gender

Table 9b

Partial Correlations^a Between Childhood Fear Variables and Childhood Attachment Style to Mother

	Attachment Styles				
	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.17*	-.08	.17*	.16*	-.23**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.26**	-.20*	.24**	.22**	-.23**
2. Unknown	.07	-.016	.07	.07	-.12
3. Minor injury & small animals	.09	-.01	.07	.12	-.20**
4. Danger & death	.15	-.07	.12	.06	-.19*
5. Medical fears	.08	-.02	.07	.12	-.20*
6. Other fears	.02	-.00	.12	-.04	-.15

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

^a Covarying out state anxiety and gender

used participants reporting high levels of security also reported fewer childhood fears ($r = -.25, p < .01$).

Subscale 1- Failure and criticism. When examining the specific Ssubcales, the following significant correlations were found. 1—Failure and criticism: Participants rating themselves higher on reporting insecure attachment styles of hostile attachment ($r = .50, p < .01$) also reported scored higher on fear of failure and criticism. than Participants reporting high levels of security (on the rough measure of security of attachment) reported significantly fewer fears in this area ($r = .31, p < .01$).

When controlling for trait anxiety and gender, participants rating themselves high on insecure attachment also report higher fearfulness of failure and criticism [avoidant ($r = .23, p < .01$), hostile ($r = .16, p < .05$) and ambivalent ($r = .15, p < .06$)] whereas secure and the rough measure of security is negatively related to fear of failure and criticism (secure, $r = -.20, p < .05$; rough measure of security, $r = -.19, p < .05$).

When controlling for state anxiety and gender the same pattern of results is found: Participants who rated themselves high on insecure attachment also reported higher fearfulness of failure and criticism [avoidant ($r = .26, p < .01$), hostile ($r = .24, p < .05$) and ambivalent ($r = .22, p < .01$)] whereas secure and the rough measure of security is negatively related to fear of failure and criticism (secure, $r = -.20, p < .05$; rough measure of security, $r = -.24, p < .05$).

Subscale 2 -The Unknown. Participants reporting overall security of attachment to mother in childhood on the rough attachment measure ($r = .17, p < .05$) reported fewer scored low on fears of The Unknown. When controlling for trait anxiety, state

anxiety, and gender, none of the coefficients were significant. However, participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style to mother in childhood had a very low correlation ($r=.01$, ns) with fear of the unknown.

Subscale 3 -Minor injury and small animals. Participants reporting ambivalent attachment style ($r = \text{~~-.16~~$, $p < .05$) reported more fears in this area, whereas scored higher on fear of minor injury and animals than participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment reported fewer fears of this kind ($r = \text{~~-.24}~~$, $p < .01$). This latter finding held even when trait anxiety and gender and state anxiety and gender were controlled for ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$, $r = -.19$, $p < .05$, respectively).

Subscale 4 -Danger and death. Participants reporting hostile attachment style ($r = \text{~~-.18}~~$, $p < .05$) reported more scored higher on fears in this area, whereas ~~of danger and death than~~ participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment reported fewer fears of this kind ($r = \text{~~-.23}~~$, $p < .01$). This latter finding held when trait anxiety and gender were controlled for and when state anxiety and gender were controlled for ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$, $r = -.19$, $p < .05$, respectively).

Subscale 5 -Medical fears. Participants reporting ambivalent attachment style ($r = \text{~~-.18}~~$, $p < .05$) reported more fears in this area. Pseored higher on medical fear than participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment reported fewer fears of this kind ($r = \text{~~-.24}~~$, $p < .01$) which held up when trait anxiety and gender and state anxiety and gender were controlled ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$, $r = -.19$, $p < .05$, respectively).

Subscale 6 -Other fears. Participants reporting hostile attachment style ($r = \text{~~-.17}~~$, $p < .05$) reported more fears in this area, whereasseored higher on other fears than participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment reported fewer

fears of this kind ($r = .20, p < .05$). These results were not supported when trait anxiety, state anxiety, and gender were controlled.

Overall, the following relationships were found: participants reporting insecure attachment scored higher on the FSSC overall score and subscales than participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style and overall security on the rough measure of attachment.

In summary, the hypothesis was partially supported. Participants who rated themselves high on insecure attachments reporting to mothers also insecure attachment styles in childhood reported more overall more childhood fear even after controlling for anxiety and gender. Moreover, fearfulness than participants rating themselves reporting securely attached style to mothers also reported fewer childhood fears and this relationship held after controlling for anxiety (trait/ state) and gender.

Table 9

Correlation Between Fearfulness Variables (FSSC) and Reported childhood attachment Style to Mother (Avoidant, Dependent/Secure, Hostile and Ambivalent & A Rough Measure of Security of Attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.21*	.09	.26**	.23**	.31**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.05	.00	.50**	.32**	.31**

2. Unknown	.08	.01	.15	.13	.17*
3. Minor Injury & Small Animals	.08	.02	.14	.16*	.24**
4. Danger & Death	.14	.06	.18*	.11	.23**
5. Medical Fears	.12	.02	.13	.18*	.24**
6. Other fears	.05	.01	.17*	.01	.20*

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

Attachment to Father: The same approach to analyses was used on the father attachment style data. As recommended by Sperling (personal communication) Pearson's Bivariate correlations were run with attachment to father and the Fear Survey Schedule for Children (Table 10).

Overall fears: Participants reporting insecure attachment style to father in childhood of the avoidant and hostile attachment style also reported subtypes scored higher scores on the FSSC overall (avoidant $r = .24$, $p < .01$, hostile $r = .20$, $p < .05$) (Table 10). than participants who reported secure/dependent attachment ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$) and overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment also reported fewer overall fears ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$ and $r = (-.27$, $p < .01$, respectively). When trait anxiety, and gender were controlled, the correlations did not hold for the insecure attachment styles or for the rough measure of security of attachment. Moreover, when state anxiety and

gender were controlled, the coefficients between insecure attachment styles to fathers and overall fears was low and insignificant. However, for the rough measure of security of attachment to fathers, those participants reporting higher security of attachment also reported fewer overall fearfulness ($r = -.19, p < .05$).

Subscale 1 -Failure and criticism. Participants reporting insecure attachment style (avoidant $r = .30, p < .01$, hostile $r = .23, p < .01$ and ambivalent $r = .18, p < .05$) also reported ~~scored~~ higher ~~fearfulness on fear~~ of failure and criticism (avoidant $r = .30, p < .01$, hostile $r = .23, p < .01$ and ambivalent $r = .18, p < .05$). ~~than~~ ~~P~~ participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style ($r = -.26, p < .01$) and overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment reported less fearfulness ($r = -.26, p < .01, r = (-.27, p < .01, respectively)$). -When controlling for trait anxiety and gender, the coefficients are low and insignificant.

Table 10

Correlations Between Fearfulness Variables (FSSC) and Reported Childhood Attachment to Father (Avoidant, Dependent/Secure, Hostile and Ambivalent & A Rough Measure of Security of Attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.24**	-.18*	.20*	.16	-.27**
Subscales:					
1. Failure & criticism	.30**	-.26**	.23**	.18*	-.27**

2. Unknown	.09	-.04	.11	.10	-.10
3. Minor injury & small animals	.15	-.14	.15	.11	-.26**
4. Danger & death	.12	-.07	.05	.05	-.20*
5. Medical fears	.26**	-.14	.20*	.17*	-.18*
6. Other fears	.18*	-.10	.16*	.15	-.18*

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

However, when state anxiety and gender are controlled for, only the avoidant insecure attachment style is significantly correlated with more fears of failure and criticism ($r = -.20, p < .05$) and secure attachment styles to father is associated with fewer fears of failure and criticism ($r = -.20, p < .05$).

Subscale 2 -The Unknown. No significant correlations were found in any of the analyses.

Subscale 3 -Minor injury and small animals. Participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment also reported ~~scored~~ less low fearfulness on fear of minor injury and small animals ($r = (-.26, p < .01)$) which held even when trait anxiety and state anxiety and gender were controlled for ($r = -.19, p < .05, r = -.20, p < .05$). ~~Participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style also scored low on fear of minor injury and small animals, but the coefficient was not significant ($r = .14, ns$).~~

Subscale 4 -Danger and death. ~~Participants who rated higher on reporting overall security on~~ the rough measure of security of attachment also reported less ~~scored low on~~ fearfulness of danger and death ($r = (-.20, p < .05)$). However, this finding became insignificant when anxiety and gender were controlled. ~~Participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style also scored low on fear of danger and death, but the coefficient was not significant ($r = .07, ns$).~~

Table 10

Correlation Between Fearfulness Variables (FSSC) and Reported Childhood Attachment to Father (Avoidant, Dependent/Secure, Hostile and Ambivalent & A Rough Measure of Security of Attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Participants (n=153)					
FSSC Total	.24**	.18*	.20*	.16	.27**
Subscales:					
1. Failure					
& criticism	.30**	.26**	.23**	.18*	.27**
2. Unknown					
	.09	.04	.11	.10	.10
3. Minor					
	.15	.14	.15	.11	.26**
Injury & Small Animals					
4. Danger					
	.12	.07	.05	.05	.20*
& Death					
5. Medical					
	.26**	.14	.20*	.17*	.18*
Fears					
1. Other fears					
	.18*	.10	.16*	.15	.18*

*=significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

Subscale 5 -Medical fears. Participants who rated higher on reporting avoidant, ($r=.26, p<.01$) hostile- ($r=.20, p<.05$) and ambivalent ($r=.17, p<.05$) attachment styles reported scored higher on medical fearfulness (avoidant $r = .26, p<.01$, hostile $r = .20, p<.05$, ambivalent $r = .17, p<.05$, ~~than~~ whereas participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment reported less medical fearfulness ($r = (r=-.18, p<.05)$). When anxiety and gender are controlled for, participants who rated high on

avoidant attachment to their fathers also reported more fearfulness on medical issues (trait anxiety and gender $r = .18, p < .05$; state anxiety and gender $r = .20, p < .05$).

Subscale 6 - Other fears: Participants who rated reporting high on the insecure attachment styles of avoidant ($r = .18, p < .05$) and hostile ($r = .16, p < .05$) attachment also reported scored higher fearfulness of Other fears (avoidant $r = .18, p < .05$; hostile ($r = .16, p < .05$). than participants who rated high on reporting overall security on the rough measure of security of attachment also reported less fearfulness of Other fears ($r = .18, p < .05$). These coefficients were insignificant when anxiety and gender were controlled, and participants reporting secure/dependent attachment, but the coefficient was not significant ($r = .10, ns$).

A note: These analyses were recomputed using only anxiety (trait, state) as the covariate, dropping gender. The coefficients remained virtually unchanged.

Overall, the following relationships were found: participants reporting insecure attachment styles scored higher on the FSSC overall and subscales than participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style and overall security on the rough measure of attachment, who scored lower on the FSSC overall score and subscales.

In summary, the hypothesis was partially supported. Participants reporting insecure attachment styles with mothers in childhood also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting secure attachment styles. reported higher childhood fearfulness particularly in the areas of failure and criticism. This was the case for those participants rating themselves high insecure attachment styles including avoidant. Participants reporting secure attachment styles to mothers also reported less childhood fearfulness. The results held even after controlling for gender and trait/state anxiety.

Participants' ratings of insecure attachment styles to fathers and their reports on childhood fearfulness overall and in specific subscales were low and non-significant once anxiety and gender were controlled for. However, participants who rated themselves high on security of attachment to fathers also reported less childhood fears and this finding remained after controlling for anxiety and gender. However, an unexpected finding was that participants reporting avoidant attachment style also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style.

Relationship between Hypotheses Testing for Current (Adulthood) Fears and Views of Parents and Attachment Styles Fearfulness

The A similar pattern of results was found for adulthood fears followed a similar pattern fears as for childhood fears. This is not surprising given his finding makes sense in light of the high correlation found between childhood fears and adulthood fears ($r = .82$).

Hypothesis 4: current adulthood fearfulness with view of parents:

It was predicted that adults who report their parents as having been in the neglectful category (low care, low protection) or in the affectionless control category (low care, high protection) as measured by the Parental Bonding Inventory would also will report more *overall current* fearfulness as measured by the Fear Survey Schedule (FSS) than those who report their parents as having been in the optimal parenting (high care, in low and protection) and/or affectionate constraint (high care, low protection) categories protective.

Hypothesis 4a:

- Adulthood Fearfulness was assessed on each of the three factors of fear (viz. factor 1 -Threats to the self, factor 2 -Small animals, factor 3 -High places) to determine if certain fears were more highly related to views of parents than others.

(See H1 Reports of Childhood Fears for more details on the coding of the PBI).

PBI-Mother:

Hypotheses 4 and 4a were tested using a 2x2 MANOVA with FSS as the dependent variable and care (high, low) and protection (high, low) as the independent variables, not controlling for any covariates. The results yielded a significant overall main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace, $F(3,145) = 3.88, p < .01$. There was no significant main effect for care Hotelling's trace, $F(4,144) = .14, ns$. for the interaction between maternal care and protection Hotelling's Trace $F(3,145) = 1.32, ns$

An ANCOVA revealed significance for maternal protection was attributed to factor 1 -Threats to the self, $F(1,147) = 5.57, p < .05$ (~~M:~~ 131.14 vs. 150.50).

Participants who reported high maternal protection also reported current overall adulthood fearfulness and current fearfulness on subscale 1 -Threats to the self.

~~Trait anxiety and gender were highly correlated with the FSS and could confound the results.~~ The analysis was rerun with gender and trait anxiety and gender as covariates. ~~The analysis testing hypotheses 3 and 3a was recomputed with trait anxiety and gender as covariates.~~ The MANCOVA results yielded no significant overall main effect for care Hotelling's Trace $F(4,142) = 1.41, ns$. The results yielded an overall main effect for protection Hotelling's Trace $F(4,142) = 2.90, p < .05$. There was no significant interaction

between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(4,142) = .91$, ns. With the covariates of trait anxiety and gender, the pattern of results remained the same as above.

An ANCOVA revealed significance for protection on Factor 3 -High places (approaching significance) $F(1,145) = 3.38$, $p = .07$ (~~$M:(M):$~~ 5.00 vs. 4.12). Participants reporting mothers with ~~high~~low protection reported more fearfulness than participants with mothers with high protection. When the analysis was rerun using state anxiety and gender, identical results were found.

The hypothesis was partially supported.

PPBI-Father.

Hypotheses 4 and 4a were tested using a 2x2 MANOVA with FSS as the dependent variable and care (high, low) and protection (high, low) as the independent variables, not controlling for any covariates. The results yielded an overall main effect for care which approached overall significance, Hotelling's Trace, $F(4,141) = 2.28$, $p = .06$. The results yielded no significant main effect for protection Hotelling's Trace, $F(4,141) = 1.45$, ns or for the interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(4,141) = .39$, ns.

~~The~~An ANCOVA~~s~~ revealed significance for care on Factor 1 -Threats to the self, $F(1,144) = 3.89$, $p < .05$ (~~$M:(M):$~~ 151.48 vs. 136.23). Participants who experienced their fathers as providing low care had more fearfulness on ~~subscale~~factor 1 -Threats to the self than participants who experienced their fathers as providing high care.

~~Trait anxiety and gender were highly correlated with the FSS and could confound the results.~~The analysis was rerun with ~~gender and~~trait anxiety and gender as covariates. The results yielded no significant overall main effect for protection Hotelling's Trace $F(4,139) = 1.71$, ns or for care Hotelling's Trace $F(4,139) = 1.36$, ns. There was no

significant interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(4,139) = .30$, ns.

The same results held when the MANCOVA was recomputed with state anxiety and gender covaried. There were no significant main or interaction effects.

The hypothesis for current fears and view of fathers was not partially supported.

~~*Participants who reported their fathers as providing low care had more fearfulness on factor 1 - Threats to the self than participants who experienced their fathers as providing high care.*~~

Hypothesis 5

~~current attachment style with adulthood fearfulness~~: It was predicted that adults with ~~specifically~~ insecure attachment of the preoccupied and fearful styles as measured by the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) ~~would~~ will report more overall *current* fearfulness as measured by the Fear Survey Schedule than those with insecure attachment of the

dismissing sub-type or secure attachment as measured by the [Relationship Questionnaire](#).

Hypothesis 5a

~~Adulthood~~ ~~÷~~ ~~Fearfulness~~ ~~were~~ ~~was~~ also assessed on each of the three subscales of fear (viz. [subscalefactor](#) 1 -Threats to the self, [subscalefactor](#) 2 -Small animals, [subscalefactor](#) 3 -High places) to determine if certain fears ~~were~~ ~~are~~ more highly related to current attachment style than others.

Hypotheses 5 and 5a were tested using a one-way MANOVA with FSS [and its three subscales](#) of fears as the dependent variable and current attachment style (secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissing) as the independent variables, not controlling for any covariates. The results yielded no significant main effect for current attachment style Hotelling's Trace, $F(3,146) = 1.45$, ns.

~~Trait anxiety and gender were highly correlated with the FSS and could confound the results.~~ The analysis was rerun [as a MANCOVA](#) with trait anxiety and gender as covariates. Although trait anxiety was highly significant, $F(3,144) = 23.36$, $p < .001$, gender was not significant $F(3,144) = 2.36$, ns. The analysis yielded a marginally significant main effect for attachment style Hotelling's Trace, $F(4,143) = 1.81$, $p = .07$, which was attributed to [subscalefactor](#) 1-Threats to the self $F(3,146) = 4.46$, $p < .01$.

Tukey's post hoc analysis revealed that participants who reported preoccupied attachment style also reported more fear on [subscalefactor](#) 1-Threats to the self than participants who reported dismissing attachment styles (M : ~~(M~~: 160.38 vs. 121.59). There was no mean difference in fearfulness between participants reporting secure attachment styles and participants reporting dismissing attachment styles (M : ~~(M~~: 138.94 vs. 121.59). [However,](#)

when the MANCOVA was recomputed with state anxiety and gender as covariates, there were no significant differences in current fears between attachment styles.

In summary, the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 6 ~~adulthood fearfulness with reported childhood attachment style:~~

It was predicted that adults with insecure attachment of the hostile or ~~resistant~~ ambivalent subtypes to their mother and/or father in childhood as reported on the Attachment Style Inventory will report more *overall current* fearfulness as measured by the Fear Survey Schedule than those with secure attachment or dismissing attachment styles to their mother and/or father as reported on the Attachment Style Inventory.

Hypothesis 6a

~~÷ Adulthood Fearfulness~~ ~~were~~ ~~was~~ also assessed on each of the three subscales of fear (viz. ~~subscale factor~~ 1 -Threats to the self, ~~subscale factor~~ 2 -Small animals and ~~subscale factor~~ 3 -High places) to determine if certain fears are more highly related to reported childhood attachment style to parents than others.

Reported Childhood Attachment to Mother

~~Pearson~~ ~~Pearson's~~ Bivariate correlations were computed between current fears and the three subscales and the four attachment styles of childhood and the rough measure of security ~~also run~~ (Table 11).

Overall current fears. ~~Participants who~~ ~~On overall fearfulness,~~ ~~participants~~ ~~rated~~ higher on ~~reporting~~ insecure attachment style to mother in childhood also reported more current overall fears (~~of the~~ avoidant ~~-~~ $r = (.18, p < .05)$, hostile $r = (.30, p < .01)$ ~~and~~, ambivalent $r = (.27, p < .01)$). ~~Participants who rated high on the subtypes scored higher~~

~~on the FSS overall than participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of security reported less current adult fearfulness attachment ($r = (-.34, p < .01)$).~~

~~When the correlations were recomputed as partial correlations controlling for trait anxiety and gender, there were no significant correlations for insecure attachment styles. However, the coefficient between rough measure of security of attachment was significantly correlated with current fears ($r = -.24, p < .01$).~~

~~When the partial correlations were rerun with state anxiety and gender controlled, participants who rated higher on insecure attachment style to mother in childhood also reported more current overall fears (hostile $r = .16, p < .05$, ambivalent $r = .19, p < .05$). Participants who rated higher on overall security on the rough measure of attachment also reported fewer current fears ($r = -.27, p < .001$). Participants reporting the secure/dependent attachment style also reported less fear on the FSS overall, however, the coefficient was not significant ($r = .02, ns$).~~

~~*SubscaleFactor 1 -Threats to the self_*: Participants reporting avoidant ($r = .18, p < .05$), hostile ($r = .29, p < .01$) and ambivalent ($r = .28, p < .01$) rating higher on insecure attachment styles also reported scored higher fears on *SubscaleFactor 1 -Threats to the self* (avoidant $r = .18, p < .05$, hostile, $r = .29, p < .01$, ambivalent $r = .28, p < .01$). ~~Phan~~ participants who rated higher on reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment also reported fewer current fears ($r = (-.34, p < .01)$). Participants reporting the secure/dependent attachment style also reported less fear on the FSS overall, however, the coefficient was not significant ($r = .03, ns$).~~

Table 11

Correlations of FSS overall fear score and subscales 1-3 (Threats to self, Small animals, High places) with attachment style to mother in childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough
Overall	.18*	-.02	.30**	.27**	-.34**
Subscale 1	.18*	-.03	.29**	.28**	-.34**
Threats to the self					
Subscale 2	.04	.08	.09	.08	-.06
Small animals					
Subscale 3	.13	-.03	.20*	.14	-.26**
High places					

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

When the correlations were recomputed controlling for trait anxiety and gender, the coefficients between insecurity of attachment style and current fears were low and insignificant. However, participants who rated higher on overall security on the rough measure of attachment also reported fewer fears of threats to self ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

When the partial correlations were rerun with state anxiety and gender controlled, participants who rated higher on insecure attachment style to mother in childhood also reported more fears that entailed threats to self (hostile $r = .16, p < .05$, ambivalent $r = .19, p < .05$). Participants who rated higher on overall security on the rough measure of attachment also reported fewer of these types of fears ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

~~SubscaleFactor 2 -Small animals.~~ There were no significant correlations found between attachment style in childhood to mother and current fearfulness on ~~subscalefactor 2 -Small animals.~~ This result held even after controlling for –anxiety (trait or state) and gender.

~~SubscaleFactor 3 -High places-~~ Participants rating higher onreporting hostile attachment style also reported more fears of high places ~~-($r = (.20, p < .05)$).~~ scored higher on factor 3 –High places then P participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment- reported fewer such fears of high places ($r = (.26, p < .01$).

These results held after controlling for ~~Participants reporting the secure/dependent attachment style also reported less fear on the FSS overall, however, the coefficient was not significant ($r = -.03, ns$).~~ anxiety (trait or state) and gender.

Overall, the following relationships were found: participants reporting insecure attachment styles scored higher on the FSS overall and factors than participants reporting

~~secure/dependent attachment style and overall security on the rough measure of attachment, who scored lower on the FSS overall score and factors.~~

In summary, the hypothesis was partially supported. Participants reporting ~~insecure attachment styles in childhood reported more fearfulness than participants reporting~~ secure attachment styles to mother also reported fewer current fears. In terms of insecure attachment, trait anxiety had an effect in altering the correlations on overall current fears. However, participants who rated high on hostile and ambivalent attachment styles to mother reported more current fears even after controlling for state anxiety and gender. ~~An unexpected finding was that participants reporting avoidant attachment styles also reported more overall fearfulness than participants reporting secure attachment styles.~~

Table 11

Correlations of FSS overall fear score and factors 1-3 (Threats to self, Small animals, High places) with attachment style to mother in childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough
Overall	.18*	.02	.30**	.27**	.34**
Factor 1 Threats to the self	.18*	.03	.29**	.28**	.34**
Factor 2 Small animals	.04	.08	.09	.08	.06
Factor 3 High places	.13	.03	.20*	.14	.26**

* significant at the .05 level

** significant at the .01 level

Reported Childhood Attachment to Father

As recommended by Sperling (personal communication), Pearson's Bivariate correlations were run (Table 12). On Overall fears, Pparticipants reporting insecure attachment in childhood to father of also reported higher overall current fears (avoidant $r = (.28, p < .01)$ hostile $r = (.27, p < .01)$ and ambivalent $r = (.28, p < .01)$ (Table 12). subtypes scored higher on the FSS overall than Pparticipants reporting reporting the secure/dependent attachment and overall security on the rough measure of attachment reported fewer current fears ($r = (.2934, p < .01)$ and participants reporting the secure/dependent attachment style, $r = (.34, p < .01, respectively$ 29, ns). When controlling for trait anxiety and gender (Table 12a), insecure attachment to fathers and current fears were no longer significant with the exception of the rough security of attachment measure. Participants who rated themselves high on security of attachment to fathers also reported fewer current fears ($r = -.20, p < .05$). The results held after controlling for state anxiety (Table 12b).

SubscaleFactor 1 -Threats to the self: Pparticipants reporting insecure attachment styles to others also reported more fears on subscaleFactor 1 -Threats to the self than participants reporting secure/ dependent attachment (avoidant $r = .29, p < .01$, hostile $r = .28, p < .01$, ambivalent $r = .28, p < .01$). Participants, who rated higher on than secure/dependent and the rough measure of security of attachment to fathers also reported fewer fears to self ($r = -.21, p < .01, r =$ and participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment $= (.34, p < .01, respectively)$).

When controlling for trait anxiety and gender, significance was approached for ambivalent group ($r = .16, p < .054$). Participants who rated themselves high on security of

attachment to fathers also reported fewer current fears to self ($r = -.20, p < .05$). The same results were found after controlling for state anxiety.

~~Subscale Factor 2 -Small animals~~ Participants reporting overall security on the rough measure of attachment scored low on ~~subscale factor 2 -Small animals~~ ($r = (-.18, p < .05)$). ~~Participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style also scored low on factor 3 -High places, but was not significant ($r = -.03, ns$).~~ When controlling for trait anxiety and gender, the coefficients between attachment to father and

Table 12

Correlations Between Overall FSS and Subscales 1-3 with Attachment Style to Father in Childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Overall	.28**	-.20*	.27**	.28**	-.34**
Subscale 1					
Threats to self	.29**	-.21**	.28**	.28**	-.34**
Subscale 2					
Small animals	.08	-.03	.11	.04	-.18*
Subscale 3					
High places	.04	.00	.04	.09	-.12

*=significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

Table 12a

Correlations^a Between Overall FSS and Subscales 1-3 with Attachment Style to Father in Childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Overall.08	-.10	.09	.07	.07	-.20*
Subscale 1					
Threats to self .09	-.11		.10	.16*	-.20*
Subscale 2					
Small animals .02	.02		.03	-.03	-.10
Subscale 3					
High places .05	.05		-.04	.02	-.04

*=significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

^a Covarying out Trait Anxiety and Gender

Table 12b

Correlations^a Between Overall FSS and Subscales 1-3 with Attachment Style to Father in Childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Overall	.15	-.15	.17*	.20*	-.25**
Subscale 1					
Threats to self	.16	-.16	.18*	.21*	-.25**
Subscale 2					
Small animals	.00	.00	.05	-.01	-.12
Subscale 3					
High places	-.04	.04	.05	-.01	-.05

*=significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

^aCovarying State Anxiety and Gender as Covariates

fear of small animals were low and insignificant. The same results were found after controlling for state anxiety and gender.

Subscale 3-High Places. There were no significant correlations between attachment style in childhood to father and current fearfulness on ~~subscalefactor~~ 3 -High places.

Overall, the following relationships were found: participants reporting insecure attachment styles scored higher on the FSS overall and ~~subscalefactors~~ than participants reporting secure/dependent attachment style and overall security on the rough measure of attachment, who scored lower on the FSS overall score and ~~subscalefactors~~. When state and trait anxiety were controlled for, the results changed somewhat, except for the finding that ratings of security on the rough measure of attachment were highly correlated with fearfulness.

Table-12

Correlations Between Overall FSS and Factors 1-3 with Attachment Style to Father in Childhood (avoidant, secure/dependent, hostile and ambivalent and the rough measure of security of attachment)

	Avoidant	Secure/dependent	Hostile	Ambivalent	Rough measure
Overall	.28**	.20*	.27**	.28**	.34**
Factor 1					
Threats to self	.29**	.21**	.28**	.28**	.34**
Factor 2					
Small animals	-.08	-.03	.11	.04	.18*
Factor 3					
High places	.04	.00	.04	.09	.12

*=significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

In summary, the hypothesis was partially supported. Participants reporting insecure attachment styles in childhood also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting secure attachment styles. An unexpected finding was that participants reporting avoidant attachment styles also reported more overall fearfulness.

Summary of the Finding for Hypotheses Testing (Table 13)

Childhood fearfulness

PBI. Mothers: Participants who reported their mothers as high in protection also reported more overall fearfulness than participants who reported their mothers as low in protection, in particular fear of failure and criticism, the unknown and danger and death.

~~Anxiety W was found to be a significant covariate and when it trait/state anxiety and gender were was accounted for, the pattern of results remained similar, but with only fear of failure and criticism as the fear reported.~~

PBI. Fathers: Participants who reported their fathers as low in care also reported more fearfulness than participants who reported their fathers as high in care, in particular, fear of failure and criticism and medical fears. When trait anxiety and gender were was accounted for, the pattern of results remained similar, although no one fear was

attributed. When state anxiety and gender were accounted for, the pattern of results remained the same as without the covariates.

RQ. Participants who reported preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness of failure and criticism, minor injury and small animals and danger and death than participants reporting dismissing attachment styles. When trait anxiety and gender were was accounted for, the results were no longer significant. When state anxiety and gender were accounted for, the results were the same as without the covariates.

ASI. [Mothers](#): Participants reporting insecure attachment styles (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) to mother in childhood also reported more overall fearfulness on the FSSC than participants reporting secure attachment styles (secure/dependent).

Participants who

reported hostile attachment styles also reported fear of failure and criticism, danger and death and other fears. Participants reporting ambivalent attachment styles also reported fear of minor injury and small animals and medical fears. [When trait/state anxiety and gender were controlled for, the results remained almost exactly the same.](#)

ASI. [Fathers](#): Participants reporting avoidant and hostile attachment to father in childhood also reported more overall fearfulness on the FSSC than participants reporting secure attachment styles (secure/dependent). Participants reporting all three types of insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) also reported fear of failure and criticism. Participants reporting all three attachment styles (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) also reported medical fears. Participants reporting avoidant and hostile attachment styles also reported other fears. [When trait/state anxiety and gender were controlled for, some of the results were no longer significant.](#)

Adulthood fearfulness

PBI. [Mothers](#): Participants who reported their mothers as having been high on protection also reported more fearfulness than participants who reported their mothers as having been low on protection, in particular threats to the self. When [trait/state anxiety and gender werewas](#) accounted for, the pattern of results remained similar, but this time the fear reported was high places.

PBI. [Fathers:](#) Participants who reported their fathers as having been low on care also reported more fearfulness than participants who reported their fathers as being high on care, in particular, fear of threats to the self. When [trait/state](#) anxiety was accounted for, the results did not remain significant.

RQ. There was no significant main effect for attachment style, with and without accounting for the effects of [state](#) anxiety [and gender](#). [However, when trait anxiety was accounted for, there was a marginally significant effect.](#) [Participants reporting preoccupied attachment style also reported greater fearfulness than participants reporting dismissing attachment style.](#)

ASI. [Mothers:](#) Participants who reported insecure attachment styles to mother in childhood (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) also reported more overall fearfulness than participants who reported secure attachment styles (dependent/secure). Participants reporting all three attachment styles (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) also reported more fearfulness of threats to the self than participants reporting secure attachment styles. Participants reporting hostile attachment styles also reported more fear of high places than participants reporting secure attachment styles. [When trait/state anxiety and gender were accounted for, results remained similar.](#)

ASI. [Fathers:](#) Participants reporting hostile and ambivalent attachment styles to father in childhood also reported more overall fearfulness on the FSSC. Participants reporting all three insecure attachment styles (avoidant, hostile and ambivalent) also reported more fear of threats to the self than participants reporting secure attachment styles (dependent/secure). [When trait/state anxiety and gender were accounted for, results remained similar.](#)

Table 13

Summary of the Results: Hypotheses, Without Covariates, With Trait Anxiety and Gender and with State Anxiety and Gender

Without Covariates	With T-Anxiety & Gender	With S-Anxiety & Gender
Hypotheses 1 and 1A: Childhood Fears and PBI (Views of Mother and Father)		
<p>Mothers: High fears, high maternal protection. <i>Types</i> Failure & criticism The Unknown Danger and death.</p>	<p>Mothers: Same. <u><i>Types</i></u> Failure & criticism (approaches significance).</p>	<p>Mothers: Same. <i>Types</i> Failure & criticism (approaches significance).</p>
<p>Fathers: High fears, low paternal care <i>Types</i> Failure & criticism Medical fears.</p>	<p>Fathers: Same <i>Types</i> No specific types.</p>	<p>Fathers: Same <i>Types</i> Failure & criticism.</p>

Without Covariates

Hypotheses 2 and 2A:

Greater fears in preoccupied attachment than secure & dismissing attachment.

Types

Failure & criticism,
Minor injury
Small animals
Danger & death.

With T-Anxiety and Gender

Childhood Fears and Adult Attachment

No mean difference in childhood fears among attachment styles.

With S-Anxiety and Gender

(RQ)

Greater fears in preoccupied attachment than dismissing attachment.

Types

Minor injury & small animals
Danger & death.

Without Covariates

Hypotheses 3 and 3A:

Mothers:

Overall: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent).
Lower fears reported by those rating

With T-anxiety and Gender

Childhood Fears and Attachment Style

Mothers:

Overall: Same for high in avoidant only
Same for security of attachment.

With S-anxiety and Gender

(ASI)

Mothers:

Overall: Same as without covariates.

higher security of attachment.

Failure & criticism:

Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the hostile subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

The Unknown: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Failure & criticism: Greater fears

reported by those rating higher insecure attachment

(avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

The Unknown: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Failure & criticism: Same as with trait anxiety.

The Unknown: Same as with trait anxiety.

Minor injury and small animals: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the ambivalent subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Danger & death: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the hostile subtype. Lower

Minor injury and small animals: Same.

Danger & death: Same.

Minor injury and small animals: Same.

Danger & death: Same.

fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Medical fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the ambivalent subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Other fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the hostile subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Without Covariates

Fathers:

Overall: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the hostile and avoidant subtypes. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

With T-Anxiety and Gender

Fathers:

Overall: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Medical fears: Same.

Other fears: Same.

With S-Anxiety and Gender

Fathers:

Overall: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Failure & criticism: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

The Unknown: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Minor injury & small animals: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Danger & death: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Medical fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher

Failure & criticism: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

The Unknown: Same.

Minor injury & small animals: Same.

Danger & death: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Medical fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the avoidant subtype.

Failure & criticism:

Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the avoidant subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

The Unknown: Same.

Minor injury & small animals: Same.

Danger & death: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Medical fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the avoidant subtype.

security of attachment.

Other fears: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Other fears: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Other fears: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Hypotheses 4 and 4A:

**Adulthood Fears and Views of Mother (PBI)
and Father**

Without Covariates

Mothers:

High fears, high maternal protection.

Types

Threats to the self.

Fathers:

High fears, low paternal care.

Types

Threats to the self.

With T-Anxiety & Gender

Mothers:

High fears, high maternal protection
(approaches significance).

Types

Threats to the self.

Fathers:

No mean difference in adulthood fears
among attachment styles.

With S-Anxiety & Gender

Mothers:

Same as with trait anxiety.

Fathers:

Same as with trait anxiety.

Without Covariates

Hypothesis 5 and 5A:

No mean difference in adulthood fears among attachment styles.

With T-Anxiety and Gender

Adulthood Fears and Adult Attachment

Greater fears in preoccupied attachment than secure & dismissing attachment.

Types

Threats to the self (marginally significant).

With S-Anxiety and Gender

(RQ)

No mean difference in adulthood fears among attachment styles.

Without Covariates

Hypothesis 6 and 6A:

Mothers:

Overall: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent).

Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Threats to the self: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Small animals: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

High places: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the hostile subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Without Covariates

With T-Anxiety and Gender

Childhood Fears and Attachment

Mothers:

Overall: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Threats to the self: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Small animals: Same.

High places: Same.

With T-anxiety and Gender

With S-Anxiety and Gender

(ASI)

Mothers:

Overall: Same as without covariates.

Threats to the self: Same as without covariates.

Small animals: Same.

High places: Same.

With S-anxiety and Gender

Fathers:

Overall: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Threats to the self: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment (avoidant, hostile, ambivalent). Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Small animals: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

High places: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

Fathers:

Overall: Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment.

Threats to the self: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the ambivalent subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment (marginally significant).

Small animals: No correlations of childhood fears with attachment styles.

High places: Same.

Fathers:

Overall: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the ambivalent subtype. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment (marginally significant).

Threats to the self: Greater fears reported by those rating higher insecure attachment of the ambivalent and hostile subtypes. Lower fears reported by those rating higher security of attachment (marginally significant).

Small animals: Same as with Trait anxiety.

High places: Same.

Exploratory Analyses

In addition to the hypotheses, there are a number of exploratory analyses that were conducted. This section is organized into four main areas. The first area examines childhood and adulthood fears with the RSQ (a longer measure of the RQ). A second area examines the additional fear questions that the FSS and FSSC did not address with the parent measures. The third area investigates participants' descriptions of parents and relationships with parents to detect idealization or devaluation that may have affected reports of attachment to parents (ASI) or views of parents (PBI). Finally, other exploratory analyses were conducted to further investigate interesting issues that arose in the initial analysis stage, namely the relationship between anxiety and security of attachment.

The RSQ: Childhood and Adulthood Fearfulness

Griffen and Bartholomew (1994) intend that the RSQ be treated as a continuous rather than categorical variables. Therefore the data were analyzed using multiple regressions. Participants rate themselves on a 7-point Likert scale on each of the four attachment styles, namely, secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing. These variables were regressed on the FSSC and its six subscales (failure and criticism, the unknown, minor injury and small animals, danger and death, medical fears and other fears). Trait anxiety and gender were entered into the first step to control for their effects. Then, the four styles of attachment on RSQ were entered on the next step. The FSSC was the dependent variable. The regression was then rerun with the FSS as the dependent variable. The analyses were re-run for each of the subscales of the FSSC and the FSS.

The main finding of the series of regressions with the FSSC was that participants reporting high preoccupied attachment styles also reported fear on overall fear, subscale 1 -Failure and criticism, subscale 3 -Minor injury and small animals and subscale 5 - Medical fears (Appendix 1). The main findings of the FSS were that participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles also had overall fearfulness and fearfulness on [subscalefactor](#) 1- Threats to the self.

Additional Fear Questions (Childhood Fears)

Additional questions that were not included in the FSSC and the FSS were asked about childhood and adulthood fears. Childhood fear questions were divided into 3 [subscalefactors](#): fantasy based fears, sensitivity to criticism, and night time fears. Although there was no formal hypothesis, the analyses tested if participants who reported low parental care and protection on the PBI and insecure attachment styles in childhood and currently on the ASI and RQ also report more fearfulness on the Additional Fear Questions for Children (AFQC). All MANOVAs were run first without covariates and then with the covariates of trait anxiety and gender because anxiety and gender were significant in all previous analyses.

PBI- Mothers. A 2x2 MANOVA was run with PBI (high, low) as the independent variable and the AFQC and its three [subscalefactors](#) as the dependent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for care Hotelling's Trace $F(3,146) = 2.91, p < .05$ and protection Hotelling's Trace $F(3,146) = 4.80, p < .01$. An ANOVA revealed significance for care to be on [subscalefactor](#) 2- Sensitivity to criticism $F(1,148) = 3.97, p < .05$ ($M: (M: 19.61$ vs. $21.91)$). It also revealed significance for protection to be on AFQC overall fear $F(1,148) = 12.80, p < .001$ ($M: (M: 17.39$ vs. $14.55)$), which was

attributed to subscalefactor 1 -fantasy based fears $F(1,148) = 5.40, p < .05$ ($M:(M: 17.80$ vs. 15.25) subscalefactor 2 -Sensitivity to criticism $F(1,148) = 12.22, p < .001$ ($M:(M: 22.88$ vs. 18.74), and subscalefactor 3 -night time fears $F(1,148) = 4.56, p < .05$ ($M:(M: 11.52$ vs. 9.66). Participants reporting low maternal care also reported more fearfulness on subscalefactor 2 -Sensitivity to criticism than participants reporting high maternal care. Participants reporting high maternal protection also reported more overall fearfulness and more fearfulness of fantasy based fears, sensitivity to criticism and night time fears than participants reporting low maternal protection.

~~It was thought that trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound the results. Therefore,~~ the MANCOVA was rerun with trait anxiety and gender ~~these variables~~ as covariates. The results yielded no significant overall main effect for maternal care Hotelling's Trace $F(3,143) = 1.69, ns$ or for the interaction between care and protection Hotelling's Trace $F(3,143) = 1.28, ns$. The results yielded a significant overall main effect for maternal protection Hotelling's Trace $F(3,143) = 3.65, p < .05$. An ANCOVA revealed significance on subscalefactor 2 -Sensitivity to criticism $F(1,145) = 9.59, p < .01$. Participants reporting high maternal protection also reported more fearfulness of criticism ($M:(M: 22.22$ vs. 18.91). When trait anxiety and gender were accounted for, the results for care or for subscalefactor 1 -fantasy based fears and subscalefactor 3 -night time fears on protection were no longer significant.

PBI-Fathers. A 2x2 MANOVA was run with the AFQC and its three subscalefactors as the dependent variable and PBI (high, low) as the independent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for paternal care Hotelling's Trace $F(3,140) = 4.50, p < .01$ but no overall main effect for paternal protection Hotelling's Trace F

(3,140)=.43, ns, or for the interaction between care and protection Hotelling's Trace F (3,140)=.16, ns. An ANOVA revealed significance on [subscalefactor 2](#) $F(1,145)=10.63$, $p<.001$ ($M:(M: 19.30$ vs. $22.91)$). Participants reporting low paternal care also reported more fearfulness on [subscalefactor 2](#) -Sensitivity to criticism.

~~It was thought that trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound the results. Therefore, T~~the analyses were rerun with [trait anxiety and gender](#) ~~these variables~~ as covariates. The results yielded no main effect for paternal care Hotelling's Trace F (3,140)=1.68, ns or for paternal protection Hotelling's Trace F (3,140)= .06, ns, or for the interaction between care and protection Hotelling's Trace F (3,140)= .15, ns. Therefore, when gender and anxiety are accounted for, the results were no longer significant.

Current Attachment Style

A one way MANOVA was run with current attachment (secure, fearful, preoccupied, avoidant) as the independent variable and the AFQC and its three [subscalefactors](#) as the dependent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for attachment style $F(3,147)=1.89$, $p<.05$. An ANOVA revealed significance on total fear $F(3,149)=2.98$, $p<.05$ which was attributed to subscale 1 - fantasy based fears $F(3,149)=2.60$, $p=.058$ ($M:(M: 18.38$ vs. $13.86)$) and subscale 2-Sensitivity to criticism $F(3,149)= 3.65$, $p<.05$. Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that on [subscalefactor 1](#) -fantasy based fears, participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles also reported more fearfulness than participants reporting dismissing attachment styles. Tukey post hoc analysis also revealed that on [subscalefactor 2](#) -Sensitivity to criticism, participants reporting fearful attachment and participants reporting preoccupied attachment also

reported more fearfulness than participants reporting dismissing attachment styles

(~~M:~~M: 22.37 vs. 18.00 and 22.88 vs. 18.00).

~~The~~It was thought that ~~trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound~~
~~the results. Therefore, the~~ analyses were rerun with trait anxiety and gender ~~these~~
~~variables~~ as covariates. The results yielded no significant overall main effect for
attachment style Hotelling's Trace $F(3,144) = 1.49$, ns. When the effects of trait anxiety
and gender were accounted for, the results are no longer significant.

Reported Childhood Attachment to Mother

~~Pearson~~pearson's Bivariate correlations were run with reported childhood
attachment style to mother (avoidant, dependent/secure, hostile, ambivalent) and the
AFQC. No significant results were found and therefore analyses were not rerun with
covariates.

Reported Childhood Attachment to Father

~~Pearson~~pearson's Bivariate correlations were run with reported childhood
attachment style to father (avoidant, dependent/secure, hostile, ambivalent) and the
AFQC. No significant results were found and therefore analyses were not rerun with
covariates.

Additional Fear Questions (adulthood fears). Extra questions were asked about
adulthood fears. Adulthood fear questions were ~~subscale~~factor analyzed, but since the
~~subscale~~factors were not clinically meaningful, the mean of total fear was used. Although
not a formal hypothesis, it was thought that participants who reported low parental care
and protection on the PBI and insecure attachment styles in childhood and currently also
report more fearfulness on the Additional Fear Questions for adulthood (AFQA). All

MANOVAs were run first without covariates and then with the covariates of trait anxiety and gender since they were significant in all previous analyses.

PBI-Mothers. A 2x2 MANOVA was run with PBI (high, low) as the independent variable and the AFQA as the dependent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 146) = 4.31, p < .05$ ($M: (M: 1.91$ vs. $1.69)$) but no overall main effect for care, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 146) = .01, ns$ or for the interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 146) = .60, ns$. Participants reporting high maternal protection also reported more fearfulness on additional fear questions than participants reporting low maternal protection.

~~It was thought that trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound the results. Therefore, t~~The analyses were rerun with trait anxiety and gender these variables as covariates. The results yielded no overall main effect for maternal care, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 144) = 1.24, ns$, for maternal protection Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 144) = .92, ns$, or the interaction between maternal care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 144) = .36, ns$. When trait anxiety and gender were accounted for, the results did not remain significant.

PBI-Fathers. A 2x2 MANOVA was run with PBI (high, low) as the independent variable and the AFQA as the dependent variable.

The results yielded an overall main effect approaching significance for paternal care, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 143) = 3.50, p = .06$ ($M: (M: 1.73$ vs. $1.92)$). There was no main effect for paternal protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 143) = 3.00, ns$ or the interaction between care and protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(1, 143) = .37, ns$. Participants who reported low care also reported more fearfulness on the additional fear questions.

~~It was thought that trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound the results. Therefore, †~~The analyses were rerun with trait anxiety and gender ~~these variables~~ as covariates. The results did not yield an overall main effect for care, protection or the interaction of care and protection.

Current Attachment Style

A one way MANOVA was run with current attachment (secure, fearful, preoccupied, avoidant) as the independent variable and the AFQA as the dependent variable. The results yielded no overall main effect for attachment style $F(3, 147)=1.92$, ns. ~~It was thought that trait anxiety and gender may be covariates and confound the results. Therefore, †~~The analyses were rerun with trait anxiety and gender ~~these variables~~ as covariates. The results yielded an overall main effect for attachment style Hotelling's Trace $F(3, 145)=2.63$, $p<.05$ (~~M:~~(M: 1.67 vs. 1.91). Participants reporting avoidant attachment style also reported less fearfulness on additional fear questions than participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles.

Reported Childhood Attachment to Mother

Pearson~~Pearson's~~ Bivariate correlations were run with reported childhood attachment style to mother (avoidant, dependent/secure, hostile, ambivalent) and the AFQA. No significant results were found and therefore analyses were not rerun with covariates.

Reported Childhood Attachment to Father

Pearson~~Pearson's~~ Bivariate correlations were run with reported childhood attachment style to father (avoidant, dependent/secure, hostile, ambivalent) and the AFQA. Adulthood fearfulness was significantly correlated with reported childhood

attachment style to father, $r=.22$, $p<.01$. It is not possible to determine which type of fearfulness was most highly correlated with attachment style. In order to maintain consistency, analyses were not rerun with covariates.

Correlations Between Participants' Anxiety And Reported Parental Anxiety

In order to understand fearfulness, anxiety needs to be understood. Although not hypothesized, reported parental anxiety may be related to participants' anxiety. An exploratory analysis was run between participants' state and trait anxiety and reported parental (trait) anxiety. ~~Pearson~~^{Pearson's} Bivariate Correlation was conducted and the following correlations were found: Between state anxiety and reported maternal anxiety, $r=.27$, $p<.01$, between state anxiety and paternal anxiety, $r=.32$, $p<.01$, between trait anxiety and maternal anxiety, $r=.31$, $p<.01$, between trait anxiety and paternal anxiety $r=.40$, $p<.01$. State and trait anxiety are highly correlated, $r=.79$, $p<.01$. State anxiety consists of 64% trait anxiety, 8% maternal anxiety and 9% paternal anxiety. ~~This finding of a moderate correlation makes clinical sense as it reflects the intergenerational transmission of anxiety. Also, being anxious can color many areas in life and therefore participants reporting anxiety would also report parents as having anxiety. Only some of the participants describe their parents as anxious and therefore not all the data are colored by anxiety.~~

Adjectives of Parents

Although there was no hypothesis, participants' descriptions of parents (mother and father) relationships with parents were collected. Adjectives were coded as positive, negative or neutral. However, the data were not normally distributed and there were

uneven amounts of adjectives in each classification. Therefore, the data will be reported here descriptively (Table 14).

Gender with PBIM Protection and PBIF

To follow up on the significant results of fears and the PBI, the effects of gender were explored.

The MANOVAs were run with gender and maternal protection as the independent variables and the FSSC and FSS and their [subscalefactors](#) as the dependent variables.

A one way MANCOVA was run with gender and maternal protection (high, low) as the independent variable and FSSC and its six [subscalefactors](#) as dependent variables, with the covariate of anxiety. The results yielded no significant main effect for the interaction between gender and maternal protection, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,141)=1.04$, ns.

It was thought that gender and views of maternal protection may interact and influence adulthood fearfulness. A one way MANCOVA was run with gender and paternal care with maternal protection (high, low) as the independent variable and FSS and its three [subscalefactors](#) as dependent variables, with the covariate of anxiety. The results

Table-13

Background Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	Percent (n)
-----------------	-------------

Adjectives of Mother

Positive 72.6% (111)

Neutral 18.4% (25)

Negative 6.5% (10)

Relationship with Mother

Positive 73.2% (112)

Neutral 10.5% (16)

Negative 9.2% (14)

Adjectives of Father

Positive 58.9% (90)

Neutral 20.9% (32)

Negative 10.5% (16)

Relationship with Father

Positive 53.6% (82)

Neutral 17.0% (26)

Negative 15.7% (24)

yielded no significant main effect for the interaction between gender and maternal protection care, Hotelling's Trace $F(4,143) = 1.81$, ns.

Table 14

Adjectives Describing Parents

Characteristics	Percent (n)
Adjectives of Mother	
Positive	72.6% (111)
Neutral	18.4% (25)
Negative	6.5% (10)
Relationship with Mother	
Positive	73.2% (112)
Neutral	10.5% (16)
Negative	9.2% (14)
Adjectives of Father	
Positive	58.9% (90)
Neutral	20.9% (32)
Negative	10.5% (16)
Relationship with Father	
Positive	53.6% (82)
Neutral	17.0% (26)
Negative	15.7% (24)

MANOVAs were run with gender and paternal care as the independent variables and the FSSC and FSS and their subscales as the dependent variables.

It was thought that gender and views of paternal care may interact and influence childhood fearfulness. A one way MANOVA was run with gender and paternal care (high, low) as the independent variable and FSSC and its six subscales as dependent variables, with the covariate of anxiety. The results yielded no significant main effect for the interaction between gender and paternal care, Hotelling's Trace $F(6,138) = .31$, ns.

It was thought that gender and views of paternal care may interact and influence adulthood fearfulness. A one way MANOVA was run with gender and paternal care (high, low) as the independent variable and FSS and its three subscales as dependent variables, with the covariate of anxiety. The results yielded no significant main effect for the interaction between gender and paternal care, Hotelling's Trace $F(4, 140) = .50$, ns.

Gender and Anxiety

It was thought that gender may influence which specific types of childhood fears are reported. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with gender as the independent variable and the FSSC and its six subscales as the dependent variables. The results yielded an overall main effect for gender, Hotelling's Trace $F(6, 146) = 3.55$, $p < .01$ (Table 15). An ANOVA revealed differences on overall fear $F(1,151) = 5.68$, $p < .05$ ($M: 189.70$ vs. 167.34) which were attributed to subscale 2 The Unknown $F(1,151) = 9.98$, $p < .01$ ($M: 40.56$ vs. 32.88), subscale 3 Minor Injury & small animals $F(1,151) = 9.96$, $p < .01$ ($M: 38.11$ vs. 30.66) and subscale 4 Danger and death $F(1,151) = 8.64$, $p < .01$ ($M: 30.65$ vs. 24.32). Females reported more fearfulness than males on all subscales mentioned above.

Table 15

Gender and Specific Childhood Fears

Gender:	Female	Male
Overall Fearfulness	189.70*	167.34*
Failure & criticism	60.16	60.32
The Unknown	40.56**	32.88**
Minor injury & small animals	38.11**	30.66**
Danger & death	30.65**	24.32**
Medical fears	10.92	10.60
Other fears	9.31	8.60

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

It was thought that gender may influence which specific types of adulthood fears are reported. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with gender as the independent variable and the FSS and its three subscales as the dependent variables. The results yielded an overall main effect for gender, Hotelling's Trace $F(3, 148) = 2.74, p < .05$ (Table 16). An ANOVA revealed differences on overall fear $F(1, 150) = 6.02, p < .05$ ($M: 52.14$ vs. 43.77) which were attributed to subscale 1-Threats to the self $F(1, 150) = 5.48, p < .05$ ($M: 145.63$ vs. 122.88) and subscale 2- Small animals $F(1, 150) = 5.36, p < .05$ ($M: 6.09$ vs. 4.64). Females reported more fearfulness on the above mentioned scales than males.

Gender and Anxiety

It was thought that gender may influence reported anxiety. Therefore, a two way MANOVA was run with gender as the independent variable and state and trait anxiety as the dependent variables. There was no significant main effect found, Hotelling's Trace $F(2, 149) = .08, ns$. Gender does not influence degree of reported anxiety.

The Effect of Therapy

It was thought that therapy may affect amount of fearfulness that participants report in childhood. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with therapy as the independent variable and the FSSC and its six subscales as the dependent variables. The results yielded no overall main effect for therapy, Hotelling's Trace $F(6, 143) = 1.95, ns$. Therapy does not effect fearfulness in childhood.

It was thought that therapy may affect amount of fearfulness that participants report in adulthood. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with therapy as the

independent variable and the FSS and its three [subscale factors](#) as the dependent variable.

The

Table 16

Gender and Specific Adulthood Fears

Gender:	Female	Male
Overall Fearfulness	52.14*	43.77*
Subscale 1		
-Threats to the self	145.63*	122.88*
Subscale 2		
-Small animals	6.09*	4.64*
Subscale 3		
-High places	4.70	3.80

*significant at the .05 level

results yielded no overall main effect for therapy, Hotelling's Trace $F(4,145) = 1.90$, ns. Therapy does not effect fearfulness in adulthood.

Anxiety

It was thought that trait anxiety may be related to attachment style. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with current attachment style as the independent variable and trait anxiety as the dependent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for trait anxiety, Hotelling's Trace $F(3,148) = 10.62$, $p < .001$.

Tukey post hoc analysis attributed the differences in attachment style to participants reporting secure attachment style, fearful attachment styles and preoccupied attachment styles. Participants reporting secure attachment style reported less trait anxiety than participants reporting fearful and preoccupied attachment styles.

It was thought that state anxiety may be related to attachment style. Therefore, a one way MANOVA was run with current attachment style as the independent variable and state anxiety as the dependent variable. The results yielded an overall main effect for therapy, Hotelling's Trace $F(3,148) = 6.54$, $p < .001$.

Tukey post hoc analysis attributed the differences in attachment style to participants reporting secure attachment style and participants reporting fearful attachment styles and participants reporting secure attachment styles and participants reporting preoccupied attachment styles. Participants reporting secure attachment style reported less state anxiety than participants reporting fearful and preoccupied attachment styles.