Adolescent Attachment, Identity, and Adjustment to College: Implications for the Continuity of Adaptation Hypothesis

DANIEL K. LAPSLEY, KENNETH G. RICE, and DAVID P. FITZGERALD

We examined the concurrent relationship between late adolescent attachment to parents and peers and two broad indices of adolescent adaptation—personal and social identity and adjustment to college. Participants included 130 college freshmen and 123 upperclassmen. Although freshmen were disadvantaged relative to upperclassmen with respect to social and personal-emotional adjustment, there were no group differences on the attachment measures, on the measures of academic adjustment and goal commitment, and on the measure of social identity. Freshmen scored higher on personal identity than did upperclassmen. Women reported less alienation from peers, had more trust and better communication with peers, and had higher scores on personal and social identity than men. The attachment variables were significant predictors of personal and social identity. Pervasive relations were also found between attachment and adjustment to college, particularly for the upperclassmen sample.

There is considerable consensus that many important developmental tasks of adolescence find their resolution within the context of family relationships. Indeed, it is now argued that any complete account of the adolescent process must consider the organization and operation of the family, for it is the family that facilitates the adolescent's completion of developmental tasks (Constantine, 1987; Sabatelli & Mazor, 1985). It is well known, for example, that adolescent identity formation is sensitive to variations in parenting style (Adams & Jones, 1983; Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr, 1979; Quintana & Lapsley, 1987), and in communication patterns within the family (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985). Separation-individuation and psychological emancipation from the family (Benjamin, 1979; Constantine, 1987), as well as adolescent coping style (Shulman, Seiffge-Krenke, & Samet, 1987), have also been decidedly linked to aspects of family functioning.

In recent years there has been an attempt to establish adolescent attachment to parents as another important variable that facilitates adolescent development and adjustment (see, for example, Kenny, 1987). Adolescent attachment is theoretically understood in the life span continuity of adaptation framework proposed by proponents of the organizational perspective of human development (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). According to the organizational perspective, individual differences in the quality of attachment should be related to different patterns of behavioral organization. Secure attachment, according to this view, should facilitate the mastery of both concurrent developmental tasks and also successful adaptations in later developmental periods (Waters & Sroufe, 1983). There is now a burgeoning literature that attests to the continuity of adaptation between attachment and a variety of social and intellectual competencies in infancy and early childhood (Sroufe & Waters, 1977).

Although many agree that early attachment relationships remain important throughout the life span (Lerner & Ryff, 1978) and that attachments can occur beyond the mother-child dyad, research on adolescent attachment has been slower to develop. This was no doubt due to the fact that, until recently, there has not been a suitable assessment available for measuring adolescent attachment. Research in this area has been greatly facilitated by the construction of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment by Greenberg and his colleagues (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Greenberg, Siegel, & Leitch, 1983). This measure assesses felt security (perceived quality of affect toward parents and peers) and proximity-seeking (degree to which adolescents use or seek out parents and peers under varying conditions of stress), two dimensions of attachment relationships that are derived from the ethological-organizational perspective (Bowlby, 1958; Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Early research using this instrument has shown that positive attachment relationships (particularly to parents) convey a number of advantages for adolescent development (Armsden, 1986; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Greenberg et al., 1983). Attachment to parents, for example, accounts for a considerable amount of variation in self-esteem, life satisfaction, and affective status measures. It is positively correlated with several indices of healthy family climate and negatively correlated with family conflict and control. Adolescents with strong attachment relationships with parents present a better profile of adjustment than do insecurely attached adolescents.

However, not all of the available evidence is supportive of the continuity of adaptation between attachment and adolescent adjustment. In a 1987 study, Quintana and Lapsley were unable to find a significant association between adolescent attachment and ego identity development. This finding is noteworthy, given the fact that ego identity development is widely regarded as the principal developmental task of adolescence (Erikson, 1959). Indeed, individual differences in identity development have been shown to be related to patterns of personological (Marcia, 1980) and relational (Orlofsky, Marcia, & Lesser, 1973) adjustment in adolescence. Hence, demonstrating an empirical relationship between attachment and identity would have been a richly informative confirmation of the continuity of adaptation hypothesis. However, the Quintana and Lapsley (1987) finding suggests instead that attachment to parents is of little benefit

for negotiating the most important adaptational challenge that adolescents face—the development of identity commitments. This finding has the additional consequence of limiting the generality of the continuity of adaptation framework. The purpose of this study, then, was to explore further the relationship between attachment and identity in late adolescence. In addition, we wanted to determine if attachment contributed to another area of adolescent adaptation, namely, adjustment to college.

College adjustment is an important variable to study in this context because, for many adolescents, leaving home for college is a major life transition, one that could be expected to tax adaptational resources. According to Kenny (1987), the securely attached adolescent would view leaving home for college as an opportunity to exercise environmental mastery and control. In her view, there are broad parallels between the "strange situation" in which infants are assessed for attachment (see Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978) and the naturally occurring strange situation in which adolescents find themselves upon first attendance at college. In her study Kenny (1987) found that positive attachment relations were significantly associated with social competence (e.g., assertive behavior and dating) in the college environment.

In this study we assessed adolescent attachment with the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment developed by Armsden and Greenberg (1987). In addition, we employed measures of adaptive functioning that are novel to this literature. In contrast to Quintana and Lapsley (1987), we used the measures of personal and social identity developed by Cheek and Briggs (1982) in order to determine if the continuity of adaptation between attachment and identity could be detected with an alternative measure (and conceptualization) of identity. We also charted adaptation along a broader front by employing the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) developed by Baker and Siryk (1984). This measure provided information on the academic, social, and personal-emotional adjustment of students and also on their goal commitment. Given the theoretical premises of the continuity of adaptation framework, we hypothesized that attachment to parents (and, to a lesser extent, peers) would account for a significant amount of variation in both personal and social identity and in the various college adjustment measures. Although we were primarily interested in these hypothesized relationships in a college freshman sample, we also included a comparison group of upperclassmen to determine if there were developmental differences in the attachment-adjustment relations. This information was not yet available in the literature.

METHODS

Participants

A total of 130 (78 male, 52 female) freshmen who were enrolled in a first semester introductory psychology course volunteered to participate in the study. A total of 123 (70 male, 53 female) juniors and seniors enrolled in a child development course also volunteered to participate. Students were predominantly Caucasian. Participation in this study was contingent upon informed consent by subjects. All of the subjects attended a private, Catholic university in the midwest. Students generally come from upper-middle class backgrounds. Admission is selective. The median SAT scores generally average between 1240–1270. The student attrition rate from the freshman to senior year has ranged between 6%–8%. Although participants were recruited from psychology courses, they nonetheless represented diverse educational backgrounds. The freshman group consisted of 33 liberal arts majors, 6 preprofessional, 38 business, 8 engineering, 23 physical science, and 22 undecided. The upperclassmen group consisted of 52 liberal arts majors, 12 preprofessional, 36 business, 4 engineering, and 19 physical science. The mean age of the freshman group was 18.5 years ($SD = 2.3$), while the mean age of the upperclassmen sample was 20.3 ($SD = 1.9$). Participants received extra credit points for their participation.

Instruments and Procedure

Attachment. Attachment was assessed with the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). One scale (28 items) measures attachment to parents, while another scale (25 items) measures attachment to peers. Each scale assesses feelings of mutual trust, understanding and respect, the accessibility, responsivity, and predictability of parents or peers, and experiences of isolation, anxiety, or detachment from them. Participants are required to indicate whether each statement is *almost always true, often true, seldom true, sometimes true,* or *almost never true.* The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment enjoys good psychometric properties (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Quintana & Lapsley, 1987). A factor analysis suggested that three factors are tapped by this measure: *trust, communication,* and *alienation.* Armsden and Greenberg (1987) reported reliability estimates for the three parent attachment subscales. Cronbach's coefficient alphas were .91 for the Trust subscale, .91 for the Communication subscale, and .86 for the Alienation subscale. Comparable reliability estimates were reported for the peer attachment subscales.

Identity. The Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ) developed by Cheek and Briggs (1982) was used to assess personal and social identity. Personal identity concerns one's private conception of self and feelings of continuity and uniqueness. Social identity concerns one's roles and relationships. This dual nature of identity is congruent with Erikson's (1959) view that mature identity formation requires the balancing of personal needs with the opportunities and requirements of the social world (Cheek & Briggs, 1982). Participants are asked to respond to nine statements concerning personal identity and eight statements concerning social identity. The various statements are responded to in a 5-step Likert format ranging from *not very important to my sense of who I am* to *extremely important to my sense of who I am.* Factor analysis has shown that the scales are distinct factors. The scales appear to be reliable (coefficient alphas = .70), and validity has been established with differential correlations with public and private self-consciousness (Cheek & Briggs, 1982).

College adjustment. Adjustment to college was assessed by the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) developed by Baker and Siryk (1984). The SACQ is a 67-item self-report measure that assesses four features of college adjustment, namely, academic, social, and personal-emotional adjustment, and goal commitment-institutional attachment. The Academic Adjustment subscale consists of 24 items that refer to the educational demands of the college experience. The Social Adjustment subscale contains 20 items that assess how well adolescents deal with interpersonal experiences (meeting people, making friends, joining groups). The Personal-Emotional Adjustment subscale consists of 15 items that refer to whether the student is experiencing general psychological distress or the somatic consequences of distress. The Goal

Commitment subscale consists of 15 items that relate to the student's sense of commitment to a college education and to the school that they are attending.

Each item of the SACQ is a statement that asks participants to indicate how well they are managing various experiences and affects. Participants respond to the statements in a 9-step Likert format (*applies very closely to me–doesn't apply to me at all*). High scores on the subscales represent better adjustment. Published reliabilities (coefficient alphas) of the subscales are uniformly high, in the range of .82 to .92 (Baker & Siryk, 1986). Criterion-related validity was established by demonstrating theoretically consistent relationships between the subscales and several variables (e.g., attrition, appeals for psychological services, grade point average, and social activities checklist) that are differentially relevant to the subscales (Baker & Siryk, 1986).

Freshmen and upperclassmen were administered these questionnaires in group settings in the 6th week of the fall semester. The testing was done in accordance with standard instructions. The questionnaires were randomly ordered (for each subject) to control sequencing effects. The total time of administration was approximately 45 minutes.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Attachment, Identity, and Adjustment to College, by Group

	Freshmen		Upperclassmen	
Variables	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
Attachment: Parents				
Trust	22.4	5.0	23.3	5.3
Communication	21.3	6.2	22.5	6.3
Alienation	27.6	4.1	27.6	3.8
Attachment: Peers				
Trust	17.3	4.7	17.3	4.6
Communication	17.9	5.2	17.3	4.9
Alienation	27.0	3.6	27.7	3.5
Identity				
Personal	37.8	3.9	36.1	4.3
Social	27.3	4.6	26.3	4.9
Adjustment to College				
Academic	141.3	21.1	141.8	22.5
Social	123.7	22.6	137.0	22.2
Personal-emotional	87.3	14.9	91.2	16.0
Goal commitment	109.1	15.9	111.2	15.0

RESULTS

Reliabilities

The first set of analyses calculated instrument reliabilities (coefficient alpha) for each of the measures. The reliabilities for the parents dimension of the attachment inventory for Trust, Communication, and Alienation were $\alpha = .77$, .85, and .58. Regarding the peers dimension of attachment, for Trust, $\alpha = .84$; for Communication, $\alpha = .86$; for Alienation, $\alpha = .66$. The reliability of the Personal Identity scale was $\alpha = .71$. For the Social Identity scale, $\alpha = .79$. The reliabilities of the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire were as follows: for Academic Adjustment, $\alpha = .80$; for Social Adjustment, $\alpha = .87$; for Personal-Emotional Adjustment, $\alpha = .73$; for Goal Commitment/Attachment, $\alpha = .78$. Hence all of the measures, with the possible exception of the Alienation measure of parental attachment, demonstrated adequate reliability.

Analysis of Group Differences

A Grade (2) × Sex (2) MANOVA was calculated to determine group differences on the attachment, identity, and adjustment to college measures. Means and standard deviations for these comparisons are reported in Table 1. The Grade × Sex interaction was not significant. Significant multivariate differences (Pillai) emerged for Grade, $F(11,236) = 3.85$, $p < .001$, and for Sex, $F(11,236) = 5.51$, $p < .001$. Univariate F tests were calculated to locate the sources of significant variation. These analyses indicated that freshmen scored higher than did upperclassmen on Personal Identity, $F(1,246) = 10.21$, $p < .002$. The upperclassmen scored higher than did freshmen on Social Adjustment to college, $F(1,246) = 21.67$, $p < .001$, and also (marginally) on Personal-Emotional Adjustment, $F(1,246) = 2.92$, $p < .08$. No significant group differences were evident for the attachment measures.

Significant sex effects were evident for Trust in peers, $F(1,246) = 18.01$, $p < .001$; for Communication with peers, $F(1,246) = 37.35$, $p < .001$; for (low) Alienation from peers, $F(1,246) = 11.35$, $p < .001$; for Personal Identity, $F(1,246) = 9.49$, $p < .002$; and (marginally) for Social Identity, $F(1,246) = 3.51$, $p < .06$. The direction of effect in all cases favored women—that is, women were higher in Trust and Communication with peers, were less Alienated from peers, and had higher scores on Personal and Social Identity, than did men.

Regression Analyses

Separate regression analyses were calculated for each group (freshmen and upperclassmen) to determine how well the indices of attachment (Trust, Communication, Alienation) predicted personal and social identity and adjustment to college. The parent and peer attachment scales were entered as blocks into the regression equations. The first block consisted of the parent variables (Trust, Communication, Alienation), and the second block consisted of the peer attachment variables. The measures of Personal and Social Identity and the SACQ subscales were entered as criterion variables. The mean correlation of Trust, Communication, and Alienation *within* each parent and peer block was substantial, $M_r = .65$. In contrast, the mean correlation *between* blocks was quite modest, $M_r = .21$. Consequently, no attempt was made to interpret the betas for individual predictors, given the likely presence of multicollinearity among the variables within each block.

Identity. The regression analyses indicated that the block of parental attachment variables (Trust, Communication, Alienation) accounted for a significant amount of variation in the Personal Identity scores of both freshmen ($R^2 = .09$, $F = 3.32$, $p < .05$) and upperclassmen ($R^2 = .07$, $F = 2.86$, $p < .05$). The addition of the block of peer attachment variables to the regression significantly improved the prediction of Personal Identity for both the freshman ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, $\Delta F = 5.65$, $p < .001$) and upperclassmen ($\Delta R^2 = .10$, $\Delta F = 4.47$, $p < .005$) groups. Hence, the attachment variables appear to account for about 20% of the variance in the Personal Identity scores of freshmen and about 17% of the variance in upperclassmen.

The block of parental attachment variables also accounted for significant proportions of the variance in Social Identity scores for both freshmen ($R^2 = .08$, $F = 3.77$, $p < .05$) and upperclassmen ($R^2 = .09$, $F = 3.78$, $p < .05$). The block of peer attachment variables did not improve the prediction of Social Identity for freshmen. The peer variables, however, did improve the prediction of Social Identity for upperclassmen ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F = 3.02$, $p < .03$). Taken together, then, the attachment variables accounted for

8% of the variance in freshman Social Identity scores and 16% of the variance in the Social Identity scores of upperclassmen.

In summary, personal and social identity were significantly predicted by attachment to parents in both the freshman and upperclassmen samples. The addition of peer attachment variables significantly improved the prediction of personal identity in both groups but only improved the prediction of social identity for the upperclassmen sample.

Adjustment to college. The measures of parent and peer attachment were also entered as predictors of adjustment to college. In the freshman group the block of parent attachment variables accounted for a significant amount of the variation only in Academic Adjustment scores ($R^2 = .08$, $F = 3.66$, $p < .05$). The peer attachment variables did not improve the prediction. The blocks of parent and peer attachment variables also failed to predict Social Adjustment in freshmen. Although the block of parent attachment variables failed to predict Personal-Emotional Adjustment in freshmen, the addition of peer variables to the equation did account for significant variation in Personal-Emotional Adjustment ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F = 3.17$, $p < .05$).

A more pervasive relationship between attachment and adjustment to college is evident in the upperclassmen sample. Here the block of parent attachment variables accounted for a significant amount of variation in Academic Adjustment ($R^2 = .16$, $F = 7.21$, $p < .05$), Social Adjustment ($R^2 = .09$, $F = 3.84$, $p < .05$), Personal-Emotional Adjustment ($R^2 = .16$, $F = 7.24$, $p < .05$), and Goal Commitment ($R^2 = .09$, $F = 3.65$, $p < .05$). The addition of peer attachment variables significantly improved the prediction of Social Adjustment ($\Delta R^2 = .14$, $\Delta F = 7.16$, $p < .001$), Personal-Emotional Adjustment (marginally, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F = 2.50$, $p < .06$) and Goal Commitment ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, $\Delta F = 5.40$, $p < .001$). Hence the parent and peer attachment variables accounted for 23% of the variance in Social Adjustment scores, 21% of the variance in Personal-Emotional Adjustment scores, and 20% of the variance in Goal Commitment scores.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to further examine the implications of attachment relationships for adaptive functioning in late adolescence. According to the organizational perspective, there should be continuity of adaptation between attachment and other concurrent (and prospective) adaptational tasks. In this study we charted the relationship between adolescent attachment and identity, using measures of identity that are novel to this literature. We also charted adolescent adjustment along a broader front than has heretofore been attempted in the adolescent attachment literature. To this end, we examined the relationship between attachment and four indices of adjustment to college.

In our analysis of grade effects, we found that freshmen did not differ significantly from upperclassmen in their felt attachment to parents or to peers. Freshmen were, however, disadvantaged relative to upperclassmen with respect to social and personal-emotional adjustment to college. These findings suggest that the transition to college may entail adaptational risks, but certainly not across the board. There were no group differences, for example, in goal commitment, in academic adjustment, or in social identity. Indeed, freshmen scored higher on our measure of personal identity than did upperclassmen. One may speculate that freshmen typically enter the university with a well-developed sense of personal identity that has been forged in the prior developmental experiences of adolescence. Subsequent exposure to the regimen of college life, with the challenging of belief and value systems that one might expect upon attendance at college, may undermine the certainties on which personal identity had been built. The process may be reflected in the pattern of personal identity scores observed here.

A number of gender differences were also observed in our data. Women scored higher than did men on measures of trust and communication with peers. In addition, women reported less alienation from peers, and they also scored higher on measures of personal and social identity. These findings are supportive of a developing consensus that the feminine orientation to psychosocial development revolves around such themes as attachment, connectedness, communion, and bonding, as opposed to the more typically male themes such as autonomy, separation, and detachment (Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1988; Lueptow, 1984).

It should be mentioned, however, that the *absence* of significant gender differences in attachment to *parents* is also a noteworthy finding. There has been some suggestion in the literature that men may have more problematic relations with parents during the transition to adulthood (Moore, 1987; White, Speisman, & Costos, 1983). Our findings do not support this position, at least with respect to parental attachment. Men and women appear to report comparable levels of trust and communication with their parents from the first to the last years of college, suggesting further that felt attachment to parents is a continuous aspect of the parent-adolescent relationship.

The principal aim of this study was to chart the relationship between attachment and several indices of adolescent adaptation (personal and social identity and adjustment to college). Regarding the identity variable, our findings suggest that adolescent attachment to parents and to peers mediates personal identity in both the freshman and upperclassmen groups. The findings with respect to social identity are strikingly comparable. Once again, the parental attachment variables significantly predicted social identity in both groups. Attachment to peers also makes a contribution to social identity.

These findings are contrary to those reported by Quintana and Lapsley (1987) in their test of the continuity of adaptation hypothesis. In their study they found no association between parental attachment and identity for a sample of late adolescents. As a result, they argued that adolescent attachment may have a function that is quite different from infant attachment patterns or that is much less critical for psychological adaptation than is the case in infancy. They wrote: "The adolescent is not as vulnerable to the vagaries of the inanimate and social environment as is the infant, and is hence much less likely to require parental attachment to mediate adaptation. Indeed, the organization of these ontogenetic advantages may be more decisive for adolescent adaptation than is the quality of attachment to parents" (Quintana & Lapsley, 1987, p. 406).

This conclusion, however, must be tempered in light of the present findings. One difference between our studies lies in the measures used to assess adolescent identity. The two assessments of identity in the Quintana and Lapsley (1987) study focused on how well students resolved the conflicts of the psychosocial stages prior to adolescence, and the extent to which students have made commitments to various identity options. In our study we assessed felt continuity (personal identity) and identification with social groups (social identity). The assessments used in both studies devolve from the Eriksonian tradition. This tradition views identity as a multifaceted construct that must necessarily defy any simple operationalization (Bourne, 1978). Hence, one conclusion that can be drawn is that adolescent attachment variables contribute to some (this

study) but not all (Quintana & Lapsley, 1987) features of identity development. That is, the continuity of adaptation hypothesis seems to hold for aspects of social and personal identity but may not be applicable to the full range of identity tasks.

This study is the first one to examine attachment with respect to college adjustment. In the freshman sample, academic and personal-emotional adjustment was significantly predicted by attachment to parents and to peers. In the upperclassmen sample, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and goal commitment were strongly predicted by parent and peer attachment. Academic adjustment was also predicted by attachment to parents. These findings give encouraging support to the continuity of adaptation framework. They extend Kenny's (1987) conception of family relations as a secure base from which the adolescent may go forward to negotiate confidently the transition to college. Our findings suggest that the facilitating effects of attachment are not limited to support during the freshman transition but rather contribute to adaptation throughout the college years.

It would be tempting to draw implications for counseling practice from these results. The continuity of the adaptation framework, for example, with its emphasis on the adaptational consequences of secure attachment relationships, might serve as a diagnostic marker for understanding presenting problems in counseling centers. We think this would be premature, however, in the absence of longitudinal assessments of the attachment-adjustment relationship. In addition, the reliance on self-report paper-and-pencil assessments of these constructs guarantees that shared method variance will make an undue contribution to observed correlations. Future research should consider using a broader array of assessments to mitigate the potential biasing effects of shared method variance.

REFERENCES

Adams, G., & Jones, R. (1983). Female adolescents' identity development: Age comparisons and perceived child-rearing experience. *Developmental Psychology, 19,* 249–256.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Armsden, G. (1986). *Coping strategies and quality of parent and peer attachment in late adolescence.* Paper presented at the first biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, Madison, Wisconsin.

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16,* 427–453.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,* 179–189.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1986). Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,* 31–38.

Benjamin, L. (1979). Structural analysis of differentiation failure. *Psychiatry, 42,* 1–23.

Bourne, E. (1978). The state of research on ego identity: Part 1. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7,* 223–251.

Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 39,* 350–373.

Cheek, J. M., & Briggs, S. R. (1982). Self-consciousness and aspects of identity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 16,* 401–408.

Constantine, L. (1987). Adolescent process and family organization: A model of development as a function of family paradigm. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 2,* 349–366.

Enright, R., Lapsley, D., Drivas, A., & Fehr, L. (1979). Parental influences on the development of adolescent autonomy and identity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8,* 113–130.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. *Psychological Issues, 1,* 1–171.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M., & Leitch, C. J. (1983). The nature and importance of attachment relationships to parents and peers during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12,* 373–386.

Grotevant, H., & Cooper, C. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationships and the development of identity exploration in adolescence. *Child Development, 56,* 415–428.

Josselson, R. (1988). The embedded self: I and thou revisited. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Self, ego, and identity: Integrative approaches* (pp. 91–108). New York: Springer.

Kenny, M. E. (1987). The extent and function of parental attachment among first-year college students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16,* 17–27.

Lerner, R. M., & Ryff, C. D. (1978). Implementation of the life-span view of human development: The sample case of attachment. In P. B. Baltes (Ed.), *Lifespan development and behaviors* (pp. 1–44). New York: Academic Press.

Lueptow, L. B. (1984). *Adolescent sex roles and social change.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159–187). New York: Wiley.

Moore, D. (1987). Parent-adolescent separations: The construction of adulthood by late adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 23,* 298–307.

Orlofsky, J. L., Marcia, J., & Lesser, I. M. (1973). Ego identity status and the intimacy vs. isolation crisis of young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27,* 211–219.

Quintana, S. M., & Lapsley, D. K. (1987). Adolescent autonomy and ego identity: A structural equations approach to the continuity of adaptation. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 2,* 393–410.

Sabatelli, R. M., & Mazor, A. (1985). Differentiation, individuation, and identity formation: The integration of family system and individual developmental perspectives. *Adolescence, 20,* 619–633.

Shulman, S., Seiffge-Krenke, I., & Samet, N. (1987). Adolescent coping style as a function of perceived family climate. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 2,* 367–381.

Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational perspective. *Child Development, 48,* 1184–1199.

Waters, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Social competence as a developmental construct. *Developmental Review, 3,* 79–97.

White, K. M., Speisman, J. C., & Costos, D. (1983). Young adults and their parents: Individuation to mutuality. *New Directions for Child Development, 22,* 61–76.

Daniel K. Lapsley *is an assistant professor, and* ***Kenneth G. Rice*** *and* ***David P. FitzGerald*** *are doctoral students, all in the Department of Psychology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Daniel K. Lapsley, Dept. of Psychology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556.*